Illuminating Narrative: An Interdisciplinary Investigation of the Fifteenth-century St Cuthbert Window, York Minster

5 Volumes

Volume 1

Katharine Eve Harrison

PhD

University of York

History of Art

May 2019

Abstract

The fifteenth-century St Cuthbert Window, which is one of three vast windows in the east end of York Minster, is an internationally significant monumental narrative and the only extant Cuthbertine cycle in stained glass. Despite the rarity of its survival *in situ*, as well as the survival of both a known pictorial source and the wider monumental glazing scheme within which it was designed, few studies of the window have been undertaken. This thesis addresses the challenges posed by the window's current condition by bringing together methodological developments in both hagiographic narrative analysis and stained glass studies to undertake an interdisciplinary investigation of the St Cuthbert Window. This interdisciplinary methodology is of value to the wider study of late medieval monumental narratives. The methodology adopted prioritises examination of the window and past interventions, using this as the foundation for broader exploration of the window's hagiographic and socio-political contexts. As a result, this thesis provides an authoritative reconstruction of the original narrative, drawing upon multiple strands of evidence. The hagiographic context is established through a new reassessment of Cuthbertine narratives in the fifteenth century, which considers all of the diverse textual and pictorial cycles together for the first time. Exploration of the patterns of patronage in York Minster's choir glazing, alongside the political and personal connections of the window's donor, reveals new insights into the commissioning of the window and the wider scheme. These diverse strands of investigation are drawn together to provide, for the first time, a detailed analysis of the St Cuthbert Window's narrative and iconographic themes. This thesis therefore presents a new reading of the St Cuthbert Window, within its wider hagiographic and socio-political contexts, which demonstrates the creativity and complexity of late medieval narrative design, and the dynamic nature of pictorial hagiographic narratives.

List of Contents

VOLUME 1

VOLUME 3: CATALOGUE (PART 1)

VOLUME 4: CATALOGUE (PART 2)

VOLUME 5: ILLUSTRATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

AR 19	Archbishop's Register 19: John Kemp (1425-1452)
BIA	Borthwick Institute for Archives, York
BL	British Library
BNF	Bibliothèque Nationale de France
CPR	Calendar of Patent Rolls
CVMA	*Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi*
DCL	Durham Cathedral Library
DCYM	Dean and Chapter of York Minster
DUL	Durham University Library
Fairfax	Oxford, Bodleian, Fairfax 6 (*Life of Cuthbert*)
GPC	Green Photographic Collection
HE	*Historia Ecclesiastica*
Libellus	*Libellus de nativitate sancti Cuthberti*
MFTC	Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge
NAL	National Art Library
Rites	*Rites of Durham: Being a Description or Brief Declaration of All the Ancient Monuments, Rites, and Customs Belonging or Being within the Monastical Church of Durham before the Suppression*
Scriptores Tres	Raine, James, ed. *Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres, Gaufridus De Coldingham, Robertus De Greystanes, Et Willielmus De Chambre, Surtees Society*, vol. IX. London: Nichols & Son, 1839.
SEL	*South English Legendary*
Trinity	Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O.1.64 (*Life of Cuthbert*)
Univ. 165	Oxford, University College, MS 165 (*Life of Cuthbert*)
VAM	Victoria and Albert Museum
VM	Bede, *Vita Metrica*
VP	Bede, *Vita Prosaica*
Windows	*A discription of the histories sett foorth in the glasse windowes in the Cathedrall Church of Duresme*
YGT	York Glaziers' Trust
YMLA	York Minster Library and Archive
YT26	London, British Library, Yates Thompson 26 (*Life of Cuthbert*)

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I am grateful to my supervisors Professor Tim Ayers and Sarah Brown, for their unwavering support and astute guidance throughout the course of this research. I cannot thank them enough for the generosity, patience and enthusiasm with which they shared their wisdom. I am also incredibly grateful to my Thesis Advisory Panel member, Jeanne Nuechterlein, for her perceptive comments on my work and constructive suggestions.

I am very grateful to the Arts & Humanities Research Council, who supported this work through the White Rose College of the Arts & Humanities (grant number AH/L503848/1), and to the British Archaeological Association, whose Ochs Scholarship enabled me to focus during the final phase of writing up. Conference scholarships from both organisations, as well as from the Harlaxton Medieval Symposium, and British and International *Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi*, introduced me to the wider worlds of stained glass, and medieval literature, art and architecture. I am grateful to the numerous scholars in these fields who shared their knowledge with me. Professor Christopher Norton provided invaluable insights regarding the St William Window's iconography. I am also particularly grateful for valuable knowledge shared by Amanda Daw, Louise Hampson, Stuart Harrison, Professor Rachel Koopmans, Dr Heather Gilderdale-Scott, Philip Lankester, Dr Helen Lunnon, Dr Nicola McDonald, Professor Lisa Reilly, Dr Catherine Reynolds, Dr Lynda Rollason and Dr Philippa Turner.

I am thankful to so many people who have provided practical support. Firstly, to Nick Teed, of York Glaziers Trust, whose incredible photography has enabled much of the detailed analysis which underpins this thesis. Secondly, to the librarians and archivists at the Bodleian Library, the British Library, Durham University and Cathedral libraries, Lincoln's Inn Library, the Wren Library, and of course, York Minster Library, who were all extremely helpful. Thirdly, but equally, to all of the custodians of cathedrals and churches in Britain, France and Switzerland, who provided warm welcomes and valuable knowledge. I am also particularly thankful to my excellent proof-readers Amanda Daw, Zoe Harrigan and Roger Willcox.

Finally, I am very grateful to my family, for both practical and emotional support. To my mum, and my grandparents, for their unwavering encouragement and enthusiasm. To my siblings, for keeping me grounded and cheerful. To the Willcoxes, for their tireless moral

support, excellent photography and proofreading. Above all, I thank my partner, Mark Willcox, for his patience, technical support, and enduring optimism.

Author's 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.

Introduction

The St Cuthbert Window (Figure 1.1) is an internationally significant artwork, both as a monumental narrative in its own right, and as a major work of pictorial Cuthbertine hagiography. The window is one of three monumental narratives that form an "immense glazed triptych for the high altar" of York Minster (Figure 1.2 and Figure 1.3).[1] Not only does the window survive *in situ*, amongst a substantial proportion of the fifteenth-century scheme to which it belongs, but one of its known pictorial sources is also extant. The window's donor, Thomas Langley (Bishop of Durham 1406-37), is depicted alongside Lancastrian kings and prelates in a commemorative display which is of unprecedented scale within York Minster. Consequently, the St Cuthbert Window presents a rare opportunity to investigate the iconography and design of a monumental narrative window both in relation to a known source, and its wider hagiographical and socio-political context. However, the window's location, vast size and deteriorated condition have made it difficult to access, examine and interpret. This partially explains its previous neglect and misinterpretation by scholars, as well as the necessity of an innovative methodology. This interdisciplinary study will undertake an investigation of the St Cuthbert Window, its hagiographical and social-political contexts, in order to reconstruct its original narrative, and analyse the window's design and significance as a monumental narrative. The significant new contributions to knowledge discussed in this thesis will demonstrate the value of applying this approach to the study of monumental narratives more widely.

I.1 Past Scholarship and New Opportunities

The clear need for this study, and its methodology, is indicated by the limited interest expressed in late medieval narrative windows by scholars of hagiography. Since the late twentieth century, scholars have increasingly highlighted how pictorial hagiographic cycles were designed in response to their temporal and social contexts, and the insights they can provide into contemporary cults and cultures.[2] However, this body of research has focused

[1] Christopher Norton, "Richard Scrope and York Minster," in *Richard Scrope: Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr*, ed. Peter Jeremy Piers Goldberg (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2007), 148.

[2] Barbara Fay Abou-El-Haj, *The Medieval Cult of Saints: Formations and Transformations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 33-34; Magdalena Elizabeth Carrasco, "The Construction of

predominantly upon the high medieval period, and has largely been preoccupied with manuscript illustrations. Even Cynthia Hahn, whose innovative investigation into pictorial narrative construction could be applied to multiple media, provided limited engagement with monumental narrative cycles in stained glass or other media.[3] This presents a significant gap within the scholarship, as the failure to recognise, and engage with, the implications which different media have for hagiographic narrative design has caused significant aspects of pictorial traditions to remain unstudied, or misinterpreted, as examination of the past scholarship for the St Cuthbert Window will show. Consequently, while these studies of pictorial hagiography are crucial for developing methodological approaches to the analysis of narrative windows, it is also evident that the interdisciplinary investigation, which is proposed by this study into a monumental scheme, can contribute to developments in hagiographic scholarship.

A similar focus upon high medieval cycles has been evident in stained glass scholarship on monumental narrative. In the late twentieth century, Madeline H. Caviness, Wolfgang Kemp and Colette Manhès-Deremble inspired a generation of scholars with their pioneering studies of the construction of such schemes.[4] Although not limited to hagiographic narratives, their reassessments of the relationships between stained-glass narratives and cycles in other media recognised the complexity, and creativity of high medieval window design, highlighting the individuality of each narrative cycle and the importance of examining social and devotional contexts.[5] While subsequent studies of high medieval narrative

---

Sanctity: Pictorial Hagiography and Monastic Reform in the First Illustrated Life of St Cuthbert," *Studies in Iconography* 21 (2000): 47-89; Cynthia Hahn, *Portrayed on the Heart: Narrative Effect in Pictorial Lives of Saints from the Tenth through the Thirteenth Century* (London: University of California Press, 2001), 45-46.

[3] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 29-58, 319, 326-331.

[4] Madeline Harrison Caviness, "Images of Divine Order and the Third Mode of Seeing," *Gesta* 22, no. 2 (1983): 99-120; Madeline Harrison 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, *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, vol. 89* (Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1992), 103-147; Wolfgang Kemp, *The Narratives of Gothic Stained Glass* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Colette Manhès-Deremble and Jean-Paul Deremble, *Les Vitraux Narratifs de la Cathédrale de Chartres: Étude Iconographique*, Corpus Vitrearum, France, Etudes, 2 (Paris: Léopard d'or, 1993).

[5] Caviness, "Biblical Stories," 109, 122, 126, 135, 141-142, 145-146; Manhès-Deremble and Deremble, *Vitraux Narratifs*, 75-113, 261; Kemp, *Narratives*, 91-101, 219-222.

windows have employed comparable methodologies,[6] few analogous investigations of late medieval narrative windows have been undertaken. This apparent lack of interest is compounded by the significant loss of cycles from this period, particularly from monastic institutions,[7] as well as the damaged and dislocated state of many which do survive.[8] As a result, researchers must engage with the impacts of past interventions when analysing the original narrative construction. The lack of the diverse skill-set required to undertake such research has hampered many attempts to reconstruct stained-glass cycles.[9] Moreover, the knowledge, time and resources which are required to undertake studies of monumental schemes have undoubtedly affected the scope and course of research. These issues are present in stained glass scholarship more widely, and have long been recognised by the *Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi* (CVMA), which was founded in the mid-twentieth century. In addition

---

[6] Michael W. Cothren, "The Infancy of Christ Window from the Abbey of St.-Denis: A Reconsideration of Its Design and Iconography," *The Art Bulletin* 68, no. 3 (1986): 158-164; Jane Welch Williams, *Bread, Wine & Money: The Windows of the Trades at Chartres Cathedral* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993); Claudine Lautier, "Les Vitraux de la Cathédrale de Chartres. Reliques et Images," *Bulletin Monumental* (2003): 3-97; Evelyn Staudinger Lane, Elizabeth Carson Pastan, and Ellen M. Shortell, eds., *The Four Modes of Seeing: Approaches to Medieval Imagery in Honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009); Chloe Morgan, "A Life of St Katherine of Alexandria in the Chapter-House of York Minster," *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 162, no. 1 (2009): 169-170.

[7] M. R. James, *On the abbey of S. Edmund at Bury: I. The library. II. The church* (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, Macmillan & Bowes, 1895), 190-193, 199; Reginald R. Darlington, ed. *The Vita Wulfstani of William of Malmesbury: to which are added the extant abridgments of this work and the miracles and translation of St. Wulfstan*, Camden Society Third Series (London: Royal Historical Society, 1928), 4-5; Robin Flower, "A Metrical Life of St Wulfstan of Worcester," *The National Library of Wales Journal* 1, no. 3 (1940): 123-129; Jeremy Haselock and David O'Connor, "The Medieval Stained Glass of Durham Cathedral," in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham Cathedral*, ed. Nicola Coldstream and Peter Draper, *British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions for the year 1977, 3* (Leeds: W.S. Maney, 1980), 105-129; Penny Hebgin-Barnes, *The Medieval Stained Glass of the County of Lincolnshire* (Oxford: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1996), 304-305, xxxix; Ute Engel, *Worcester Cathedral: An Architectural History* (Chichester: Phillimore, 2007), 200; Sarah Brown, *The Great East Window of York Minster: An English masterpiece* (London: Third Millennium Publishing, 2018), 91.

[8] J. Green Waller, "On Ancient Painted Glass in Morley Church," *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 8, no. 1 (1852): 28-34; Daniel John Chadwick, "The Ancient Glass in the East Window of the Church of St Andrew, Greystoke, Cumbria" (unpublished B.Phil dissertation, The University of York, 1974); Henrietta Reddish, "The St Helen Window, Ashton-under-Lyne: A Reconstruction," *The Journal of Stained Glass* XVIII, no. 2, (1986-87): 150-165.

[9] Ben Nilson, *A Reinterpretation of the St. William Window in York Minster* (Leeds: Imries Printeries, 1996); Clara Barnett, "The St Cuthbert Window of York Minster and the Iconography of St Cuthbert in the Late Middle Ages,"(Unpublished MA Dissertation, The University of York, 1991).

to full catalogues, which provide detailed studies,[10] the CVMA also publishes summary catalogues which document extant windows, thereby laying the groundwork for more comprehensive analysis.[11] These are of particular value for the research of monumental cycles, as they provide comprehensive photographic records along with basic iconographic and contextual details. Both of York Minster's other monumental narratives, the Great East Window (1) and the St William Window (n7), have been the subject of such publications by the late Thomas French, facilitating more recent research.[12]

To date, few narrative cycles have been the subject of CVMA full catalogues. However, David King's reconstruction and analysis of the windows of St Peter Mancroft, Norwich, demonstrates the insights which can be gained from more detailed research.[13] In particular, his analysis has identified iconographic links with other narrative cycles and the windows' wider political, social and devotional contexts.[14] The evidence-led approach advocated by the CVMA has also been employed successfully on small-scale narrative cycles. For example, Rachel Koopmans' reassessment of the sixteenth-century St Thomas Becket series from St Michael-le-Belfrey, York, drew upon Helen Bower's detailed investigation and reconstruction.[15] Koopmans has demonstrated the significant insights which can be gained from prioritising the evidence of past interventions, and using it as the foundation for wider analysis of narrative cycles within their hagiographic, spatial and social contexts.[16] Her study also shows the value of wider hagiographic research for both the identification of scenes and

---

[10] Madeline Harrison Caviness, *The Windows of Christ Church Cathedral, Canterbury* (London: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1981); Tim Ayers, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Wells Cathedral*, 2 vols. (Oxford: University Press, 2004); David King, *The Medieval Stained Glass of St. Peter Mancroft, Norwich* (Oxford: University Press, 2006); Tim Ayers, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Merton College, Oxford* (Oxford: University Press, 2013).

[11] Hebgin-Barnes, *Lincolnshire*.

[12] Thomas French, *York Minster: The St. William Window* (Oxford: University Press, 1999); Thomas French, *York Minster: The Great East Window* (Oxford: University Press, 2003).

[13] King, *Mancroft*.

[14] Ibid., lxxxiii-cxxiii, ccx-ccxiii.

[15] Rachel Koopmans, "Early Sixteenth-Century Stained Glass at St. Michael-le-Belfrey and the Commemoration of Thomas Becket in Late Medieval York," *Speculum* 89, no. 04 (2014); Helen Bower, "An Archaeological Investigation, Documentation and Reconstruction of the Becket Cycle Glass from the York Minster Chapter House and St Michael Le Belfry, York" (Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of York, 2010).

[16] Koopmans, "Becket," 1040-1100.

the analysis of iconographic themes.[17] Detailed studies upon larger cycles are rare and recent studies have employed a range of methodological approaches, which do not always consider narrative construction. For example, Heather Gilderdale-Scott's doctoral study of the medieval glazing of Great Malvern Priory, which includes several narrative windows, was based upon a thorough examination of the history of the glass, and aimed to demonstrate the value of stylistic analysis for establishing authorship, working practice and mapping relationships between cycles.[18] Consequently, her valuable analysis of the iconography as an expression of individual and institutional agendas did not incorporate detailed analysis of narrative construction.[19] Nevertheless, her findings provide clear evidence of creative narrative design, indicating the need for further study.[20]

Moreover, research conducted into the iconography of both the St William Window and the Great East Window, York Minster, during the course of rigorous conservation campaigns over the past twenty years, has reinforced the importance of iconographic analysis which draws upon evidence of past interventions, as well as investigations of wider contemporary contexts. While Christopher Norton's research into the St William Window is yet to be published, Sarah Brown's recent publications, informed by unpublished research by both Norton and Nigel Morgan, demonstrate the significant insights which have been gained during the interdisciplinary, conservation-led study of the Great East Window.[21] In particular, the revelation of the complexity of its design and multifaceted iconography both established its significance and uniqueness as an artwork, but also indicates the need for further research into monumental narrative design and construction.

Consequently, this study's interdisciplinary investigation of the St Cuthbert Window, which draws upon methodologies developed by scholars of stained glass and hagiographic narratives, and prioritises examination of the glass itself as the starting point for analysis, can

---

[17] Ibid., 1061-1065, 1080.
[18] Heather Gilderdale-Scott, "The Painted Glass of Great Malvern Priory (Worcs.) c.1430-c.1500" (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art (University of London), 2008), 19-20.
[19] Ibid., 19-20, 80-169.
[20] Ibid., 103-107.
[21] Sarah Brown, *Apocalypse: The Great East Window of York Minster* (London: Third Millennium Publishing, 2014); Brown, *East Window*.

provide original contributions to knowledge in both fields. This study will not only provide a broader and more nuanced understanding of Cuthbertine hagiography in the later medieval period, but also significant new insights into the design of monumental narrative windows more generally. By examining the window within its wider scheme and socio-political context, the findings of this study contribute to understanding of the conception and reception of such cycles, and the relationships between patrons, institutions and glaziers. The methodology adopted may also be adapted to monumental narratives in other media. The current scholarship on the cult of St Cuthbert further demonstrates the need for a new approach to the study of both monumental narrative windows and pictorial hagiographic cycles. The remainder of this introduction will provide an overview of the St Cuthbert Window's condition and the extent of current scholarship and evidential sources both for the window and the cult. Research questions and methodological issues will be identified, before the methodology and structure adopted by this thesis is outlined.

I.2 The St Cuthbert Window and the Cuthbertine Cult

The St Cuthbert Window (s7) is located in the south-east transept of York Minster, and has previously been dated to *c.*1440, based on design and stylistic evidence (Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.3).[22] It consists of five lights, and is divided by transoms into four equal sections (A-D), each comprising thirty panels, including the heads of the lights (Figure 1.4). The main lights are surmounted by tracery, which contains a further thirty panels. The lowest section (D) contains a large central figure of St Cuthbert, holding the head of St Oswald, flanked by two rows of members of the Lancastrian elite, all set within architectural canopies. The upper three sections (A-C) contain scenes from St Cuthbert's life. Successive interventions during the past five centuries have substantially disturbed the original design. Within individual panels the iconography is disrupted by numerous mending leads, the disarrangement or loss of original glass and its replacement with alien insertions; together these alterations render some panels virtually illegible. Six narrative panels and the entirety of the original tracery

[22] Sarah Brown, *'Our Magnificent Fabrick', York Minster: An Architectural History c.1220-1500* (Swindon: English Heritage, 2003), 232. See discussion in Chapter 3.1 and 3.2.1.

glass had been lost by 1775.[23] Most strikingly, the window no longer retains its original narrative structure. The current arrangement of the narrative panels, which are intended to be read from left to right, from the bottom to the top, reverses the original reading order of the narrative. This arrangement was first implemented by the York glazier John Ward Knowles in 1886-8, under the direction of Joseph Thomas Fowler, a canon of Durham; it incorporates eleven narrative panels designed by Fowler and Knowles.[24]

The window's condition and history raise the first research question posed by this study: to what extent can the original narrative be identified? The damage, loss and disarrangement of glass within the window pose significant challenges for interpretation. Consequently, a detailed investigation into the impact of past interventions, to establish the value and reliability of the evidence provided by each panel, is central to this study. The author's specialist stained-glass knowledge, as well as the documentary and antiquarian sources available, have provided the opportunity to undertake an evidence-led analysis, which follows the rigorous tradition established by the CVMA. Such an approach has been lacking in previous studies of the St Cuthbert Window, particularly the first scholarly examination, which was undertaken in 1877 by Canon Joseph Thomas Fowler.[25] Fowler's limited understanding of stained glass as a medium, as well as his failure to engage with both the visual and documentary sources available, led him to misidentify numerous panels, as well as to rearrange the narrative order erroneously.[26] This underlines the necessity of specialist knowledge of stained-glass manufacture and conservation for accurately interpreting the evidence provided by the glass and documentary sources. Additionally, Clara Barnett's masters research into the St Cuthbert Window demonstrates the importance of

---

[23] James Torre, "The Antiquities of York Minster Collected out of the Records of the Said Church and Some Other Authorities", YMLA, L1/7, c.1690-1, f.51r; Joseph Thomas Fowler, "On the St. Cuthbert Window in York Minster," *Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal* IV (1877): 363, 373-375. See Catalogue: Lost Panels.

[24] Joseph Thomas Fowler, "On the St. Cuthbert window in York Minster: Additional notes," *Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal* 11 (1891): 486-487; Frederick Harrison, *The Painted Glass of York: An Account of the Medieval Glass of the Minster and the Parish Churches* (London: S.P.C.K., 1927), 103, 110-111.

[25] Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 249-376.

[26] Ibid., 252, 276-361, 374-375; Fowler, "Additional Notes," 486-487.

examining all of the evidence available.[27] The topic is simply too broad for an MA dissertation, which prevented her from closely analysing the glass itself, or from consulting all of the documentary sources. As a result, despite the methodological strength of other aspects of her study, her reconstruction of the narrative sequence is flawed.[28]

The present study reassesses all of the known documentary and antiquarian sources, which provide evidence of past condition and interventions. Both graffiti scratched into the glass, and entries in York Minster's fabric rolls, record the dates of some interventions up to the late nineteenth century.[29] Crucially, the earliest description of the window, made by the antiquarian James Torre, provides careful, objective descriptions of the contents of each panel as they appeared to him *c.*1690.[30] Later descriptions are neither as comprehensive, nor consistent, with the exception of Fowler's in 1877 and 1891.[31] More detailed evidence is provided by rubbings made during Knowles' intervention, in 1886-8, and by a small number of twentieth-century photographs taken before the most recent intervention in 1955-7.[32] Additionally, the availability of recent high-resolution photographs of the window has allowed the condition and provenance of glass within each panel to be more accurately assessed than by examination through binoculars alone. Combined analysis of these sources, for the first time, has enabled the reliability of the visual evidence of each panel to be established.

The scholarship discussed above has demonstrated the valuable role which narrative cycles in other media can play in supporting the identification of scenes, as well as wider iconographic trends, and the expression of contemporary agendas. Past studies of the St Cuthbert Window have revealed its links with other Cuthbertine cycles, most notably British Library, Yates Thompson MS 26 (YT26), which has been clearly established as a known

---

[27] Barnett, "Cuthbert Window"
[28] Ibid., 99-151, 159.
[29] YMLA, E3/57 (1580/1).
[30] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.51r-54r.
[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: Thomas Hammond, 1730), 155-156; Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 249-376; Fowler, "Additional Notes," 486-501; Harrison, *Painted Glass*, 112-118.
[32] YMLA, GPC 2837-2999; VAM, E.725-1929 - E.799-1929; Harrison, *Painted Glass*, facing p.112.

pictorial source for the window.[33] However, their failure to recognise the individuality of each cycle has contributed to the misinterpretation of individual scenes, as well as obscuring the true relationship between Cuthbertine hagiography in different media.[34] Consequently, while the present study recognises the value of other cycles to the task of reconstructing and analysing the window, it is also evident that the Cuthbertine narratives must first be comprehensively explored, to establish the hagiographical landscape within which the window was created. The St Cuthbert Window's relationship with both its known source, YT26, and other Cuthbertine cycles can then be questioned.

The extent of current scholarship, on both the St Cuthbert Window and Cuthbertine hagiography more widely, demonstrates the necessity of undertaking an interdisciplinary investigation of both textual and pictorial Cuthbertine hagiography. St Cuthbert (c.634-687) was a prominent Anglo-Saxon saint whose cult flourished throughout the medieval period, following its establishment at Lindisfarne in the late seventh century.[35] Upon leaving Lindisfarne in 875, the monastic community carried Cuthbert and his relics with them, ultimately settling at Durham in 995.[36] By the fifteenth century, a rich hagiographic tradition existed at Durham, which remained by far the most important locus of Cuthbert's cult throughout the medieval period. The extensive medieval corpus of Cuthbertine hagiography, which exists in a range of media, can provide valuable insights into the broader hagiographic context of the St Cuthbert Window. Comparison of narrative construction within these cycles can indicate the extent to which the Cuthbertine narrative was developed or adapted to suit

---

[33] Malcolm Baker, "Medieval Illustrations of Bede's Life of St. Cuthbert," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 41 (1978): 44; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 149-152.

[34] Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 249-376; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 16-49.

[35] David Hugh Farmer, ed. *The Age of Bede*, Rev. ed. (London: Penguin, 1998), 96, 98-99; Alan Thacker, "Lindisfarne and the Origins of the Cult of St Cuthbert," in *St. Cuthbert: His Cult and His Community to AD 1200*, ed. Gerald Bonner, David Rollason, and Clare Stancliffe (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989), 103-106, 110; Bertram Colgrave, ed. *Two lives of Saint Cuthbert: A Life by an Anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's Prose Life.* (Cambridge: University Press, 1940), 358-359.

[36] Gerald Bonner, David Rollason, and Clare Stancliffe, eds., *St. Cuthbert: His Cult and his Community to AD 1200* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989), xxi; Eric Cambridge, "Why did the community of St Cuthbert Settle at Chester-le-Street?," in *St. Cuthbert: His Cult and His Community to AD 1200*, ed. Gerald Bonner, David Rollason, and Clare Stancliffe (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989), 367; Ted Johnson South, ed. *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto: A History of Saint Cuthbert and a Record of his Patrimony* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002), 2.

different temporal, architectural and devotional contexts and agendas.[37] However, there are currently significant gaps in scholarship of both the textual and pictorial hagiography. To date, research into textual Cuthbertine hagiography has focused predominantly upon the most accessible and abundant of Cuthbert's eighth-century *vitae*, Bede's *Vita Prosaica* (VP), as well as later miracle collections compiled at Durham.[38] This research is particularly valuable to the present study, as a substantial proportion of the St Cuthbert Window's narrative scenes are drawn from VP. However, there has been more limited examination of the twelfth-century miracle collection, the *Libellus de Nativitate* (*Libellus*),[39] which has been linked to several scenes in the window.[40] Likewise, while two scholars have recently considered the *Libellus'* inclusion, alongside VP, in a fifteenth-century vernacular verse compilation of Cuthbertine hagiography, their narrow foci leave many questions unanswered.[41] Consequently, this study

---

[37] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 33-34; Carrasco, "Construction," 47-89; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 45-46.

[38] Colgrave, *Two Lives*; C. Grant Loomis, "The Miracle Traditions of the Venerable Bede," *Speculum* 21, no. 4 (1946): 404-418; Bertam Colgrave, "Bede's Miracle Stories," in *Bede: His Life, Times, and Writings*, ed. Alexander Hamilton Thompson (New York: Russell & Russell, 1966), 201-229; Walter Berschin, ""Opus deliberatum ac perfectum": Why Did the Venerable Bede Write a Second Prose Life of St. Cuthbert?," in *St. Cuthbert, his Cult and his Community to A.D. 1200*, ed. Gerald Bonner, David Rollason, and Clare Stancliffe (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 1989), 95-102; David Rollason, *Symeon of Durham: Libellus de Exordio atque Procursu istius, hoc est Dunhelmensis, Ecclesie: Tract on the Origins and Progress of this the Church of Durham.*, trans. David Rollason, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford Clarendon Press, 2000); Johnson South, *Historia*; A. Joseph McMullen, "Rewriting the Ecclesiastical Landscape of Early Medieval Northumbria in the Lives of Cuthbert," *Anglo-Saxon England* 43 (2014): 57-98; Olga Gusakova, "A Saint and the Natural World: A Motif of Obedience in Three Early Anglo-Saxon Saints' Lives," *Studies in Church History* 46 (2016): 42-52; Sarah Foot, "Bede's Northern Saints," in *Saints of North-East England, 600-1500*, ed. Margaret Coombe, Anne Mouron, and Christiania Whitehead (Turnhout: Brepols, 2017), 19-40.

[39] Madeleine Hope Dodds, "The Little Book of the Birth of St Cuthbert," *Archaeologia Aeliana* 6, 4th series (1929): 52-94; P. Grosjean, "The Alleged Irish Origin of St. Cuthbert," in *The Relics of Saint Cuthbert: Studies by Various Authors*, ed. C. F. Battiscombe (Oxford: University Press, 1956), 144-154; Thomas Owen Clancy, "Magpie Hagiography in Twelfth-century Scotland: the Case of *Libellus de Nativitae Sancti Cuthberti*," in *Celtic Hagiography and Saints' Cults*, ed. Jane Cartwright (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2003), 216-217; Sally Crumplin, "Cuthbert the Cross-border Saint in the Twelfth Century," in *Saints' Cults in the Celtic World*, ed. Steve Boardman, John Reuben Davies, and Eila Williamson (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), 126.

[40] Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 274-281; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 22; Barnett, "Cuthbert Window" 106-111.

[41] Christian Liddy, *The Bishopric of Durham in the Late Middle Ages: Lordship, Community and the Cult of St Cuthbert* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2008), 193-207; Christiania Whitehead, "Regional and with Attitude: the Middle English Metrical *Life of St Cuthbert*," in *"Booldly bot meekly": Essays on the Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages in honour of Roger Ellis*, ed. Catherine Batt and René Tixier, *The Medieval Translator 14* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), 115-132.

has the opportunity to provide significant new insights into the treatment and role of the *Libellus* as a facet of Cuthbertine hagiography in the later middle ages, in addition to elucidating its relationship with the St Cuthbert Window.

Comparable opportunities to provide original contributions to knowledge are evident in previous scholarship relating to the pictorial Cuthbertine cycles. Although at least two fifteenth-century Cuthbertine narrative schemes in glass, and one upon linen, are known to have existed at Durham,[42] only six pictorial Cuthbertine narrative cycles, including the St Cuthbert Window at York, are extant. Three date to the twelfth century: two are cycles of manuscript illustrations to the *Life of St Cuthbert*, in Oxford, University College, MS 165 (Univ. 165), c.1100,[43] and London, British Library, Yates Thompson MS 26 (YT26),[44] while the third comprises two surviving scenes from a wall-painting cycle at St. Lawrence, Pittington, a Durham dependency.[45] The other three cycles, including the St Cuthbert Window, date to the fifteenth century: a cycle of illustrations in the Salisbury Breviary, Paris, BNF, Latin 17294, is closely contemporaneous with the St Cuthbert Window,[46] while a cycle painted on the backs of the choir stalls at Carlisle Cathedral dates to the late fifteenth century.[47] In common with wider hagiographic scholarship, examination of pictorial Cuthbertine cycles has primarily focused upon the twelfth-century manuscript illustrations. Until the late twentieth century, the predominant aim was to establish the relationships between the two manuscript cycles,

---

[42] Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 105-106, 111; Lynda Rollason, "Northern Saints and the Painted Glass of Durham Cathedral in the Later Middle Ages," in *Saints of North-East England, 600-1500*, ed. Margaret Coombe, Anne Mouron, and Christiania Whitehead (Turnhout: Brepols, 2017), 331; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 43.

[43] Anne Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts in Northumbria in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002), 90.

[44] Nigel J. Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts*, 2 vols., vol. I: *1190-1250* (London: Harvey Miller, 1982), 58.

[45] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 44.

[46] Paris, BNF, Latin 17294, f.434v-437v; Catherine Reynolds, "The Salisbury Breviary, Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, MS.Lat.17294, and Some Related Manuscripts." (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art (University of London) 1986), 130, 146, 148, 270, 292, 393, 406, 408.

[47] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 44; David Park and Sharon Cather, "Late Medieval Paintings at Carlisle," in *Carlisle and Cumbria. Roman and Medieval Architecture, Art and Archaeology, The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 27*, ed. Mike McCarthy and David Weston (Leeds: The British Archaeological Association and Maney Publishing, 2004), 214-215, 220.

and occasionally the other extant pictorial cycles.[48] A comparable approach is evident in Fowler's 1877 study of the St Cuthbert Window, in which he aimed to identify each panel's textual and pictorial 'source', by comparing them with the two twelfth-century manuscript cycles and the Carlisle scheme.[49] Like Bertram Colgrave's study of the Carlisle paintings,[50] and Otto Pächt's assessment of narrative construction in Univ. 165 and YT26,[51] Fowler's rigid assumptions regarding the role of YT26 as a source contributed to a significant misinterpretation of the window's iconography.[52]

Similar issues are evident in Malcolm Baker's 1978 article, which aimed to establish the relationships between the extant and lost cycles, to trace the development of Cuthbertine iconography.[53] Baker relied heavily upon Fowler, and did not undertake a comprehensive analysis of the cycles' iconography; he compared only selected scenes and his tabulated comparison of the subjects of each cycle excluded those at York and in the Salisbury Breviary which did not appear elsewhere.[54] Consequently, Baker's conclusion that all of the cycles could be linked to the Durham pictorial tradition must be reconsidered critically.[55] Judith Pearce has convincingly refuted Baker's proposal that the Cuthbertine illustrations in the French-made Salisbury Breviary can be linked to the Durham-led pictorial tradition.[56] However, further analysis of their iconography has not been undertaken. That new investigations of the pictorial cycles are warranted is demonstrated by recent reassessments of Univ. 165's illustrations, which have contributed significant insights into their design,

---

[48] Bertram Colgrave, "The St. Cuthbert Paintings on the Carlisle Cathedral Stalls," *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 73, no. 424 (1938): 17-21; Otto Pächt, *The Rise of Pictorial Narrative in Twelfth-century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 14-15, 20-21.
[49] Fowler, "Cuthbert Window."
[50] Colgrave, "Cuthbert Paintings," 17.
[51] Pächt, *Pictorial Narrative*, 14-15, 20-21.
[52] Fowler, "Cuthbert Window."
[53] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 16-49.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Ibid., 42-46.
[56] Judith M. Pearce, "Text and Image in the Salisbury Breviary (Paris, BN ms lat 17294): The Decorative Cycle and its Paris Precursors" (Unpublished PhD Thesis, 2 vols., Australian National University, 1987), 125-126; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 44.

particularly the extent to which they respond to contemporary contexts and agendas.[57] Similarly, Christiania Whitehead's recent examination of the Carlisle cycle has highlighted how the selection of narrative scenes may be linked to the agendas of the fifteenth-century community.[58] As a scholar of literature and hagiography, Whitehead has understandably focused upon textual links. Nevertheless, her analysis demonstrates the need for new reassessments of both textual and pictorial cycles, which not only recognise their individuality, but also consider how this relates to their contexts.

The use of YT26 as a source for both the St Cuthbert Window and the Carlisle paintings provides a rare opportunity to compare the way in which two narrative cycles were created for different temporal, spatial and ecclesiastical contexts.[59] While the different media of the two cycles must also be taken into account, closer analysis of the Carlisle cycle's use of YT26 as a source may help to identify the ways in which the window's designers responded to technical challenges and expressed hagiographical or political agendas. Both Barnett's MA research and another unpublished MA dissertation, by Zoe Dumelow, on the symbolism of vision scenes, have demonstrated that exploration of the hagiographical and socio-political contexts of the window can provide new insights into its narrative construction.[60] Consequently, an interdisciplinary investigation of Cuthbertine narratives can not only establish the hagiographical, art-historical and, to some extent, the socio-political contexts of the St Cuthbert Window, but can also generate a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the Cuthbertine cult in the late medieval period. The focus upon the St Cuthbert Window makes it both logical and practical to limit the scope of this exploration to narratives linked to the Bedan and Libellan traditions. Thus, the vast corpus of material

---

[57] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 39-45, 51-55, 58; Carrasco, "Construction," 47-89; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 46-47, 181-182, 184-185; Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 89-108.

[58] Christiania Whitehead, "Visual and Verbal Vernacular Translations of Bede's *Prose Life of St Cuthbert* in Fifteenth-Century Northern England: The Carlisle Panel Paintings," in *What is an Image in Medieval and Early Modern England?*, ed. Antoinina Bevan Zlatar and Olga Timofeeva, *Swiss Papers in English Language and Literature 34* (Narr Francke Attempto, 2017), 11-37.

[59] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 44; Park and Cather, "Paintings," 214-215, 220; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 151-152, n137; Brown, *Apocalypse*, 39-40.

[60] Zoe Dumelow, "Seeing with Spiritual Eyes: The Symbolism of the Visions of St. Cuthbert in Medieval Pictorial Narratives" (Unpublished MA Dissertation, The University of York, 2007); Barnett, "Cuthbert Window".

composed at Durham from the twelfth century onwards, which does not feature in the window's iconography, is not examined in this thesis.

Previous scholarship has raised a number of questions regarding the St Cuthbert Window's political significance and intended role within York Minster's fifteenth-century choir glazing.[61] Barnett characterised the commemorative section (D) as "Lancastrian propaganda", which she saw as problematic in such close proximity to the cult of Richard Scrope, who was executed for his part in a rebellion against Henry IV.[62] However, Brown and Norton have drawn attention to the temporal distance of the window from this event, as well as links between the window's donor, Thomas Langley, Bishop of Durham and former Dean of York, and individuals from the Scrope family's circle.[63] This thesis succeeds in resolving some of these conflicting interpretations by considering the relationship between the narrative and the commemorative sections of the window, which has not previously been explored.

Additional questions remain regarding the patronage and commissioning of the window. In recent years, theories have been proposed regarding the date at which the window was commissioned and executed. Sarah Brown has proposed that the window was glazed *c.*1440, acknowledging that the depiction of the figures in the commemorative section creates a broader dating range of *c.*1439-1447.[64] While Christopher Norton agrees with this glazing date, he has argued that the St Cuthbert Window was initially planned alongside the Great East Window (1405-08) and the St William Window (*c.*1414).[65] Norton suggests that the three monumental narratives were intended to "form a kind of immense glazed triptych for the high altar", which was situated at the intersection of the three windows.[66] Brown has also argued that stylistic evidence indicates that the clerestory windows of the south choir

---

[61] Barnett, "Cuthbert Window"; Brown, *York Minster*, 230-234; Christopher Norton, "Sacred Space and Sacred History: The Glazing of the Eastern Arm of York Minster," in *Glasmalerei im Kontext: Bildprogramme und Raumfunktionen: Akten des XXII. Internationalen Colloquiums des Corpus Vitrearum, Nürnberg, 29. August-1. September 2004*, ed. Rüdiger Becksmann (Nürnberg: Germanisches Nationalmuseum, 2005), 167-180; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 138-213.
[62] Barnett, "Cuthbert Window" 51-58.
[63] Norton, "Richard Scrope," 192-196; Brown, *York Minster*, 230-232.
[64] Brown, *York Minster*, 232, 283.
[65] Norton, "Sacred Space," 167-170.
[66] Norton, "Richard Scrope," 148.

transept, S6 and S7, were glazed at the same time as the St Cuthbert Window, raising questions regarding the co-operation this would require between the donors of these windows and Langley or his executors.[67] Consequently, a key research question for this study is the degree to which the St Cuthbert Window was intended as part of a wider iconographic scheme within York Minster's eastern arm. In particular, while the lack of publication of recent research into the St William Window presents a barrier to detailed comparison,[68] the present study provides the opportunity to consider its relationship with the St Cuthbert Window in new depth. While Gilderdale-Scott has demonstrated that stylistic analysis can support studies investigating relationships between stained-glass cycles,[69] the potential subjectivity of stylistic analysis and the research aims of the present study make it more appropriate to frame questions regarding the relationship of the St Cuthbert Window with the choir glazing in terms of patronage, iconography and narrative design.

I.3 Methodology and Structure

To overcome the challenges set out above, this study has devised an innovative methodology, guided by both the limitations and successes of past scholarship. This combines detailed research into the material and documentary evidence of the stained glass and its potential sources, with a broader interdisciplinary study of the contemporary architectural, art-historical, hagiographical (both literary and pictorial) and political contexts. This approach addresses the various research questions identified above, which may be summarised as:

1. Can the original narrative structure be identified?
2. What is the relationship between the St Cuthbert Window and its sources?
3. What is the significance of the narrative within contemporary hagiographical, art-historical and socio-political contexts?
4. What implications does a new reading of the St Cuthbert window have for studying large scale narrative windows and hagiographic scholarship?

---

[67] Brown, *York Minster*, 230-232.

[68] I am particularly grateful to Christopher Norton, Nick Teed and Sarah Brown for sharing insights, information and resources gathered during the conservation project.

[69] Gilderdale-Scott, "Great Malvern."

To enable this monumental window to be studied in detail, without losing sight of the overarching themes and contexts within which it must be analysed, it has been necessary to devise a structure which enabled the focus to shift between close and broad study.

The historiographical discussion above has highlighted the importance of adopting not only an interdisciplinary approach to hagiographical narrative analysis, but an evidence-led investigation of the glass itself. Consequently, Chapter 1 will discuss the extent to which the original narrative structure can be identified, based upon the material, art-historical and documentary evidence outlined above. While visual evidence constitutes a key source, it is not proposed to undertake a stylistic assessment for the present purpose. The detailed investigation into the impact of past interventions is central to Chapter 1. Consequently, the data compiled for each panel is provided in the Catalogue, which is located in volumes 4 and 5 of this thesis. The Catalogue employs a sequential panel order, in accordance with CVMA practice; lost panels and foreign panels which have been removed from the window are included at the end. Although a brief summary of the nineteenth-century tracery glass is provided, due to the focus of this thesis upon the medieval glass, the tracery has been included with the other lost glass. Throughout this thesis, extant panels are referred to by their panel number, e.g. "Catalogue: 1a". Lost panels are referred to by their proposed original location, e.g. "Catalogue: Location 7d" or "Catalogue: Tracery". Foreign panels are referred to by their current locations, e.g. "Catalogue: s4 1a". The material contained in the Catalogue supports the discussion throughout the thesis, and potentially has value for future condition assessments and conservation.

In Chapter 2, an interdisciplinary exploration of both textual and pictorial Cuthbertine hagiography will provide the most detailed and extensive investigation to date of the development and treatment of Bedan and Libellan Cuthbertine hagiography in the later middle ages. Through the reassessment of the evidence for Durham's lost Cuthbertine windows, a new analysis of the Carlisle cycle and the first detailed comparison of the Libellan manuscripts, this study will address notable gaps in the previous scholarship. These significant new insights are of wider value to hagiographical scholarship. The findings discussed within this chapter will support the reconstruction of the narrative, detailed in Chapter 1 and the Catalogue. In addition, by establishing the contemporary hagiographical

and art-historical context of the St Cuthbert Window, Chapter 2 will inform the analysis of the narrative in Chapter 4.

Chapter 3 will explore the window's socio-political context, considering questions of authorship and agency, as well as mechanisms of stained-glass patronage at York Minster. An examination of patterns of patronage within the fifteenth-century choir glazing will provide deeper insights into the complexity and intergenerational nature of patronage within large ecclesiastical building projects. It will also inform a reassessment of the commemorative section of the St Cuthbert Window, which seeks to provide a more nuanced and authoritative understanding of its distinctive iconography. The extent of the donor's role in designing the window will be reconsidered, drawing upon a broader examination of his career and circle. This will not only support a re-reading of the commemorative section as an integral part of the window as a whole, but will also identify personal, institutional and national agendas, which may be expressed elsewhere within the window, informing the analysis in Chapter 4.

Finally, Chapter 4 will draw together the research strands explored in the preceding chapters to address research questions 2 to 4. The chapter will first return to the historiography of pictorial narrative analysis, to consider the medieval approach to narrative design and outline the analytical methodology adopted by this study. This will inform the reassessment of the window's relationship with its sources, providing significant new insights into its narrative design. The second half of the chapter will combine these new insights with those gained into the St Cuthbert window's wider hagiographical and socio-political contexts, to present, for the first time, a detailed thematic reading of the window's iconography. In addition to identifying and contextualising the St Cuthbert Window's multifaceted significance, the implications of this new interpretation for the study of hagiographical cycles and particularly monumental narratives will be demonstrated.

From the outset, a key challenge has been the development of a structure which prioritised the evidence provided by the window itself, but also enabled the interdisciplinary exploration of the window's wider contexts to inform analysis of its iconography and creation. Having trialled different formats during the early stages of the research, the present structure was chosen as the most effective of the solutions available, given the methodology to be employed. However, certain structural issues require explanation. The structure adopted

necessitates a degree of duplication of the discussion within Chapters 1 and 4. It was judged that the importance of using the evidence of the window itself as the foundation of this research, in contrast with previous scholarship, and the significant findings gained from this approach, justified the examination and reconstruction of the narrative in Chapter 1. Here, the value of the combined physical and documentary evidence for the reconstruction of the narrative will be discussed. However, the historiography of pictorial narrative analysis is not addressed in Chapter 1. Instead, it is presented in Chapter 4, where the methodological insights provided by this study's assessment of the historiography can be discussed in closer proximity to the analysis which it informed. While the structure adopted within this thesis is therefore not ideal, it is considered to be the most effective solution for communicating the significant new findings provided by this innovative, interdisciplinary investigation of the St Cuthbert Window.

Chapter 1: Reconstructing the Narrative of the St Cuthbert Window

In this chapter, the physical and documentary evidence for the narrative as originally intended will be outlined and evaluated. Following this, the original structure, as far as it can be determined, will be proposed. The identification of specific panels is set out in the Catalogue (volumes 3 and 4). The reconstruction proposed by this study reveals a substantial proportion of the original narrative and wider design of the St Cuthbert Window. The significance of the narrative will be analysed in relation to other Cuthbertine narratives in Chapter 4.

The St Cuthbert Window currently contains seventy-five panels depicting narrative scenes, of which sixty-four are original. As a result of numerous past interventions, the window no longer retains its original narrative structure, which had been lost, along with five original panels, before the first description of the window by James Torre, *c.*1690-1. Consequently, no record survives of the St Cuthbert Window's original appearance. However, by combining and analysing the surviving evidence, using the methodology outlined in the Introduction, it has been possible to draw significant new conclusions regarding the original appearance of the window. In addition to the identification of past misattributions and erroneous alterations, it has been possible to identify most of the panels and their probable location within the narrative.

1.1 Evidence for Reconstructing the Original Narrative Structure

The proposed reconstruction of the original narrative structure is based upon a combined analysis of textual and pictorial analogues of the Life of St Cuthbert, the visual evidence of the panels and the surviving documentary evidence. In this section, the insights provided by the various sources will be discussed and their reliability evaluated.

1.1.1 Textual and Pictorial Analogues

A key methodological flaw in past scholarship has been the interpretation of panels as direct representations of the narrative that is presented in other textual and pictorial Cuthbertine narratives. In particular, it is apparent that Fowler's adoption of this approach led to the misidentification, damage and erroneous reordering of the narrative panels. The consequences for narrative analysis will be explored in Chapter 4. However, as the methodology used for the identification and reconstruction of the narrative has been guided

by hagiographic narrative scholarship, key principles will be highlighted here. As we have seen, recent research indicates that hagiographic narratives frequently existed in multiple pictorial and textual versions.[1] Therefore, this study acknowledges that the episodes depicted, their iconography and chronology, are not necessarily identical to those of other cycles. Nevertheless, other textual and pictorial Cuthbertine cycles can provide valuable evidence when reconstructing the St Cuthbert Window. To avoid the assumption or implication of a specific source-copy relationship, when analysing such cycles, they are identified as 'analogues'.

By comparing the iconography of the panels with a range of Cuthbertine texts, it is apparent that the St Cuthbert Window depicts scenes analogous with two textual narratives: the *Libellus de Nativitate Sancti Cuthberti (*hereafter *Libellus)*, written *c.*1190, which focuses primarily on events in Cuthbert's childhood, and Bede's *Vita Prosaica (*hereafter VP*)*, written *c.*720, which relates events from Cuthbert's childhood to his death, followed by a small number of posthumous miracles.[2] While the relationship with these texts had been recognised by previous studies, the nuanced way in which the two textual analogues are represented and integrated within the window is here revealed for the first time. The creators of the panels were not intending to precisely represent the events of Cuthbert's *Lives* as they appear in the texts. Indeed, panels 23c and 23e appear to summarise the final miracles related in VP, rather than represent specific events.[3] Similarly, there appears to have been a selective use of events from the *Libellus*, as well as innovative editorial choices, to combine the two narratives smoothly. Such differences between textual and pictorial hagiographic cycles can be shown to convey contemporary concerns and ideologies, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.

The unique character of many events in Cuthbert's life has enabled numerous scenes to be identified from a comparison with the text alone. Similarly, the visual tradition

---

[1] Kemp, *Narratives*, 221; Caviness, "Biblical Stories," 135, 141-132, 145; Morgan, "St Katherine."; Koopmans, "Becket."; Brown, *Apocalypse*.

[2] James Raine, ed. *Miscellanea Biographica: Oswinus, Rex Northumbriae; Cuthbertus, Episcopus Lindisfarnensis; Eata, Episcopus Haugustaldensis*, Surtees Society (London: Nichols, 1838), 63-87; Dodds, "The Little Book of the Birth of St Cuthbert," 52-94; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 142-307.

[3] Catalogue: 23c, 23e.

developed by the fifteenth century means that certain events, such as deaths, were depicted in ways which conform to recognisable 'types' and visual *topoi*.[4] The Introduction noted that the twelfth-century Durham manuscript *Life of Cuthbert*, British Library, Yates Thompson MS 26 (hereafter YT26), was almost certainly used as a pictorial, as well as textual, source for the window's Bedan narrative scenes. YT26 will be discussed alongside other Cuthbertine cycles in Chapter 2, and the precise nature of its relationship with the St Cuthbert Window will be analysed in Chapter 4. However, the undoubted use of the manuscript as a source for the window's design must be briefly addressed here, as the illustrations can provide evidence for the subjects of many panels.

Although panels and illustrations have been lost from both cycles, the overwhelming majority of subjects from VP which are illustrated in YT26 are also represented in the window. Indeed, in several cases, such as for VP chapters 5 and 10, the iconography is so close in both cycles that YT26 is likely to have been the primary source of the St Cuthbert Window's design (Figure 1.5 and Figure 1.6).[5] Yet, studies have increasingly demonstrated that earlier pictorial cycles, particularly in other media, were often employed selectively and creatively as sources for stained glass.[6] Consequently, although YT26 was almost certainly used as a pictorial source for the St Cuthbert Window, it may not have been the only cycle the designer referred to. Therefore, where the iconography of panels differs from illustrations in YT26, it does not necessarily indicate that they do not represent the same subject, or that a panel has been wrongly identified because the subject is not depicted in YT26. Indeed, it is clear that the manuscript was not directly copied throughout, with evidence of adaptation and invention by the glaziers, and the use of other sources. For example, there are several instances where the iconography of single-page scenes depicting multiple moments in YT26 has been expanded to fill two panels in the window.[7] The reasons for this approach, which combines such expansions in some areas of the narrative with omission and compression elsewhere,

---

[4] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 41, 177.

[5] London, BL, Yates Thompson MS 26, f.14r, 24r (hereafter cited as YT26); Catalogue: 10d, 13d.

[6] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 39-40; Jill Rickers, "Glazier and Illuminator: The Apocalypse Cycle in the East Window of York Minster and its Sources," *The Journal of Stained Glass* XIX No. 3, 1994-95 (1996): 272-273, 275.

[7] Catalogue: 17c & 20c, 15e & 16a, 14a & 14b, 17a & 17b, 14b & 19e.

will be discussed in Chapter 4. In this chapter, the focus will be on understanding the window's 'analogue' relationship with YT26, and other cycles, to support the identification and reconstruction of the narrative.

In particular, comparison of the manuscript illustrations with the stained glass can help to identify panels where the iconography is uncertain or unusual for a particular scene, in relation to the written analogues; such iconographic quirks are sometimes derived from other pictorial cycles, rather than textual interpretation.[8] Likewise, other Cuthbertine cycles, such as the earlier twelfth-century illustrated *Life of Cuthbert*, Oxford, University MS 165, the fifteenth-century illustrations in the Salisbury Breviary and the late fifteenth-century Carlisle choir screen paintings, provide valuable comparative material for establishing the variety of ways in which specific episodes were depicted.[9]

From analysis of their iconography in relation to textual and pictorial analogues, fifty-two of the extant panels can be firmly identified,[10] along with the possible subjects of a further twelve.[11] In many cases, the location of securely identified panels within the window can be established through other visual and documentary evidence. Consequently, these panels can provide evidence for the structure of the narrative as a whole. Equally, closer analysis of these panels allows common modes of depiction and narrative devices to be identified, which can support the interpretation of the remaining panels. Likewise, through comparison with documentary sources, they provide evidence of the reliability of other forms of visual and documentary evidence, as will be discussed in the next section.

1.1.2 The Window: Documentary Evidence

As noted in the Introduction, there are a number of surviving descriptions of the St Cuthbert Window, which build a picture of the historic positions of the panels and the state of the St Cuthbert Window before the twentieth century. The earliest, made by James Torre, was written *c.*1690-1, with the next most comprehensive record provided by Rev. J.T. Fowler

[8] Catalogue: 9a & 20b, 17c & 20c; YT26, f.55v, 33v.
[9] Paris, BNF, MS Latin 17294, f.434v-437v.
[10] Catalogue: 7a-d, 8b, 8d, 9a-b, 9d-e, 10a-d, 11c-d, 13a-d, 14b, 14d, 15b, 15e, 16a, 16c-e, 17a-d, 19a-e, 20b-c, 20e, 21a-b, 21d-e, 22a, 22c-d, 23a-e.
[11] Catalogue: 9c, 13e, 14a, 14e, 15d, 11b, 15a, 15c, 16b, 20a, 21c, 22b.

in 1877.[12] Less extensive descriptions were provided by Thomas Gent in 1730 and Rev. Frederick Harrison in 1927.[13] During his restoration of the panels in 1886-8, J.W. Knowles recorded the only descriptions made at close quarters,[14] as well as taking full-scale rubbings, executed by his children John Alder, Richard and Jane Elisabeth, who supplied pictorial details to varying degrees.[15] Unfortunately, only twelve known photographs, dated to *c.*1930 and *c.*1950-5, record the condition of a selection of panels before the most recent substantial alterations of 1955-7.[16] A full set of photographs from *c.*1957 records their post-restoration condition and Dean Eric Milner-White published short summaries of the alterations, particularly to the borders of the panels.[17] York Minster's fabric rolls provide limited evidence of interventions, due to their incomplete survival and variable levels of detail. The graffiti found scratched into the interior and exterior surfaces of the glass will be discussed alongside the documentary sources, as they provide evidence of the past locations of the panels.

1.1.2.1 Reliability of Sources

The level and quality of the information provided varies, particularly between the descriptions. In comparison to some of the early twentieth-century descriptions of the window, Torre's descriptions are of particular value as he describes what is visible and rarely attempts to interpret the scene. In recent years, Torre's records have proved essential to the understanding and conservation of the St William Window (n7) and the Great East Window (1).[18] They are of comparable use in identifying the location of panels within the St Cuthbert Window *c.*1690; Torre provided descriptions of sixty-seven panels.[19] From comparison with

---

[12] James Torre, "The Antiquities of York Minster Collected out of the Records of the Said Church and Some Other Authorities", YMA, L1/7, c.1690-1, ff.51r-54r; Fowler, "Cuthbert Window." Appendix 1.1 contains a diagram showing the numbering systems used by Torre and Fowler in relation to the CVMA numbering used by this study.

[13] Harrison, *Painted Glass*, 112-118; Gent, A*ntient and Modern History*, 155-156.

[14] J.W. Knowles, "St Cuthbert's Window Vol. 1", London, VAM, NAL, MSL/1929/1211, 86.BB.52, *c.*1886-8; J.W. Knowles, "St Cuthbert's and St William's Windows Vol. 2", London, VAM, NAL, MSL/1929/1212, 86.BB.53, *c.*1886-1907.

[15] Knowles, "St Cuthbert", NAL, MSL/1929/1211, 86.BB.52, inside cover.

[16] YMLA, GPC 2837, 2854, 2856, 2858, 2865, 2871, 2885, 2906, 2913, 2922, 2960, 2968.

[17] Eric Milner-White, "The Return of the Windows," in *The Friends of York Minster Twenty-Ninth Annual Report* (York: H. Morley and Sons Ltd., 1957), 11, 29-39.

[18] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 14.

[19] Torre, "Antiquities", YMA, L1/7, f.51v-54r.

the glass and Knowles' rubbings, sixty-two can be securely matched to extant panels and four to inserted panels (Appendix 1.2).

Fowler also provides a relatively objective record of the contents of the panels, enabling the arrangement as seen in 1877 to be completely reconstructed (Appendix 1.3). As a result, when employed critically, the details that they provide can be used to build evidence of the original narrative of the St Cuthbert Window, as well as establishing the reliability of the current appearance of the panels. A comparison of Torre's and Fowler's descriptions provides further evidence of the illegibility and alteration to the panels by 1877.[20] As Fowler was given access to the triforium bridge and used a telescope, his view of the window would have been better than that afforded from the ground.[21] Yet he was limited by the technology and research methods available to him. He apparently had to rely upon notes and a transcription of Torre's manuscript when making his comparisons and analysis.[22] In particular, his difficulties in matching his descriptions with Torre's suggest that he was not comparing the visual material directly with Torre's accounts.[23]

There were probably other reasons for Fowler's confusion, meaning that the level of illegibility cannot be inferred solely on the basis of errors in his description. Despite Fowler's detailed knowledge of Cuthbertine literature and iconography, his misidentification of numerous scenes can be traced in several cases to his misidentification of, or failure to recognise, key elements of the iconography. For instance, when describing panel 7c, which depicts Cuthbert miraculously lighting a fire, Fowler misidentifies the fire as red grass.[24] Similarly, when identifying panel 8b, showing Cuthbert's miraculous identification of an unborn calf, he describes the cow but does not recognise its relevance to the subject.[25] He corrects several 'visual' errors in an article written in 1891, following the restoration of the

[20] Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 311, 374-375.
[21] Ibid., 368. Torre does not state the level of access gained for his descriptions, although the detail given for the upper panels suggests that he also had access to the triforium bridge.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid., 277, 279, 282, 289-290, 301, 309-210, 313, 320-321, 324, 333-334, 338, 344, 349-350, 352, 355-356, 360-361. Fowler misattributes Torre's descriptions for eight panels and fails to identify fourteen.
[24] Ibid., 277.
[25] Ibid., 279.

window, but notes far fewer iconographic errors.[26] Consequently, his ability to read and interpret stained glass as a medium must be questioned.

Knowles' rubbings, and his descriptions, which include details and sketches indicating that they were also made with close reference to the panels themselves, provide more accurate information regarding the condition of the panels in the late nineteenth century.[27] The iconography and visual details of the additional panels, which Knowles made *c.*1886-8, demonstrate his close engagement with the original glass, revealing a particularly clear understanding of the design of the architectural surrounds.[28] The incomplete nature of details drawn upon the rubbings, particularly in the border areas, as well as the lack of rubbings for the panels occupying the heads of the lights present challenges regarding the visual evidence of the panels, which will be discussed below. Nevertheless, as they record key iconographic elements, later stopgaps and canopy details for many panels, they are an invaluable source when establishing the reliability of the visual evidence of the panels as they now appear.

In many medieval windows, including those in York Minster, such as the Great East Window, pre-twentieth-century repairs preserved the rough form of the original leadlines through re-leadings and repairs.[29] This may also have occurred in the St Cuthbert Window. For example, in panel 9c, where Torre saw a figure of a man dressed in white with yellow trousers *c.*1690,[30] an eighteenth-century repair has retained the figure of a man (Figure 1.7). Although potentially valuable, the accuracy of the details retained in this way can often be uncertain. In particular, Milner-White's alterations in the 1950s are known to have preserved the leadlines to a lesser degree than earlier interventions, in some cases altering iconography through patching and rearrangement.[31] Consequently, it has been necessary to compare these

---

[26] Fowler, "Additional Notes," 488-490.
[27] Knowles, J.W. 'St Cuthbert's Window', *c.*1886-1907, London, National Art Library, MSL/1929/1211; Knowles, J.W. 'St Cuthbert's and St William's Windows, Vol. 2', *c.*1886-1907, London, National Art Library, MSL/1929/1212; Knowles & Sons. Rubbings of the St Cuthbert Window, York Minster, *c.*1887, VAM, E.748-1929 – E.799-1929.
[28] Catalogue: 7e, 8a, 8c, 8e, 10e, 11a, 11e, 14c, 17e, 20d, 22e.
[29] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 21; Brown, *East Window*, 74, 83, 85.
[30] Torre, "Antiquities", YMA, L1/7, f. 51v.
[31] Brown, *East Window*, 71, 74, 83, 85.

details with the leadnets recorded in Knowles' rubbings, and where possible, pre-1957 photographs, and to consider the likelihood of glass fragments being moved between panels.[32]

1.1.2.2 Effects of Past Interventions

While much of the evidence provided by the documentary sources reveals the disarrangement and alteration of the panels, there are also indications of the original arrangement. The descriptions provided by James Torre in *c.*1690 and J.T. Fowler in 1877 provide evidence that the window originally contained only seventy narrative panels.[33] The level of detail they contain has enabled the location of the panels in both 1690 and 1877 to be established (Appendix 1.2 and 1.3). It is also clear from Torre's description that the original narrative had already been disrupted by 1690 (Appendix 1.2).[34] Nevertheless, the locations and descriptions of the panels given by Torre are suggestive of the original narrative structure of the St Cuthbert Window.

In particular, although the individual scenes are not arranged consecutively, the broad phases of Cuthbert's life were relatively intact within the three sections of narrative created by the transoms (Appendix 1.2). For instance, in Section A of the window (Locations 19a-23e) the panels that Torre recorded depicted scenes from Cuthbert's early life up to chapter 10 of VP. Similarly, in Section B (Locations 14e-17e) all of the scenes relate to St Cuthbert's life as a monk and hermit, whilst in Section C (Locations 7a-11e) the majority of the panels relate scenes from Cuthbert's election and life as Bishop of Lindisfarne up to the end of VP. This suggests that the original narrative was presented in relatively clear divisions within the structure of the window. It may also indicate that the earliest intervention(s) did not remove all of the panels simultaneously, or that the panels were somehow grouped by their section during removal, storage and reinstallation. This is supported by a record in the fabric roll for 1580, which lists work "on the greate lanthorne wyndowe over the Revestrie, in taking some of the glasse thereof downe and in settinge the same agayne in newe leade".[35] The wording

[32] Catalogue: 14d.
[33] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.52v; Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 371.
[34] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.51r-54r.
[35] YMLA, E3/57. I am grateful to Louise Hampson for drawing my attention to this record.

suggests that only a selection of panels was removed for re-leading, meaning that disarrangement of the panels was restricted within each section.

This study attempted to identify the way in which the panels became disordered, by comparing Torre's record with the reconstruction proposed below.[36] While the reconstruction is in part guided by Torre's record, potentially biasing this comparison, this is mitigated by the reconstruction's use of the full range of documentary and visual evidence discussed in this chapter. Thus, the comparison enabled an approximation of the degree of disorder by 1690 to be ascertained. The level of disorder varied between the three sections, with a greater degree of dislocation within sections A and B compared to C. In section C, the locations of seventeen panels correspond between Torre's description and the proposed reconstruction, suggesting that they were still in their original locations *c.*1690. Of those which do not correspond, three panels, two of which are a pair, appear in different locations within the same row, while another two appear to have been directly transposed. Additionally, Torre recorded the two inserted panels, of shared origin, in the locations proposed for missing panels by this study's reconstruction. This is highly suggestive that these panels were removed and replaced as groups in either one or two interventions. Chloe Morgan has identified a similar mechanism of dislocation in CH n4, where panels belonging to two separate lights were transposed.[37] Torre's description of sections A and B suggests that this mechanism of disarrangement had led to the loss of the original narrative structure by 1690. In both sections, the locations of only four panels correspond between Torre's description and this study's proposed reconstruction. Torre's record indicates that half of the panels in section B were located in their proposed original rows, compared to only a third of those in section A. Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that the panels remained within their original sections.

It is uncertain whether restorers working before 1690 had understood or attempted to preserve the narrative sequence. Some pairs of panels and consecutive scenes appear together, for example panels 17a and 17b in row 14, although it is possible that they had not been removed during earlier interventions (See Appendix 1.2). In some instances, iconographically

[36] Appendix 1.2 and Appendix 5.1.
[37] Morgan, "St Katherine," 156.

similar scenes appear to have been grouped together, such as row 21, where panels 9d, 11c and 9e, all showing Cuthbert's interactions with angels, were placed consecutively. This could indicate an attempt to retain, or recreate, the narrative sequence, albeit without understanding the subjects of the scenes. However, it may be coincidental, as other iconographically similar scenes, such as panels 22a and 10b, which both depict ships, had been relocated to row 23 and 19 respectively, by 1690. As they were originally paired, their separation suggests that the iconography of the panels was not understood by the time the window was restored.

Certainly, Torre's misunderstanding of the iconography of panels, where he does offer interpretations, demonstrates a lack of knowledge on his part. Given Torre's level of education and interests, which included ecclesiastical antiquities,[38] he would likely have had a greater understanding of Cuthbertine iconography than most post-reformation viewers and restorers. Although the suppression of saints' cults at the reformation did not cause immediate loss of knowledge, or devotion, by the end of the sixteenth century awareness of the Cuthbertine narrative would probably have been limited. [39] Unlike St William, St Cuthbert does not appear to have featured in the fourteenth-century tables of the vicars choral, which displayed texts relating key elements of the history of the church at York.[40] Cuthbertine manuscripts survived in the possession of Catholics, primarily gentry, as the ownership histories of YT26 and Egerton 3309 demonstrate.[41] Copies of some texts, including VP and a summary of the *Libellus*, were included in *Acta Sanctorum Martii III*, first printed in 1668.[42] In addition, elements of Cuthbert's life are included in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* (hereafter HE), which was printed

[38] Jan Broadway, "Torre, James (1649–1699)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* , (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, September 2004), https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/27561, accessed 29 January 2019.

[39] Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400-c.1580*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 431-432, 479, 591, 593.

[40] J. Purvis, "The Tables of the York Vicars Choral," *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 41 (1966): 741, 744; French, *William Window*, 16.

[41] Joseph Thomas Fowler, ed. *The Life of Saint Cuthbert in English Verse, c. A.D. 1450*, Surtees Society (Durham: Andrews, 1891), v; "Yates Thompson MS 26." *Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts* British Library, http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Yates_Thompson_MS_26, accessed 21 August 2018; Liddy, *Bishopric*, 193.

[42] Bollandists, *Acta Sanctorum Martii*, vol. III (Antwerp: Jacobum Meursium, 1668), 95-142.

in both Latin and English versions from the sixteenth century.[43] It is unlikely that the plumber-glaziers responsible for the repairs to the windows would have been familiar with the Cuthbertine narrative through these sources.

The early disruption to the narrative, at a point when the recognition of the window's iconography had dwindled, probably accounts for the continued disordering of the panels during subsequent restorations. Certainly, a comparison of the arrangement of panels *c.*1690 and in 1877 shows a greater loss of the narrative structure in the intervening years (Appendix 1.2 and 1.3). The scratched graffiti marking the locations of some panels within the window provide further evidence of this. Only one corresponds with its *c.*1690 location, while half correspond with their 1877 location. Consequently, it appears that each of the restorations caused additional disarrangement and increasing movement of panels between the three narrative sections.

In addition to the disruption of the narrative structure, interventions in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were responsible for the loss of other parts of the St Cuthbert Window. Most notably, any remaining tracery panels were replaced with plain glass, including the date of the intervention, in 1775, during a significant intervention led by glazier Thomas Sanderson.[44] It is possible that one figure, St Katherine (C7), may survive in s4 1a, a panel removed from the window *c.*1886-8.[45] However, Torre's description of the tracery glass present *c.*1690 is otherwise not detailed enough to enable a reconstruction of its iconography, beyond that it contained a series of figures of saints, some flanked by angels.[46] Barnett's suggestions for the identities of some of the saints are plausible but cannot be proven.[47] This limits the scope for analysis of the intended relationship between the iconography of the tracery and the rest of the window. The loss of the vertical borders from many panels is particularly problematic for the reconstruction of the original narrative, as evidence of the

---

[43] Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, ed. Thomas Stapleton (Antwerp: John Laet, 1565), 145-153; Bede, *Ecclesiasticae historiae gentis Anglorum*, ed. John Grave (Antwerp: Ioannes Grauius, 1550), 199-208.

[44] Catalogue: Tracery; YMLA, E3/123; Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 252.

[45] Catalogue: Tracery.

[46] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.51r; Catalogue: Tracery.

[47] Catalogue: Tracery; Barnett, "Cuthbert Window," 15-16, 100-105.

architectural frames can help to group the panels, as will be discussed below. Although the evidence does not indicate the precise intervention responsible for their initial truncation, references in the fabric rolls to the purchase of white glass "for borders" occur in the 1750s,[48] and "for margens"[49] in the 1760s and 1770s.[50] The latter include bills provided by Sanderson, although his bill for 1774-5 does not survive. Knowles' rubbings confirm that the borders had been truncated before 1886-8.[51] Their present condition is due to Milner-White's extensive alteration of the surviving border fragments in the 1950s.[52]

1.1.3 The Window: Visual Evidence of the Panels

The extant panels provide a range of visual evidence which, when combined with documentary evidence, can also enable the subjects of panels to be identified and their location within the original narrative proposed. Although the past alterations to the panels must be taken into account, close study and comparison with the earliest visual and textual records suggests that many have retained much of their original material and that insertions are mostly easily identifiable to a stained glass specialist. The visual evidence provided by the panels varies from small iconographic details, which can contribute to the identification of specific scenes within the narrative, to the use of narrative devices and modes of representation which cumulatively enable interpretation of the subject. Specific evidence is discussed in the Catalogue, but the broader trends and arguments are outlined here.

1.1.3.1 Depictions of St Cuthbert

As the central figure within the narrative, the identification of St Cuthbert within a scene is of primary importance. Cuthbert is clearly identified to the viewer throughout the window by a combination of visual conventions, such as figure types and status signifiers. Such strategies were employed to make figurative and narrative stained glass understandable to contemporary viewers, and in particular to identify key figures. For example, the Great East Window and St William Window employ consistency of appearance for St John the Evangelist

[48] YMLA, E3/123V, Myers & Jackson bill, 28 March 1757.
[49] YMLA, E3/134V, Sanderson bill, 1769
[50] YMLA, E3/135V, Sanderson bill, 1770.
[51] Knowles & Sons, VAM, E.748-1929 – E.799-1929.
[52] Milner-White, "The Windows," 29.

and St William respectively.[53] Whilst there is a degree of variation in minor details and clothing colour, the consistency of the figures makes them identifiable to the viewer. In the Great East Window, where there is arguably slightly more variation in St John's hairstyle, he is generally depicted with an elaborate nimbus (Figure 1.8); these signifiers are employed even when figures are clearly not by the same painter.

This is the approach adopted in the St Cuthbert Window, where the eponymous saint is depicted with a nimbus throughout the window, from his birth until death. Although there is a small degree of variation in the form of the nimbus, the designs are generally consistent for each of the figure types used to depict Cuthbert. Arguably, this method of identifying the saint is highly effective, and particularly useful, both because the saint's appearance changes across the course of the window and as he is often surrounded by characters of the same status, with whom he might be confused. For example, as the St William Window does not use nimbuses to identify the saint, in instances where the same head types used for the saint are used for other characters, issues of identification can arise (Figure 1.9 and Figure 1.10).[54] In contrast, the depiction of Cuthbert with a nimbus means that the use of the same head or figure types for other characters is not problematic. Indeed, when identifying panels which might depict several different scenes, the ability to immediately identify St Cuthbert enables the range of interpretations to be reduced.[55] Although alterations mean that Cuthbert's head has been lost in some panels, the lack of nimbuses on intact figures within these panels can suggest a likely candidate for the saint (Figure 1.11).[56] Due to the prevalence of paired and multi-panel scenes, in numerous instances the lack of a nimbed figure indicates instead that Cuthbert is not present, because he was depicted in a different panel within the group.[57] Yet, the lack of a nimbus may sometimes indicate iconographical or production errors rather than

[53] Janice Smith, "The Saint William Window: The Problem with Authorship," *Journal of Stained Glass* 23 (1999): 10.
[54] Ibid., 10-11.
[55] Catalogue: 9a.
[56] Catalogue: 15b.
[57] Catalogue: 9a, 20b.

Cuthbert's absence.[58] In these cases, other visual evidence can help to identify Cuthbert and the other figures present.

In narrowing down the potential subject of a panel and its location within the narrative, Cuthbert's appearance can be particularly instructive. Within the window, St Cuthbert is depicted using six different figure types: as an infant, child, youth and young man, and then as a monk and bishop. In each type, Cuthbert's appearance is distinctly different (Appendix 2.1). Within each of these modes of depiction there are minor variations, such as the precise design or colour of Cuthbert's clothing or hair. Such variations are likely due to the freedom given to the glass-painter to apply the detail of the imagery, within the elements of the overall design provided by the master.[59] However, these tend to be restricted. For example, as a monk and bishop, Cuthbert is always clean shaven. Indeed, the general forms of Cuthbert's appearance are consistent, suggesting he was deliberately depicted in different statuses as his life progressed. This consistency enables individual panels to be identified as belonging to distinct periods within St Cuthbert's life. Moreover, where other elements of a panel's iconography are uncertain, it can help to narrow down the specific subject.[60] In particular, Cuthbert's staff can enable his identification where damage to his head allows for the possibility that another monk may have been depicted.[61]

This representation of the stages in the saint's life can also be traced in manuscript cycles, including the two twelfth-century Cuthbertine cycles Univ. 165 and YT26, where St Cuthbert is shown as a young layman, as a monk and as a bishop.[62] As YT26 was a visual source for the St Cuthbert Window, the designers may have drawn inspiration from the manuscript's use of figure types. However, the use of set figure types and costume can also be seen in contemporary and near-contemporary stained glass, such as the St William

---

[58] Catalogue: 11b; in the Great East Window, John is not nimbed in panels 11h, 10g, 10h, 3a, 2j, possibly to ensure visual clarity within the composition.

[59] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 24-25; L. F. Salzman, *Building in England down to 1540: A Documentary History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 178-179; Anna Santolaria Tura, *Glazing on White-washed Tables = Vitralls sobre taules de vitraller: la taula de Girona* (Catalunya: Institut Català de Recerca en Patrimoni Cultural, 2014), 46-47.

[60] Catalogue: 9a, 22b.

[61] Catalogue: 17c.

[62] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 93, n.21.

Window, York Minster.[63] Indeed, as in the St William Window, the figure types and costume employed in the St Cuthbert Window are depicted according to contemporary fashion and convention, rather than the fashions employed in YT26. Consequently, Cuthbert's stylised appearance in the window would have been familiar and easily comprehensible to the contemporary viewer.

By grouping the panels according to Cuthbert's six 'ages' and examining the number and distribution of panels in each group, the broad narrative structure was revealed. Appendix 2.2 shows the panels grouped in this way, including panels which do not depict Cuthbert, but which formed part of the same episode.[64] It provides insights into the narrative construction, revealing that the six visual phases of Cuthbert's life were not equally represented within the window. Cuthbert's pre-monastic phases total eighteen extant panels and probably one lost panel. In comparison, twenty-nine extant panels (potentially thirty-one originally) depict scenes from Cuthbert's monastic years, and seventeen (potentially eighteen originally) from his consecration as bishop onwards. Comparison with the textual analogues reveals that this is not solely due to the underlying Cuthbertine narrative. Only eight extant episodes, one depicted across two panels, and possibly one lost scene, can be linked to episodes in the *Libellus*, which relates around twenty-three events from Cuthbert's childhood. Likewise, fifty-five extant panels can be linked to episodes in VP, which contains forty-six chapters. While a few chapters arguably relate more than one episode, it is apparent that, even accounting for the five lost panels, not all of the episodes described in VP are represented within the window. Moreover, many of the episodes, particularly in Cuthbert's monastic phases, are depicted across multiple panels. The implications this has regarding the construction of the narrative and its iconographic themes will be discussed in chapter 4.

1.1.3.2 Figure Types

The identification of other figures within the window has been particularly important, due to the depiction of figures who do not appear to serve a primary narrative function, and

[63] French, *William Window*, 25.

[64] Although Cuthbert is not shown in every panel, most can still be grouped due to the subject or iconographic details of the scene. This has been done to allow consideration of the weighting within the narrative.

cannot be linked to individuals in the textual and pictorial analogues.[65] Similar, but less extensive, 'additional' figures are evident in some scenes in the twelfth-century pictorial analogues, as previous scholarship has highlighted.[66] The proliferation of such figures within the St Cuthbert Window is consistent with fifteenth-century narratives in stained glass and other media, including the St William Window and narrative windows of St Peter Mancroft, Norwich.[67] Their potential narrative functions will be discussed in Chapter 4; however, recognition of their presence has been essential to ensure the correct identification of figures and their roles, and thus the subjects of individual panels.

As with St Cuthbert himself, the designer used a series of set figure types, whose appearance, and particularly costumes, would have indicated their status to the medieval viewer, thereby enabling their role within the narrative to be easily identified.[68] For example, the boy with whom Cuthbert is travelling in panels 13b and 13c (Figure 1.12) closely resembles Cuthbert's own appearance when a boy (Figure 1.13).[69] Discerning the status and identity of the various figures supports the interpretations of both individual panels, as well as the broader narrative. These figures require careful scrutiny, as the details which would have been easily recognisable to the medieval viewer are nuanced and not immediately apparent today. Pictorial cycles' depictions of costumes were not realistic renderings, but rather stylised and idealised, in order to evoke particular ranks and statuses.[70] Consequently, comparison with other cycles where the ranks of the subjects are known can help to identify the intended significance of specific figure types. In his study of the St William Window, Thomas French provided a typology for key figure types,[71] several of which are also evident in the St Cuthbert Window. In combination with the study of contemporary depictions in other media, primarily stained glass and manuscript illustrations, it has been possible to propose a similar typology for the figures in the window.

---

[65] Catalogue: 10d, 21d, 15c.
[66] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 25.
[67] King, *Mancroft*, lxxxvi, lxxxviii, 20, 30.
[68] Margaret Scott, *Fashion in the Middle Ages* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2011), 9-10.
[69] Catalogue: 7c, 8b, 8d, 9b.
[70] Scott, *Fashion in the Middle Ages*, 9-10.
[71] French, *William Window*, 25.

Appendix 2.3 contains definitions and examples of the figure types within the window, expanding upon the typology outlined by French for the St William Window.[72] Although it has been possible to identify distinct and consistent depictions of most of the key figure types, such as monks, bishops and noblewomen, it is unclear whether the differences between laymen indicate various ranks. Separate types and their status are suggested based on contemporary examples and their use in confirmed contexts within the window. [73] For example, the lowest status of layman has been guided by the clothing of shepherds and sailors, while Type 4 laywomen are probably noblewomen, as Cuthbert's mother and grandmother fall within this group. Likewise, the appearance of a Type 3d layman alongside a noblewoman, suggests that it also evoked nobility. However, the damage to the window, as well as the difficulty in determining artistic variations from social signifiers has prevented more nuanced interpretation.

In particular, many of the laymen have been classified as Type 2, as the general form of their *houppelandes* is consistent, despite variations in cut, colour or material. This variation does not seem to be linked to their status, as most appear as attendants to Cuthbert or the nobility. Nor does the depiction of dagged hems appear intended to evoke comments on morality, despite contemporary criticism from some moralists, or their association with foolishness in some art and literature.[74] Indeed, as there was a delay between the adoption of dagged clothing by the nobility and its subsequent popularity amongst wealthy citizens and lower ranks in the first half of the fifteenth century, the presence of dagged clothing may indicate elite, rather than noble status.[75] Yet, despite the regulation of clothing through

---

[72] Ibid.

[73] Aileen Ribeiro and Valerie Cumming, *The Visual History of Costume* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1989), 27, 58-66; Margaret Scott, *Late Gothic Europe, 1400-1500*, ed. Aileen Ribeiro, The History of Dress (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1980), 80, 82-83, 93, 106, 110-111, 137, 151, 154; Isis Sturtewagen, "Unveiling Social Fashion Patterns: A Case Study of Frilled Veils in the Low Countries (1200–1500)," in *Medieval Clothing and Textiles 7*, ed. Robin Netherton and Gale R. Owen-Crocker (Boydell and Brewer, 2011), 44, 50.

[74] Andrea Denny-Brown, "Rips and Slits: The Torn Garment and the Medieval Self," in *Clothing Culture, 1350-1650*, ed. Catherine Richardson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 224, 236-237; John Block Friedman, "The Iconography of Dagged Clothing and Its Reception by Moralist Writers," in *Medieval Clothing and Textiles 9*, ed. Robin Netherton and Gale R. Owen-Crocker (Boydell and Brewer, 2013), 122-123, 125, 127.

[75] Friedman, "Iconography," 126-127.

sumptuary laws, the passing of clothing between ranks, as either payments or gifts, also led to the blurring of class distinctions and lower ranks' adoption of trends initiated within the nobility.[76] Of particular relevance to Type 2 laymen, who mostly seem to be retainers to the nobility, or Cuthbert, was the tendency of patrons to dress their household richly to demonstrate their social prestige.[77] Indeed, the *houppelandes* with pleated, and front-slit, skirts worn by Type 2 laymen closely resemble those which Henry VI's court are shown wearing in the near-contemporary Talbot Shrewsbury Book, *c.*1445 (Figure 1.15).[78] Consequently, nuances between elite citizens and the nobility are difficult to determine based on style of dress alone. However, the consistency of their garment length appears to confirm research which indicates that shorter dress typically indicates lower rank, or youth, a distinction arising from the regulation of quantity and quality of materials based on rank.[79]

The variation evident in the range of hats worn by both Type 2 and Type 3 laymen does not seem to articulate nuances of rank, as it appears common within contemporary depictions.[80] For example, in the Bruges Garter Book, *c.*1430-40, the various hats in which the individuals are depicted do not articulate their various ranks (Figure 1.16).[81] However, in the window, subtypes 2b and 2c have been assigned based on the presence of swords or money-bags, which might be intended to differentiate status; as daggers or small swords were worn to signify knightly status, the swords could be intended to identify the wearer as an elite retainer or knight.[82] Similarly, the money-purse might indicate a treasure-clerk or wealthy layman. It is unclear whether the presence of cloaks or raised hoods indicates status or the act of travelling, affecting the interpretation of Types 3a, 3b and 4b.

---

[76] Ibid.; Joanna Crawford, "Clothing Distributions and Social Relations c.1350-1500," in *Clothing Culture, 1350-1650*, ed. Catherine Richardson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 154-156, 158-159.
[77] Crawford, "Clothing," 158-159.
[78] London, BL, Talbot Shrewsbury Book, Royal 15 E.vi, f.2v.
[79] Raymond van Uytven, "Showing off One's Rank in the Middle Ages," in *Showing Status*, ed. W. Blockmans and A. Janse, *Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe* (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 1999), 31; Crawford, "Clothing," 157.
[80] Ribeiro and Cumming, *Visual*, 66.
[81] London, BL, Bruges Garter Book, Stowe 594, ff.7v-20r; Richard Marks, Paul Williamson, and Eleanor Townsend, eds., *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547* (London: V & A Publications, 2003), 214-215.
[82] Friedman, "Iconography," 126; van Uytven, "Showing," 31.

Nevertheless, examination of the appearance of the figures has enabled the subjects of several scenes to be established with greater certainty, as well as revealing iconographic significance.[83] The use of contemporary visual signifiers locates the events of the window within the recognisable world of the medieval viewer, indicating a conscious updating of the imagery from the potential textual and visual sources.[84] Margaret Scott has observed that the use of dress of the recent past in manuscript illumination is a way of locating the narrative in the more distant past,[85] presumably while still being recognisable, and therefore comprehensible, to the contemporary viewer. Whether this is employed in the St Cuthbert Window is difficult to confirm, both due to the relatively slow changes in fashion, as well as the uncertainty regarding the date at which the design of the window was laid out. For instance, the distinctive straw hat worn by one Type 4a layman (Figure 1.17), was in fashion from the late-fourteenth to the mid-fifteenth centuries;[86] a closely comparable example can be seen in in BL, Harley MS 4431, *c.*1415 (Figure 1.18).[87] However, comparison with the clothing of the St William Window is suggestive that costume depicted in the St Cuthbert Window drew more upon contemporary fashion. In particular, the former commonly depicts noblemen in chaplets (Figure 1.19), yet these are absent from the latter. Furthermore, the distinctive chunky belt employed in the St William Window (Figure 1.20), which was fashionable in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries,[88] is absent. In contrast, in the St Cuthbert Window, both men and women wear slimmer, flatter belts, those of the noblewomen with long straps and decorated tips (Figure 1.21).

1.1.3.3 Gesture and Direction

In addition to the use of relatively standardised figure types, medieval narratives used conventions of figural form and gesture to communicate meaning and narrative progression

---

[83] Catalogue: 13e.
[84] James Bugslag, "St. Eustace and St. George: Crusading Saints in the Sculpture and Stained Glass of Chartres Cathedral," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 66, no. 4 (2003): 458.
[85] Margaret Scott, *Medieval Dress and Fashion* (London: British Library, 2009), 129.
[86] Ibid., 126.
[87] London, BL, Harley MS 4431, f. 95r.
[88] Ribeiro and Cumming, *Visual*, 54-57, 59.

to the viewer.[89] Medieval viewers recognised the role of "forms and figures" in guiding sight and enlightenment,[90] as Michael Baxandall has argued, citing the codified gestures of itinerant medieval preachers.[91] Consequently, analysis of figural gesture and orientation has been used to support not only the identification of individual panels, but also the broader reconstruction of the narrative. For instance, the dominance of left-to-right movement within the panels (Figure 1.22) indicates that the window was originally designed with a left-to-right reading order along each row, rather than right-to-left, or boustrophedon arrangement.[92]

David King has noted the importance of gesture for conveying both narrative flow and sentiment in fifteenth-century glazing at St Peter Mancroft, where expressive figural forms arguably perform the functions of facial expressions in contemporary continental painting.[93] Drawing upon Jonathan Alexander's observation of a similar style in manuscript illumination, he has suggested that the "bland" faces of the figures are due to contemporary English tastes.[94] However, they may instead indicate the glazier's recognition of the lack of visibility of finer details in monumental glazing, making gesture the primary mode of expression. This interpretation is particularly relevant to the St Cuthbert Window, whose distance from the viewer makes gesture a crucial guide of narrative action, as well as flow. However, as with costume, the modern viewer's ability to interpret gestures correctly is potentially limited. This issue has been raised in relation to gesture in both theatrical and pictorial contexts.[95] Consequently, gestural interpretation should be based upon clearly identifiable scenes,

---

[89] Kemp, *Narratives*, 27, 150, 152; Michael Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-century Italy: a Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: University Press, 1988), 63-66, 71; Michael T. Davis, "Frames of Vision: Architecture and Stained Glass at Clermont Cathedral," in *The Four Modes of Seeing: Approaches to Medieval Imagery in Honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness*, ed. Evelyn Staudinger Lane, Elizabeth Carson Pastan, and Ellen M. Shortell (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), 211; Caviness, "Images," 115-116.

[90] Caviness, "Images," 115-116.

[91] Baxandall, *Painting*, 63-66, 71.

[92] Catalogue: 10d, 10c, 9d, 13d.

[93] King, *Mancroft*, lxxxix, xci.

[94] Ibid., lxxxix, xci, cxxxviii; J. J. G. Alexander, "'William Abell 'lymnour' and 15th -Century English Illumination'," in *Kunsthistorische Forschungen Otto Pächt zu seinen 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Artur Rosenauer and Gerold Weber (Salzburg: Residenz Verlag, 1972), 170.

[95] Pamela Sheingorn, "The Bodily Embrace or Embracing the Body: Gesture and Gender in Late Medieval Culture," in *The Stage as Mirror: Civic Theatre in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. Alan E. Knight (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 1997), 55, 57, 63, 67; Baxandall, *Painting*, 61, 67, 70.

acknowledging the potential for misidentification or multiple interpretations.[96] In the St Cuthbert Window some gestures do appear to have been used to indicate a range of actions or emotions. Nevertheless, specific gestures and arrangements of figures have been used consistently to indicate actions such as preaching, predicting and astonishment. Although visual elements were repeated due to stained-glass production practices,[97] the adaptation of gestures and figural arrangements to suit the subject of each panel make it clear that gestural repetition was intentional. These findings are comparable to Alyce Jordan's discovery that visual repetition was intentionally used to narrative effect in the Ste. Chapelle narratives, rather than being solely attributable to production practice.[98] Consequently, by identifying consistent gestures, it has been possible to identify the action, and thus the subjects, of uncertain scenes;[99] gesture has been particularly important for identifying the subjects of panels where damage to the glass has led to the loss of iconographic material.[100]

1.1.3.4 Setting and Iconographic Details

As small iconographic details can prove essential to the identification of many scenes, the loss of material has obscured and confused the subject of some panels. For instance, the identification of panel 16b as belonging to a group depicting scenes from a single episode,[101] has only been possible because lost glass was recorded in Knowles' rubbing.[102] In its current state, the panel shows only St Cuthbert, accompanied by three monks making surprised and reverent gestures (Figure 1.23). However, Knowles' rubbing (Figure 1.24) clearly shows the presence of pieces of glass showing the 'dolphin meat' miraculously provided, in a composition closely comparable to YT26 (Figure 1.25).[103] Without the rubbing, the lack of the

---

[96] Baxandall, *Painting*, 61, 64.
[97] Brown, *East Window*, 39; Tura, *Tables* 46, 70.
[98] Alyce A. Jordan, "More is Better: Amplification and Design Theory in the Windows of the Ste.-Chapelle in Paris," in *Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi: XIXth International Colloquium, Kraków 1998, 14-16 May, Proceedings: Stained Glass as Monumental Painting*, ed. Lech Kalinowski, Helena Małkiewicz, and Paweł Karaszkiewicz (Kraków: Dept. for Conservation and Restoration of Works of Art, Academy of Fine Arts, 1998), 147, 149, 151.
[99] Catalogue: 15c, 13e.
[100] Catalogue: 14e.
[101] Catalogue: 17d, 15a, 16b; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 192-195.
[102] Knowles & Sons, VAM, E.766-1929; Catalogue: 16b.
[103] YT26, f. 26v.

glass which distinguishes the unique subject of the panel would preclude definitive identification. Consequently, close attention has been paid to small iconographic details in both the current glass as well as past descriptions and Knowles' rubbings.

Additionally, this example demonstrates the importance of setting in supporting the identification of panels. In common with fifteenth-century art in various media, narrative windows used setting to provide iconographic information, as well as guiding the narrative flow. This is evident in the Great East Window and St William Window, York Minster, as well as St Peter Mancroft, Norwich, which employ contemporised and stylised imagery to evoke the relevant locations of narrative scenes.[104] Likewise, in the St Cuthbert Window, settings not only employ contemporary architectural and landscape styles, but show evidence of intertextual reading which helps to locate the narrative action.[105] As with costume and gesture, landscape and architectural details are used consistently; indoor scenes are set within cutaway buildings or against hangings, while outdoor scenes are differentiated by the buildings set within a landscape, or the inclusion of fences to indicate gardens.[106] As a result, the examination of panels' settings has been used to support identifications where other evidence is limited.[107]

1.1.3.5 Architectural Frames: Evidence of Design

Each of the narrative panels originally had an architectural frame, consisting of a canopy along the upper edge and a vertical border at either side. The canopies survive to varying extents, while the borders have been lost from most panels. Architectural frames are a common design feature in stained glass; similar designs can be seen in the Great East Window and St William Window at York Minster, and the east and west windows of St Martin-le-Grand, Coney Street. The architectural frames of these windows have generally survived in better condition than many of those in the St Cuthbert Window, providing supporting evidence for the reconstructions, which are drawn from analysis of the documentary and physical evidence. The evidence of windows S6 and S7, which are close

[104] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 42-43, 62; King, *Mancroft*, cxviii-cxxiii.
[105] Catalogue: 22b, 11c.
[106] Catalogue: 15a, 15e, 16c, 16e.
[107] Catalogue: 22b.

contemporaries of the St Cuthbert Window and were probably made by the same workshop, if not during the same glazing project, is particularly valuable.

Because there are several different designs, which can be shown to have varied in a coherent way, the surviving canopies can provide additional evidence for the narrative sequence, supporting some of the interpretations suggested by the iconography; this will be discussed in the next section. First, the evidence for the design of the architectural frames will be analysed, and its limitations acknowledged. Knowles' rubbings demonstrate that the survival of original material varies considerably between panels. For example, from close scrutiny of panel 8b (Figure 1.13), it can be concluded that most of the canopy is intact: most of the pieces appear original and were present in Knowles' rubbing (Figure 1.26), much of the canopy matches the edging line of the background and the same treatment of elements such as staining and cross-hatching can be observed throughout.[108] In contrast, the rubbing of panel 15e (Figure 1.27) shows that a portion of another canopy and background had been inserted prior to this date.[109] Additionally, many canopies were altered, and the remains of the vertical borders were removed, rearranged and replaced, *c.*1955-7.[110] Of the sixty-four panels which are likely original to the window, only nineteen retain more than seventy-five percent of their original canopy glass; most retain between twenty-five and seventy-five percent. Only three have lost most, if not all of their original canopy glass. Whilst it is important to acknowledge the potential impact of the loss of material upon the identification of the canopy types, the evidence provided by Knowles' rubbings is often compelling and enables the original canopy design to be identified. By combining the evidence, it has been possible to securely identify forty-eight of the panels' canopy designs, and to suggest with reasonable confidence the designs for the remaining panels.[111]

Analysis of the narrative panels alongside Knowles' rubbings has enabled the identification of ten distinct architectural canopy designs (sections A-C); a further two designs, each with subtypes, have been identified in section D (see Appendix 3.1). The canopy

[108] Knowles & Sons, VAM, E.731-1929; Catalogue: 8b.
[109] Knowles & Sons, VAM, E.764-1929; Catalogue: 15e.
[110] Milner-White, "The Windows," 11, 29.
[111] See Catalogue for details of individual panels.

type and extent of original material is detailed in the catalogue entry for each panel. Although the amount of evidence for each design varies, it allows conclusions to be drawn about the design of the architectural canopies across the whole window. Several canopy types, especially D, F, G, I and J, can be reliably identified. Small variations in these designs demonstrate that minor differences, such as in decorative details, shading or silver stain, occurred within the canopy types. As these are evident in panels where the glass appears original, they are probably due to different painters' interpretations of the same cartoon (Figure 1.28, Figure 1.29, Figure 1.30, Figure 1.31 and Figure 1.32).[112]

No more than five panels each survive for six of the ten distinctive designs.[113] Between eight and ten of each of the remaining four designs survive.[114] There were originally fourteen rows of narrative scenes.[115] It appears, therefore, that the intention was to use a single design for the five panels in each row; four of the designs (types B, D, E and H) were used for two rows.[116] The visual evidence suggests that at least some of the canopy types used across two rows were distinguished from one another through different staining and shading, although the variation in other types and the damage to the panels means that firm conclusions cannot be drawn. The use of a single design in each row is comparable to the use of architectural frames in the middle section of the Great East Window (rows 7 to 11), where the canopy design was intended to be consistent across the entire row.[117] There is a more complex alternation of architectural frames in the lower and upper sections.[118] The St William Window exhibits a different approach to architectural framing,[119] which Christopher Norton has argued was intended to actively disrupt the grouping of panels within rows.[120] Moreover, with the exception of row 1, the canopies are less elaborate than in the St Cuthbert Window. Although other arrangements, such as the alternation or grouping of canopy designs according to the

---

[112] Knowles & Sons, VAM, E.750-1929, E.776-1929; Catalogue: 13a, 19b; Brown, *Apocalypse*, 27.
[113] Types A.i, C, F.i, G.i, I, J.
[114] Types B, D, E, H.
[115] Rows 7-11, 14-17 and 19-23.
[116] Appendix 3.1.
[117] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 27; French, *East Window*, 70, 76.
[118] French, *East Window*, 46, 52, 61, 106, 115, 122, 129; Brown, *Apocalypse*, 27.
[119] French, *William Window*, 16, 32, 49, 62.
[120] Christopher Norton, discussion, 15/01/2019.

narrative, have been considered, the evidence of the rubbings and extant glass cannot be seen to support this in the St Cuthbert Window. Panels with the same canopy type typically depict subjects which appear sequentially in the textual analogues. Moreover, those with canopy types used across two rows can be split into two distinct groups based on their iconography. This suggests that the canopy types were grouped by row, and that they can provide evidence for the narrative reconstruction, as will be discussed in the next section.

As in other windows, the canopy designs are formed using a selection of architectural elements and motifs, in different combinations. This creates coherence throughout the window; for example, type G.i-ii in Section C closely resembles type L.v-vi in Section D (Figure 1.33 and Figure 1.34). Furthermore, certain elements suggest relationships between the glass and other contemporary cycles. In particular, elements of the architectural canopies in windows S6 and S7 closely resemble elements in the St Cuthbert Window, suggesting they were made by the same workshop, or from the same design sources. For example, the central arch in S6 5c, and S7 5c, closely resembles the central arch in s7 5c, (Figure 1.34, Figure 1.35 and Figure 1.36), while the upper canopies rising into panel 6c in each of the windows are also strikingly similar. Moreover, the two side arches in S6 5c, and S7 5c, are very similar to the central arches in canopy types G.i-ii (Figure 1.33). This confirms that the designers of the windows were employing motifs and 'modules' of architecture, which could be combined in different ways as required. This discovery is of particular value when reconstructing the lost areas of the architectural frames.

In S6 and S7, the unique designs of the architectural frames include vertical borders. It is evident that the St Cuthbert Window panels also originally incorporated vertical borders, which 'supported' the architectural canopy. This is apparent in the panels of section D, where the frames are more intact. Additionally, a few narrative panels have retained parts of their vertical borders, including panel 22c, where the edges of the canopy clearly join with vertical shafts (Figure 1.37). Knowles' rubbings and a number of photographs taken before 1955 confirm that the borders had been significantly truncated and disarranged before 1877, but that some borders partially survived until the intervention of *c.*1955-7 (Figure 1.38 and Figure

1.39).[121] By comparing fragments surviving *in situ* at the edge of panels with the documentary evidence, it is possible to draw tentative conclusions about their appearance. In most cases, Knowles' leadlines show a 'shaft' on each side of the panel, which probably indicates the extent of the architectural frame. This is supported by the early twentieth-century photographs and rubbings where Knowles provided visual details. For example, in panel 14a (Figure 1.40), Knowles recorded some of the painted detail of the left-hand frame, and the leadlines to the right.[122] The painted details show an architectural shaft, with half a standing figure, set on a plinth beneath a small niche. In the other panels with canopy type F.i, the leadlines in Knowles' rubbings are very similar to those in 14a. Moreover, a matching architectural shaft, with half a standing figure set on a plinth within a small niche, forms the right-hand frame of panel 13b (Figure 1.41).[123] As the current leadlines broadly match Knowles' rubbing, it seems the frame survives *in situ*. Additionally, the distinctive shape of the leadline where it follows the figure's feet and cloak can be seen in Knowles' rubbings of panels 14a (Figure 1.40, right edge), 16b (Figure 1.42, right edge), 17d (Figure 1.43, left edge) and possibly 15a (Figure 1.44, right edge), all of which have canopy type F.i.[124] Consequently, it is likely that these panels had the same architectural frames at the sides as well as the top edge.

Further evidence from other canopy groups suggests that the frames were specific to each canopy type, although limited reconstruction has been possible within the scope of this study. The presence of two or more alternating designs within each row, as seen in the Great East Window, cannot be ruled out.[125] Despite the damage to the panels' borders, their probable original width makes it unlikely that scrolls or devices originally decorated the outer edges, as in windows n8-10 (Figure 1.45). Likewise, it is unlikely that the variations in the dimensions and locations of the 'shafts' in Knowles' rubbings, represent variations in the original widths of the architectural frames. Indeed, the variable truncation of one or both vertical borders is

[121] YMLA, GPC 2837, 2885.
[122] Knowles & Sons, VAM, E.755-1929.
[123] Knowles & Sons, VAM, E.751-1929.
[124] Knowles & Sons, VAM, E.755-1929, E.766-1929, E.773-1929, E.760-1929.
[125] Rows 2a-5j. Brown, *East Window*, 33-34.

evident in the extant glass (Figures 1.46 and 1.47). Consequently, the architectural frames were probably of equal width on both sides, using a design similar to those seen in section D, as well as S6 and S7, where they are substantially intact. This symmetrical design is common in fifteenth-century glass, as demonstrated by examples in the Great East Window and former east and west windows of St Martin's, Coney Street.

1.1.3.6 Architectural Frames: Evidence of Narrative Structure

Although interpretation of the evidence drawn from architectural canopies must be nuanced, a conjectural reconstruction of the window based solely upon the canopy designs has nevertheless provided a valuable tool for the reconstruction of the narrative (Appendix 3.2). It has been argued above that the narrative need not follow an identical chronology to the textual versions, as beyond certain events which anchor the progression of Cuthbert's life, many of the events do not have to be read in 'chronological' order to effectively convey their message. Nevertheless, when the panels are assembled according to their canopy type, each group of panels typically comprises a cluster of episodes that occur in a similar sequence to the textual narratives. Consequently, in the reconstruction the panels are grouped by their canopy type, and the arrangement of the groups across the rows is based on the narrative order. Within the rows, a left to right reading order has been followed, as suggested by the analysis of gesture, and the existence of a similar structure in the St William and Great East Windows.[126]

The evidence of canopy types A.i-ii, F.i-ii and G.i-ii confirms that the window should be read from top to bottom and follows the broad chronology of Cuthbert's life. Types A.ii, F.ii and G.ii were all designed to fit within the heads of the lights, in rows 12, 18 and 24 respectively, making it impossible to move the panels to other rows. Types A.i, F.i and G.i all lack the visible horizontal arches seen in the other canopy types, and are instead dominated by vertical shafts, suggesting they were designed to show the canopy continuing into the head of the light, where the shafts would form full arches. As discussed above, this can be seen in numerous other fifteenth-century windows, including the Great East Window, where the

[126] Ibid., 60; French, *William Window*, 16.

shafts visible in the panels in row 11 form arches in the corresponding panels in row 12 (Figure 1.48). Although the heads of the lights in the St Cuthbert Window were not documented by Knowles, and had been altered to varying degrees by the twentieth century, the extant glass provides enough information for the original form to be identified, confirming the respective alignments of A.i and A.ii, F.i and F.ii, and G.i and G.ii (Figure 1.33 and Figure 1.49).[127] These conclusions are further supported by the specific similarities with S6 and S7 windows, discussed above.

Type A.ii, F.ii and G.ii each only fit in a single row: 24, 18 and 12, respectively. Therefore, the original rows of the corresponding narrative panels can also be identified securely, in rows 23, 17 and 11, thereby confirming fixed points within the narrative structure. Significantly, the placement of type A.i panels beneath type A.ii in row 24 confirms that the narrative began in row 23, because these panels depict scenes from Cuthbert's childhood.[128] Furthermore, when types F.i and G.i are respectively located beneath F.ii and G.ii, the scenes they depict appear to be arranged according to the broad textual narrative order. The visual evidence is also strengthened by Torre's observations; despite the evident disarrangement of the panels, he recorded three type A.i panels in row 23, three type F.i panels in row 17, and four type G.i panels in row 11.[129] As this places a greater number of panels in their 'correct' rows than elsewhere in the upper two sections, it is unlikely to be accidental.

Within this reconstruction, there are several instances where the arrangement by canopy type means that scenes appear in a different order from the textual analogues. Some of these may represent a deliberate narrative arrangement which differs from the textual analogues, as discussed in Chapter 4. However, others are harder to explain. In particular, when grouped by canopy type, the panels placed in row 17 depict scenes from chapters 11, 12 and 13, while those in row 16 represent scenes from chapters 12, 13 and 15 (Appendix 3.2). It is striking that this splits the two scenes from chapter 12 (panels 13b and 13c) across the two rows. The presence of a monk in 13c looking leftwards from the panel appears intended to

[127] Catalogue: 12a-e, 18a-e, 24a, 24d, 24e; Appendix 3.1.
[128] Catalogue: 7a, 7b, 9c, 11b, 21c.
[129] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.51v, 52v-53r; Appendix 1.2; Appendix 3.

provide a visual link to the preceding panel, suggesting they were originally intended to be adjacent in the same row (Figure 1.50). In unpicking this apparent error, two alternative explanations should be considered. First, the sequence suggested by the canopies may indicate that panel 14a does not depict an additional scene from VP chapter 13, as this study proposes, but instead shows a scene from the start of VP chapter 11 or 12. It would therefore have been intended to precede panel 15a or 13b, in row 17. This would resolve the disruption of the narrative, as it would place chapters 11, 12 and 13 in row 17, and 13, 14 and 15 in row 16. However, both of these interpretations for panel 14a are iconographically unlikely.[130] The alternative explanation, of a glazing error during production, appears to provide a more convincing explanation. During the recent conservation of the Great East Window of York Minster, errors in the design of canopies have been identified for panels in rows 2, 8 and 9.[131] In this period, glaziers were probably still working on whitewashed tables: the cartoon would be drawn out by the master, the panel glazed upon it and then the table whitewashed again to allow it to be reused.[132] It seems to have been common for the cartoon for the canopy to be reused, with only the inner area being refreshed and the narrative detail being redrawn for each panel.[133] Consequently, Sarah Brown has suggested that the most likely explanation for the errors in the Great East Window resulted from the narrative scenes being drawn inside the wrong architectural frames.[134] As the St Cuthbert Window employs a distinct canopy design for each row, and there is evidence of the reuse of their cartoons, it is possible that the same working method, and consequently, errors, may have occurred.[135]

In the St Cuthbert Window, there is no evidence that the panels were originally inserted in the wrong order, so the proposed reconstruction has adopted the arrangement following the chronological order which was probably intended, thereby retaining the interpretation of panel 14a as the first scene from VP chapter 13. Details of arguments

---

[130] Catalogue: 14a; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 192-197.
[131] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 27.
[132] Tura, *Tables* 58-63, 108.
[133] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 27; Tura, *Tables* 60-61.
[134] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 27.
[135] It is possible that 19c and 21a, which share one of the canopy designs used for two rows, may have been transposed during the original installation, as they were the only two, other than the lost panels, out of place by 1690. Catalogue: 19c, 21a; Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.53r-54r.

weighing the possibility of further glazing errors against misidentifications of the panels are recorded in the Catalogue. They are of particular relevance to the analysis of the narrative construction, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.

1.1.3.7 Coloured Backgrounds

With a single exception,[136] each panel within the window has either a blue or a red foliate background. In many fifteenth-century narrative windows, the background colours have been found to create patterns within the arrangement of the panels.[137] However, in past studies of both the St Cuthbert Window and other monumental narrative windows, most notably the St William Window, scholars have been unsuccessful when attempting to arrange the narrative based on the coloured backgrounds.[138] Consequently, in this study, although the possibility of background patterns has been recognised, the evidence of the backgrounds was not used in the initial reconstruction of the narrative. Instead, the reconstruction was used to assess whether patterns could be discerned, and whether these provided supporting evidence for the arrangement of panels.

The majority of panels retain enough of their original material to indicate their background colour. This has been supplemented by Knowles' and Fowler's documentary evidence for the few panels whose background colour was uncertain.[139] The reconstruction proposed by this study reveals that the panels were probably originally designed with a counterchanged pattern of alternating red and blue, creating a chequerboard effect across the whole window (Appendix 5.3). This was certainly the arrangement of the panels in the donor section, which follow a comparable pattern of alternating red and blue (Figure 1.51). Moreover, as with the architectural frames, the heads of the lights in rows 12, 18 and 24, provide a relatively secure indicator of the original arrangement. Although they have been laterally rearranged, the number of panels of each background colour can indicate their original arrangement within a counterchanged pattern: rows 12 and 24 have three blue and

[136] Catalogue: panel 16a.
[137] King, *Mancroft*, clxxi-clxxii, clxxvi.
[138] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 22; French, *William Window*, 16; Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 250-251.
[139] Catalogue: 20b.

two red panels, while row 18 has three red and two blue.[140] The existence of this pattern supports the narrative arrangement proposed by this study, particularly where the original arrangement does not appear to have followed a chronological narrative sequence.[141] However, there are several instances where the panels do not appear to follow this sequence. This may indicate errors in the reconstruction, as the proposed arrangement is based upon a chronological reading of the narrative structure, unless the evidence has indicated otherwise. However, they may also be original alterations to the pattern to create narrative emphases. For instance, in the first row of the narrative, the two panels depicting Cuthbert's birth are both red.[142] This might be an intentional narrative device, to draw attention to the beginning of his life.

It is also possible that such panels represent glazing errors, as suggested in the architectural frames of rows 16 and 17. Indeed, four of the panels appear close together in the reconstruction, in rows 15, 16 and 17. The detection of these probable errors can therefore provide valuable insights into medieval glazing practice. In particular, the location of these anomalies in the upper three rows of sections A and B may indicate areas vulnerable to errors in the glazing process, or possible changes in the production team at certain phases in the project. Indeed, the execution of the backgrounds may also indicate changes in personnel, as well as providing evidence of the original arrangement. The original foliate backgrounds are rendered using two distinct methods: with 'solid' paint (Figure 1.52) and with cross-hatching (Figure 1.53). The recent conservation of the Great East Window revealed distinctive versions of the backgrounds, as well as different hands at work throughout the window.[143]

The 'solid' backgrounds are mostly found in panels which depict the early life of St Cuthbert, including all of the scenes drawn from the *Libellus*, up to around chapter 7 of VP, and originally occupied the uppermost section of the Window.[144] As a result, they may support the groupings of panels indicated by Torre's description *c.*1690 (Appendix 1.2), as

[140] Catalogue: 12a-e, 18a-e, 24a-e.
[141] Catalogue: 20e, 21d, 21e, 23b, 21a, 21b.
[142] Catalogue: 7a, 9c.
[143] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 29.
[144] Catalogue: 7a, 7b, 7c, 9b, 9c, 9d, 9e, 10b, 10c, 10d, 11b, 11c, 15c, 20a, 21c, 22a.

well as analysis of narrative order and visual evidence. The lack of 'solid' backgrounds within any of the panels located in the later narrative may be an intentional design feature. Alternatively, it might indicate a change in the painters working on the window. The change of backgrounds occurs in row 19, possibly indicating that work was disrupted at this point. Whether this was due to the departure of a glass-painter, or even master, can only be the subject of speculation. However, if the window was being glazed from the top down, following the narrative sequence, this would immediately precede the apparent errors in the canopies of rows 15 and 16.

1.1.3.8 Multi-panel Scenes

In common with other monumental fifteenth-century narrative windows, including the St William Window and Great East Window,[145] individual episodes are often depicted across multiple panels. The presence of multi-panel scenes, although potentially more difficult to identify, provides valuable evidence of the original narrative structure. There are at least fifteen, and probably as many as seventeen, instances of multi-panel scenes (Appendix 5.4).[146] Only five sets of these panels were correctly identified and reunited in past rearrangements, although additional pairs of panels have been identified in late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century scholarship.[147] The separation of identifiable iconography across two or more panels is the most common explanation for the misidentification of panels and past failures to recognise panels which should be read together. This is often compounded by loss or damage to crucial elements of iconography.

The correct identification of multi-panel scenes requires cautious consideration of all available visual and documentary evidence. As noted above, it has not been assumed that the panels have direct source-copy relationships with YT26. Nevertheless, as YT26 is a known pictorial source, the treatment of two-page, and single-page multi-scene, illustrations within

---

[145] Brown, *East Window*, 45-47; French, *William Window*, 16; King, *Mancroft*, lxxxix-xci; Gilderdale-Scott, "Great Malvern," 95.

[146] Throughout the thesis, references to multiple panel scenes will use "&" to indicate their grouping. Confirmed multi-panel scenes: Catalogue: 7a & 9c; 9d, 20a & 9e; 10b & 22a; 7d & 10a; 22b & 11c; 15c & 13d; 15a, 17d & 16b; 13b & 13c; 17c & 20c; 15e & 16a; 16c & 16d; 17a & 17b; 14b & 19e; 19b, 19c & 19d; 9a & 20b. Possible multi-panel scenes are: Catalogue: 15d & Location 10b; 16e & Location 14e/15d.

[147] Dumelow, "Seeing," 49, 51-52.

the manuscript has proved a valuable tool for identifying multi-panel scenes within the window. Comparison of securely identified multi-panel scenes with illustrations of the same episodes in YT26 has revealed that, while the window employs iconographic details and compositional elements found in YT26, an illustration's specific composition and arrangement are rarely followed in the window.[148] For example, episodes in YT26 which are evoked by single illustrations depicting multiple moments are often depicted across multiple panels in the window.[149] Similarly, in a pair of panels, a single illustration might be the source for one panel's iconography, with another panel depicting iconography not found in YT26.[150] Indeed, there is evidence that the designer combined compositions drawn from YT26 with additional iconography. For instance, analysis of the combined visual and documentary evidence for panels 17c and 20c (Figure 1.54 and Figure 1.55) reveals that they depict two moments from VP, chapter 15. Panel 17c, which shows Hildmer asking Cuthbert to help his sick wife, is not paralleled in YT26, but adheres closely to the textual analogue.[151] In contrast, panel 20c and YT26 (Figure 1.56) share strikingly similar iconographic deviations from the textual analogues, by depicting Cuthbert at the side of the recovered woman's bed, rather than showing him being greeted by her as related in the text.[152]

Recognition of such design creativity, particularly the blending of iconographic details and sources, has enabled the identification of ten multi-panel scenes where at least one of the panels corresponds with iconography in YT26, yet at least one other employs unique iconography.[153] The identifications proposed for these groups are supported by the evidence of their previous locations within the window, as well as a range of visual evidence. In particular, the designers appear to have been conscious of the challenge posed to the viewer by these multiple groupings of panels. They encouraged grouped panels to be read together through the use of visual devices such as symmetry of composition and, most commonly,

---

[148] Catalogue: 10b & 22a, 22b & 11c; YT26, f.10v-11r, 17v-18r.
[149] Catalogue: 15e & 16a; YT26, f.39r.
[150] Catalogue: 13b & 13c; YT26, f.28v.
[151] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 202-207.
[152] YT26, f. 33v.
[153] Catalogue: 9d, 20a & 9e; 22b & 11c; 15c & 13d; 15a, 17d & 16b; 13b & 13c; 17c & 20c; 16c & 16d; 17a & 17b; 14b & 19e; 19b, 9a & 20b.

continuity of setting. As sections 1.1.3.5 and 1.1.3.6 have shown, the evidence of architectural surrounds and backgrounds must be examined critically. However, comparison of these elements has also provided strong evidence of the relationship between panels. In particular, where the canopies are intact, only two pairs do not match one another.[154] As has been discussed, errors in production provide a possible explanation for one pair. However, the other pair appears to have been split across two rows as part of the original design.[155] This phenomenon has also been observed in the Great East Window and in the Toppes Window (nIII), St Peter Mancroft, Norwich.[156]

Likewise, due to the alternating pattern, most paired panels have different coloured backgrounds. In addition to the exception noted above,[157] the backgrounds to a three-panel scene also do not appear to alternate, perhaps due to a glazing error.[158] Nevertheless, the general consistency of the alternating backgrounds supports the proposed locations of the multi-panel scenes within the wider reconstruction. Similarly, the combined evidence of the original arrangement suggests that there was a relatively consistent distribution of multi-panel groups within the structure of the stonework. Yet, there were also exceptions to the general trends. In the Great East Window, multi-panel scenes typically span three panels, often set within the three-light subdivisions of the nine-light window.[159] Sarah Brown has demonstrated that the thicker mullions between lights c and d, and f and g, act as "stone 'bookmark[s]'", indicating which panels should be read together (Figure 1.57).[160] The smaller scale of the St Cuthbert Window, which has only five lights, may explain the preference for pairs of panels rather than larger groups of panels: of the fifteen confirmed multi-panel scenes only two span three panels. Indeed, the reconstruction suggests that pairs of panels were most often located in a+b or c+d lights; only two pairs appear to break this trend (Appendix 5.4, A and B).

---

[154] Catalogue: 13b & 13c; 22b & 11c.
[155] Catalogue: 11c, 22b.
[156] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 27; King, *Mancroft*, lxxxix.
[157] Catalogue: 7a, 9c.
[158] Catalogue: 9d, 20a & 9e.
[159] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 41; Rickers, "Glazier," 272-273.
[160] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 41.

Consequently, it is possible that the thicker mullions on either side of light c may have provided a similar "bookmarking" function to those in the Great East Window, by creating visual distance between the two pairs of panels on either side of the central light. The extent to which the original placement of the panels responded to the stonework will be explored further in Chapter 4. However, it is clear that the three-panel scenes would have run across the 'bookmark' created by the wider mullions (Appendix 5.4, A and B). Moreover, the reconstruction suggests that, in both cases where three-panel scenes were employed, they were located in lights a-c, with lights d and e occupied by a two-panel episode. There is evidence of the similar arrangement of two- and three-panel scenes in the St William Window, despite other differences in structure and reading order, which will be discussed in Chapter 4.[161] Together, this range of evidence supports the subjects and locations proposed for the multi-panel scenes.

1.2 Lost Panels

It is apparent that six original panels have been lost. Although the amount of evidence for their original design is variable, analysis of this in combination with the wider reconstruction of the narrative has enabled their original subjects and locations to be proposed through a process of deductive reasoning. The available evidence for the iconography, original locations and date at which each panel was lost, as well as the foreign panels inserted to replace them, is detailed in the Catalogue.[162] Torre's descriptions of locations 10b, 11b, 15e and 16e confirm the loss of at least four panels by *c.*1690 (See Appendix 1.2) and enable their replacements to be identified as originating in the St William Window (locations 10b and 11b) and a Life of Thomas Becket cycle in St Michael-le-Belfrey (locations 15e and 16e).[163] The donor panel (2c) from S7, which had been inserted into the St Cuthbert Window by 1877, was still in its original window when Torre saw it.[164] This indicates that the foreign panels present by the nineteenth century had been inserted in at least two separate interventions; the close

[161] Christopher Norton, discussion, 15/01/2019.
[162] Catalogue: Locations 7d, 10b, 11b, 14e/15d, 16c, 22b; Catalogue: Foreign Panels, CH1 2b, CH1 4c, n7 2d, n7 10d, s4 1a, S7 2c.
[163] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.52v; Koopmans, "Becket," 1040, 1055.
[164] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.61r; Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 374.

proximity of the two panels from the St William Window, in section C, and likewise the Becket panels, in section B, suggests that each pair was installed together. Additionally, as S7 2c was inserted into the upper section of the window, it seems likely that the panel it replaced was seen by Torre in location 22a, the only one of Torre's descriptions which cannot be matched to an extant panel.[165] The iconography of the panel, the evidence of architectural surrounds and the grouping of other panels in rows 21 to 23 make it likely that the panel depicted a scene from the *Libellus*.[166]

The date at which the sixth panel was lost is uncertain. Although Torre does not give descriptions for three of the panels, in locations 7d, 9e and 23d, marking the latter two as "not plain", it is likely that the current panels 20b and 22b account for two of Torre's undescribed locations (probably locations 7d and 23d); they survive and cannot be matched with any of his other descriptions.[167] Consequently, it is unclear whether the third gap left by Torre had at that point been filled by the St Katherine panel removed by Knowles in *c.*1886-8, or whether it contained an original panel.[168] Torre's evidence has also confirmed that the fifteenth-century panel that was combined with one made by Knowles to form panel 11a was located in n9 1a in the seventeenth century.[169] Later descriptions by George Benson and Frederick Harrison have confirmed that the panel remained in n9,[170] until Milner-White oversaw its alteration and insertion into the St Cuthbert Window in 1955-7.[171] Analysis of the surviving glass and an early twentieth-century photograph of the panel indicate that it did not originate in the St Cuthbert Window.[172]

The locations in which Torre saw the inserted panels provide some evidence of the lost panels' original positions within the narrative. From the analysis above, it may be concluded

---

[165] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.51v.
[166] Catalogue: Location 22b.
[167] Catalogue: 20b, 22b.
[168] Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 373.
[169] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.34r; Catalogue: 11a.
[170] Harrison, *Painted Glass*, 89; George Benson, *The Ancient Painted Glass Windows in the Minster and Churches of the City of York* (York: Yorkshire Philosophical Society, 1915), 94-95.
[171] Milner-White, "The Windows," 32-33.
[172] Catalogue: 11a; YMLA, GPC, 2637.

that one panel was lost from section A, probably depicting a scene from the *Libellus*.[173] Two panels were lost from section B and three from section C. Both sections B and C contained only scenes derived from VP; episodes from twelve chapters are currently not represented within the window.[174] Consequently, it is clear that some episodes were deliberately omitted. Yet, through comparison of the missing panels' possible original locations with episodes not depicted in the extant panels, their potential subjects can be proposed.

The disarrangement of section B by 1690 makes it unlikely that the locations of its inserted panels indicate the original locations of its lost panels. However, within the section that contains scenes from VP chapter 11 to 21, only two chapters are not now represented. The first, chapter 14, can be convincingly located in row 16, both due to its location in the narrative and because one panel is missing from the type E canopy group.[175] The second, chapter 18, is slightly more complicated, as an extant panel, 14e, could depict either chapter 18 or a second scene from chapter 21, respectively located in row 15 or 14.[176] However, it is likely that the lost panel depicted whichever scene panel 14e does not.[177] Consequently, although it has not been possible to establish which of these two solutions was original, this does not have a significant impact upon the broader interpretation of the narrative.

The close correspondence between the proposed reconstruction and the arrangement seen by Torre in section C suggests that its inserted panels may indicate the locations of its lost panels. Indeed, location 11b is where VP chapter 23 would occur, if the narrative chronology were followed.[178] Furthermore, glass now in s4 1a contains fragments which correspond with the iconography of this episode.[179] Similarly, location 7d, which Torre described as "not plain", is situated between Cuthbert's first tomb and his shrine in the reconstruction based upon the combined evidence discussed above.[180] Additionally, only four

---

[173] Catalogue: Location 22b.
[174] VP chapters 14, 18, 23, 28, 31, 36, 41-43 and 45-46. Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 200-203, 216-221, 230-235, 248-251, 254-257, 266-271, 288-307.
[175] Catalogue: Location 16c.
[176] Catalogue: 14e.
[177] Catalogue: Location 14e/15d.
[178] Catalogue: Location 11b.
[179] Ibid.
[180] Catalogue: Location 7d; Appendix 4.2.

extant panels have the distinctive canopy type J.[181] Consequently, the lost panel probably depicted the discovery of Cuthbert's incorrupt body, which is depicted in all of the extant Cuthbertine cycles and is a key authenticator of his sanctity.[182] The resulting completeness of the final row of narrative, combined with relatively non-specific representations of Cuthbert's tomb and shrine, suggests that episodes from VP chapters 41, 43, 45 and 46 were intentionally omitted from the window. Likewise, the final lost panel from section C was probably in location 10b, based on the position where Torre saw a foreign panel, as well as the evidence of the canopies.[183] However, while it is possible that it depicted a scene from VP chapter 28, 31 or 36, this location makes these subjects unlikely. Moreover, the depiction of Cuthbert's charitable acts across two panels within the same row raises the likelihood that the panel in location 10b depicted another scene related to Cuthbert's election,[184] creating thematic symmetry within the row, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.

1.3 Proposed Narrative Reconstruction

Using the evidence discussed in this chapter, it has been possible to reconstruct a substantial proportion of the original narrative structure of the St Cuthbert Window. Fifty-seven of the extant panels can be firmly identified, along with the probable subjects and locations of the remaining six extant and six missing panels.[185] Due to the variety and complexity of the evidence used to produce the reconstruction, a series of diagrams has been produced. Appendix 4.1 shows only panels whose subjects have been securely identified. Their locations within the reconstruction are based upon their location within the narrative, combined with the evidence of the canopies and Torre's evidence of their past locations. Appendix 4.2 includes all of the panels, arranged according to the most likely subjects suggested by their iconography, the evidence of the canopies and antiquarian evidence. This is the reconstruction which the author deems most representative of the narrative structure as originally intended and which will be used for the analysis of the narrative in Chapter 4; it is

[181] Appendix 3.1; Appendix 4.2.
[182] Catalogue: Location 7d.
[183] Catalogue: Location 10b.
[184] Ibid.
[185] Catalogue: 13e, 14a, 14e, 15d, 11b, 15c, 21c; Catalogue: Locations 22b, 16c, 14e/15d, 11b, 10b, 7c.

the basis of the diagrams in Appendix 5 and 6. However, given the uncertainty regarding the subjects and locations of two of the missing panels, as well as the possible misidentification of panel 14a, Appendix 4.3. shows the alternative interpretation of the evidence.

Nevertheless, several significant conclusions can be drawn regarding the original narrative structure. This study has confirmed that the St Cuthbert Window originally contained seventy narrative panels, which were set within the upper three sections of the window and read from left to right, from the top (row 23) to the bottom (row 7); of these, sixty-four panels are extant. Nine extant panels depicting Cuthbert's childhood have been identified, suggesting that two rows of panels depicted scenes drawn from the *Libellus*. This is confirmed by the evidence of the canopies, which place these panels in the two uppermost rows of the window (Appendix 3.2). Additionally, one of these panels, 9b, appears to combine Bedan and Libellan episodes, providing a link between the scenes drawn from separate narrative traditions.[186] Fifty-five panels can be identified as representing events described in Bede's VP.

Broad trends in narrative construction and the use of specific narrative devices have been identified. There are between fifteen and seventeen instances of scenes spanning two or more panels. Such expansions of the narrative are more prevalent in sections A and B. Additionally, although some scenes are expanded in the upper three rows of section C, there is clear evidence of the omission of some episodes and evidence that the narrative intentionally followed a different order to the textual analogues. This contrasts with sections A and B, where it is unlikely that any scenes from VP were omitted and there is only one clear instance of the narrative sequence differing from the textual analogues. Significantly, these appear to be deliberate editorial choices, which, combined with the creative and selective use of textual and pictorial sources, indicate the complexity of the narrative's construction. This raises questions regarding the individuals involved in the commissioning and design of the window, as well as its intended significance. In the following two chapters, the wider evidence

[186] Catalogue: 9b.

of Cuthbertine cycles and patterns of patronage will be explored, to support the reinterpretation of this new reconstruction of the narrative in Chapter 4.

Chapter 2: Cuthbertine Hagiography Available in the Fifteenth Century

The cult of St Cuthbert began shortly after his death in 687. By the fifteenth century, a rich corpus of hagiographic material, both textual and pictorial, was available to the creators of the St Cuthbert Window. These materials demonstrate the continual adaptation of Cuthbertine hagiography over time, in response to contemporary concerns and interests. Consequently, they can provide insights into approaches to the construction of hagiographical narrative, as well as the devotional landscape within which the St Cuthbert Window was conceived. Of particular interest is the way in which contemporary preoccupations were manifested in the iconography and narrative construction of the cycles. Past studies have shown that the cult's proponents repeatedly returned to earlier material, in order to craft new textual and pictorial cycles which expounded their contemporary concerns and ideologies.[1] Indeed, in Chapter 1, it was demonstrated that YT26, made *c.*1200, was consulted during production of the St Cuthbert Window. This raises questions regarding the enduring authority of earlier texts and pictorial cycles in the expression and proliferation of the cult in the fifteenth century.

This chapter will consider the development and adaptation of Cuthbertine narrative in both textual and pictorial media, up to the fifteenth century, with a particular focus upon the cycles which were probably used as sources for the St Cuthbert Window, as well as those which can provide insights into contemporary hagiographical trends. The fifteenth-century texts produced at Durham will be examined in relation to the inclusion of Cuthbert in a range of hagiographical compilations, such as the South English Legendary. It will also be argued that the inclusion of a Cuthbertine pictorial cycle in the richly illustrated Salisbury Breviary not only highlights the saint's presence in the liturgy, but also points to a wider circulation or creation of imagery contemporaneous to the St Cuthbert Window.[2] The use of earlier iconography produced at Durham can be detected later in the fifteenth century, in painted panels at Carlisle Cathedral. Like the York window, the Carlisle cycle drew upon YT26.[3]

---

[1] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 106-108; Thacker, "Origins," 110; Johnson South, *Historia*, 9, 11-12; Rollason, *Libellus de exordio*, xlii; Carrasco, "Construction," 76; Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 40.
[2] Paris, BNF, Latin 17294, f.434v-437v.
[3] Park and Cather, "Paintings," 214-215; Colgrave, "Cuthbert Paintings," 18, 21.

Consequently, the way in which the iconography has been selected and adapted can provide further insights into the selection process that informed the conception of the St Cuthbert Window. Finally, in Section 2.4, lost glazing programmes undertaken at Durham in the early fifteenth century will be considered. As Bishop Thomas Langley, the donor of the St Cuthbert window at York, contributed to these schemes, this discussion will demonstrate his role as a key proponent of the Cuthbertine cult.[4] Moreover, given the demonstrable links between the Durham and York cycles, exploration of the iconographic themes evident at Durham may enable the possible expression of comparable agendas in the York window to be identified.

The discussion within this chapter is necessarily limited by the undoubted losses of hagiographical imagery in a variety of media. The wider availability of narrative material must be borne in mind when exploring the creation of pictorial narrative cycles. The community in Durham possessed a range of Cuthbertine images, pre-dating the earliest extant cycles, which no longer survive.[5] Anne Lawrence-Mathers has argued that the developed nature of the Cuthbertine iconography employed in the earliest manuscript cycle, *c.*1100, which also accords with twelfth-century wall-paintings at Durham Cathedral (Figure 2.1) and Pittington, a Durham dependency (Figure 2.2), is evidence of the existence of earlier iconography, if not narrative cycles.[6] She cites Francis Wormald's argument that narrative cycles which appear in manuscripts from the end of the tenth century had often been developed in other media, including objects associated with the shrine and wall-paintings.[7] Indeed, St Cuthbert's coffin is a key example of such an object, which uses iconography to visually articulate complex ideas of sanctity.[8] The limited survival of other objects and narrative cycles can be attributed to the upheavals experienced by the Cuthbertine

[4] Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 111; Rollason, "Northern Saints," 334, 338-339.
[5] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 92-93.
[6] Ibid., 93.
[7] Francis Wormald, "Some Illustrated Manuscripts of the Lives of the Saints," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 35 (1934): 256; Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 91-92.
[8] John Higgitt, "The Iconography of St. Peter in Anglo-Saxon England, and St. Cuthbert's Coffin," in *St. Cuthbert: His Cult and his Community to AD 1200*, ed. Gerald Bonner, David Rollason, and Clare Stancliffe (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 1989), 268-270, 284-285.

community, the rebuilding of Durham cathedral in the eleventh century and the extensive loss of portable devotional objects, textiles and wall paintings at, and after, the Reformation.[9]

No evidence survives of pictorial Cuthbertine narratives dating to the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. Again, this may be explained by the extensive loss of wall paintings, textiles, manuscripts and glass. It is possible that Cuthbertine narrative windows were not made, as monumental hagiographic narratives appear, on the surviving evidence, to have been largely absent from fourteenth-century windows. Instead, schemes favoured large standing figures, with single or small-scale narrative groups, often presenting key events, rather than whole narratives.[10] This is evident in the nave windows at York Minster, and may also have been the case at St Mary's Abbey, whose windows apparently contained hagiographic narrative scenes for a number of saints, including St Cuthbert.[11] Whether this was also the case at Durham is uncertain; sixteenth-century descriptions of the lost glazing record a proliferation of standing figures in the windows, but very few can be identified as fourteenth-century in date, with most securely dated to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.[12]

2.1 Cuthbertine Texts

By the fifteenth century, the Cuthbertine cult had a rich textual tradition in both Latin and the vernacular. In addition to his *vitae* and the miracle collections written at Durham,

---

[9] M.G. Snape, "Documentary Evidence for the Building of Durham Cathedral and its Monastic Buildings," in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham Cathedral*, ed. Nicola Coldstream and Peter Draper, *British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions for the year 1977, 3* (Leeds: W.S. Maney, 1980), 21.

[10] Richard Marks, *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages* (Abingdon: Routledge, 1993), 167, 180; Fiona M. Whyte, "The East Window of the Chapel of St Nicholas at All Saints Church, North Moreton," *The Journal of Stained Glass* XIX, no. 2, (1991-93): 107-109. A sixteenth-century description of Durham's customs, monuments and furnishings provides valuable evidence of material lost at Durham. New insights are provided by Philippa Turner's recent investigation of the role of devotional artworks at both Durham and York. Joseph Thomas Fowler, ed. *Rites of Durham: being a description or brief declaration of all the ancient monuments, rites, and customs belonging or being within the monastical church of Durham before the suppression. Written in 1593*, Surtees Society (Durham: Andrews, 1903); Phillipa Turner, "Image and Devotion in Durham Cathedral Priory and York Minster, c.1300-c.1540: New Contexts, New Perspectives" (Unpublished PhD Thesis, 2 vols., University of York, 2014).

[11] Brown, *York Minster*, 130-133, 288-291; Tim Ayers, "Writing about Art: A Monastic Art of Memory at St Mary's Abbey, York, c.1300," in *Word and Image: Proceedings of the Corpus Vitrearum 27th International Colloquium, York, 7-11 July 2014* (York: Corpus Vitrearum, 2014), 24-27; Sarah Brown, *Stained Glass at York Minster* (London: Scala, 2017), 36-39, 42, 47-48.

[12] Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 113-115; Rollason, "Northern Saints," 328.

Cuthbert also featured in the liturgy.[13] This study has briefly surveyed this vast corpus of material to identify potential sources for the St Cuthbert Window's iconography. As discussed in Chapter 1, the reconstruction of the window revealed that the textual sources appear to be limited to Bede's *Vita Prosaica* (hereafter VP) and the anonymous *Libellus de Nativitate* (*Libellus*). Consequently, Section 2.1.1 will focus primarily upon the texts and manuscripts which potentially functioned as sources. The treatment of these textual sources can provide insights into the fifteenth-century Cuthbertine cult, and wider interests in St Cuthbert. Consequently, Section 2.1.2 will also examine the inclusion of these texts in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century liturgical and hagiographical compilations.

The circulation, or availability, and status of all these texts in the fifteenth century may indicate why episodes they feature were selected for depiction in the St Cuthbert Window. Yet, the limited evidence of the contents of York Minster's library, which was established by canon John Newton's bequest of books in 1414, does not record any Cuthbertine texts.[14] A single record – chantry priest John Fewlare's 1530 bequest of a "*librum De vita Sancti Cuthberti*" in 1530 – hints at the circulation of Cuthbertine material by the beginning of the sixteenth century.[15] But it has not been possible to place any of the extant Cuthbertine manuscripts permanently in York.[16] Consequently, the extant sources and manuscripts skew the following discussion towards Durham, the locus of the cult and natural centre of production for

---

[13] Johnson South, *Historia*, 1-2, 5; Dominic Marner, *St. Cuthbert: His Life and Cult in Medieval Durham* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 22, 31; John Hodgson Hinde, ed. *Symeonis Dunelmensis opera et collectanea*, vol. 1, Surtees Society (Durham: Andrews and Company, 1868), 158; Rollason, *Libellus de exordio*; Stephen Willoughby Lawley, ed. *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesie Eboracensis*, 2 vols., vol. 2, Surtees Society (Durham: Andrews, 1882), 221-229.

[14] C. Barr and Bernard L., "The Minster library," in *A History of York Minster*, ed. G. E. Aylmer and Reginald Cant (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 494; John Block Friedman, *Northern English Books, Owners, and Makers in the Late Middle Ages* (Syracuse: University Press, 1995), 205-206; Hannah Jeans, "Book Collections at the Minster before 1414," in *1414: John Neuton and the Re-Foundation of York Minster Library*, ed. Hanna Vorholt and Peter Young, (June 2014), https://hoaportal.york.ac.uk/hoaportal/yml1414essay.jsp?id=42, accessed 14 May 2016; Michele Campopiano, "Neuton's Will," ibid., https://hoaportal.york.ac.uk/hoaportal/yml1414transcription.jsp?id=13, accessed 14 May 2016; Nigel Ramsay, "The Minster Bequest," ibid., https://hoaportal.york.ac.uk/hoaportal/yml1414essay.jsp?id=14, accessed 14 May 2016.

[15] Claire Cross, *York Clergy Wills, 1520-1600: I Minster Clergy*, Borthwick Texts and Calendars: Records of the Northern Province (York: University of York, 1984), 27.

[16] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 20-42; Friedman, *Northern English*, 237-265.

Cuthbertine texts. However, given the relationship between the two institutions, and the donor's role as bishop of Durham, there were clearly opportunities for the transmission of material between York and Durham. Indeed, YT26 was twice loaned to individuals possibly connected to the St Cuthbert Window, firstly to Richard Scrope (Archbishop of York 1398-1405) before 1405, and secondly in 1438 to Robert Neville (Bishop of Durham 1437-57).[17] This not only suggests the lack of such a source in York, but demonstrates that the designers had access to at least VP. It also suggests a mechanism by which they may have accessed the *Libellus*.

2.1.1 Known Textual Analogues: Bede's Vita Prosaica *and the* Libellus de Nativitate

VP was the third Cuthbertine *vita* to be written, but was considered to be the most prestigious throughout the medieval period;[18] indeed, only manuscripts containing VP are known to have been illustrated.[19] VP's popularity was perhaps partly due to the status of its author, Bede (673-735), but also its broad appeal.[20] Before writing VP in *c.*720, Bede had written a metrical *Vita S. Cuthberti* (hereafter VM), *c.*705.[21] By restructuring, revising and expanding upon the anonymous *Life* of *c.*699-705, he created a more universal and timeless narrative which focused on the symbolic and didactic significance of the events it contained.[22] VP closely, but not completely, follows the structure and content of the metrical *Vita.*[23] Yet its "plainer language" makes it more accessible and therefore more suitable for the broader transmission of Cuthbert's cult, rather than private contemplation, responding to the need for universal appeal as the cult was promoted further afield in England and on the continent.[24]

---

[17] DUL, Misc.Ch. 2352; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 149, 193.
[18] Michael Lapidge and Rosalind Love, "The Latin Hagiography of England and Wales (600-1500)," in *Hagiographies*, ed. Guy Philippart (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), 214.
[19] London, BL, Yates Thompson 26; Oxford, University College, MS 165; Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O.1.64.
[20] Lapidge and Love, "Latin Hagiography," 213-214.
[21] Michael Lapidge, "Bede's Metrical *Vita S. Cuthberti*," in *St. Cuthbert: His Cult and his Community to AD 1200*, ed. Gerald Bonner, David Rollason, and Clare Stancliffe (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 1989), 85.
[22] Thacker, "Origins," 115, 119; Lapidge and Love, "Latin Hagiography," 214-215; Lapidge, "Metrical *Vita*," 77-78, 84-85, 90-91; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 13; Berschin, "Opus deliberatum," 95.
[23] Lapidge, "Metrical *Vita*," 77; Berschin, "Opus deliberatum," 99.
[24] Lapidge, "Metrical *Vita*," 77, 93; Lapidge and Love, "Latin Hagiography," 214-215.

After Bede, several authors contributed additional material on St Cuthbert, often drawing upon VP, alongside the continued copying of both the anonymous and Bedan *vitae*. While these were not used as sources for the St Cuthbert Window, they demonstrate the continual collection, compilation and adaptation of Cuthbertine narratives to promote contemporary agendas.[25] The tenth- or eleventh-century *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto (*hereafter *Historia)* follows a summary of Cuthbert's life with descriptions of property at Lindisfarne and that which had been acquired during the Community's travels, essentially documenting and defending their possessions.[26] Similarly, after the Benedictines ousted the Community at Durham *c.*1080, they began an ambitious rebuilding, to provide an appropriate setting for St Cuthbert's shrine, which would rival contemporary cathedrals that were also in possession of great saints.[27] In 1104 they translated St Cuthbert's relics, in a re-enactment of his first translation, in order to authenticate and popularise his presence in Durham.[28] This event was accompanied by the prolific acquisition, study and compilation of Cuthbertine texts, as well as their expansion with additional Durham-focused miracles.[29] In a self-conscious campaign to justify and promote Benedictine control, texts were carefully crafted to convey new elements of Cuthbert's cult, such as his misogyny, whilst emphasising the links between the contemporary community and the early cult at Lindisfarne.[30] These included seven additional miracles recorded *c.*1070-80,[31] four derived from the *Historia*,[32] followed by another eight miracles between 1100 and 1104, collectively referred to as the *Miracula Sancti Cuthberti*

---

[25] Thacker, "Origins," 110.
[26] Johnson South, *Historia*, 1-2, 5, 11-12.
[27] Malcolm Thurlby, "The Roles of the Patron and the Master Mason in the First Design of the Romanesque Cathedral of Durham," in *Anglo-Norman Durham: 1093-1193*, ed. David Rollason, Margaret Harvey, and Michael Prestwich (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994), 161, 165-166; John Crook, "The Architectural Setting of the Cult of St Cuthbert in Durham Cathedral (1093-1200)," ibid., 239.
[28] A. J. Piper, "The First Generations of Durham Monks and the Cult of St Cuthbert," in *St. Cuthbert: His Cult and his Community to AD 1200*, ed. Gerald Bonner, David Rollason, and Clare Stancliffe (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989), 437-438.
[29] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 96-97, 106.
[30] Piper, "First Generations," 439-440, 444-445; William M. Aird, *St Cuthbert and the Normans: the Church of Durham, 1071-1153*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998), 125, 137; Rollason, *Libellus de exordio*, lxxxiii.
[31] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 95-96.
[32] Johnson South, *Historia*, 9.

(hereafter *Miracula*).[33] Likewise, Symeon of Durham drew heavily upon the *Historia* for his early twelfth-century *Libellus de exordio*.[34] Both Symeon and Reginald of Durham wrote accounts of the 1104 translation of Cuthbert's body, in the early- and mid-twelfth century respectively.[35] These accounts, along with the twelfth-century *Brevis Relatio*, a collection of extracts from Bede and Symeon, often appear in manuscripts containing VP, demonstrating that they did not supplant Bede's authoritative *vita*.[36]

Likewise, the substantially greater number of known and extant manuscripts of VP, compared to the anonymous and metrical *vitae*, suggests its greater popularity. Colgrave identified VP in thirty-eight extant manuscripts, dating from the tenth to the sixteenth centuries, and a further twenty-five lost manuscripts.[37] In contrast, only seven copies of the anonymous *Life*, and around twenty of the metrical *Vita* are known to be extant.[38] While the extensive loss of manuscripts means that such comparisons can only be indicative, the Durham Cathedral Priory book catalogues of 1392, 1395 and 1416 also record a greater number of copies of VP; of the seven manuscripts which are described as lives of St Cuthbert, four can be linked to extant manuscripts containing VP, but not the other two *vitae*.[39] While the labelling of the remaining three manuscripts does not distinguish which *vita(e)* they contained, it is likely that at least one also contained VP, as it is described identically to two of the extant manuscripts, suggesting similar content.[40]

Three of the four extant manuscripts, including YT26, have been dated to the twelfth century,[41] indicating the importance of VP in the reinvigoration of the cult at this date.

---

[33] Bertram Colgrave, "The Post-Bedan Miracles," in *The Early Cultures of North-West Europe: H.M. Chadwick Memorial Studies*, ed. Cyril Fox and Bruce Dickins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950), 308, 310-319; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 16-17; Marner, *Cuthbert*, 31; Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 156.
[34] Johnson South, *Historia*; Rollason, *Libellus de exordio*, xlii.
[35] Marner, *Cuthbert*, 22; Hodgson Hinde, *Symeonis*, vol. 1, 158.
[36] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 17; Colgrave, "Miracles," 309.
[37] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 20-42.
[38] Ibid., 17-20; Helmut Gneuss and Michael Lapidge, "The earliest manuscript of Bede's metrical *Vita S. Cudbercti*," *Anglo-Saxon England* 32 (2003): 43.
[39] DCL, MS B.IV.46, f.10r-10v, 21r-21v, 32r, 41v.
[40] Ibid., f.21r, 32r.
[41] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 21, 31-33.

Furthermore, the dating of the other extant manuscripts indicates near-continuous production throughout the medieval period, demonstrating Bede's enduring authority.[42] The contents of manuscripts containing VP are particularly indicative of its status and function. In manuscripts focused primarily on Cuthbert, VP often appears as the first main text, usually followed by additional miracles, or summaries based on VP, composed at Durham in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[43] Indeed, the longstanding authority of VP is demonstrated by its use as a source for later Cuthbertine compilations and liturgical material, as will be discussed below. Many of the extant manuscripts include VP alongside numerous other saints' lives, demonstrating its importance for the promotion of Cuthbertine devotion.[44] In fact, while only eight Cuthbertine manuscripts are listed in the Durham catalogues, Colgrave suggested that up to sixteen were made at Durham before the sixteenth century.[45] That so few remained there suggests that many were made for wider distribution. There is also evidence that manuscripts were lent to individuals and institutions, such as two different "*Vita[e] Sancti Cuthberti*", respectively lent to the Prior of Stamford in 1422 and sent to Durham College, Oxford *c.*1400.[46]

Although sparse, the descriptions of the manuscripts retained at Durham can provide evidence of devotional trends. Of particular interest to the investigation of the St Cuthbert Window is the presence of at least two manuscripts containing the *Libellus* in the Durham book catalogues;[47] the labelling and location of a third within a cluster of Cuthbertine *vitae* suggests that it too contained the *Libellus*, or possibly one of its sources.[48] The presence of so many copies of the *Libellus* in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries demonstrates that the cult perceived it as an important part of Cuthbertine hagiography by this date. As a key source for the St Cuthbert Window, which has received little scholarly attention, a brief survey of its contents and structure is necessary. The text itself has been dated to the 1190s,

[42] Ibid., 20-42.
[43] Ibid., 26-28, 34, 36.
[44] Ibid., 26, 29-31, 33-38.
[45] Ibid., 21-23, 25-26, 28-34.
[46] DCL, MS B.IV.46, f.47v; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 41.
[47] DCL, MS B.IV.46, f.10r, 21v, 41v.
[48] "A. liber de mirabilibus hybernie", DCL, MS B.IV.46, f.10v, 41r.

and is composed primarily of Scottish sources which have been adapted to substantiate Cuthbert's alleged Irish origins.[49] The various episodes, relating to both Cuthbert's infancy and adulthood, were arranged together, with additional material which the anonymous author identified as interpolations.[50] As a result, although the text follows a broadly chronological structure, the narrative is frequently interrupted by interpolated miracles.

Latin versions of the *Libellus* are known in only five manuscripts, all probably made at Durham.[51] Three of these, London, BL, Cotton Titus A.II (hereafter Titus), York, Minster Library and Archive, MS XVI.I.12 (hereafter York) and Oxford, Bodleian, Fairfax 6 (hereafter Fairfax), have been respectively dated to the early, mid- and late fourteenth century.[52] Fairfax has been identified in the Durham cloister catalogue of 1395, while an *ex libris* in York also places it in Durham in the fifteenth century.[53] The incipits and the Libellan text in both of the other two manuscripts, London, Lincoln's Inn, Hale 114 and London, BL, Harley 4843, which respectively date to the early fifteenth century and *c.*1528,[54] indicate that they were copied from Fairfax.[55] Consequently, the discussion here will initially focus upon the three fourteenth-century manuscripts. As Fairfax was copied in the fifteenth century, and is otherwise the closest in date to the St Cuthbert Window, this study has used it for all transcriptions and translations of the *Libellus* given below.

This study's comparison of the division and labelling of the texts has revealed that, although the Libellan text in each of the manuscripts is broadly consistent in content and division, the labelling differs. In Titus, rubricated titles precede each episode, providing

---

[49] Crumplin, "Cuthbert," 126; Clancy, "Magpie Hagiography," 216-217; Grosjean, "Alleged," 144.
[50] Oxford, Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.1r; Clancy, "Magpie Hagiography," 217, 225.
[51] London, BL, Cotton Titus A.II, f.134r–147v; London, BL, Harley 4843, f.2r-9v; Oxford, Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.1r-8r; YMLA, MS XVI.I.12, f.71r–84v; London, Lincoln's Inn, Hale 114, f.171v-181r; Rollason, *Libellus de exordio*, xxxi-xxxiii, xxxiv-xxxix; Thomas Duffus Hardy, ed. *Descriptive catalogue of materials relating to the history of Great Britain and Ireland to the end of the reign of Henry VII*, vol. 1 (London: Longman, 1862), 310.
[52] N. R. Ker and A. J. Piper, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, vol. 4: Paisley-York (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 720; Rollason, *Libellus de exordio*, xxxii, xxxvi, xxxviii.
[53] DCL, MS B.IV.46, 21r; Ker and Piper, *Manuscripts*, vol. 4: Paisley-York, 722.
[54] BL, Harley 4843, f.262r; N. R. Ker and A. J. Piper, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, vol. 1: London (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), 131-132.
[55] H. H. E. Craster, "The Red Book of Durham: I. Liber Ruber," *The English Historical Review* 40, no. 160 (1925): 507.

summaries of the content similar to those in VP. In contrast, York and Fairfax only provide three rubricated incipits and explicits, and a single additional title (Figure 2.3 and Figure 2.4), marking an interpolation at chapter 11, all of which differ slightly from Titus.[56] Additionally, Titus has marginal numbering, which runs from the first to the fourteenth heading, then restarts at an interpolation at chapter 15.[57] There is no evidence of this division in the other manuscripts, and no acknowledgement or explanation is given in Titus. As the printed transcription of York,[58] and summary translation,[59] do not provide details of these differences, they have been summarised in Appendix 7.1. To avoid confusion, references to chapters within *Libellus* use this table's numbering.

While further research is warranted, a brief comparison of the structure of the *Libellus* within the three manuscripts provides insights into the origin and treatment of the episodes and highlights its compiled structure. Of particular interest to this study is the separation of the childhood and adulthood episodes evident in all three manuscripts. Thomas Clancy linked two of the adult miracles to the same source as some of the childhood miracles.[60] Yet, the evidence of divisions and labelling within the extant manuscripts suggests that their different subject-matter, if not source, was recognised. York and Fairfax have an explicit: "Here ends the little book about the birth of St Cuthbert, selected and translated from Scottish histories", after the miracle of Cuthbert's clothing;[61] Titus simply has "*Explicit*".[62] Moreover, while York lacks an incipit for the adult miracles, and Titus gives "Here begins another [book] about Cuthbert's infancy and his miracles",[63] Fairfax labels them "Here begins [material] about his arrival in Scotland",[64] stating in the explicit to this section that they were excerpted from

[56] BL, Harley 4843, f.2r-9v; Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.1r, 3r, 6r, 7v; YMLA, MS XVI.I.12, f.71r-71v, 75v, 80v, 84r; BL, Titus A.II, f.134r–134v, 138v, 143v, 147v.
[57] BL, Titus A.II, f.140v.
[58] Raine, *Miscellanea*, viii-ix, 64-87.
[59] Dodds, "The Little Book of the Birth of St Cuthbert," 64-94.
[60] Clancy, "Magpie Hagiography," 220, 223-224.
[61] "*Explicit libellus de natiuitate sancti Cuthberti de hystoriis hybernensum excerptus et translatus*" (with minor spelling variants), Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.6r; YMLA, MS XVI.I.12, 80v; Appendix 7.1.
[62] BL, Titus A.II, f.143v; Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.6r; YMLA, MS XVI.I.12, 81r.
[63] "*Incipit alia de Infancia Cuthberti et miraculis ipsius*", BL, Titus A.II, f.143v.
[64] "*Incipit de aduentum eius in Scocia*", Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.6r.

Scottish histories.[65] Indeed, this distinction is recorded in the Durham Catalogue entry for Fairfax.[66]

The different degrees of embellishment between the manuscripts suggests that different patrons or functions were intended. In Titus both titles and decorated initials mark the start of each episode. With the exceptions noted above, York marks each episode only with a decorated initial (Figure 2.5), and Fairfax only with a slightly larger initial (Figure 2.6). As this seems to represent a trend in diminishing embellishment as the century progressed, it may suggest that the later volumes were made for dissemination or study. James Clark has identified a similar pattern in manuscripts produced for study within St Alban's Abbey in the late fourteenth century.[67] Further comparison of the contents of Titus, York and Fairfax supports this interpretation. Although Titus has been rebound with other material, obscuring its original structure, the Libellan text may be coeval with the copy of Symeon's *Libellus de Exordio*, which currently occupies f.2r-68r.[68] Both York and Fairfax also contain the *Libellus de Exordio*, as well as other Durham histories.[69] However, in addition to Cuthbertine texts, including VP and VM, Fairfax also incorporates a substantial quantity of other hagiographical material.[70] This shift towards compilations of a greater range of hagiographical, devotional and historical material corresponds with wider trends seen in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century monastic manuscript production, including at St Alban's.[71]

The longstanding tradition of including the *Libellus* at the beginning of manuscripts which combined Cuthbertine hagiography and history is demonstrated by London, BL, Arundel 332, whose contents are strikingly similar to the twelfth-century manuscripts

---

[65] "*Explicit libellus de vita sancti Cuthberti de hystoriis scottorum excerptus*", Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.7v.
[66] DCL, MS B.IV.46, f.10v, 21r.
[67] James G. Clark, *A Monastic Renaissance at St. Albans: Thomas Walsingham and his Circle, c. 1350-1440* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), 104.
[68] BL, Titus A.II, f.2r-68r, 134r–147v; Rollason, *Libellus de exordio*, xxxi-xxxiii.
[69] YMLA, MS XVI.I.12, f.96r-165v; Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.212v-248r. Ker and Piper, *Manuscripts*, vol. 4: Paisley-York, 720-722; Rollason, *Libellus de exordio*, xxxiv-xxxix.
[70] Falconer Madan, H. H. E. Craster, and Noël Denholm-Young, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, vol. 2, pt.2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), 773-775.
[71] Clark, *Monastic Renaissance*, 103-109; Lapidge and Love, "Latin Hagiography," 303-310.

containing VP discussed above.[72] Dated to the mid-thirteenth century, and bearing a fifteenth-century Durham *ex libris*, it originally contained a now-lost copy of the *Libellus*, followed by VP, HE 31 and 32, the *Miracula* and the *Brevis Relatio*.[73] Consequently, while the extensive collection of material contained in Fairfax likely results from the wider fourteenth-century trend for the compilation of hagiographic and historical material,[74] the similarities in the contents of manuscripts containing the *Libellus* indicate its consistent status through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In particular, its repeated appearance alongside texts related to the history of the community and Cuthbertine hagiography indicates its perceived historical, as well as devotional, importance. This is further supported by the fifteenth-century transcription of material from Fairfax in Hale 114, which has been linked to Prior Wessington through the historical compilation which precedes it.[75] Wessington led the fifteenth-century Durham community in compiling various histories of the cult, the church of Durham and the Benedictine order.[76] While the *Libellus* is written in a different hand,[77] its inclusion in this context and at this date suggests that it was considered of particular relevance to the history of the cult. Moreover, as will be discussed in Chapter 2.4, Wessington was possibly involved in the design of the lost Cuthbertine glass at Durham, around this time.[78] Consequently, Hale 114 is a valuable indication of his familiarity with, if not his compilation of, material relevant to the design of pictorial Cuthbertine narratives.

Additionally, Hale 114 contains a copy of a poem found in Titus, which combines the *Libellus* with other Cuthbertine sources. H.H.E. Craster identified the author as Thomas Stockton, a Durham monk who died in 1354, based on an attribution that appears only in Hale 114.[79] The poem, which has been previously misidentified as both Bede's VM[80] and the

---

[72] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 29-30.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Lapidge and Love, "Latin Hagiography," 302.
[75] R. B. Dobson, *Durham Priory, 1400-1450* (Cambridge: University Press, 1973), 379-380; Craster, "Red Book," 513, 515-516.
[76] Dobson, *Durham*, 379, 380.
[77] Craster, "Red Book," 505.
[78] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 340-341; R. L. Storey, *Thomas Langley and the Bishopric of Durham, 1406-1437* (London: S.P.C.K., 1961), 199; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 44.
[79] Lincoln's Inn, Hale 114, f.154v; Craster, "Red Book," 506.
[80] Rollason, *Libellus de exordio*, xxxii.

Libellus,[81] has not been published, nor have its sources been fully identified. It summarises the Libellan events and features very little of Cuthbert's adult life, probably drawing upon the anonymous *Life*,[82] but provides a substantial summary of posthumous and Durham-focused events.[83] Consequently, the poem not only demonstrates the compilation of episodes from a range of sources, including the *Libellus* and historically-focused Durham texts in the fourteenth century, but its transcription in Hale 114 shows the continued interest in such compilations in the fifteenth century.

From this brief survey, it is clear that both VP and the *Libellus* had enduring authority and prestige in the fifteenth century. This is demonstrated by the retention and continued use of copies in twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts, at least one of which contained both texts, as well as the creation of new manuscripts, including Fairfax and Hale 114, when the Durham community was actively expanding and formalising its library.[84] While the small number of manuscripts limits broad conclusions, the change, by the fifteenth century, in the contents of manuscripts which contain VP and the *Libellus* probably responds to wider trends in hagiographic compilation.[85] Yet the manuscripts also demonstrate an interest in elevating the cult's status and defending the rights of the Durham community. The use of Cuthbertine hagiography to support this agenda raises the possibility that contemporary pictorial cycles articulated similar ideas. If so, some of these agendas may have been articulated in the St Cuthbert Window, particularly if Durham sources or individuals were involved in its design.

As noted above, although there is limited evidence of the manuscripts in circulation at York during the fifteenth century, Cuthbertine manuscripts certainly travelled beyond

---

[81] Raine, *Miscellanea*, xi.

[82] Lincoln's Inn, MS 114, f.150r, refers to the river "ledyr", a detail given in the anonymous *Life*, but not VP or VM. Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 68-69, 164-167. Further examination of the potential sources is needed.

[83] Lincoln's Inn, Hale 114, f.149r-154v.

[84] Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.1r-8r, 13r-29v; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 23-24, 29-30; Ker and Piper, *Manuscripts*, vol. 1: London, 131-132; Dobson, *Durham*, 364-369.

[85] Lapidge and Love, "Latin Hagiography," 303-310; Clark, *Monastic Renaissance*, 103-109; Virginia Blanton, "The Lost and (not) Found: Sources for Female Saints' Legends in John of Tynemouth's Sanctilogium," in *A Companion to British Literature, I: Medieval Literature, 700-1450*, ed. Robert DeMaria, Jr., Heesok Chang, and Samantha Zacher (Malden, Mass.: Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 67.

Durham.[86] The elements of Cuthbert's *vitae* which featured in liturgical texts and hagiographical compilations can also provide evidence of the wider projection of Cuthbert, beyond the locus of the cult, which may have affected the design of the St Cuthbert Window. It is to these texts that we now turn.

2.1.2 Cuthbert in the Liturgy and Legendaries

A brief overview of Cuthbertine material in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century liturgical and hagiographical compilations reveals not only the enduring authority of VP, but also the selectivity and flexibility with which narrative episodes were compiled. The lack of standardisation in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century liturgical and hagiographical manuscripts complicates broader interpretations.[87] Nevertheless, the selection of material can indicate established hagiographical traditions.[88] Consequently, although it is beyond the scope of this study to undertake an extensive comparison of the Cuthbertine material included in different manuscripts, in addition to the printed editions of the York and Sarum Uses, one extant manuscript of each Use has been consulted.[89] This brief sketch provides valuable insights into Cuthbert's devotional presence beyond the locus of his cult, and potential attitudes to St Cuthbert at York Minster, where there is no evidence of a particular devotion to St Cuthbert before 1426, as will be discussed in Chapter 3.

The most widespread transmission of the Cuthbertine legend would have occurred through liturgical readings for his feast day on 20th March and his translation on 4th September.[90] Copies of both Sarum and York Use breviaries prescribe nine lessons for

---

[86] DCL, MS B.IV.46, f.41v, 47v.
[87] Richard William Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History* (Cambridge: University Press, 2009), 3, 148, 365; Sherry Reames, "Unexpected Texts for Saints in Some Sarum Breviary Manuscripts," in *The Study of Medieval Manuscripts of England: Festschrift in Honor of Richard W. Pfaff*, ed. George Hardin Brown and Linda E. Voigts, *Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, 35* (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2010), 163.
[88] Pfaff, *Liturgy*, 3; Reames, "Unexpected Texts," 165.
[89] BNF, Latin 17294, f.434v-437v; YMLA, Additional 70, f.239r-240v; Francis Procter and Christopher Wordsworth, eds., *Breviarium ad Usum Insignis Ecclesiae Sarum*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: University Press, 1879–86), vol. 3, 217-224; Lawley, *Breviarium Eboracensis*, vol. 2, 221-229.
[90] Friedman, *Northern English*, 255.

Cuthbert's feast day and three for his translation.[91] As Richard Pfaff stresses, "the presence of a particular text or rubric or feast in a service book is not firm evidence for actual *use*", a caution increasingly echoed in recent scholarship.[92] However, Cuthbert's presence in both the Sarum and York Uses, and status as a major English saint, make it likely that his lessons would have featured within the liturgy. More pertinent to the present study are the differences in the content of the lessons, not only between the York and Sarum Use, but also between individual manuscripts of the same Use.[93] Both Uses source miracles only from VP, but those consulted have only four episodes in common.[94] While differences between the Uses can only be tentatively sketched here, they illustrate the variation in the content and structure of the lessons, demonstrating the difficulties faced when investigating possible links between liturgical practice and editorial choices in pictorial cycles. York Use breviaries reference a greater number of Cuthbertine miracles in the antiphons preceding and following the lessons; as a result, they typically refer to around fifteen different episodes, whereas Sarum Use manuscripts focus on only ten. This may reflect the greater awareness of, and interest in, Cuthbertine material in the northern archdiocese. Additionally, although beginning with events early in VP and ending with Cuthbert's death, the York Use lessons otherwise present the events in a different order to VP; this chronological fluidity is amplified by the antiphons. In contrast, the Sarum Use breviaries sampled generally employ a chronology close to VP.

These differences in content and structure are important for understanding the selection of Cuthbertine miracles transmitted in vernacular hagiographical compilations. St Cuthbert's legend appears in at least twenty extant manuscript copies of the *South English Legendary* (SEL), which was produced in increasing numbers from the thirteenth century.[95]

---

[91] BNF, Latin 17294, f.434v-437v, 565r-566r; YMLA, Additional 70, f.239r-240v; Procter and Wordsworth, *Breviarium Sarum*, vol. 3, 217-224, 765; Lawley, *Breviarium Eboracensis*, vol. 2, 221-229, 530-531.

[92] Pfaff, *Liturgy*, 3; Reames, "Unexpected Texts," 163-164; ibid.; John Lowden, "Illuminated Books and the Liturgy: Survey of Research (1980–2003) and Some Reflections on Method," in *Objects, Images, and the Word: Art in the Service of the Liturgy*, ed. Colum Hourihane (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 22.

[93] Andrew Hughes, *Cataloguing Discrepancies: The Printed York Breviary of 1493* (Toronto: University Press, 2010), 61.

[94] VP chapters 4, 7, 24/25 and 39/40. See Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 164-167, 174-179, 234-241, 282-289.

[95] Anne Booth Thompson, *Everyday Saints and the Art of Narrative in the South English Legendary* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 3.

The content and format of the Cuthbertine material, which is generally consistent between surviving SEL manuscripts, suggests it was derived from a York Use breviary.[96] All eight episodes in the SEL feature in the York Use, while the only correspondences with the Sarum Use are the four episodes noted above as common to both York and Sarum.[97] The presence of these miracles in the vernacular would have enabled broader transmission, as they would have been comprehensible to a wider demographic. Anne Thompson has argued that the SEL's language and metre were comprehensible to the relatively uneducated, making it suitable for public readings to lay audiences, as well as private devotion.[98] Moreover, scholarship increasingly identifies a greater level of literacy in the late medieval period than was previously thought.[99]

The contents of the SEL may therefore have been shaped by wider audiences, and potentially can indicate popular conceptions of the Cuthbertine cult. For example, the identification of Cuthbert as bishop of Durham, rather than Lindisfarne, is indicative of the success of the Durham community in promoting itself as the locus of the cult.[100] This is further amplified in the Cuthbertine material appended to some copies of the *Gilte Legende* of *c.*1438.[101] As Cuthbert was not included in the French *Legenda Aurea,* upon which the *Gilte Legende* was based, a summarised form of the Cuthbertine material from the SEL was used.[102] Cuthbert is again described as bishop of Durham, but an additional episode highlights the movement of Cuthbert's body to a shrine at Durham, emphasising the cult's contemporary locus.[103] These

---

[96] Oxford, Bodleian, Bodley 779, f.134r-135r; Oxford, Bodleian, Laud Misc. 108, f.154v-155v; Charlotte D'Evelyn and Anna Jean Mill, eds., *The South English Legendary*, 3 vols., vol. 1, Early English Text Society, Original Series no. 235 (Oxford University Press, 1956), x, 118-121.

[97] Bodleian, Bodley 779, f.134r-135r; Bodleian, Laud Misc. 108, f.154v-155v; BNF, Latin 17294, f.434v-437v, 565r-566r; YMLA, Additional 70, f.239r-240v; Procter and Wordsworth, *Breviarium Sarum*, vol. 3, 217-223; Lawley, *Breviarium Eboracensis*, vol. 2, 223-229; D'Evelyn and Mill, *SEL*, vol. 1, 118-121.

[98] Thompson, *Everyday Saints*, 193.

[99] Maidie Hilmo, *Medieval Images, Icons, and Illustrated English Literary Texts: From Ruthwell Cross to the Ellesmere Chaucer* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 193; Friedman, *Northern English*, xxi, 1.

[100] Bodleian, Bodley 779, f. 134v; D'Evelyn and Mill, *SEL*, vol. 1, 121.

[101] R. F. S. Hamer and Vida Russell, eds., *Supplementary Lives in Some Manuscripts of the Gilte Legende*, Early English Text Society, Original Series no. 315 (Oxford: University Press, 2000), xiii-xv.

[102] Manfred Görlach, *Studies in Middle English Saints' Legends* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1998), 72-73, 113; Hamer and Russell, *Supplementary*, xiv, 217-221.

[103] "aftir his deth he was translatid and put into a worshipful shyryne in the towne of Derham", Hamer and Russell, *Supplementary*, 221.

emphases are of interest given the almost complete absence of Durham references in the St Cuthbert Window itself, within York Minster.

The slight changes in content between the York Use breviaries, the SEL and the *Gilte Legende* demonstrate the continued adaptation, as well as the selectivity with which the Cuthbertine narrative was employed in formats beyond the cult's core hagiography. In particular, they underline the authority of VP as the primary source of Cuthbertine material. Of similar interest to this study is John of Tynemouth's fourteenth-century *Sanctilogium*, a comprehensive Latin legendary of English saints. Although it survives only in BL, Cotton Tiberius E.I, there are several extant late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century copies of the text arranged in alphabetical, rather than liturgical, order, known as the *Nova Legenda Anglie*.[104] The *Sanctilogium* uses both the *Libellus* and VP, as well as later Durham texts by Symeon and Reginald, as sources for the entry on St Cuthbert.[105] As both versions probably circulated in monastic institutions, the comparably extensive collections of hagiographic material for other saints in the *Sanctilogium* likely demonstrate the author's alignment with the contemporaneously common trend for compiling comprehensive collections, rather than a specific interest in St Cuthbert.[106] Nevertheless, the inclusion of a significant proportion of Libellan episodes indicates its status at this date and is of particular interest when considering the combination of episodes from VP and the *Libellus* in the St Cuthbert Window. The *Sanctilogium* excludes several episodes, some of which were described as interpolations by the Libellan author.[107] At least two of these episodes feature in the St Cuthbert Window.[108] In further contrast with the window, the *Sanctilogium* does include some Libellan adult miracles.[109] It therefore provides evidence of other approaches to the excerption and compilation of Cuthbertine episodes in the fourteenth century.

---

[104] Blanton, "Sanctilogium," 66-67; Lapidge and Love, "Latin Hagiography," 310.
[105] Carl B. Horstmann, ed. *Nova Legenda Anglie: As Collected by John of Tynemouth, John Capgrave, and Others, and First Printed, with New Lives, by Wynkyn de Worde A.D. MDXVI* (Oxford: Clarendon press, 1901), xxx-xxxi.
[106] Ibid.; Blanton, "Sanctilogium," 67; Lapidge and Love, "Latin Hagiography," 306.
[107] *Libellus*, chapters 3, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15-17, 19-20, 23, 28, 29.
[108] *Libellus*, chapters 20 and 23. Catalogue: 8d, 9b.
[109] *Libellus*, chapters 24-27.

Even more valuable evidence of the treatment and combination of the various Cuthbertine narratives is provided by London, BL, Egerton 3309 (hereafter Egerton), which was written in or near Durham, in the first or second quarter of the fifteenth century.[110] While not strictly a legendary, but rather, a vernacular compilation of Cuthbertine narratives, it has compositional similarities with both the earlier Cuthbertine manuscripts and the later selections of material in the legendaries.[111] It comprises four books of English verse translations from several of the Latin Cuthbertine lives. Book I opens with an introduction and summary of the contents by the author, followed by the *Libellus*, with the exception of the final chapters 24-29. Book II contains the whole of VP, while Book III begins with HE chapters 31 and 32, followed by material from the *Auctarium de Miraculis* and Symeon's *History of the Church of Durham*. Finally Book IV begins with the opening chapters of the *Brevis Relatio*, followed by further historical material relating to the cult and community at Durham, and ending with the translator's own conclusion.[112]

Like the *Libellus*, Egerton has received little scholarly attention since its nineteenth-century transcription by Fowler, who became aware of it shortly after the restoration of the St Cuthbert Window.[113] Recently, however, Christian Liddy has considered the agendas evident in Book III, while Christiania Whitehead's broader re-examination of the author's approach to translation and compilation considered the question of its intended audience.[114] Such questions are of interest to the present study, as the manuscript was not only made around the same time as the St Cuthbert Window, but also nearby. As a result, insights into Egerton's function, and the author's approach to narrative construction, can provide evidence of contemporary attitudes to the Cuthbertine legends.

---

[110] Angus McIntosh, M. L. Samuels, and Michael Benskin, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, vol. 1 (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1986), 109; Liddy, *Bishopric*, 193.
[111] Whitehead, "Regional," 129.
[112] London, BL, Egerton 3309; Joseph Thomas Fowler, ed. *The life of Saint Cuthbert in English verse, c. A.D. 1450, from the original MS. in the library at Castle Howard*, Surtees Society (Durham: Andrews and Company, 1891), vi-vii; Whitehead, "Regional," 115-117.
[113] Fowler, "Additional Notes," 487.
[114] Liddy, *Bishopric*, 193-198, 106-207; Whitehead, "Regional," 115-118, 122-130.

Egerton's contents are strikingly similar to the twelfth-century manuscripts containing VP, as well as the thirteenth-century BL, Arundel 332.[115] As these manuscripts have been linked to the promotion and defence of the cult and community, it is plausible that a similar function was intended for Egerton in the fifteenth century. As noted above, the fifteenth-century community, led by Prior Wessington, certainly engaged in the contemporaneously common practice of compiling material both to illustrate its history and defend its rights.[116] Liddy and Whitehead have argued that regional agendas of the Durham monks are evident both in the material selected, and in its precise translation and presentation.[117] Indeed, while Books I and II closely translate the *Libellus* and VP, both Liddy and Whitehead have argued that the author translates the various sources for Books 3 and 4 more freely, to promote and defend the bishopric's rights and foster cohesion with the people of Durham.[118] This is achieved through the augmentation of the narrative to emphasise the ancient association between the people of the saint, the *Haliwerfolc*, as both protectors and beneficiaries of St Cuthbert, aligning them with the agendas of the bishopric.[119] Moreover, Whitehead has argued that the author's preface and use of the vernacular suggest that a member of the community at Durham compiled the text with a lay audience in mind.[120]

Egerton's circulation and intended use can be tentatively proposed. As noted above, there is some evidence of the circulation of devotional material, including Cuthbertine *vitae*, between York chantry priests in the early sixteenth century.[121] While specific associations cannot be proven, the format of the book suggests that it was intended to be both portable and easy to use one-handed.[122] Consisting of 103 folios, measuring *c.*140 x 255mm, it is of similar

---

[115] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 29-30.
[116] Liddy, *Bishopric*, 198; Katherine J. Lewis, "History, Historiography and Re-writing the Past," in *A Companion to Middle English Hagiography*, ed. Sarah Salih (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 2006), 128-133; Whitehead, "Regional," 117; Dobson, *Durham*, 377-380.
[117] Liddy, *Bishopric*, 193-198, 106-207; Whitehead, "Regional," 115-118 122-130.
[118] Liddy, *Bishopric*, 193, 195-197; Whitehead, "Regional," 120-122.
[119] Liddy, *Bishopric*, 193, 195-197, 206-207; Whitehead, "Regional," 120-122.
[120] Whitehead, "Regional," 117-118.
[121] Cross, *Clergy Wills*, 27; N.A. Edwards, "The Chantry Priests of York Minster in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century" (Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of York, 1999), 19-20.
[122] Erik Kwakkel, "Decoding the material book: cultural residue in medieval manuscripts," in *The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches*, ed. Michael Johnston and Michael Van Dussen, *Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 60, 72.

dimensions and has a comparably narrow relative width (0.55:1) to manuscripts which Suzanne Reynolds and Eric Kwakkel identified as intended for teaching uses.[123] The various contents of similarly narrow manuscripts, so-called "holsterbooks", have been highlighted in a range of scholarship debating their function.[124] While there is a lack of consensus, most of the examples cited, such as household account books, devotional material, plays and romances, would likewise have benefitted from being both portable and easy to consult in a single hand. Consequently, it is plausible that Egerton was written for public lay edification at Durham.

Given the interest in both textual and pictorial Cuthbertine narratives at Durham in the fifteenth century, it is worth considering whether Egerton was intended for use alongside the stained glass, as has been suggested elsewhere, including at Canterbury.[125] However, the close translation of VP and the *Libellus*, and the lack of evidence for windows depicting scenes drawn from Books III and IV, suggests that it was not written as an interpretative aid for stained glass at Durham. Nevertheless, Egerton and the St Cuthbert Window exhibit comparable approaches to the combination of episodes from the *Libellus* and VP. In addition to demonstrating the continued compilation and augmentation of Cuthbertine narratives to suit contemporary agendas, Egerton indicates an interest in providing a more streamlined synthesis of its sources.[126] Egerton is the sole extant vernacular version of the *Libellus*, and, significantly, it is also the only manuscript which joins the *Libellus* to VP at a chronologically coherent point, by omitting the *Libellus*' adult miracles.[127] Whitehead has suggested that contemporary anti-Scottish sentiment may account for the omission.[128] While this is a

---

[123] Ibid., 71-72; Suzanne Reynolds, *Medieval Reading: Grammar, Rhetoric, and the Classical Text* (Cambridge: University Press, 1996), 108-115.
[124] Kwakkel, "Decoding," 60, 72; Simon Horobin and Alison Wiggins, "Reconsidering Lincoln's Inn MS 150," *Medium Ævum* 77, no. 1 (2008): 32; Taylor Andrew, "The Myth of the Minstrel Manuscript," *Speculum* 66, no. 1 (1991): 57-58; Maldwyn Mills and Gillian Rogers, "The manuscripts of popular romance," in *A Companion to Medieval Popular Romance*, ed. Raluca Radulescu and Cory James Rushton, *Studies in Medieval Romance* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2009), 50-51; Reynolds, *Medieval Reading*, 108-116.
[125] Marks, *Stained Glass*, 61.
[126] Whitehead, "Regional," 119.
[127] BL, Egerton 3309, f.15r.
[128] Whitehead, "Regional," 127.

possibility, an alternative explanation can be offered. The adult miracles served the agendas of the twelfth-century cult at Durham; three of the final four miracles provide evidence of Cuthbert's distrust and banishment of women, in common with miracles written at Durham to justify the Benedictines' eviction of the community of married clerics in 1083.[129] By the fifteenth century, when the cult was secure, these episodes may no longer have been considered essential elements of the Cuthbertine narrative.[130] Indeed, the discussion above has shown that the adult miracles had long been distinct from Cuthbert's childhood. Consequently, it is possible that the decision to omit them may have been intended to streamline and clarify the narrative, in common with editorial choices elsewhere in the manuscript.[131] This approach to narrative construction and its relevance to the St Cuthbert Window's design will be discussed in Chapter 4.2.

2.2 Changing Perspectives: Articulating Agendas in the Illustrations of YT26, Univ. 165 and Trinity

The crafting of hagiographic narratives to articulate contemporary agendas is evident in pictorial narrative cycles, as well as texts and compilations. This section will examine the way in which three Cuthbertine pictorial manuscript cycles were constructed. The primary focus will be upon London, BL, Yates Thompson 26 (hereafter YT26), a known pictorial source for the St Cuthbert Window, whose survival provides a rare opportunity to analyse stained glass narrative design. The treatment of YT26 as a source for the window will be explored in Chapter 4. In this section, the composition and function of YT26's illustrations will be examined alongside two closely related pictorial manuscript cycles, which were probably not used as sources for the window.[132] Hahn has stressed the importance of visualisation in

[129] W. M. Aird, "St Cuthbert, the Scots and the Normans," in *Anglo-Norman Studies, XVI: Proceedings of the Battle Conference, 1993*, ed. Marjorie Chibnall (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), 6; Rollason, *Libellus de exordio*, lxxxiii; Liddy, *Bishopric*, 15.
[130] Dobson, *Durham*, 14-15, 19-30-32, 360, 376, 379; Liddy, *Bishopric*, 176-177, 188-196.
[131] Whitehead, "Regional," 119; Liddy, *Bishopric*, 195.
[132] Univ. 165 was no longer in Durham by the fifteenth century, while Trinity's illustrations were not completed. Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 89-90.

shaping narrative for the readers of medieval manuscripts.[133] Consequently, the extent to which the selection and composition of YT26's illustrations appears to have responded to contemporary interests, and the manuscript's intended function, will be explored. Additionally, narrative devices and *topoi* which were employed in multiple cycles will be identified. Establishing both the consistency and flexibility of narrative design will support the investigation of the St Cuthbert Window's narrative construction in Chapter 4.

YT26 dates to the fourth quarter of the twelfth century and comprises VP, HE chapters 31 and 32, twenty-five additional miracles,[134] the *Brevis Relatio* and an account of the provosts at Hexham.[135] The manuscript probably originally contained fifty-five full-page illustrations of the Bedan miracles, of which one partial detail and forty-six full pages survive.[136] VP is prefaced with two miniatures (Figure 2.7) and each of its chapters, as well as HE chapters 31 and 32, originally had at least one miniature.[137] Despite variations in size and number, the presentation of the miniatures is generally consistent: they are set within gold frames and usually occur between the rubricated title and the main text.

Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O.1.64 (hereafter Trinity), *c.*1200, was also made at Durham and now consists of VP, followed by HE chapter 31.[138] It is likely that at least HE chapter 32, if not additional texts, were also intended, or have been lost, as an erasure on the final page might indicate the removal of the rubric for chapter 32 (Figure 2.8).[139] Fifty-four spaces, ranging in size from half to full pages, were left for illustrations.[140] As in YT26, they are located between the rubricated chapter heading and the main text, following a similar,

---

[133] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 50-51.
[134] Including the seven featured in Univ. 165, f.87r-101r.
[135] Morgan, *Manuscripts*, vol. I: *1190-1250*, 58; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 21.
[136] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 31-32; Morgan, *Manuscripts*, vol. I: *1190-1250*, no. 12 (a), 57-59, pls 38-43; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 21.
[137] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 31-32.
[138] Morgan, *Manuscripts*, vol. I: *1190-1250*, 59.
[139] Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O.1.64, f.88v.
[140] The lack of the actual illustrations leaves the function of the spaces open to interpretation. In several instances, the remainder of a page is left blank beneath the rubric, with another full or partial page before the text commences. As this phenomenon is also observed before the full-page illustrations in YT26 (for example, f.76v), most of these have been interpreted as intending only a single page.

although not identical, distribution to YT26.[141] Only two of the miniatures were sketched, a pair of scenes for chapter 2, depicting an angel healing Cuthbert's knee (Figure 2.9), one of which was later overdrawn.[142] Although the lack of illustrations in Trinity precludes detailed comparison with YT26, the distribution and number of the illumination spaces provide some insights into the intentions of the creator(s).[143]

Oxford, University College, MS 165 (hereafter Univ. 165) was made around a century earlier than YT26 and Trinity, in *c.*1100.[144] Like YT26, the illustrations are located between each chapter's rubricated title and its text, but, with the exception of the illustrations preceding the preface and first chapter (Figure 2.10 and Figure 2.11), they are unframed and occupy no more than half a page (Figure 2.12).[145] Scholars agree that Univ. 165 was created for private devotion, rather than as a shrine book, due to its size and the lack of liturgical material.[146] Additionally, both J.J.G. Alexander and Lawrence-Mathers have argued that the placement of the illustrations between the rubricated chapter headings and the text creates a close relationship between the three, which is particularly appropriate for private devotional use.[147] As both YT26 and Trinity have similar formats, they were potentially created for analogous use. Indeed, their content and small size are comparable: YT26 now measures 135 x 98 mm and Trinity is a little larger at 158 x 108 mm, while at 197 x 122 mm Univ. 165 is the largest of the three.[148]

Specific patrons have not been identified, although the retention of YT26 at Durham, combined with the contemporaneous production of Trinity, suggests that it was probably

---

[141] Morgan, *Manuscripts*, vol. I: *1190-1250*, 59.
[142] Trinity, MS O.1.64, f.9v; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 25; Montague Rhodes James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge: A Descriptive Catalogue*, 13 vols., vol. 3 (Cambridge: University Press, 1904), 66-67.
[143] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 25.
[144] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 90.
[145] Oxford, University College, MS 165, 18, 22 (hereafter cited as Univ. 165).
[146] David H. Farmer, "A Note on the Origin, Purpose and Date of University College, Oxford, MS 165", Appendix D to Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 47; Carrasco, "Construction," 49; Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 89-90.
[147] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 98; J. J. G. Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators and their Methods of Work* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 85.
[148] Morgan, *Manuscripts*, vol. I: *1190-1250*, 57, 59; C. M. Kauffmann, *Romanesque Manuscripts, 1066-1190* (London: H. Miller, 1975), 66.

intended for use by the Durham community, whereas Trinity was perhaps made for another institution or individual. Comparison of the distribution and scale of illustration spaces in Trinity and YT26 indicates that their pictorial cycles would not have been identical. Some similar emphases were apparently intended, as two full facing pages before chapters 3 and 25, and two facing half-pages before chapter 7, in Trinity correspond with two-page illustrations in YT26.[149] The above analysis of Cuthbertine texts suggests these were all significant episodes, appearing in the York Use liturgy.[150] It is surprising, therefore, that both appear not to have illustrated chapter 4, a key episode which also features in the liturgy.[151] Such correspondences do not guarantee that identical illustrations were intended for Trinity. Although most of Trinity's spaces correspond with YT26's illustrations, their smaller scale may have affected their design. Furthermore, certain discrepancies suggest that the two manuscripts were intended to have some different emphases.[152] There are three instances in Trinity where two illustrations appear to have been intended, rather than single illustrations as in YT26,[153] and possibly two instances where the situation is reversed (Figure 2.9 and Figure 2.13).[154] This probably indicates that the two cycles were tailored to their intended audiences, as well as responding to more widely shared contemporary interests and concerns. For example, where YT26 has a pair of scenes focused on obedience, a key monastic interest, Trinity has only a single illustration.[155] Additionally, in Trinity no illustration was planned for chapter 16, where YT26 shows Cuthbert teaching monastic reform (Figure 2.14).[156] Consequently, it is possible that Trinity was designed for a patron not based in a monastic institution.

---

[149] Trinity, MS O.1.64, f.11v-12r, 18v-19r, 51v-52r; London, British Library, Yates Thompson 26, f.10v-11r, f.17v-18r, f.53v-54r (hereafter cited as YT26).
[150] Lawley, *Breviarium Eboracensis*, vol. 2, 223, 225-228.
[151] Ibid., 224. Trinity, MS O.1.64, f.13v-14r; YT26, f.12v-13r. This omission appears certain in Trinity and highly likely in YT26, although, in the latter, as no text is missing from the end of chapter 3, and the rubric for chapter 4 appears at the top of f.13r, it is also possible that a leaf with an illustration on each side has been lost, between f.12v and 13r.
[152] Morgan, *Manuscripts*, vol. I: *1190-1250*, 59.
[153] VP chapters 2, 15 and 40. Trinity, MS O.1.64, f.9v-10r, 32v-33r, 76r-76v; YT26, f.9r, 33v, 74v.
[154] VP chapters 11 and 24. Trinity, MS O.1.64, f.26v, 49r; YT26, f.26r-26v, 50v-51r. It is possible that the small space on f.48v in Trinity may have been intended for illustration.
[155] VP chapter 11. YT26, f.26r-26v; Trinity, MS O.1.64, f.26v; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 179, 181-182.
[156] Trinity, MS O.1.64, f. 34v.

The evidence that the illustrations in YT26 and Trinity were probably tailored to their intended functions makes it possible that a similar explanation can be offered, along with changes in style over a century, for the differences between the pictorial cycles of YT26 and Univ. 165. While both manuscripts were made at Durham, the community's contemporary concerns were markedly different in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as discussed above.[157] Produced *c.*1100, Univ. 165 was made shortly after the Benedictines replaced the secular clerics of the Community of St Cuthbert in the 1080s, and actively articulates their agenda through both textual content and imagery.[158] For instance, Lawrence-Mathers has suggested that the illustrations accompanying the seven newly-written, Durham-based miracles were intended to elevate the post-Bedan events to the level of Bede's earlier tradition, making a bold statement about Benedictine legitimacy at Durham.[159] Indeed, Abou-el-Haj has argued that these miracles emphasise Cuthbert's punishment of "those who violate his church and relics", thereby asserting Benedictine authority.[160] Furthermore, their imagery also reveals the conflicting needs of the cult's Benedictine proponents: to depict recent, Durham-focused miracles, while delegitimising the ousted secular Community of Cuthbert who probably composed them.[161] Lawrence-Mathers has argued that the depiction of figures in secular, rather than monastic, clothing constitutes an elegant solution, illustrating the post-Bedan miracles without questioning the validity of contemporary Benedictine control.[162]

Throughout the twelfth century, the community at Durham had periodically revised and expanded upon the hagiographic material of the cult, as well as embarking upon additional building work.[163] However, as the century progressed, the Benedictines' position

---

[157] Donald Matthew, "Durham and the Anglo-Norman World," in *Anglo-Norman Durham: 1093-1193*, ed. David Rollason, Margaret Harvey, and Michael Prestwich (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994), 19; Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 52.
[158] Matthew, "Durham," 19; Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 90.
[159] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 103.
[160] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 58.
[161] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 106.
[162] Ibid.
[163] Victoria Tudor, "The Cult of St Cuthbert in the Twelfth Century: The Evidence of Reginald of Durham," in *St. Cuthbert: His Cult and his Community to AD 1200*, ed. Gerald Bonner, David Rollason, and Clare Stancliffe (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989), 447-449; S. A. Harrison, "Observations on the Architecture of the Galilee Chapel," 213; Snape, "Documentary," 22-23.

became more secure, diminishing the need for the overt expressions of legitimacy seen in Univ. 165. Consequently, while the community's early twelfth-century activities were intended to further strengthen and develop the Cuthbertine cult in response to internal political pressures, towards the end of the century, they increasingly responded to external pressures, particularly devotional competition.[164] Of particular relevance for understanding the development and augmentation of the Cuthbertine pictorial narratives was a change in the focus of many of the miracles written during this period. This can be linked both to the emergence of new popular cults, such as St Thomas Becket's in the 1170s, as well as wider hagiographical trends.[165] It also reveals changes within the Cuthbertine cult itself.[166] For instance, it has been argued that the late twelfth-century miracles written by Reginald of Durham attempted to broaden Cuthbert's appeal, particularly by tempering the misogyny and punitive aggression introduced in the eleventh century.[167] Written a century later, when the cult was more stable, and benevolent healing saints were more popular, Cuthbert's misogyny and punitive powers were no longer crucial facets of his hagiography.[168] These textual augmentations of the Cuthbertine narrative are paralleled in the editorial treatment of YT26's illustrations. For example, while YT26 includes the same post-Bedan miracles illustrated in Univ. 165, none of these are illustrated.[169] The decision not to visually emphasise Cuthbert's powerful vengeance arguably articulates the cult's shift in focus towards Cuthbert's benevolent behaviour.[170]

YT26 is known to have been used as a pictorial source for the St Cuthbert Window. Consequently, the identification of the agendas and interests articulated by its illustrations can enable the recognition of the origin and significance of the iconographic elements which

---

[164] Aird, *St Cuthbert*, 156-158; Christopher Norton, *St. William of York* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell Press, 2006), 160; Matthew, "Durham," 19, 21.
[165] Matthew, "Durham," 19, 22; Tudor, "Reginald," 454-456, 459; Sally Crumplin, "Modernizing St Cuthbert: Reginald of Durham's Miracle Collection," *Studies in Church History* 41 (2005): 182, 184-185.
[166] Crumplin, "Modernizing," 184.
[167] Tudor, "Reginald," 456-458; A. J. Piper, "The First Generations of Durham Monks and the Cult of St Cuthbert,", 443.
[168] Crumplin, "Modernizing," 184; Tudor, "Reginald," 454, 456-458.
[169] Morgan, *Manuscripts*, vol. I: *1190-1250*, 58; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 21.
[170] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 58; Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 103.

they inspired in the window. Moreover, some of the interests expressed in YT26 may also have appealed to the window's designers. For instance, healing miracles, which were emerging as a hagiographic trend in the twelfth century, had been established as key authenticators of episcopal sanctity by the fifteenth century.[171] The treatment of healings in YT26's illustrations aligns with contemporary expressions of this interest in recently written texts. Sally Crumplin has argued convincingly that Reginald's mid-twelfth-century collection responded to wider hagiographic trends, particularly for healing miracles, driven by increasing pilgrimage, and not just perceived competition from specific saints.[172] Reginald included significantly more healing episodes than earlier collections, albeit fewer than newly emerged cults, such as Becket's.[173] Moreover, by articulating Cuthbert's superiority as an intercessor and healer, Reginald consciously addressed the potential competition posed by other saints.[174]

Although Reginald's collection was not included in YT26, comparison of the illustrations of the Bedan healing miracles in YT26 and Univ. 165 suggests that YT26's designers also attempted to emphasise Cuthbert's healing power. In the text, Cuthbert is absent at the actual moment of five of the nine healing miracles performed during his lifetime.[175] However, in YT26 Cuthbert is shown as present in the illustrations of three of these healings, using compositions which are markedly different to both the text and Univ. 165's illustrations (Figures 2.15-18).[176] Additionally, one illustration of a posthumous healing draws upon the text to show Cuthbert's healing touch from within his coffin (Figure 2.19), in contrast to Univ. 165 (Figure 2.20).[177] These illustrations emphasise Cuthbert's efficacy as healer by conveying the immediacy of the cure, his presence underlining his intercessory power.

---

[171] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 153, 170.
[172] Sally Crumplin, "Rewriting History in the Cult of St Cuthbert" (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of St Andrews, 2004), 220-221; Crumplin, "Modernizing," 182-186.
[173] Crumplin, "Rewriting," 220-221; Crumplin, "Modernizing," 182-186; Michael Staunton, *Thomas Becket and his Biographers*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion 28 (Boydell and Brewer, 2006), 8, 12.
[174] Crumplin, "Modernizing," 183.
[175] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 206-207, 232-233, 240-241, 252-257.
[176] YT26, f. 33v, 54r, 61r; Univ. 165, p.57, 86, 99.
[177] YT26, f.83r, 84r; Univ. 165, p.140.

As will be discussed in Chapter 4.1-2, past studies which have aimed to establish direct lineages between cycles have misinterpreted compositional and iconographic differences as imprecise or awkward adaptations of an established model, rather than nuanced selections.[178] Although a range of pictorial sources was probably available at Durham,[179] the creator of YT26 was arguably drawing upon elements from these sources both selectively and creatively to influence the viewer's reading of text and image.[180] Consequently, it is necessary to establish the reasons for differences in the treatment of scenes, in order to identify whether they are significant to the narrative. This is particularly important in the case of narrative devices and techniques which may have inspired the design elements in the St Cuthbert Window. One of the most evident, and debated, differences in the expression of the narrative between YT26 and Univ. 165 is the use in YT26 of single-page scenes, or "self-contained units",[181] whereas, in Univ. 165, illustrations were composed of sequential 'scenes'.[182] However, the difference in the number of scenes within each illustration in Univ. 165 and YT26 is partly due to their different formats. The 'landscape' orientation of Univ. 165's illustrations facilitates the sequential representation of multiple moments from an episode within a single image (Figure 2.18). In contrast, YT26 employs a standardised layout common in twelfth-century manuscripts, which dictates a 'portrait' format, limiting the depiction of multiple scenes side by side (Figure 2.21).[183] Consequently, single-page illustrations depicting single moments are the most common composition in YT26.

Nevertheless, for some chapters in YT26, separate moments from the same episode are shown across two single-page illustrations (Figure 2.21 and Figure 2.22), while others evoke multiple moments within single illustrations. The latter employ a comparable range of compositional variety and function to those in Univ. 165, which variously convey successive moments in time and simultaneity.[184] As discussed in Chapter 1, some depict two separate

[178] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 23, 26-27, 34.
[179] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 91.
[180] Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators*, 107; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 9, 46.
[181] Pächt, *Pictorial Narrative*, 21.
[182] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 46-47; Carrasco, "Construction," 52, 57-58; Pächt, *Pictorial Narrative*, 14-15.
[183] Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators*, 97.
[184] Carrasco, "Construction," 52-53, 57; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 46-47.

moments with a repetition of imagery (Figure 2.23),[185] while six single-page illustrations evoke multiple moments by combining imagery which can be read sequentially or simultaneously (Figure 2.24).[186] These densely compressed illustrations are comparable to the multi-scene illustrations of Univ. 165 (Figure 2.25). Moreover, they can be linked to the interests of the contemporary cult. For example, as highlighted in Chapter 1, YT26's illustration to VP chapter 15, a healed woman is shown thanking St Cuthbert while still in bed (Figure 2.15), rather than greeting the saint and her husband at the door, as the text describes and Univ. 165 shows (Figure 2.16).[187] Rather than a clumsy contraction, or reversion to "a standard type of healing miracle",[188] this construction focuses both upon the moment of her cure, and Cuthbert's miraculous foresight and power. Her recovery is indicated by her seated position, with her foot emerging as if she is climbing out of bed, while Cuthbert's placement on grass, and in an ambiguous relationship with the architecture, suggests he is outside, or at the doorway. This simultaneously evokes Cuthbert's prophecy and the woman's immediate recovery, paralleling the text's emphasis on the immediate effect of Cuthbert's intercession.[189] The illustration is both adapted to the restrictions of the format, and to the contemporary promotion of Cuthbert's efficacy as a healer. Indeed, chapter 15 in Trinity was intended to have a two-page illustration, suggesting a similar emphasis upon Cuthbert's healing miracles.[190]

The comparable approaches to narrative construction in Univ. 165 and YT26, and the targeted iconographic selectivity evident in all three manuscripts, demonstrate the habitual tailoring of pictorial narratives to both the contemporary concerns of the Cuthbertine cult, and to wider hagiographic trends. Recognition of this flexibility of construction and meaning has enabled nuanced analysis of the way in which YT26's illustrations functioned as a source of both iconography and approaches to narrative composition. For example, the relationship between panel 20c and YT26's illustration of chapter 15 suggests that the designer used YT26's

---

[185] YT26, f. 39r.
[186] YT26, f.24r, 33v, 39r, 41r, 42v, 44r, 45v, 54r.
[187] YT26, f.33v; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 204-207.
[188] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 35.
[189] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 240-241.
[190] Trinity, MS O.1.64, f. 32v-33r.

pictorial, rather than textual, analogue for the panel's composition.[191] It may also indicate the designer's recognition that the densely evocative iconography was a good solution to the limited space allowed by the medium. Indeed, this issue posed particular challenges for stained-glass designers. In manuscripts, illustrations amplify elements of the text, whereas, in a window, all of the pertinent narrative elements must be depicted; the omission of details excludes them from the narrative completely. Alongside wider traditions of narrative construction, these findings have informed the analysis of the St Cuthbert Window, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.

2.3 Pictorial Cuthbertine Cycles Beyond Durham

The above discussion has demonstrated that both textual and pictorial Cuthbertine narratives were tailored to their specific temporal and devotional contexts. As noted above, there is limited evidence of Cuthbertine cycles outside Durham, including at York. However, two fifteenth-century cycles survive: a series of manuscript illustrations in the Salisbury Breviary and a sequence of paintings on the backs of the choir stalls at Carlisle Cathedral. Their distinctly different contexts and media allow an exploration of contrasting approaches to pictorial narrative design, both of which shed light on the design of the St Cuthbert Window.

2.3.1 Salisbury Breviary

The Salisbury Breviary, Paris, BNF, Latin MS 17294, contains Cuthbertine illustrations which are roughly contemporaneous with the St Cuthbert Window. This Sarum Use breviary comprises an annotated Calendar, *Temporale*, *Sanctorale* and *Communale sanctorum*, all originally intended to be accompanied by an extensive pictorial cycle, which is incomplete.[192] Production began in 1424 and the text was complete before 1435; Catherine Reynolds has demonstrated that the decoration, including illustration, was undertaken in three campaigns before being abandoned in the 1460s.[193] The illustrations were designed for a distinctly

---

[191] Catalogue, 20c.

[192] Eleanor P. Spencer, "The Master of the Duke of Bedford: The Salisbury Breviary," *The Burlington Magazine* 108, no. 765 (1966): 607; Pearce, "Text and Image," 30-32.

[193] Mary Dockray-Miller, "The St. Edith Cycle in The Salisbury Breviary (c.1460)," *Fifteenth-Century Studies* 34 (2009): 49-50; Reynolds, "Salisbury Breviary," 2, 109, 146, 270, 292, 349; Catherine Reynolds,

different medium, function and patron to the St Cuthbert Window, and are demonstrably independent of the Cuthbertine pictorial tradition developed at Durham. Consequently, they can provide valuable insights into the treatment and transmission of the Cuthbertine narrative beyond Durham, and allow common fifteenth-century approaches to pictorial narrative design to be identified.

The Salisbury Breviary was made by the Bedford Workshop in Paris, initially for Henry V's brother, John of Lancaster, Duke of Bedford and Regent of France, and his wife Anne of Burgundy, who both died before its completion.[194] Although Bedford had links to the community at Durham, there is no evidence that this activity amounted to an interest in Cuthbert.[195] Moreover, Judith Pearce has suggested that Bedford was not closely involved in the Salisbury Breviary's hagiographic design.[196] The Breviary's size, content and patronage indicate that it was intended for private devotion, rather than for use in a chapel or public setting.[197] The illustrations must therefore be seen as part of the contemporary trend for increasingly sumptuous manuscripts, of both Latin and vernacular texts, and particularly private devotional books, such as books of hours and breviaries.[198]

In common with other Sarum Use breviaries, St Cuthbert features in the *Sanctorale* twice. On 20th March, his major feast day, nine lessons are given, and for his translation on 4th September, a short prayer is provided and the reader is referred back to the nine lessons given for the 20th March, or to three lessons from the *Communale*.[199] The text of the lessons accords closely with the version of the Sarum Use published by Procter and Wordsworth,[200] as is the

---

"The Workshop of the Master of the Duke of Bedford: Definitions and Identities," in *Patrons, Authors and Workshops: Books and Book Production in Paris around 1400*, ed. Godfried Croenen and Peter Ainsworth (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 443, 445-446.

[194] Spencer, "Salisbury Breviary," 607; Reynolds, "Definitions and Identities," 443.

[195] Dobson, *Durham*, 174.

[196] Pearce, "Text and Image," 152.

[197] Spencer, "Salisbury Breviary," 607.

[198] Godfried Croenen, "Patrons, Authors and Workshops: Books and Book Production in Paris around 1400," in *Patrons, Authors and Workshops: Books and Book Production in Paris around 1400*, ed. Godfried Croenen and Peter Ainsworth (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 6.

[199] BNF, Latin 17294, f.434v-437v, 565r-566r.

[200] BNF, Latin 17294, f.434v-437v, 565r-566r; Procter and Wordsworth, *Breviarium Sarum*, vol. 3, 217-224, 765-766.

case for the other lessons in the *Sanctorale*.[201] No particular Cuthbertine devotion is indicated by the illustrations of the Cuthbertine readings, which appear consistent with others in the *Sanctorale*. The text relating to each saint's major feast day is usually, but not always,[202] accompanied by one large miniature, which depicts several scenes, as well as four medallions containing further scenes on each page.[203] The Cuthbertine illustrations conform to this structure, comprising a large miniature and twenty-four border medallions across six pages (Figures 2.26-32).[204] The illustrations' subjects, distribution and correspondence with the text are given in Appendix 8.1. Reynolds has demonstrated that the Cuthbertine illustrations likely belong to the second campaign, which has been dated to between the late 1430s and early 1440s.[205] This is supported by the mislabelling of Cuthbert as "Turbert" in the large miniature (Figure 2.33), a scribal error which is not paralleled in the text.[206] As veneration of St Cuthbert was limited beyond England, these errors might be explained by the lack of English guides during the second campaign, when the Breviary probably remained in French-held territory.[207]

The selection and treatment of the narrative images is of particular interest given the context within which they were produced. The illustrations correspond closely with the events described in the text.[208] This is underlined by the scrolls held by figures in the medallions, which directly quote a few words, usually the beginning of a sentence, from the relevant text (Appendix 8.1).[209] This, combined with the apparently intentional proximity between each medallion and the corresponding text on the page, suggests that the images were intended to highlight key aspects of each episode, perhaps providing a meditative

---

[201] Pearce, "Text and Image," 32.
[202] Dockray-Miller, "Edith Cycle," 48-49.
[203] Reynolds, "Definitions and Identities," 443.
[204] BNF, Latin 17294, f.434v-437v. The text for Cuthbert's translation (4th September) is accompanied by a single medallion illustration of a priest reading the prayer, which will not be discussed here. BNF, Latin 17294, f.565r, lower left medallion.
[205] Reynolds, "Salisbury Breviary," 130, 146, 148, 270, 292, 393, 406, 408.
[206] Ibid., 130; Pearce, "Text and Image," 73.; BNF, Latin 17294, f.435r.
[207] Reynolds, "Salisbury Breviary," 130, 149, 263.
[208] Ibid., 364.
[209] Pearce, "Text and Image," 76.

focus.[210] Reynolds has argued that a "fairly detailed programme" for the miniatures and medallions, listing the textual quotations and the imagery to be depicted, was devised before the end of the first campaign and remained with the manuscript throughout subsequent illustration campaigns.[211] Both Reynolds and Pearce have suggested that the Duke's chaplains devised this programme; Reynolds also proposed that another breviary was used, thereby accounting for the occasional differences between the main text and quotations.[212] These arguments are convincing, not least because they explain the awareness of the wider text evident in many of the illustrations.[213]

The design of the Cuthbertine cycle supports Reynolds' and Pearce's conclusions, and provides insights into contemporary approaches to narrative design. Although it is possible that a pictorial cycle was consulted, comparison of the illustrations with the text strongly suggests that the illustrations were devised from consultation of the text alone, employing common hagiographic *topoi* and visual conventions which are found throughout the Breviary's illustrations. Nevertheless, while Godfried Croenen has observed that fifteenth-century Parisian miniaturists frequently adapted or copied existing examples to streamline production,[214] the lack of wholly identical imagery between cycles suggests that the illustrators were employing models in combination with textually derived guidance. For example, comparison of the Cuthbertine illustrations with those for St Martin reveals that, when showing the two saints in prayer, a composition which is common throughout the Breviary is employed (Figure 2.34, Figure 2.35 and Figure 2.36). Yet, while there are consistencies in the composition – the kneeling posture of the figure, the presence of God looking down from heaven and the addition of a figure holding the text scroll – the orientation of the figures has at least three variants, while details such as clothing and setting are adapted to the specific episode. Thus, where Martin is accompanied by a priest, Cuthbert is accompanied by a shepherd and appears in secular clothing. Further comparison of the cycle

[210] Reynolds, "Salisbury Breviary," 364.
[211] Ibid., 356-357, 359, 365.
[212] Ibid., 356, 359, 364; Pearce, "Text and Image," 152-154.
[213] Reynolds, "Salisbury Breviary," 364.
[214] Croenen, "Patrons," 11.

with others within the Breviary would likely reveal further nuances in the adaptation and individualisation of pictorial models, and visual conventions.

The reliance upon textual, rather than pictorial, Cuthbertine models for the design of the cycle can be clearly demonstrated. Pearce has convincingly shown that the illustrations of lesson 1 can be linked to the details of the text, rather than the imagery in YT26, as proposed by Malcolm Baker.[215] Additionally, comparison of the illustrations for St Cuthbert and St Martin refute Malcolm Baker's suggestion that the "striking similarity" between the illustrations of lesson 3 (f.436r, Figure 2.37 and Figure 2.38) and the double-page illustration of the same events in YT26 (f.17v and 18r, Figure 2.39 and Figure 2.40) indicate a common source.[216] While the composition of the feet-washing scenes are similar, the Breviary illustration is closer to another illustration accompanying the readings for St Martin (Figure 2.41).[217] Indeed, the majority of Cuthbertine illustrations bear no resemblance to those in YT26, either in terms of selection or composition. Moreover, within the Breviary illustrations there is a notable absence of details found in the pictorial tradition characterised by Univ. 165 and YT26, such as Cuthbert's tau-staff (Figure 2.24 and Figure 2.18), or the winged depiction of the angel disguised as a man (Figure 2.39 and Figure 2.42).

Therefore, the Breviary illustrations are probably not related to the Cuthbertine pictorial narrative tradition which originated at Durham, nor are they necessarily indicative of a wider Cuthbertine pictorial tradition. Instead, they must be considered as exemplars of a "long tradition of breviary illumination".[218] Whilst Spencer has suggested that the pictorial representations show both nuance and innovation in places, as well as references to the patrons and contemporary events, she concludes that there is less evidence of this in the *Sanctorale* and *Communale*.[219] Nevertheless, they can provide valuable insights into contemporary pictorial narrative design, both in terms of visual devices and structural composition. The use of setting, cutaway scenes, clothing and *topoi* to accurately convey

[215] Pearce, "Text and Image," 125-127; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 44-46.
[216] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 44.
[217] BNF, Latin 17294, f.638v.
[218] Pearce, "Text and Image," 3.
[219] Spencer, "Salisbury Breviary," 608.

meaning reveals a common visual language with the St Cuthbert Window and other fifteenth-century narratives. The selection of details to focus upon key textual narrative events, which is evident in the medallions, is comparable to the foci created by the illustrations of both YT26 and Univ. 165. The carefully selected combinations of text and image can potentially indicate wider contemporary interests in specific aspects of the Cuthbertine narrative; such instances will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Moreover, despite the difference in media, the Breviary illustrations can provide insights into expected modes of looking and engagement with pictorial narratives, because they were designed for a patron whose high status and education were comparable to the probable patron and audience of the St Cuthbert Window, as we shall see in Chapter 3. In particular, the large miniature presents a densely-populated series of images (Figure 2.43), which summarise Cuthbert's progression to bishop and evoke his sanctity.[220] The expectation that these scenes would be read both individually and in sequence, to convey multiple messages, is comparable to the complex imagery of some of YT26's illustrations discussed above. Consequently, it reveals a continued reliance upon the viewer's ability to identify and assimilate multiple strands of meaning within an image, as well as to follow the correct narrative sequence in a variety of arrangements. This is particularly relevant to the design of the St Cuthbert Window, which employs comparably varied narrative sequences and multi-layered imagery.

2.3.2 Carlisle Choir Screen Paintings

A final extant Cuthbertine cycle enables comparison of the selective and adaptive use of pictorial sources in the St Cuthbert Window. The late fifteenth-century cycle at Carlisle Cathedral consists of seventeen scenes from the life of St Cuthbert, painted on the backs of the choir stalls within a single bay (Figure 2.44 and Appendix 9.1); above each episode is a vernacular couplet (Figure 2.45 and Appendix 9.2).[221] The cycle postdates the St Cuthbert Window by at least three decades, but almost certainly used the illustrations in YT26 as a

[220] BNF, Latin 17294, f.435r.
[221] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 17; Park and Cather, "Paintings," 214-215, 219; Whitehead, "Carlisle Paintings," 17.

pictorial source.[222] It seems likely that Richard Bell (Bishop of Carlisle, 1485-1495) provided access to YT26, as he had previously been prior of Durham and had a particular interest in Cuthbertine hagiography.[223] Analysis of the use of the same pictorial source at Carlisle can greatly inform this study's understanding of the St Cuthbert Window's design. The selection and treatment of the episodes depicted at Carlisle can provide insights into the tailoring of pictorial sources to specific temporal, spatial and devotional contexts, as well as different media. The cycle may also provide evidence of illustrations lost from YT26, which might have been used as sources for the window.

The Carlisle choir stall scheme comprises scenes from the lives of three saints: St Anthony, St Cuthbert and St Augustine, as well as standing figures of the twelve apostles. Each group occupies the back of the choir stalls within a single bay of the choir arcade: on the north, from west to east, are St Anthony, the apostles and St Cuthbert; on the south side St Augustine's scheme occupies the easternmost bay, the other two bays were left undecorated.[224] The scheme is associated with Prior Thomas Gondibour, whose monogram appears in the background of a scene of St Augustine, and on the stone bench beneath the Cuthbertine cycle.[225] This gives a broad dating of *c.*1465-1500, while the likelihood that Bishop Bell provided access to YT26 narrows this range to *c.*1478-95.[226] David Park and Sharon Cather have identified the St Cuthbert and St Augustine cycles as being coeval on stylistic grounds, suggesting that they were also the first to be executed, since they occupy the most liturgically significant location (i.e. easternmost).[227] Yet they have highlighted the contrasting approaches to the selection and distribution of the narrative scenes within the St Augustine and St Cuthbert cycles.[228] The Augustine cycle contains twenty-two scenes regularly distributed

[222] Park and Cather, "Paintings," 214-215, 220.
[223] Colgrave, "Cuthbert Paintings," 17-18; Park and Cather, "Paintings," 220.
[224] Park and Cather, "Paintings," 214-215.
[225] Ibid.
[226] Colgrave, "Cuthbert Paintings," 17-18; Park and Cather, "Paintings," 220.
[227] Park and Cather, "Paintings," 216.
[228] Ibid., 220.

across four registers, with a consistent left-to-right horizontal reading order from top left to bottom right.[229]

In contrast, the St Cuthbert cycle, which comprises only seventeen scenes, is distributed across three registers, beginning at the upper left.[230] Initially, it follows a descending vertical reading order for each column of imagery, which, if followed throughout, presents the final eight scenes in a drastically different order to the text (Appendix 9.3). As has been discussed, pictorial cycles, and indeed shorter textual compilations, did not necessarily follow the same narrative order. Many Cuthbertine scenes do not need to appear in a particular order to ensure coherence of the narrative. Nevertheless, if the reading order established by the first three columns is followed, the final two columns do appear chaotic, showing Cuthbert's death before his remonstration with the crows, followed by the discovery of his incorrupt body. A closer examination and comparison with other selective narrative sequences reveals that the selection and arrangement of the scenes can be linked to their devotional significance. Park and Cather have suggested that the reading order was intended to accommodate the placement of Cuthbert's consecration and death in the lowest register.[231] Moreover, they suggest that an unpainted board at the end of the narrative, a feature common to the other hagiographic cycles, may have been the location of an altar to Cuthbert.[232] If so, the desire to place significant scenes in close proximity to the putative altar provides a plausible explanation for this arrangement.

It has not previously been observed that the five scenes of the lower register all feature among the eight episodes of the SEL (Appendix 9.4), and the nine lessons of the York Use Breviary, which suggests their particular importance to the authentication of Cuthbert's sanctity.[233] Perhaps significantly, the final four episodes of the SEL are presented in the same order along the lower register at Carlisle, preceded by the vision of Aidan's soul (Appendix 9.4). This creates a sequence of key events which can be read separately from the other

[229] Ibid., 218, 220.
[230] Ibid., 218-220.
[231] Ibid., 219.
[232] Ibid., 218.
[233] D'Evelyn and Mill, *SEL*, vol. 1, 119-121; Lawley, *Breviarium Eboracensis*, vol. 2, 223-225, 227-228.

narrative scenes above. Moreover, if the altar were located at the end of this sequence, the preceding episodes would have emphasised the altar's evocation of Cuthbert's tomb or shrine, which occurs at the end of other pictorial cycles. This interpretation is supported by the depiction of Cuthbert's incorrupt body, the final episode in the cycle, directly above the location of the putative altar; notably, this is the 'extra' episode in the *Gilte Legende* which constitutes the only difference in content from the SEL.[234] The arrangement may therefore result from a careful selection and arrangement of episodes relevant to the function and setting of the cycle. Additionally, the integration of the first three episodes within the vertical narrative structure indicates that the lower register's sequence was intended to function both independently and in combination with the other narrative scenes. The expectation that the viewer would detect and read the cycle in multiple ways, to reveal different interpretations, seems comparable to the varied compression of illustrations in YT26, and likewise, the St Cuthbert Window.

Furthermore, the selectivity with which YT26 was treated as a pictorial source is of particular relevance to the analysis of the St Cuthbert Window. Twentieth-century scholars have argued that the designer of the Carlisle cycle followed the iconography of the illustrations almost exactly, with differences primarily restricted to the updating of architecture and costume.[235] More recently, Park and Cather, while recognising YT26 as the source of the Carlisle cycle's iconography, have refuted Bertram Colgrave's argument that the designer had direct access to YT26, suggesting that the degree of variation between the two cycles could indicate the use of intermediary sketches.[236] However, while this method of transmission is possible, the differences between YT26's illustrations and the corresponding paintings at Carlisle may simply indicate the adaptation of the source imagery to suit the needs of the cycle. Indeed, this is evident in the depiction of contemporary, rather than twelfth-century, costume and architecture, as well as more realistic, rather than abstract, settings. This suggests that, while closely following the compositions provided by YT26, the

---

[234] Hamer and Russell, *Supplementary*, 221; Procter and Wordsworth, *Breviarium Sarum*, vol. 3, 224.
[235] Colgrave, "Cuthbert Paintings," 17-21; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 24-25, 28.
[236] Park and Cather, "Paintings," 220; Colgrave, "Cuthbert Paintings," 17.

Carlisle designers were not unthinkingly copying the manuscript illustrations. Consequently, no further intermediary may be necessary.

The creators of the Carlisle cycle clearly used YT26 as a source with some creativity and selectivity. Nevertheless, the close resemblance of the underlying compositions make the Carlisle cycle a valuable source of evidence for four of YT26's lost illustrations.[237] Additionally, Malcolm Baker has demonstrated the close correspondence between the Carlisle painting (no. 2, Figure 2.46) and the stained outlines of the lost scene of an angel healing Cuthbert's knee in YT26 (Figure 2.13), as well as panels 9d and 9e in the St Cuthbert Window (Figure 2.47 and Figure 2.48).[238] Consequently, it is likely that the compositions of three other Carlisle scenes can indicate the form and content of the corresponding manuscript illustrations.[239] As these episodes were also depicted in the St Cuthbert Window, comparison with the Carlisle paintings can indicate the degree of adaptation and invention employed in the design of the stained glass panels.[240] This is particularly valuable for understanding the different iconographic choices in the stained glass depicting Cuthbert's consecration, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.[241] Panel 9b, which appears to combine both a Libellan and a Bedan episode, nevertheless has compositional similarities with the Carlisle painting (no. 1) (Figure 2.49 and Figure 2.50). This could suggest that the YT26 illustration, as well as the text, inspired the panel's design.

It is notable that the painted scene (no. 6) which exhibits the greatest adaptation of the source illustrations, by combining two illustrations from YT26 into a single panel, occurs in the lowest row, suggesting its importance. The painting shows both Cuthbert ministering to an angel and the angel's provision of bread (Figure 2.51). The left side of the painting closely follows the manuscript illustrations (Figure 2.39),[242] but the right side has reversed the second illustration (Figure 2.40),[243] so that Cuthbert faces away from the earlier scene. The damage to

---

[237] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 25, 46; Park and Cather, "Paintings," 222.
[238] YT26, f.9r; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 25.
[239] Carlisle paintings no. 1, 3, 14.
[240] Catalogue: 9b, 7d, 10a, 19b.
[241] Catalogue: 19b.
[242] YT26, f.17v.
[243] Ibid., f.18r.

the painting makes it unclear whether the table originally continued behind the second figure of Cuthbert, thereby linking the two scenes. Nevertheless, the rearrangement and compression of the two images into a single painting suggests their iconographic importance to the cycle. The inclusion of the episode in both the York and Sarum Use breviaries, the SEL,[244] and the painting's position in the lowest register confirm its devotional significance.

The relationship between textual collections and the selection of episodes for the Carlisle cycle may provide wider insights into the Cuthbertine cult, as well as the way in which narrative sequences were designed (Appendix 9.5). All eight episodes in the SEL and *Gilte Legende* are depicted at Carlisle, as noted by Christiania Whitehead.[245] The present study's investigation found little evidence of a closer relationship between the paintings and various Breviary readings, instead of the vernacular collections. The SEL's selection of episodes is based upon a York Use Breviary, as noted above, and the Carlisle cycle does not depict any of the Breviary's episodes which do not feature in the SEL. Similarly, the cycle depicts only one episode in the Sarum Use Breviary that does not occur in the SEL; yet this episode is alluded to in the *Gilte Legende*.[246] A further eight scenes depicted at Carlisle do not feature in either the breviaries or the vernacular collections (Appendix 9.5).[247] This suggests that, in addition to the SEL, the designer drew directly upon VP, probably using YT26 as both a pictorial and textual source. This is supported by painting no. 10, which is based upon YT26's illustration for VP chapter 12, but whose *titulus* refers to "delfyn" (dolphin), rather than fish, effectively conflating it with VP chapter 11.[248] The use of multiple textual sources, in combination with the pictorial source, suggests that the designer was selecting scenes which were significant for a range of reasons. Consequently, motives for the inclusion of episodes beyond their textual and liturgical popularity should be considered.

---

[244] Lawley, *Breviarium Eboracensis*, vol. 2, 225-226; Procter and Wordsworth, *Breviarium Sarum*, 219-220; D'Evelyn and Mill, *SEL*, vol. 1, 120.
[245] Whitehead, "Carlisle Paintings," 20, 23.
[246] Hamer and Russell, *Supplementary*, 221; Procter and Wordsworth, *Breviarium Sarum*, vol. 3, 224.
[247] Nos. 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15.
[248] YT26, f.28v; Colgrave, *Two Lives*.

Whitehead has argued persuasively that several of the episodes included at Carlisle have an eremitic focus.[249] However, her suggestion that this is at the expense of monastic, as well as episcopal, scenes does not acknowledge the monastic focus of paintings 5-10, which depict Cuthbert in his Benedictine habit. Indeed, as in other Cuthbertine cycles, his eremitic years are not clearly visually distinguished from his earlier monastic life, which was also dominated by travel, so that he is often shown habited and in outdoor settings in episodes from both phases. Whitehead argued that three specifically eremitic episodes were intended to emphasise this aspect of Cuthbert's life within the cycle and to draw parallels with the apostles and St Anthony, who feature within the wider Carlisle scheme.[250] While plausible, the selection of scenes at Carlisle also evokes a universally appealing vision of St Cuthbert, perhaps intended to equate him more clearly with the apostles, as well as St Augustine, his counterpart on the south side, and founder of the monastic order to which the Carlisle community belonged.[251] Notably, these include scenes drawn directly from VP rather than the SEL, which authenticate key aspects of episcopal sanctity, including preaching and healing, and closely parallel scenes in the Augustine cycle. Similarly, while a limited number of scenes show Cuthbert as a bishop, both prophecies of his episcopate are depicted and his consecration is emphasised, as discussed above. Thus, Cuthbert's eremitic credentials are expressed as one aspect of his multifaceted sanctity. The desire to emphasise Cuthbert's universality can also explain the notable absence of miracles linking Cuthbert to Carlisle, despite their presence in VP, which Whitehead has highlighted.[252]

The selection of episodes to create specific themes and promote a particular vision of Cuthbert within a wider devotional scheme is particularly relevant to the analysis of the St Cuthbert Window, as will be discussed in Chapters 3 and 4. Moreover, the extent to which the Carlisle cycle appears to have been tailored to its audience and setting, and the selectivity of episode use and arrangement, provides valuable comparative evidence for analysing

---

[249] Whitehead, "Carlisle Paintings," 26.
[250] Ibid. It is uncertain whether the St Anthony and apostle cycles, which were painted later than the St Cuthbert and St Augustine cycles, were planned from the outset of the decorative project, although their thematic cohesion makes this likely. See Park and Cather, "Paintings," 216.
[251] Park and Cather, "Paintings," 215.
[252] Whitehead, "Carlisle Paintings," 27.

approaches to the design in the window at York. Additionally, Whitehead has suggested that the vernacular couplets would have enabled the literate laity and Latinate ecclesiastical audience to interact with the cycle on different levels, the former guided in their engagement with the imagery, the latter referred to Bede's fuller, Latin narratives.[253] If intentional, the Carlisle cycle may demonstrate the involvement of elite clergy in the construction of a Cuthbertine scheme intended to provide multiple layers of meaning to diverse audiences. The significance of these messages will be considered in Chapter 4, alongside analysis of the St Cuthbert Window's themes.

2.4 Cuthbertine Stained Glass in Durham Cathedral Priory

As the locus of St Cuthbert's cult, and the seat of the St Cuthbert Window's donor, Bishop Thomas Langley, Durham Cathedral Priory provides important insights into the image of St Cuthbert that was promoted by the cult, especially in new glazing schemes of the fifteenth century. Although these have been almost entirely lost, a range of documentary evidence survives, providing insights into the design and deployment of stained glass.[254] From this emerges not only a focus on Cuthbertine narrative, but also the selective use of hagiographic narrative to guide devotion. This was in keeping with wider contemporary trends for narrative schemes, particularly at York, as will be discussed in Chapter 3.

In their 1980 survey of the documentary sources, Jeremy Haselock and David O'Connor provided a valuable summary of the evidence for the glazing, its iconography and eventual destruction.[255] In a recent reassessment, Lynda Rollason has argued for a more nuanced interpretation of the sources, moving beyond Haselock and O'Connor's focus upon the number of depictions, to consider their contexts.[256] The present study attempts to adopt the type of nuanced reassessment proposed by Rollason, to consider both the emphases within

---

[253] Ibid., 34.
[254] Materials from the accounts and archives are partially printed in Joseph Thomas Fowler, ed. *Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham, From the Original MSS.*, 3 vols., vol. 2 (Durham: Andrews, 1899), 393-410; James Raine, ed. *Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres, Gaufridus de Coldingham, Robertus de Greystanes, et Willielmus de Chambre* (London: Nichols & Son, 1839), cclxviii-cclxxvi. As these are extracts, the original accounts have been searched, and will be referenced throughout this chapter.
[255] Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass."
[256] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 330.

the Cuthbertine narratives and their integration within Durham's wider iconographic schemes. Additionally, the limitations and biases of the documentary sources will be acknowledged, and previous assumptions questioned. In addition to records in the fabric accounts and *Locelli*, this reconstruction of elements of Durham's fifteenth-century glazing has drawn upon two key descriptions written before 1603.[257]

Rollason suggests that the first, which will be referred to as the *Rites*,[258] was written before 1597, probably by the Durham antiquary William Claxton, as part of a diverse collection of material, describing both the cathedral and monastic complex, and pre-Reformation ceremonies.[259] The *Rites* describes only a selection of the cathedral glazing, and it is clear that various windows, including the Cuthbertine cloister cycle, had been damaged or destroyed before it was written.[260] Consequently, some of the *Rites'* descriptions may have been given from memory, while recent research has also warned of the potential recusant agenda of its author.[261] The second description, which will be referred to as *Windows*, following Rollason, focuses solely upon the glazing.[262] It is preserved in several manuscripts, often in combination with the *Rites*.[263] The earliest manuscript, Bodleian, Rawlinson MS B.300, dates to 1603.[264] The level of detail provided may indicate that it was first written before the destruction of many windows at the Reformation, or drew upon earlier descriptions. Nevertheless, both sources must be used cautiously. Throughout this chapter, references will be given to the published transcriptions, except for direct quotations, where the author's transcription of the original manuscript(s) will be given.[265]

---

[257] Ibid., 327-328.
[258] DCL, Hogg Roll; DUL, Cosin B.II.11, f.49v-50r, 59v-60r, 66v-67r, 75r; DCL, Hunter MS 44, f.139v-140r; DCL, Hunter MS 45, f.58r-58v, 87v-93v; Fowler, *Rites*, 2-3, 31, 42, 47-51 , 56, 76- 77.
[259] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 327.
[260] Ibid., 327-328, 331; Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 105-106.
[261] Turner, "New Contexts," 54-55; Rollason, "Northern Saints," 331.
[262] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 327-328.
[263] Bodleian, Rawlinson MS B.300, f.14v-19r; DCL, Hunter MS 44, f.149v-154r; Fowler, *Rites*, 109-122.
[264] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 328.
[265] Although DCL, Hogg Roll; DCL, Hunter 44 and DCL, Hunter 45 were also consulted, quotations within this chapter use DUL, Cosin B.II.11 for the *Rites* as it is the most complete copy. Bodleian, Rawlinson B.300 has been used for *Windows* as it is the earliest extant copy.

2.4.1 Patronage and Agency: The Roles of Skirlaw, Langley and Wessington

The patronage of Durham's Cuthbertine cycles is recorded, so the discussion within Chapter 2.4 inherently focuses upon schemes funded by Thomas Langley (Bishop of Durham 1406-1437) and his predecessor Walter Skirlaw (Bishop of Durham 1388-1406), who were respectively donors of the St Cuthbert Window and Great East Window in York Minster. While analysis of these windows provides valuable insights into the representation of St Cuthbert within the cult's locus, it also potentially provides evidence of Langley's personal patronage. Within the glazing carried out while Langley was bishop, the focus upon Cuthbertine and other hagiographic narratives was most evident in the two earliest schemes (Figure 2.52). In the Chapel of the Nine Altars, c.1416-20, eight of the nine windows in the east wall (1, n2-5, s2-5) incorporated hagiographic narratives beneath standing figures, and a large Cuthbertine narrative spanned two windows in the south wall (s6-7).[266] In the cloister, the windows of the eastern walk were filled with an extensive Cuthbertine cycle, begun c.1419.[267] Both schemes were part of ambitious programmes of building and renovation that were begun under Langley's predecessor, Skirlaw. But they were completed under, and substantially funded by, Langley, both personally and as Skirlaw's executor.[268] As discussed below, the patron of s6-7 is unknown, but it was glazed during the refurbishment of the Chapel of the Nine Altars; in this work, Langley and Skirlaw are known to have funded windows 1, s2 and n2.[269] Langley's patronage of the cloister scheme was commemorated in window s18,[270] over the doorway to the eastern walk from the nave, but it is possible that one or both of the monumental narrative schemes had been planned by Skirlaw.

---

[266] DUL, Loc.XXVII:1a; DUL, DCD-Sacr.acs 1416-7; Fowler, *Rites*, 2-3, 119-122.
[267] DUL, Loc.II:19(10); Snape, "Documentary," 29; Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 111.
[268] Of the four windows where Skirlaw's arms or portrait appear, n22 and n23 were probably donated by Skirlaw during his lifetime. Although work on the Nine Altars was begun during Skirlaw's lifetime, windows 1 and n2 were undoubtedly glazed after his death. DUL, Loc.XXVII:1a; Snape, "Documentary," 30-31; R. B. Dobson, ed. *The Church, Politics and Patronage in the Fifteenth Century* (Gloucester Alan Sutton, 1984), 296.
[269] DUL, Loc.XXVII:1a; Snape, "Documentary," 29; Fowler, *Rites*, 118-119; Dobson, *Fifteenth Century*, 296.
[270] Fowler, *Rites*, 110.

Langley's other main glazing scheme, in the Galilee (*c.*1433-5) (Figure 2.52),[271] was executed after these narrative cycles were complete.[272] The different function of the scheme may explain the different iconographic choices. The refurbishment of the chapel would include the installation of Langley's tomb, close to the altar of the Virgin Mary, at which he founded a chantry.[273] Consequently, the scheme was probably intended to perform a personal, as well as a still very public, display of devotion. Three of the windows (G/w1, G/s7, G/n6) which were glazed during Langley's refurbishment are recorded in the *Rites*. They contained a series of figures of kings, bishops and saints who had connections to Lindisfarne and the community, including St Cuthbert; narrative scenes from the Life of Christ occupied the tracery.[274] The depiction of Langley in G/w1, at the heart of this group, establishes him as Cuthbert's successor.[275] Additionally, Rollason's proposal that the saints above Langley in G/w1 were intended to perform intercessory functions is convincing.[276] She suggests that the figure of Henry VI described in the Rites replaced an original figure of St Oswald.[277] This would have given the same selection of saints seen in s18, in which Langley commemorated his patronage of the cloister scheme.[278] However, as Langley opens his will in the name of the Trinity and the Virgin, followed by the saints Peter, Paul, Cuthbert and St Martin, the original figure may have been St Martin.[279] It is possible that Henry VI's figure was originally located in another of the Galilee windows funded by Langley, perhaps placed to draw parallels with the earlier kings depicted in G/s7 and G/n6. This expression of ecclesiastical dynasty and patronal devotion has parallels in section D of the St Cuthbert Window, as well as the fifteenth-century choir clerestory glazing at York Minster, as will be discussed in Chapter 3.

The focus, evident in G/w1, G/s7 and G/n6, upon individuals associated with the cult's early years in Lindisfarne also indicated the cult's contemporary interests. The inscriptions

---

[271] DUL, Misc.Ch. 5719-21; Snape, "Documentary," 31.
[272] Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 110-111.
[273] DUL, Misc.Ch. 5713-21; M.G. Snape, "Documentary", 31.
[274] Fowler, *Rites*, 47-50; Rollason, "Northern Saints," 336.
[275] Fowler, *Rites*, 49.
[276] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 334-335.
[277] Ibid.; Fowler, *Rites*, 110.
[278] Fowler, *Rites*, 110.
[279] BIA, AR 19, f.501r.

beneath the figures, including Langley, explicitly articulated their significance to the community's history.[280] As Chapter 2.1 demonstrated, there was a notable interest in the cult's history in the fifteenth century. In particular, John Wessington (Prior of Durham, 1416-1446) had an interest in both the devotional and legal history of the Durham cult, writing an extensive collection of works which drew upon the community's historical texts.[281] The evidence provided by fifteenth-century documents listing works attributed to Wessington, including the cloister glazing cycle, must be interpreted cautiously, as at least one was written in 1442 to defend and justify Wessington's actions to Langley's successor Bishop Neville.[282] Moreover, Julian Luxford has drawn attention to medieval writers' misattribution of patronage as an expression of respect for high-status individuals.[283] Consequently, while the works were certainly undertaken during Wessington's prioracy, it should not be assumed that he personally instigated the projects listed. Nevertheless, Wessington is likely to have been closely involved in the commissioning and oversight of the Durham glazing projects.[284] He returned to Durham from Durham College, Oxford, in 1407, so he was present at Durham from the early years of Langley's episcopacy, taking on the role of chancellor and later sacrist under Prior John Hemmingburgh (1391-1416).[285]

Malcolm Baker suggested that Wessington's historical and hagiographical interests likely made him a key proponent of the Cuthbertine cycles funded by Langley and Skirlaw.[286] He can certainly be linked to the sequence of 148 figures representing prominent members of the Benedictine order, which decorated the wainscot in the chapel of Sts Benedict and Jerome.[287] While it is uncertain whether he was involved in the original creation of the pictorial cycle, he is known to have written biographies of the figures for display nearby. Moreover,

---

[280] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 336.
[281] Liddy, *Bishopric*, 21; Turner, "New Contexts," 72; James G. Clark, *The Benedictines in the Middle Ages*, The Monastic Orders 4 (Boydell and Brewer, 2011), 229; Dobson, *Fifteenth Century*, 31.
[282] DUL, Loc.XXVII:1a; DUL, Misc.Ch. 7131a-b; DUL, Misc.Ch. 5727a; Dobson, *Durham*, 237; Turner, "New Contexts," 66.
[283] Julian Luxford, "The Patronage of the Church and its Purposes," in *The History of British Art: 600-1600*, ed. T. Ayers (London: Tate Publishing, 2008).
[284] Storey, *Langley*, 199.
[285] Dobson, *Durham*, 90; Storey, *Langley*, 199.
[286] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 44.
[287] Turner, "New Contexts," 72; Rollason, "Northern Saints," 337.

Barrie Dobson has highlighted that Wessington's own description of his motivation, that his contemporaries "may appreciate how glorious God made their fathers and founders",[288] exactly followed Henry V's advice given in a speech to Benedictine prelates in 1421.[289] It is possible that similar motives lay behind the creation of the Cuthbertine narratives, particularly if Wessington's involvement in the compilation of Cuthbertine hagiography in Hale 114 can be taken as evidence of his involvement in devising the stained-glass cycles.[290] The summary of works undertaken during his prioracy include "diverse rolls upon which the miracles of Saint Cuthbert are depicted, with corresponding verses for the same miracles, for the glazing of the cloister or elsewhere".[291] While they cannot be linked to Wessington directly, his knowledge, interest and position of authority from 1416 make him a clear candidate as theological advisor for such schemes.[292]

2.4.2 Narrative in the Chapel of the Nine Altars

From the surviving records, a relatively clear picture emerges of the execution of a coherent glazing scheme in the Chapel of the Nine Altars, as part of fifteenth-century renovations.[293] The integration of selected narrative scenes with standing figures alongside monumental narratives parallels the near-contemporary scheme at York, which will be discussed in Chapter 3. Moreover, it demonstrates the varied selection and treatment of narrative to suit specific functions and contexts.

A record of works between 1416 and 1442 lists the "renewal" of "stone, metalwork and glass" in the nine windows immediately above the shrines (1, n2-n5 and s2-s5) and the six clerestory-level windows (N2-N4 and S2-S4) in the east wall (Figure 2.53), as well as "the same

---

[288] Dobson, *Durham*, 382, quoting (in translation) Durham, MS B.III.30, f.6r.
[289] Ibid., 382.
[290] Ibid., 379-380; Craster, "Red Book," 513, 515-516.
[291] "B. 3. d. It(e)m diu(er)sos rotulos \depictos/ sup(er) miraculis s(an)c(t)i Cuthberti cu(m) v(er)sib(us) ei(u)sd(e)m miraculis concorda(n)tib(us) pro vitriac(ion)e claustr(i) vel alibi faciend(a)", DUL, Misc.Ch. 5727a; Raine, *Scriptores*, cclxix.
[292] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 340-341.
[293] DUL, DCD-Sacr.acs 1416-7; DUL, Loc.XXVII:1a; Snape, "Documentary," 25; Fowler, *Rites*, 2-3, 118-122; James Raine, ed. *Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres, Gaufridus de Coldingham, Robertus de Greystanes, et Willielmus de Chambre*ibid. (London: Nichols & Son, 1839), clxxii.

in the southern gable", probably s6-7 (Figure 2.54 and Figure 2.55).[294] Comparison of the extant stonework of s6-7 with a 1722 engraving of windows 1, s2 and n2, made prior to Wyatt's alterations (Figure 2.56), reveals the consistent design of the new Perpendicular tracery.[295] Similarly, the imagery of the lower windows (1, n2-n5 and s2-s5) suggests not only a consistent iconographic formula, but also the use of hagiographic narrative to guide the viewer's devotion. All but two of the altars were each dedicated to two saints, mostly in male-female pairs (Figure 2.53), and this was apparently reflected in the iconography of the corresponding windows above.[296] Similar relationships between glass and altar have been identified elsewhere, including in the fifteenth-century glazing of the transepts at both York and Durham, as well as in earlier glazing further afield, such as at Canterbury Cathedral and Wells Cathedral in England, and Notre-Dame de Chartres and Clermont Cathedral in France.[297]

Each window comprised two lights, divided midway by a transom (Figure 2.56, Figure 2.57 and Figure 2.58). With the exception of n5, which was located over the altar to St Michael, and so depicted the nine orders of angels, the *Rites'* descriptions suggest that their iconography followed a common formula; each light of each window depicted imagery relating to one of the saints venerated at the altar beneath.[298] In the upper half was a standing figure, sometimes directly above a donor figure or arms, with narrative scenes in the lower half (Figure 2.57).[299] Windows 1, s2, s4, n2 and n3, clearly conformed to this formula. Moreover, the deviations in windows n2, s3 and s5 can be explained as the result of misidentifications of the imagery or alterations to the stained glass during the fifteenth and

---

[294] "In primis, reparacio xi fenestrarum inferiorum super Novem Altaria et in gabulo australi ibidem, in opere lapideo, ferrario, et vitriario, se extendit ad cxx libras. Item reparacio vi fenestrarum superiorum ad Novum Altaria, in opere lapideo, ferrario, et vitriario, se extendit ad xj l. ix s.". DUL, Loc.XXVII:1a; *Scriptores Tres*, cclxxii; Snape, "Documentary," 25.

[295] John Smith, ed., Bede, *Historiae Ecclesiasticae* (Cambridge: University Press, 1722), frontispiece engraved by M.P. Gucht; Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 110; M.G. Snape, "Documentary," 25.

[296] Fowler, *Rites*, 118-122.

[297] Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 114; Caviness, *Canterbury*, 137-138; Ayers, *Wells*, vol.1, 155; Lautier, "Reliques et images," 19-21; Davis, "Frames of Vision: Architecture and Stained Glass at Clermont Cathedral," 207-208; Claudine Lautier, "The Sacred Topography of Chartres Cathedral: The Reliquary Chasse of the Virgin in the Liturgical Choir and Stained-Glass Decoration," 179-181.

[298] Fowler, *Rites*, 3, 118-122.

[299] Ibid.

sixteenth centuries. Figures 2.59-61 show the arrangement based on the historic descriptions; the author's proposed corrections are shown in square brackets.[300]

While the 1722 engraving suggests that a substantial proportion of this glass was still intact when described in the previous century, the descriptions are marked by inconsistencies in the depth of detail. Consequently, it is likely that standard elements were omitted, whether by accident or for brevity. For example, the description of window s3 omits to mention standing figures, and provides far more detail of the narrative scenes for St Katherine, than for St Thomas Becket.[301] Likewise, the omission of narrative scenes for St Edmund in n2, light b, seems accidental, as nothing else is described in its place.[302] Indeed, the engraving shows that the lower narrative panels of 1, s2 and n2 had been replaced with standing figures by 1722 (Figure 2.56).[303] It is probable that some narrative panels were either missed by the author, or had been damaged or replaced by the time of his description.

The *Rites* author also appears to have misidentified some scenes in windows s5 and n4. In s5, light a, narrative scenes beneath St Andrew are described as showing "some p(ar)t of the storie of (Christ) annoynting & visiting the sicke".[304] Since Christ features in pictorial cycles of the Life of St Andrew, as the extant panels at St Andrew's Greystoke demonstrate,[305] it is plausible that his inclusion in the scenes led to the misidentification of their subjects. It is also possible that the author resorted to generic attributions when uncertain of the iconography. This is evident in James Torre's seventeenth-century descriptions of York Minster's windows, where he described figures as "monks" or "nuns" when uncertain of their

---

[300] Ibid., 3, 118-122. The arrangement of the angels in n5 are arbitrary, as the descriptions do not provide clear evidence. The author of *Windows* states that eight figures are depicted, but only provides labels for six of the angels.
[301] Ibid., 119.
[302] Ibid., 121. Although the authors of the *Rites* and *Windows* do not specify which light the imagery appears in, a comparison of antiquarian drawings and engravings with the descriptions suggests that the left light (a) is described first. Consequently, for ease of description, the imagery is described as belonging to either the a or b light as indicated by the text.
[303] Smith, *Historiae*, frontispiece; Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," Pl. XVIa.
[304] Bodleian, Rawlinson B.300, f.18v; Fowler, *Rites*, 120.
[305] Chadwick, "The Ancient Glass in the East Window of the Church of St Andrew, Greystoke, Cumbria," 27, 36, 45.

identities.[306] Nevertheless, interventions and repairs undertaken before the descriptions may also have altered the imagery. A scene beneath St Helen, in n4, was identified as the Annunciation.[307] It seems unlikely that the author would misidentify this iconography, perhaps suggesting that these panels had been inserted from elsewhere. Indeed, Marian iconography is described in the tracery of several of the Nine Altars windows (1, s2, s3, s4).[308]

That it was a coherent scheme cannot be conclusively proven. Nevertheless, the descriptions demonstrate an emphasis upon the inclusion of narrative scenes for each of the saints, with the understandable exception of Archangel Michael (n5).[309] The sixteenth-century descriptions, the structure of the stonework shown in the 1722 engraving (Figure 2.56) and the extant stonework of s6-7 indicate the limited scope for narrative sequences within the narrow lights created within the earlier lancets.[310] The height of the lower section probably allowed for three or four panels, depending upon their individual heights (Figure 2.58).[311] The narrative would therefore have been read vertically, probably from top to bottom, given the description of the events as "comming downe".[312]

Haselock and O'Connor have noted the stylistic, iconographic and formal similarities between windows s3 and n3 and windows n9 (Figure 2.62) and n10 (Figure 2.63) at York Minster.[313] Indeed, the formula of each light, depicting a saint standing above key narrative scenes from their life, as well as donors or their devices, bears strong similarities to the near-contemporary series in York Minster's north choir aisle (n8-10, Figures 2.59-64). As will be discussed in Chapter 3, the York windows, like the Nine Altars', form part of a scheme incorporating monumental narratives: the St Cuthbert (s7), St William (s7) and Great East windows.[314] The choir aisle series at York, dated to *c.*1415, is set into three-light windows, with

---

[306] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.51v.
[307] Fowler, *Rites*, 122.
[308] Ibid., 118-120.
[309] Ibid., 118-122.
[310] Snape, "Documentary," 25.
[311] The latter may be more likely given the depiction of eight figures in nV, which might suggest that four panels were inserted in both the upper and lower registers.
[312] Bodleian, Rawlinson B.300, f.18r; Fowler, *Rites*, 119.
[313] Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 113.
[314] Brown, *York Minster*, 226-227, 282-283.

three narrative scenes for the saints in lights a and c, and two for the saint in light b, allowing for a donor portrait to occupy panel 2a (Figure 2.63).[315] As at Durham, these would have been read vertically, with the extant glass suggesting a top to bottom reading order.[316] While the York series was not linked to altars beneath the windows, it does suggest that York and Durham shared similar formal tastes in the early fifteenth century, whether due to connections through clerics or glaziers, or wider trends in narrative use.

The York series may support the theory that three narrative panels were set beneath each saint in the Nine Altars scheme. It is apparent that at least two narrative scenes were depicted for each saint, although in several cases the descriptions suggest three.[317] More significantly, in both series narrative is used to create specific iconographic foci. Indeed, as the number of narrative scenes was necessarily limited, those selected were probably particularly significant for the promotion of each saint. For example, at both York and Durham, the deaths of all the martyred saints are depicted, emphasising their sanctifying sacrifice, as well as evoking Christ's sacrifice, which, at Durham, would have been celebrated at the altar below.[318]

The Cuthbertine narrative scenes selected for depiction in window 1, where they both overlooked St Cuthbert's altar and aligned with his shrine, provide insights into the cult's contemporary interests. Only two of the panels' subjects are described: "St Cuthbert w(i)th the sun beame shining, vpon his mothers bedd, at his natiuity, & the building of ffarne Iland with other p(ar)t of his myracles".[319] Significantly, the selection of his birth demonstrates an emphasis upon his origin as described in the *Libellus*; this parallels the selection at York, as will be discussed in Chapter 4. Although identification of the second scene must be more cautious, two panels in the St Cuthbert Window, York Minster, depict Cuthbert building on Farne (Figure 2.65 and Figure 2.66). In 16e Cuthbert, aided by monks, uses planks divinely

---

[315] Ibid., 282-283.
[316] Ibid.
[317] Fowler, *Rites*, 118-122.
[318] Six of the nine altars at Durham were dedicated to martyrs, and twelve martyrs were depicted in the windows. Peter Draper, "The Nine Altars at Durham and Fountains," in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham Cathedral*, ed. Nicola Coldstream and Peter Draper, *British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions for the year 1977, 3* (Leeds: W.S. Maney, 1980), 83-84; Brown, *York Minster*, 282-283.
[319] Bodleian, Rawlinson B.300, f.17v; Fowler, *Rites*, 118.

provided by the sea, while 16a shows him assisted by an angel.[320] Consequently, both emphasise Cuthbert's receipt of divine support, a theme which Anne Lawrence-Mathers has shown to be emphasised in Univ. 165.[321]

This potential emphasis is of further interest when considered alongside the depiction in n4 of St Aidan's soul ascending to heaven, a key scene from the life of St Cuthbert, and one which is spread across two panels at York (Figure 2.67 and Figure 2.68). This scene highlights the link between St Cuthbert and St Aidan, and the role the latter played in instigating Cuthbert's decision to join a monastery. Indeed, it is possible that the unnamed saints or "p(ar)cell of the story of (Christ)" described in n4 represented St Cuthbert having the vision of St Aidan's ascent.[322] Cuthbert's vision of St Aidan is one of the key instances not only of his gift for visions, but also of his ability to see and communicate with angels.[323] If Cuthbert were depicted at the moment of his vision, this would indicate an extension of the iconographic emphasis from window 1, pointing to the creation of overarching coherence within the Nine Altars glazing and the visual reinforcement of Cuthbert's close relationships with certain other saints. Indeed, a similar significance may have been intended by the depiction of St Cuthbert appearing to St Oswald in 1.

It is evident that the use of narrative in the eastern glazing of the Chapel of the Nine Altars was intended to emphasise specific elements of each saint's iconography. The narrative emphasis of the eastern windows in the Chapel of the Nine Altars was continued in windows n6, s6 and s7. Windows s6-7 were filled with the Life of St Cuthbert, while n6, a six-light window, contained the Life of St Joseph.[324] Although s6-7 are identified in the records of the fifteenth-century refurbishment,[325] there is no documentary evidence for the dating of n6. Its absence from the list of works undertaken during Wessington's prioracy and its thirteenth-

[320] Catalogue: 16e and 16a.
[321] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 99-100.
[322] Bodleian, Rawlinson B.300, f.19r; Fowler, *Rites*, 121-122.
[323] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 100.
[324] Fowler, *Rites*, 3.
[325] DUL, Loc.XXVII:1a.

century stonework suggest that it predates the other windows.[326] However, it is possible that the window was re-glazed during the fifteenth-century refurbishment. Tim Ayers has suggested that John Kemp (Archdeacon of Durham 1417-19) may have donated the Josephine narrative, based on similar patronage at Merton College, Oxford.[327] This might explain the lack of reference to the window in the glazing accounts. Moreover, it would indicate that both the Cuthbertine and Josephine narratives were integrated within the fifteenth-century scheme. Nevertheless, s6-7 provide a link between the eastern windows of the Nine Altars and the larger-scale narrative cycles of the same period.[328]

2.4.3 The Monumental Cuthbertine Narratives

As noted above, the two cycles were closely contemporaneous, as the glazing of the Chapel of the Nine Altars had begun by 1416,[329] while the cloister glazing began after the completion of the stonework in 1419.[330] The loss of the windows makes it impossible to assess the precise relationship between the two monumental Cuthbertine cycles at Durham, or with the York window. Nevertheless, the close proximity in date between windows s6 and s7, the cloister cycle and the St Cuthbert Window, York Minster, as well as the involvement of both Langley and Wessington, are suggestive. In this subsection, the scale and content of the cycles, as far as can be established, will be compared, highlighting aspects of their design which provide insights into the cult's contemporary interests, and which will be of relevance to the later discussion of the York window.

Rites refers to s6-7 as a single window, which depicted:

> …the whole storye life and miracles of that holy man St Cuthbert from his birth, of his natiuitie and infancie unto the end and a discourse of his

---

[326] Georgina Russell, "The North Window of the Nine Altars Chapel, Durham Cathedral," in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham Cathedral*, ed. Nicola Coldstream and Peter Draper, *British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions for the year 1977, 3* (Leeds: W.S. Maney, 1980), 88.
[327] Ayers, *Merton*, vol.1, cxii-cxiii
[328] DUL, Loc.XXVII:1a; Raine, *Scriptores*, cclxxii.
[329] DUL, DCD-Sacr.acs 1416-7; Joseph Thomas Fowler, ed. *Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham, From the Original MSS.*, 3 vols., vol. 2ibid. (Durham: Andrews, 1899), 406.
[330] DUL, Loc.II:19(10); DUL, DCD-Sacr.acs 1421-2; Snape, "Documentary," 29; Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 111.

whole life, maruelously fine and curiously sett forth in pictures in fine coloured glass accordinge as he went in his habitte to his dying day[331]

The original number of narrative panels can be estimated from the extant stonework (Figure 2.54). Depending upon each panel's height, each light could accommodate between five and eight panels (Figure 2.69), giving between forty and sixty-four panels in total (Figure 2.70). Some panels may have depicted the donor(s), or elaborate canopies, as seen in section D of the St Cuthbert Window, or windows n8-10, at York Minster. Consequently, windows s6-7 probably contained fewer narrative scenes than the York Window.

The closely contemporary cloister scheme may have contained more narrative scenes. The *Rites* describes it running from "the cloister dore to the church dour" and showing "the whole storye and miracles of that holy man St Cuthb(ert)".[332] This suggests it spanned the windows of the cloisters eastern walk (Figure 2.52, Figure 2.72 and Figure 2.73). The original stonework was replaced in the eighteenth century and no evidence survives of its appearance.[333] However, if the eighteenth-century remodelling preserved the number and rough dimensions of windows, between sixty and one hundred panels, spanning eleven windows, may have contained narrative scenes. This puts its scale much closer to the York window's seventy narrative panels. However, this does not indicate similarity of iconography, as significantly different emphases within the Cuthbertine narrative could have been created. Their different settings, and therefore audiences and functions, as well as their different structures and proximity to the viewer would potentially have guided their design. Indeed, the provision of *tituli* beneath the cloister cycle scenes parallels other low-level windows in cloister cycles at Dale Abbey and Worcester Cathedral, as will be discussed below.[334]

Nevertheless, the limited evidence of the Durham cycles' contents can provide valuable insights into the vision of Cuthbert promoted by the Durham community. In particular, the specific reference to Cuthbert's infancy in the descriptions of both s6-7 and the

[331] DUL, Cosin B.II.11, f.49v-50r; Fowler, *Rites*, 3.
[332] DUL, Cosin B.II.11, f.75r; Fowler, *Rites*, 76.
[333] Snape, "Documentary," 29-30.
[334] Fowler, *Rites*, 76.

cloister glazing is evidence that the narrative was partly drawn from the *Libellus*, as at York.[335] The *Rites* assertion that "euery myracle that he did after, frome his infancye was sett there by it selfe" must be viewed cautiously, given the destruction of the glass before the description.[336] Indeed, the description of Cuthbert's birth in the cloister cycle closely echoes the text of the Libellan text:

> his mother lyinge in her child bed after she was deliuered, ***the bright beames did shine from heaven uppon her and uppon the child, where he did lye in the cradle***, that to euery mans thinking the holy ghost had overshadowed him, ***for euery one that did /see\ itt, did thinke that the house had beene sett all on fire, the beames did shine so bright ouer all the house both within and without***[337]
>
> *Rites*, DUL, Cosin B.II.11, f.75r

> For ***in the cradle where the infant, already born, had been placed, brightness of such great brilliance surrounded the whole of the place itself,*** which, because of the light's excessive brilliance, hardly anyone had the power to look at. ***For the whole household was believed to be consumed by flames by everyone who was nearby and beside the place.***[338]
>
> *Libellus*, Oxford, Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.2v

> ***Alsone as þe chile was borne***
> ***In credill laide, his dame beforne***
> ***Þar was a grete clernes of lyght***
> Unnes þar on men luke myght
> ***It shane all ye house aboute***
> ***Bathe with in and with oute***
> ***Ilk man wende þat it sowe***
> ***Þe house had bene in brynnande low***[339]
>
> *Metrical Life of St Cuthbert*, BL, Egerton 3309, f.4v

---

[335] Ibid., 3.
[336] DUL, Cosin B.II.11, f.75r; Fowler, *Rites*, 76.
[337] Author's italics.
[338] Author's italics. "Nam in cunis ubi infans iam natus collocatus est tantus fulgor claritatis omnem locum ipsum circumdederat . quod pre lucis nimio splendore vix quisquam aliquid intueri preualeret. Nam vicinis quibusque et secus positis tota domus putabatur flammis absumi." Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.2v.
[339] Author's italics.

This may suggest that the *Rites'* author supplemented his memories with material from a textual source. However, the presence of at least some Libellan scenes may suggest that the inclusion of Libellan scenes at York was guided by the proponents of the cult in Durham. Indeed, their inclusion in both Durham cycles and window 1 supports the above discussion of the textual Cuthbertine narratives, which has demonstrated that the *Libellus* was considered an essential element of Cuthbert's *Vita* by the fifteenth century, because it provided Cuthbert with an auspicious birth appropriate for an episcopal saint.[340] Indeed, while the *Rites*' description must be analysed cautiously, its focus upon Cuthbert's birth and royal patrimony suggests these were considered key emphases, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Nevertheless, the variable reliability of the descriptions prevents a thorough assessment of the relationship between the Durham and York cycles. Consequently, the possibility that the windows were made by the same workshop, let alone from the same cartoons, as proposed by J.A. Knowles and echoed by Malcolm Baker, Jeremy Haselock and David O'Connor, should be treated with extreme caution.[341] Windows s6-7 are not described in enough detail for conclusions to be drawn, simply referring to "his birth of his natiuitie and infancie".[342] Moreover, as the scenes are clearly all based on the Libellan account of Cuthbert's birth, descriptions of the key elements of their content would obviously sound similar enough to mask differences in the actual panels. For example, while the description of "St Cuthbert w(i)th the sun beame shining, vpon his mothers bedd, at his natiuity" in window 1,[343] accords with some aspects of the extant scene in the York window (Figure 2.71), a more detailed description may have revealed significant differences. Moreover, if the cloister description did not draw upon a textual source, its assertion that Cuthbert lay in a cradle,[344] rather than on his mother's bed, as in the York Window, and window 1 at Durham,[345] points to differing depictions.

---

[340] Fowler, *Rites*, 3, 76-77, 118; Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 37.
[341] John Alder Knowles, *Essays in the History of the York School of Glass-painting* (London: S.P.C.K. , 1936), 11; Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 111, 113; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 43.
[342] DUL, Cosin B.II.11, f.49v; Fowler, *Rites of Durham*, 3
[343] Bodleian, Rawlinson B.300, f.17v; Fowler, *Rites*, 118.
[344] Ibid., 76.
[345] Ibid., 118.

In addition to broad agreements in iconography, and the involvement of the same patrons, there is evidence of the same glaziers working in both York and Durham during the fifteenth century. Haselock and O'Connor have already noted a reference in the Durham accounts to a "certain glazier from York", paid for work in 1424.[346] It also seems likely that John Witton and John Coverham, and possibly Thomas Rosse, who were working together at Durham in 1432-3, were York glaziers;[347] both Witton and Coverham were freemen of York, and the latter was working at York Minster in 1419.[348] Consequently, the possibility that the Cuthbertine narratives at York and Durham were similar, or inspired by one another, cannot be discounted. Nevertheless, the design of the cloister glass suggests that each cycle was tailored to its architectural and devotional context, and intended function, just as has been seen in the textual narratives and manuscript illustrations discussed above. Unlike the other Durham cycles, or the York window, the cloister cycle had Latin *tituli*: "in under euerye miracle there was certain uerses sett forth in lattine that dyd declare the contents and meanings of euery miracle, and story by it selfe".[349] The record of the designs for the cloister cycle describes "corresponding verses for the same miracles".[350] This confirms that the *tituli* were an integral part of the cloister cycle's design, and that they were intended to perform a didactic function.

This use of *tituli* responds to the architectural context of the cycle, which not only placed it close to the viewer (Figure 2.73), making inscriptions clearly visible, but also situated it in one of the primary thoroughfares within the complex (Figure 2.52). The eastern walk facilitated access to the chapter house, as well as between the cathedral and the priory, and ran close to St Cuthbert's cenotaph in the cloister garth.[351] Moreover, the adjacent north aisle

---

[346] "cui(us)d(a)m vitriar(ius) Ebo(rum)", DUL, DCD-Sacr.acs 1424-5; Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 108.
[347] DUL, Misc.ch. 5719.
[348] It is possible that Rosse is Thomas Roos, made free 1418. J.A. Knowles, "Glass Painters of York: Chronological List of York Glass-Painters," *Notes and Queries* 12th series, X (1922): 185-186, 222. YMLA, E3/9.
[349] DUL, Cosin B.II.11, f.75r; Fowler, *Rites*, 76.
[350] "v(er)sib(us) ei(u)sd(e)m miraculis concorda(n)tib(us)", DUL, Misc.Ch. 5727a; Raine, *Scriptores*, cclxix.
[351] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 331; Fowler, *Rites*, 74-75.

of the cloister was fitted with carrels containing desks, set within the window bays, where the monks would study in the afternoons.[352] While the numerous copies of Cuthbert's *vitae* recorded in Durham's library demonstrate that the monks would undoubtedly have read the various versions and compilations of his life and miracles, the cloister cycle would certainly have provided a format through which they could learn, memorise and contemplate his legend.[353] Comparable designs survive from the Dale Abbey cloister scheme, depicting the Life of St Robert of Knaresborough,[354] while records of the lost St Wulfstan cycle in Worcester's cloister suggests a similar format.[355] The vague description of windows s6-7 means that comparable inscriptions there cannot be ruled out. They overlooked Cuthbert's shrine and possibly part of the processional routes taken on Sundays and feast days (Figure 2.52). High medieval windows in comparable locations at Canterbury, and in French cathedrals such as Bourges and Chartres, have textual inscriptions, providing various levels of detail.[356] Moreover, the description of the cloister designs indicates an intention to reuse them elsewhere.[357] Consequently, if the designs pre-dated windows s6-7, they might have been used as a visual or textual source. Nevertheless, the height of s6-7 may suggest that, as in the York window, inscriptions would not be legible from the primary viewing point, and so may not have been planned.

The descriptions of s6-7 and the cloister cycle obscure any differences in thematic emphases between the two cycles, although the questions they raise are relevant to the analysis of the York window. The *Windows* author's description of Cuthbert in his habit suggests s6-7 were dominated by monastic scenes.[358] The promotion of ideal monastic

---

[352] Fowler, *Rites*, 83.
[353] Dobson, *Fifteenth Century*, 31.
[354] M. R. James, On the Abbey of St Edmund at Bury, I: The Library; II: The Church, Cambridge Antiquarian Society 28 (1895), 186–203 at 186, 190–3, 199.
[355] Darlington, *Vita Wulfstani*, 4-5; Engel, *Worcester Cathedral*, 200; Flower, "Wulftan," 123-129.
[356] Caviness, *Canterbury*, 158-159; Manhès-Deremble and Deremble, *Vitraux Narratifs*, 107, 110, 213-215, 254-256, 262; Rachel Koopmans, "'Here the Blood is Applied': Inscriptions and Story-telling in a Miracle Window of Canterbury Cathedral," in *Word and Image: Proceedings of the Corpus Vitrearum 27th International Colloquium, York, 7-11 July 2014* (York: Corpus Vitrearum, 2014), 19-23; Claudine Lautier, "Les Inscriptions du Vitrail de Saint Silvestre - De la Légende à l'Affirmation du Pouvoir de l'Église," ibid., 9-14.
[357] "vel alibi faciend(a)", DUL, Misc.Ch. 5727a; Raine, *Scriptores*, cclxix.
[358] Fowler, *Rites*, 3.

behaviour by the community's special saint would be highly appropriate at Durham. Additionally, Rollason has argued that Durham's fifteenth-century glazing supports the community's promotion of Cuthbert, its own history, and Benedictine monasticism, in response to the threat of Lollard heresy.[359] While the true extent or motive of a monastic focus at Durham cannot be known, the possibility that the comparable monastic focus evident at York expresses a similar agenda will be explored in Chapter 4.

It may be that the Durham cycles, like the York window, emphasised Cuthbert's life, rather than his posthumous miracles.[360] It is difficult to confirm the absence of elements of the Cuthbertine narrative based on their omission from the descriptions. However, despite the uncertainty regarding the precise scale of the Durham cycles, it is clear they could not have included all of Cuthbert's hagiographic narratives. The *Rites'* descriptions of s6-7 and the cloister cycle state that they ended with Cuthbert's death.[361] This suggests that the numerous posthumous miracles upon which the designers might have drawn, including those related to his shrine at Durham, were omitted. This would contrast with stained-glass cycles in comparative proximity to St Thomas Becket's shrine at Canterbury, and St William's shrine at York, both of which incorporate extensive posthumous miracle scenes.[362] Moreover, as the *Rites'* descriptions were written after the destruction of the cloister cycle, and possibly s6-7, they are likely imprecise, perhaps amalgamating any posthumous scenes with Cuthbert's death. Indeed, the York window depicted four posthumous events, three of which are extant (Figure 2.74, Figure 2.75 and Figure 2.76).[363] As these are crucial for authenticating Cuthbert's sanctity, it would be highly unusual to exclude them from a comprehensive narrative of his life, particularly given the proximity of s6-7 to Cuthbert's shrine.

While the limited evidence precludes firm conclusions, Cuthbertine iconography was undoubtedly at the heart of Durham's extensive fifteenth-century glazing projects, both

[359] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 340.
[360] Fowler, *Rites*, 3, 77.
[361] Ibid.
[362] Caviness, *Canterbury*, 158-159; French, *William Window*, 16-17.
[363] Catalogue: 23c-23e.

narrative and figural.[364] This examination has highlighted broad similarities in the use of narrative with the fifteenth-century choir glazing at York Minster, which will be discussed in Chapter 3. Moreover, there is evidence that narratives were selected and edited both to articulate contemporary agendas and to tailor their iconography to specific contexts, functions and wider iconographic schemes. This aligns with the evidence provided by the other Cuthbertine narratives discussed within this chapter, demonstrating that, over the course of successive revisions, visitations and augmentations, certain elements of the Cuthbertine narrative remained immutable. At the same time, others were diminished or accentuated, and new extensions were appended to the narrative. Examination of the extant Cuthbertine hagiography, both textual and pictorial, clearly demonstrates that the development of this iconography responds to the contemporary concerns of the community within which it was made. Moreover, there is evidence that different Cuthbertine iconographies were developed for different audiences.

This study's reassessment of the evidence has concluded that all of the Durham narrative cycles probably drew upon the *Libellus* for Cuthbert's origins and childhood. In combination with the textual evidence outlined above, the Libellan scenes point to the existence at Durham of a well-formed iconographic tradition for Cuthbert's early life. While closer parallels with York cannot be confirmed, this indicates broad iconographic similarities in the Durham and York cycles. Similarly, the possibility that the Durham cycles focused upon Cuthbert's monastic life, potentially promoting Benedictine monasticism and orthodoxy in response to Lollardy, raises the question of similar agendas at York. Additionally, the involvement, to varying degrees, of Skirlaw, Langley and Wessington in Cuthbertine narrative cycles and sequences of historical figures raises questions regarding their involvement in the commissioning of the St Cuthbert Window at York, which will be considered in Chapter 3.

[364] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 330, 340-341; Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 111.

Chapter 3: Patronage, Commemoration and Politics

The exploration of Cuthbertine hagiography in Chapter 2 has demonstrated that the St Cuthbert Window cannot be viewed in isolation; it must be examined in relation to both its architectural and devotional setting, and the roles of the individuals involved in its commissioning and execution. There are a number of questions regarding the planning and patronage of the St Cuthbert Window. An inscription within the window identifies the donor as Thomas Langley (Bishop of Durham 1406-37),[1] but the iconographic, stylistic and architectural evidence indicates that the window was not executed until after Langley's death in the late 1430s. Additionally, Christopher Norton has proposed that the window was designed at the beginning of the fifteenth century, as part of a coherent glazing scheme within the eastern arm of York Minster.[2] He has suggested that Richard Scrope (Archbishop of York 1398-1405) originally intended to fund the St Cuthbert Window, prior to his execution for treason, and has argued that the Dean and Chapter retained iconographic control over some of the windows within the scheme.[3] Consequently, there are questions regarding the extent of Langley's agency over the design of the window, and the identity of the individuals who ultimately oversaw its completion.

Further questions are raised by the commemorative display in section D (Figure 3.1), the scale of which is unprecedented within York Minster's glazing. Nine figures are shown kneeling before a large image of St Cuthbert. Although the representation of Langley links the window to Durham, the locus of St Cuthbert's cult, the other figures present a much more national, and royal, focus, through their status as members of the Lancastrian elite. Only three held appointments in York, but all of the individuals in the lower register served in the government of the Lancastrian kings depicted above them.[4] It is, therefore, essential to understand the design and function of the commemorative section, in order to answer the questions regarding the commissioning and design of the window as a whole.

---

[1] Catalogue: 1-2e.
[2] Norton, "Sacred Space," 168-169, 172.
[3] Norton, "Richard Scrope," 149-150; Norton, "Sacred Space," 172.
[4] Gwilym Dodd, "The Clerical Chancellors of Late Medieval England," in *The Prelate in England and Europe, 1300-1560*, ed. Martin Heale (York: York Medieval Press, 2014), 48-49.

Consideration of the window's devotional setting raises additional questions regarding its intended function within the choir glazing scheme, and York Minster more widely. There is no evidence of the special expression of Cuthbertine devotion within York Minster before 1426, when Peter de la Hay founded a chantry to commemorate his patron Walter Skirlaw (Bishop of Durham 1388-1406).[5] No altar to St Cuthbert is listed in the 1364 survey of chantries,[6] although a relic of Cuthbert's tomb was stored in the great feretory behind the high altar in the late thirteenth century.[7] The founding of the Cuthbertine chantry appears to have occasioned the co-dedication to St Cuthbert of a thirteenth-century altar to St Andrew.[8] There has been some confusion over the altar's location; nevertheless, the combined documentary evidence and a recent analysis of burials suggest a location on the south-eastern side of the south-west crossing pier.[9] This indicates that the altar was not intended to be directly associated with the St Cuthbert Window. Additionally, Skirlaw's association with the altar means that it cannot be taken as evidence of increasing Cuthbertine devotion in York Minster. Indeed, with the exception of the St Cuthbert Window, Cuthbert is notably absent from the Minster's extant glazing.

Consequently, this chapter will consider the potential roles played by individuals and institutions in the commissioning of the St Cuthbert Window, as well as the possible impacts of contemporary politics, artistic and iconographic trends. While the focus here is upon

---

[5] The surviving records make it clear that Skirlaw did not found the chantry during his lifetime, as Glynne Jarratt has suggested. William Page, ed. *The Certificates of the Commissioners Appointed to Survey the Chantries, Guilds, Hospitals, etc. in the County of York*, 2 vols., vol. 1, Surtees Society (Durham: Andrews, 1894), 13, 23; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 149, 152; Glynne Jarratt, *The Life of Walter Skirlaw, Medieval Diplomat and Prince Bishop of Durham* (Beverley: Highgate, 2004), 156.

[6] Sarah E. McManaway, "Some aspects of the foundation of perpetual chantries in York Minster" (Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of York, 1981), 30, 157-160. Christopher Norton, discussion, 15/01/2019. I am grateful to Christopher Norton for confirming this detail, ahead of the publication of his research on the subject: Christopher Norton, discussion, 15/01/2019.

[7] Christopher Norton, discussion, 15/01/2019; Turner, "New Contexts," 96; James Raine, ed. *The Fabric Rolls of York Minster, with an Appendix of Illustrative Documents*, Surtees Society (Durham: Andrews, 1859), 151.

[8] YMLA, Chapter Act Book, 1427-1504, f.2v, 36v, 118v, 136v-137r, 143r, 167r, 193r, 215r; William Page, ed. *The Certificates of the Commissioners Appointed to Survey the Chantries, Guilds, Hospitals, etc. in the County of York*, 2 vols., vol. 1ibid. (1894), 13.

[9] Turner, "New Contexts," 116-117; Brown, *York Minster*, 180; Brown, *East Window*, 26; Raine, *Scriptores*, 114.

patronage, this analysis recognises the need to move beyond past conceptions of tripartite agency within patronage, which ascribes different roles to a patron, theological advisor and artist, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.[10] Recognition of the complexity of stained glass design, and patronage, is particularly prudent, given the apparently long genesis of the St Cuthbert Window, as well as the likely involvement of different individuals over successive generations. This chapter will first examine the fifteenth-century glazing of York Minster's eastern arm, to consider the evidence for patterns of patronage and the existence of a coherent scheme. The extent to which iconographic control was exercised by donors, and the Dean and Chapter, will be explored. This will provide insights into the contemporary mechanisms of commissioning and execution, which can shed light on the creation of the St Cuthbert Window. In Chapter 3.2, the condition, content and structure of the St Cuthbert Window's commemorative section will be analysed, focusing upon the evidence it provides for both the patronage and intended function of the window as a whole. In the final part of this chapter, the questions raised regarding Langley's agency will be addressed through an examination of his career and connections, as well as patronage and institutional networks at York Minster. This exploration of the extent of Langley's agency, and the individuals who may have acted on his behalf following his death, can provide wider insights into the planning and patronage of monumental stained glass.

3.1 The Fifteenth-Century Choir Glazing: Patterns of Patronage and Iconography

When considering the authorship and potential agency of individuals over the design of the Cuthbert Window, the fifteenth-century glazing of York Minster's eastern arm can provide insights into patterns of patronage, as well as the window's devotional setting. This is particularly valuable when assessing the degree of autonomy which donors, or executors, may have been afforded, versus the extent to which control over the iconography was retained by the Dean and Chapter. Similar questions have been explored in relation to the high

[10] Jill Caskey, "Medieval Patronage & its Potentialities," in *Patronage: Power & Agency in Medieval Art*, ed. Colum Hourihane, *The Index Of Christian Art: Occasional Papers, 15* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 4.

medieval narrative glass at Chartres;[11] a balanced appraisal of the various arguments has been provided by Brigitte Kurmann-Schwarz.[12] Elements of the opposing arguments provide interesting parallels to York Minster's glazing. In particular, while there are flaws in Jane Welch Williams' argument that Chartres' canons retained full creative control, she highlighted the important distinctions between iconographic imagery and reality.[13] Her interpretation of Chartres' iconography as "art in the service of clerical ideology"[14] may equally be applied to the St Cuthbert Window and wider choir glazing, as this chapter will demonstrate. Kemp, while arguing that subjects were individually chosen by each window's donor and that the clergy exercised limited iconographic control, credits glaziers and theological advisors with the specific narrative designs;[15] this is a key issue at York, which will be discussed in Chapter 4. Additionally, the "compromise" which Kemp identified at Bourges, whereby the highly-visible ambulatory windows followed a strict iconographic programme, while the donors were allowed greater iconographic freedom in the less-visible apsidal chapels, has parallels in York Minster's fifteenth-century glazing.[16]

The eastern arm of York Minster contains a wealth of medieval stained glass, including two of the most significant single monumental narrative windows extant in Britain: the Great East Window (1405-8) and the St William Window (c.1414).[17] Glazed in a series of phases through the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, but distorted by damage, restoration, and rearrangement, the potential existence of a coherent iconographic scheme, or multiple schemes, is difficult to determine. Yet an increasing range of scholarship, including studies by Sarah Brown and Christopher Norton, has argued for more cohesive readings, particularly of

---

[11] Kemp, *Narratives*, 96, 126, 129 134, 150, 163, 174-175; Manhès-Deremble and Deremble, *Vitraux Narratifs*; Williams, *Bread, Wine & Money*, 29-30, 36, 139.

[12] Brigitte Kurmann-Schwarz, "Récits, Programmes, Commanditaires, Concepteurs Donateurs: Publications Récentes sur l'Iconographie des Vitraux de la Cathédrale de Chartres," *Bulletin Monumental* 154, no. 1 (1996): 55-69.

[13] Williams, *Bread, Wine & Money*, 29-30, 36, 139.

[14] Ibid., 139.

[15] Kemp, *Narratives*, 163, 175.

[16] Ibid., 176.

[17] Brown, *York Minster*, 280-282.

the narrative glass.[18] Significantly, while evidence in the commemorative section aligns with the dating of the St Cuthbert Window to *c.*1440 on stylistic grounds, Norton has argued persuasively that it was designed as an integral part of a coherent glazing scheme, which was planned and begun at the turn of the fifteenth century.[19] Consequently, the following discussion explores the fifteenth-century glazing of York Minster's eastern arm. In addition to sketching the St Cuthbert Window's iconographic setting, questions will be raised regarding patronage and agency.

The eastern arm of York Minster was rebuilt in two phases: the Lady Chapel in *c.*1361-73 and the western choir in c.1394-1420.[20] However, the glazing was installed in a series of shorter phases, the earliest of which are difficult to identify and interpret due to later rearrangement and damage. In particular, the loss, damage and subsequent rearrangement of the late fourteenth-century glazing prevents conclusions regarding its original arrangement and the planning, or existence, of an overarching iconographic scheme.[21] Figure 3.2, which is based upon research by French, Norton and Brown, as well as Torre's descriptions, provides an overview of the windows, showing their dating and iconography.[22] The better-preserved fifteenth-century glazing of the western choir enabled Norton to identify a coherent scheme, executed between c.1405-20, which he has convincingly argued was originally intended to include the St Cuthbert Window.[23] Following the 1405-8 glazing of the Great East Window, which evokes "universal Christian history and salvation",[24] the western clerestory (N8-11, S8-

---

[18] Ibid., 217; Sarah Brown, "Archbishop Richard Scrope's Lost Window in York Minster," in *Saints and Cults in Medieval England, Proceedings of the 2015 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Susan Powell, *Harlaxton Medieval Studies, XXVII* (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2017), 300-310; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 193-196; Norton, "Sacred Space," 168-169.

[19] Brown, *York Minster*, 232; Norton, "Sacred Space," 168-169.

[20] Norton, "Sacred Space," 167; Brown, *York Minster*, 217.

[21] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.33r-60r; Brown, *York Minster*, 165; Norton, "Sacred Space," 168; Thomas French, "The Glazing of the Lady Chapel Clerestorey," *Friends of York Minster 66th Annual Report* (1995): 43.

[22] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.33r-60r; French, "Lady Chapel," 43, 45-46; Brown, *York Minster*, 165-167, 218, 280-286; Norton, "Sacred Space," 167-169, 172; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 158-160; Brown, "Scrope's Lost Window," 302-303, 305-310. The appearance of the first glazing of n2, which was replaced c.1440 following a fire, is unknown. Alexander B. Holton, "The Archaeology and Conservation of the East Front of York Minster" (Unpublished PhD Thesis, The University of York, 2010), 159 (Figure 180).

[23] Norton, "Sacred Space," 168-169.

[24] Brown, *East Window*, 55-65, quotation p.65; Norton, "Sacred Space," 173-177.

11) was glazed c.1408-15 with a sequence of pre-Conquest prelates, popes and kings symbolising the history of the northern church and its relationship with the universal church (Figure 3.3).[25] Norton's suggestion that the western clerestory windows promoted the prelates and popes as the successors of the apostles and prophets, depicted in the late fourteenth-century eastern clerestory, is supported by their visual echoes of form and arrangement (Figure 3.3 , Figure 3.4 and Figure 3.5).[26] Significantly, Norton has argued that, while the heraldry of both lay and ecclesiastical patrons, including Langley's (Figure 3.5),[27] appears beneath these figures, their iconography had been planned by the Dean and Chapter.[28]

The glazing of the clerestory was followed immediately by the glazing of the St William Window (n7) (Figure 3.6 and Figure 3.7), c.1414, and the choir aisles (n8-10, s8-10), c.1415-20. As discussed in Chapter 2, the format of iconic figures above narrative scenes and the donor closely resembles the nine altars windows at Durham, although altars were not located beneath the York windows. Moreover, the arrangement was potentially intended to function in multiple ways, depending upon the location of the viewer. In the aisles, the viewer is closest to the narrative, and donor depictions, which elicit prayers (Figure 3.8). Yet from the choir, only the iconic figures above are visible, contributing to the overarching evocation of Christian history in the clerestory and Great East Window (Figure 3.9). Within the aisles, the donors appear to have enjoyed the freedom to choose the windows' iconography.[29] However, the consistency of the arrangement of figures and narrative scenes across the windows suggests that this was tempered by the use of a set format, indicating that the Dean and Chapter retained ultimate control over the glazing programme.[30]

---

[25] Norton, "Sacred Space," 172-173.
[26] Ibid., 172.
[27] Langley's arms survive in S9. Torre recorded them in S10, in 1690, alongside the arms of Beaufort, Haxey, Mowbray and Mortimer, all of which remain in S10. Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.62v; Brown, *York Minster*, 286.
[28] Norton, "Sacred Space," 172.
[29] Brown, *York Minster*, 226-228; Norton, "Sacred Space," 172; David Lepine, "'Advocatis meis': Patterns of Devotion to Saints among the Late Medieval Higher Clergy," in *Saints and Cults in Medieval England, Proceedings of the 2015 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Susan Powell, *Harlaxton Medieval Studies, XXVII* (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2017), 33-34.
[30] Norton, "Sacred Space," 172.

The status of these windows' donors points to a pattern of patronage which may shed light on the commissioning of the St Cuthbert Window. Windows n8-10 (Figures 3.10-12) were respectively donated by Robert Wolveden, who held several York prebends between 1400 and 1426, and was Treasurer of York 1426-32; Thomas Parker, Prebendary of Ampleforth 1410-23; and Henry Bowet, Archbishop of York 1406-23.[31] While the western south aisle windows are more damaged, one was probably given by Thomas Walleworth Prebendary of Bugthorpe, 1386-1406 and 1406-9.[32] Their respective roles, as archbishop and canons of York, would have put them in close contact with the Dean and members of the chapter who controlled the glazing, if they were not actively involved themselves. The role of the canons in controlling the patronage and execution of the glazing will be explored further in Chapter 3.3.5. However, their periods of office also demonstrate the potential for connections between successive generations of Minster officials, enabling the planning and execution of glazing schemes over long timescales.

Indeed, examination of the commissioning of the Great East Window, for which documentary evidence is greater than for any other Minster window, can provide valuable insights into the probable mechanisms of fifteenth-century stained glass patronage at York Minster. While the original contract for the window, between the Dean and Chapter of York and the glazier John Thornton, has been lost, two summarised transcriptions and a translation survive.[33] Brown has suggested that the lack of reference to the donor, Walter Skirlaw (Bishop of Durham, 1388-1406), in the contract and the reciprocal omission of the window from Skirlaw's will make it likely that Skirlaw had given money to the Minster fabric fund during his lifetime.[34] The lack of further documentation means that the extent of Skirlaw's agency in commissioning the Great East Window is unclear, and his informal input cannot be ruled out. However, the evidence of the indenture suggests that once the funds had been provided, the Dean and Chapter oversaw production.[35]

---

[31] Brown, *York Minster*, 282-283.
[32] Ibid., 228, 284.
[33] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.11r; French, *East Window*, 2-3; Brown, *East Window*, 48-49.
[34] French, *East Window*, 5; Brown, *Apocalypse*, 12-13, 23-24; Brown, *East Window*, 25-26.
[35] Brown, *East Window*, 30.

Furthermore, there is evidence that preparations had begun some years before the indenture was drawn up. The purchase of large quantities of white and coloured glass in 1399, "for the great windows of the new choir",[36] may be the first hint of plans to glaze the Great East Window.[37] If correct, this demonstrates the lengthy period of planning and preparation required for windows of this scale, despite the apparent speed of production once work was underway.[38] Moreover, as the record specifies the "great windows",[39] rather than a single window, it is possible that the glass was purchased with the intention of glazing not only the east window, but also the two eastern transept windows, the St William and St Cuthbert windows. More significantly, Scrope borrowed YT26 before his death, probably as a source for the St Cuthbert Window.[40] This supports Christopher Norton's suggestion that the three windows were conceived together in the early fifteenth century, but that plans for the glazing of the eastern arm were thrown into disarray by the execution of Archbishop Richard Scrope in 1405.[41] This was further compounded by the fall of the tower in 1405, to which resources were swiftly diverted; Norton and Harrison have argued that the stonework of the south choir transept was capped at aisle level around this date, and not resumed until *c.*1430.[42] Nevertheless, YT26 probably remained at York until at least 1416, suggesting that, although delayed, the St Cuthbert Window remained a planned part of the scheme.[43]

Norton has argued persuasively that the St William and St Cuthbert Windows, flanking the high altar, were intended to integrate the "two pre-eminent saints of the two pre-eminent cathedrals in the North",[44] within the regional and universal history evoked by the Great East Window and the clerestory glazing. The detection and significance of correspondences in iconography between the two windows will be discussed in Chapter 4.

---

[36] "pro magnis fenestris novi chori", YMLA, E3/3 (1399).
[37] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 13.
[38] Ibid., 24.
[39] YMLA, E3/3 (1399).
[40] DCL, MS B.IV.46, f.41v; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 149-150.
[41] Ibid., 148-149, 152, 192-196.
[42] Stuart Harrison and Christopher Norton, *York Minster: An Illustrated Architectural History 627-c.1500* (Chapter of York, 2015), 42.
[43] DCL, MS B.IV.46, f.41v; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 149-150.
[44] Norton, "Sacred Space," 170.

However, the likelihood that the St Cuthbert Window was intended as an integral part of the scheme planned in the early fifteenth century raises questions regarding its iconography, as well as the agency exercised by those involved in its commissioning. In particular, while the transmission and completion of plans over extended periods is evident within the architectural scheme as a whole, it is unclear how this was achieved.

Yet, despite the late date of the St Cuthbert Window, the continuation of glazing activity within the Minster more widely suggests the perpetuation of patronage trends, and possibly even glazing workshops, seen in the early fifteenth century. In the 1430s, the eastern aisle windows of the transepts were re-glazed with figures of saints which corresponded to the altars below.[45] Two (s12 and s13, Figure 3.13 and Figure 3.14) were given by the Dean and Chapter and another two (n11 and s11, Figure 3.15 and Figure 3.16) by Robert Wolveden, donor of n8 and also S7.[46] This indicates virtually continuous glazing activity in the years leading up to the execution of the St Cuthbert Window. Additionally, as will be discussed below, Norton has suggested that John Scrope, brother of Canon Stephen Scrope, was involved in the glazing of both n12, in the transept, and S6, one of the clerestory windows adjoining the St Cuthbert Window.[47] Moreover, both Brown and Norton have argued that stylistic similarities indicate that the glazing of S6 and S7 is coeval with the St Cuthbert Window.[48] This raises questions regarding authorship and agency in relation to the St Cuthbert Window that will be discussed in Chapter 3.3. First it is necessary to look at the imagery of the donor, and other figures, commemorated in the window itself.

3.2 Section D: The Commemorative Section

Occupying one quarter of the window, section D is unusual in the extent of its commemoration of contemporary figures (Figure 3.1), particularly in comparison to the St William Window, where the donor panels occupy only Row 1 (Figure 3.17). In past

[45] Brown, *York Minster*, 235-236, 286-287.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid., 286; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 197.
[48] Brown, *York Minster*, 230-231; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 192-195.

scholarship, the identity of the figures depicted has understandably led to a discussion primarily in terms of the display of Lancastrian propaganda.[49] However, a fuller consideration of the lowest section must address both its role within the window as a whole, and what it reveals about the commissioning of the window. In particular, the identities of the individuals depicted raise questions regarding who exercised creative and iconographic control over the window, but also its lengthy chronology. Additionally, the relationship between narrative and kneeling figures, comparable in varying degrees to the other fifteenth-century stained glass, provides a valuable lynchpin for a broader analysis of the structure and design of the window. The following discussion provides an assessment and exploration of the commemorative section, examining the strength of the available evidence to enable further analysis, and highlighting questions of design, authorship and agency, for discussion in Chapter 3.3.

3.2.1 Condition and Identification

The panels within section D have undergone levels of deterioration and alteration comparable to those affecting the narrative. As the identities of the figures have implications for the assessment of Langley's involvement in the design of the window, it is necessary to reassess the identifications made in past scholarship, to provide confirmation based upon a wider range of evidence. There is less documentary evidence for the original appearance of section D compared to the narrative sections. Torre's seventeenth-century descriptions are minimal, and his transcriptions of the figures' name labels are of variable accuracy.[50] He did not transcribe inscriptions from the panels he saw in locations 1d, 1e and 3a (now panel 3b), and those provided for locations 1b and 1c are clearly wrong,[51] but he provided largely accurate labels for St Cuthbert, Henry V and John of Gaunt.[52] Torre's omissions suggest he was struggling to make sense of damaged or only partially legible texts. Indeed, several are written with a noticeably different ink, suggesting he revisited the window to provide the

[49] Barnett, "Cuthbert Window" 22, 51-52, 58; Knowles, *Essays*, 183-184.
[50] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.54r.
[51] Catalogue: 1-2b, 1-2c.
[52] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.54r; Catalogue: 3-4a, 3-4c, 3-4d.

inscriptions.[53] Moreover, closer examination of his erroneous labels reveals broad formal similarities with the actual inscriptions, which may indicate he could see them, but guessed the words.[54]

Further descriptions by Fowler and especially Knowles have provided valuable evidence of the nineteenth-century appearance and order of the panels, although Knowles generally refers to Fowler for the labels' transcriptions.[55] Nevertheless, these enable most of the extensive alterations effected under Milner-White's direction to be identified.[56] Moreover, although the glass is fragmentary and much altered in places, the consistency of forms across the figures allows reconstruction of many details. By combining close visual analysis with examination of the documentary evidence, it has been possible to draw conclusions regarding the probable original structure, the conventions of representation employed, as well as the identity of the figures. Fuller details of this evidence, and analysis relevant to the following discussion, are provided in the Catalogue.

Section D is composed of twenty-five panels, plus the heads of the lights. Rows 1-4 depict two registers of figures, while row 5 contains large architectural canopies, rising from the panels in row 4 and terminating in the heads of the lights (Figure 3.1). The current arrangement is probably very similar to the original arrangement. In light c, a large standing figure of St Cuthbert, holding the head of St Oswald, occupies the second register, flanked by crowned figures (lights a, b, d and e) (Figure 3.18). Beneath, in the first register, is a secular figure (light c), flanked by ecclesiastical figures (lights a, b, d and e). Each figure is set within its own architectural surround, against a striped curtain, kneeling before a small *prie-dieu* with an open book or scroll. Those in the lights flanking St Cuthbert are orientated to face the saint, with their hands raised together. The figure beneath Cuthbert looks to his right (eastwards), with hands raised apart. Each figure was originally identified by a scroll running across the

[53] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.54r.
[54] Catalogue: 1-2b, 1-2c, 1-2d, 3-4e.
[55] Knowles, J.W. 'St Cuthbert's and St William's Windows, Vol. 2', c.1886-1907, London, National Art Library, MSL/1929/1212, 148-168; Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 258-264. Knowles' rubbings of these panels were not located until after the completion of this study, so have not been discussed.
[56] Milner-White, "The Windows," 30-31.

pavement upon which the figures kneel. These survive to varying extents and are addressed below alongside the identity of the figures.

An examination of the architectural surrounds reveals that the current distribution of the figures is probably original. The design appears consistent across the registers of lights a, b, d and e, with some intentional differentiation in light c.[57] The figures in the lower register all originally had a base consisting of two canopied niches with praying figures set beneath them.[58] The difference in the treatment of the architecture beneath the pavements in the first and second register confirms that the panels are currently installed in their correct rows. Moreover, the distribution of the details across the panels means that switching of the panels between the registers could not be achieved without obvious visual disturbance. However, the consistency of design evident in the architectural surrounds indicates that, with the exception of light c, there was no significant differentiation of their design across the lights. Consequently, the transposition of panels, or groups of panels, between a/b lights and d/e lights, would be difficult to identify. Indeed, the upper register panels in lights a and b, and d and e were respectively transposed between 1690 and 1877.[59] Moreover, although Fowler recorded Langley's figure in panels 1-2d, Torre's descriptions are not specific enough to clarify the identity of the figures in the lower register of lights d and e.[60]

However, there is evidence of counterchange of the red and blue seaweed-pattern backgrounds. Much of this appears to be original in the lower rows, while rows 5 and 6 contain a significant proportion of later insertions. Although interpretations of counterchange must be cautious, it strongly suggests that the current arrangement reflects the original design, and also supports the posited use of counterchange in the narrative panels. This is further supported by the hangings behind the figures in the lower register, which also alternate in an "ababa" pattern from left to right.[61] As Torre's description is at best suggestive of this

[57] Appendix 3.1.
[58] Catalogue: 1-2a, 1-2b, 1-2c, 1-2d, 1-2e.
[59] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.54r; Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 263-264.
[60] Ibid., 260-261.; Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.54r.
[61] The hangings behind the kneeling figures in the upper register are all of the same design: green and blue stripe. It is likely that this design choice was made to ensure visibility of the figures against the background.

arrangement, it is also possible that they originally followed a "baaab" pattern.[62] Consequently, any interpretation of the arrangement of the figures across lights a, b, d and e, must be cautious.

As in the narrative panels, costume is employed to indicate status, helping to identify the figures. This is most striking in the crowned figures of the upper register. Here, the kneeling figures were all originally crowned and dressed in purple cloaks, lined and bordered with ermine.[63] However, each of the heads is distinctive,[64] while the crown in 4b has traces of paint which indicate the attachment of fused gems, distinguishing it from the crowns in 4a and 4d, which do not.[65] The identity of these figures is clear: they are the Lancastrian rulers and their forebear, John of Gaunt (1340-99), Duke of Lancaster and Aquitaine and King of Castile, to whom Langley owed his career.[66] Henry VI (1422-61, 1470-1) (panels 3-4b, Figure 3.20) and Gaunt (panels 3-4d, Figure 3.21) can be securely identified by their name scrolls.[67] Similarly, the evidence of surviving fragments from the inscriptions, combined with Knowles' and Torre's observations, indicate that Henry V (1413-22) is depicted across panels 3-4a (Figure 3.22), and Henry IV (1399-1413) on panels 3-4e (Figure 3.23).[68]

The figures in the lower register can be identified with varying confidence. Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (1390-1447) (panels 1-2c, Figure 3.24) and the donor, Thomas Langley (panels 1- 2e, Figure 3.25), are securely identified by their attire and labels. Langley's inscription also requests prayers and commemorates his donation of the window.[69] The other three figures have suffered varying levels of deterioration; two have lost their faces and one his name label.[70] Yet, the combined evidence provided by costume conventions, fragmentary

---

[62] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.54r.
[63] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.54r.
[64] Only the beard survives panel 4e, Catalogue: 3-4e.
[65] Catalogue: 3-4a, 3-4b, 3-4d; The crown has been lost from panel 4e, Catalogue: 3-4e.
[66] Storey, *Langley*, 3-5.
[67] Catalogue: 3-4b, 3-4d.
[68] Knowles, J.W. 'St Cuthbert's and St William's Windows, Vol. 2', c.1886-1907, London, National Art Library, MSL/1929/1212, 148-151, 158; Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.54r.
[69] "[ora]te/ [pr]/o/ [anim]a /Th(om)/[as]/ longley /E/pi(scopus)/ d/un/elm(ensis)/ q[ui]/ [i]s/tam/ fenestr/a(m) f/i[eri fecit]", Catalogue: 1-2e.
[70] Catalogue: 1-2a, 1-2d, 3-4e.

inscriptions and documentary records, allows the secure identification of two and the likely identity of the third.[71] As in the narrative panels, bishops are depicted in mitre and cope, holding a crozier (Figure 3.25).[72] Archbishops hold cross-staffs and wear a mitre, cope and pallium. The figures in 1-2b (Figure 3.26) and 1-2d (Figure 3.27) are identified as cardinals by red hats, perched above mitres with fused gems (Figure 3.28), and by red chasubles, with orphreys of fused gems along their borders (Figure 3.29).[73] Their English offices are indicated by a crozier (1-2b), and cross-staff and pallium (1-2d), respectively distinguishing them as bishop and archbishop. This, combined with the limited number of fifteenth-century English cardinals, enables their secure identification as Henry Beaufort (Bishop of Winchester 1404-47 and Cardinal of St Eusebius 1426-47) (panels 1-2b, Figure 3.26), and John Kemp (Archbishop of York 1426-52 and Cardinal of St Balbina 1439-54) (panels 1d and 2d, Figure 3.27). Both identifications are supported by their fragmentary name labels.[74]

Additionally, this study's reinterpretation of the evidence supports the previous identification of the figure in panels 1-2a (Figure 3.30) as Henry Bowet, Archbishop of York (1406-23), which was based on Torre's transcription of his label as "henricus Archiepus Ebor".[75] The validity of this transcription has been tested through comparison with the formal conventions of the other identificatory inscriptions. There appears to be some consistency within certain groups: the kings' labels follow the formula 'first name, number, title',[76] while the evidence of panels 1b and 1c indicate that the lower register figures were identified using the formula 'title, see'.[77] However, there are slight variations; Gaunt's label provides 'first name, title', while Langley's gives 'first name, toponym, title', in addition to dedicatory details.[78] Consequently, while it is possible that the "henricus" seen by Torre may have been an insertion, as was the case with the "Edwar(dus)" he saw in panel 3e,[79] it is also possible

[71] Catalogue: 1-2a, 1-2d, 3-4e.
[72] Catalogue: 1-2b, 1-2e.
[73] Catalogue: 1-2b, 1-2d.
[74] Catalogue: 1-2b, 1-2d.
[75] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.54r; Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 258-259.
[76] Catalogue: 3-4a, 3-4b, 3-4e.
[77] Catalogue: 1-2b, 1-2c.
[78] Catalogue: 3-4d, 3-4e.
[79] Catalogue: 3-4e, Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.54r; Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 260.

that Bowet's first name was included to prevent misidentification. Indeed, the formula 'name, title, see' in Torre's transcription accords with the order used for Langley and the other prelates. A consideration of alternative archbishops of York strengthens the case for Bowet. As Kemp is accounted for within the window, this leaves Thomas Arundel (Archbishop of York 1388-96, Archbishop of Canterbury 1396-98 and 1399-1414), Richard Scrope (Archbishop of York, 1398-1405) and Henry Bowet (Archbishop of York, 1406-23). It seems highly unlikely that Richard Scrope, executed for treason by Henry IV, would have been depicted among the Lancastrians; he also appears in S6. Similarly, it is unlikely that Arundel would be labelled as Archbishop of York rather than Canterbury at the date of the window.

The identities of the figures provide evidence of the dating of the window. The presence of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, places the latest date for the window sometime before his arrest and subsequent death in 1447.[80] Perhaps more significantly, the depiction of Archbishop John Kemp as a cardinal puts the date of the window after 1439, two years after Langley's death.[81] This provides a broader range of *c.*1439-47 for the glazing of the St Cuthbert Window, which aligns with the stylistic evidence for a date of *c.*1440.[82] Posthumous patronage was common in the period,[83] as evidenced by Langley's own execution of projects initiated by Walter Skirlaw after the latter's death.[84] The glazing date does not preclude the possibility of earlier design work. However, it raises questions regarding the extent of Langley's involvement in commissioning the window and who exercised creative control over its design and execution after Langley's death, particularly as his will does not refer to the window.[85] Moreover, the broad glazing date of *c.*1439-47 also raises questions about the selection of the figures depicted, which present a very retrospective focus, Gaunt having died in 1399 and Bowet in 1423. Indeed, only Kemp, Beaufort and Gloucester were alive in the 1440s. These issues will be explored in more depth in Chapter 3.3.

---

[80] Brown, *York Minster*, 232.
[81] Ibid.
[82] Brown, *York Minster*, 232.
[83] Marks, *Stained Glass*, 4.
[84] Storey, *Langley*, 196-197; Snape, "Documentary," 29.
[85] BIA, AR 19, f.501r-v.

3.2.2 Significance of Arrangement and Modes of Representation

Having established that a substantial proportion of section D's original material survives, further examination of its arrangement and iconography can provide insights into its intended function and significance, as well as its relationship with the Cuthbert window as a whole. Understanding these elements enables broader issues of patronage, devotion and display to be considered. Additionally, close scrutiny of the arrangement and representation of the figures not only raises further questions regarding the individuals chosen, but also who was involved in the conception and construction of the window.

The scale of the commemorative section, occupying one quarter of the main lights, is unprecedented within York Minster's narrative windows. As Chapter 1 has demonstrated, enough Cuthbertine material existed to fill the entirety of the window with narrative scenes. Yet, the expansion of scenes across multiple panels, as well as the evidence of other cycles discussed in Chapter 2, suggests that the narrative was not curtailed solely to accommodate section D. The exploration of the window's themes in Chapter 4 will consider the relationship intended between the narrative and section D. However, the decision to incorporate such a large commemorative display demonstrates its importance as an integral part of the window. This is supported by its structure, and iconography, which suggests the careful choreography of the display.

As noted above, the larger size of St Cuthbert and the design of the architectural surround in light c was clearly intended to emphasise and elevate the saint above the kneeling figures. As discussed in Chapter 1, the saint's central location may have been intended to align with key narrative events above, creating a central axis through the window. Moreover, as the window was designed to be read from top to bottom, the culmination of St Cuthbert's holy life and entombment would have been located directly above Section D. The significance of these design choices will be explored in Chapter 4. Nevertheless, the visual separation of the narrative from section D by the substantial architectural canopies in rows 5-6 raises the possibility that the commemorative section was also intended to be contemplated separately. This, combined with the centrally-focused arrangement, emphasises the sculptural allusions of Cuthbert's figure, perhaps intentionally paralleling devotional statuary. Indeed, his figure closely resembles the depictions of statues in the St William Window (Figure 3.31). However,

the figure more closely resembles those of other saints which proliferate within the fifteenth-century choir glazing, which Norton has argued evoke the northern church.[86] Unlike St William, whose figure appears in n9 (and S7), St Cuthbert was not represented elsewhere within this scheme.[87] Consequently, the inclusion of his figure in the St Cuthbert Window was potentially intended to provide a visual or symbolic link to the sequence of figures in the choir clerestory windows, and those in the aisle windows. It may also have been intended to foster devotion at York, as the founding of an altar to Cuthbert in 1426 would have provided a specific devotional site within York Minster.[88]

Indeed, the promotion of Cuthbert specifically appears to indicate the interests of Langley or the Dean and Chapter, rather than the Lancastrian royalty who surround the saint in the window. None of the individuals depicted, other than Langley, appear to have actively promoted the saint. Gaunt had close connections with Durham through his patronage of the Neville family and defence of the north;[89] yet there is no evidence that he, Henry IV or Henry V, expressed particular Cuthbertine devotion. Additionally, while J.A. Knowles and Barnett have drawn attention to Henry VI's visit to St Cuthbert's shrine at Durham in 1448,[90] Dobson has argued that this was considered "an obligatory part of any progress north of the Tees".[91] Nevertheless, Cuthbert's status as a prominent Anglo-Saxon saint means that the window's iconography aligns with the Lancastrian promotion of English saints in support of their political and anti-heretical agendas, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.[92]

---

[86] Norton, "Sacred Space," 170.
[87] Brown, *York Minster*, 283.
[88] Page, *Certificates*, vol. 1, 13; Turner, "New Contexts," 116-118.
[89] Mark Arvanigian, "A Lancastrian polity? John of Gaunt, John Neville and the war with France, 1368-88," in *Fourteenth Century England, III*, ed. W. Mark Ormrod, *Fourteenth Century England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2004), 122-124, 135-137; Liddy, *Bishopric*, 82; Simon Walker, "John [John of Gaunt], Duke of Aquitaine and Duke of Lancaster, styled King of Castile and León (1340–1399)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2008), https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14843, accessed 29 March 2017; Turner, "New Contexts," 175.
[90] Knowles, *Essays*, 183-184; Barnett, "Cuthbert Window," 51.
[91] Dobson, *Durham*, 29.
[92] David Lepine, "'Let Them Praise Him in Church': Orthodox Reform at Salisbury Cathedral in the First Half of the Fifteenth Century," in *After Arundel: Religious Writing in Fifteenth-Century England Medieval Church Studies, 21* (Brepols Publishers, 2011), 180-181; G. L. Harriss, *Shaping the Nation: England, 1360-1461* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), 395.

The decision to incorporate the larger, central figure of St Cuthbert likely guided the arrangement of the remaining figures, allowing only four in the upper register, but five beneath. Consideration of the potential alternative arrangements demonstrates the careful design of section D and highlights the potential significance of the chosen arrangement. For example, it could have employed a similar arrangement to row 1 of the Great East Window, where the donor Walter Skirlaw occupies the central position, flanked by kings on the left and ecclesiastics on the right (Figure 3.32, Figure 3.33 and Figure 3.34). This would potentially have enabled narrative scenes to fill the panels flanking Cuthbert, as in the near-contemporary St Martin window, at St Martin's Coney Street, where the donor kneels beneath the saint (Figure 3.35). However, this arrangement does disrupt the narrative. While these examples, and York Minster's north choir aisle windows, all show a preference for centrally-located donors, the St William Window adopts an eastward orientation, with pairs of kneeling figures in each panel except the easternmost, where the donor, Beatrice de Ros, kneels alone (Figure 3.17).

In contrast to these examples, the separation of the figures, each occupying two panels, emphasises the significance of each individual. Yet the placement of Langley in the western corner of Section D seems a strikingly peripheral location for the donor (Figure 3.1). As noted above, the transposition of figures is possible between lights a and b, and between c and d, making assessments of proximity to the saint or vertical alignment somewhat speculative. Yet, Langley's original location would have aligned him beneath either Gaunt or Henry IV, suggesting that his location in the western corner may have been intended to place him close to a particular favourite among his patrons. More significantly, it orients him towards both Cuthbert and the east. Nevertheless, he clearly was not located beneath St Cuthbert, as might be expected in such a centralised composition. Indeed, Gloucester's presence in the central location seems particularly odd. Yet, the hierarchical arrangement created by the two registers suggests reasons for Gloucester's inclusion. The placement of the Lancastrian rulers alongside the saint articulates their divinely-sanctioned authority, promoting the legitimacy of Lancastrian rule. Indeed, as will be discussed below, both Gloucester and the prelates depicted were closely involved in the operation of Lancastrian government. Moreover, the arrangement of the Lancastrian kings and their ancestor, John of Gaunt, above a group which includes two of their descendants, Beaufort and Gloucester, also expresses dynastic

continuity. The relationships between these figures and Langley will be explored in the final part of this chapter.

Comparable expressions of dynastic lineage and legitimacy can be found in other stained-glass cycles, although none equals the St Cuthbert Window's combination of monumental narrative and dynastic display. Some parallels can be drawn with York Minster's West Window, *c.*1339, whose three main registers are occupied by archbishops of York, apostles and narrative scenes respectively, revealing an interest in ecclesiastical succession.[93] More significantly, as highlighted above (Figure 3.3), the western choir clerestory glazing contains a historical sequence of popes, kings and archbishops associated with the northern church, supporting the St Cuthbert Window's relationship with this scheme.[94] Yet there are few other schemes which combine sequences of both royals and ecclesiastics.[95] Independently, the depiction of series of monarchs in ecclesiastical glazing can be traced back to at least the thirteenth century; indeed, the series in York Minster's chapter house vestibule is an early example.[96] These cycles represent royal lineage, often including figures closely associated with the institution.[97] For example, the line of kings in the choir clerestory windows of Gloucester Cathedral began with Osric, who founded the abbey.[98] Similarly, the West Window of Canterbury, *c.*1396-9, with its three tiers of English kings, surmounted by saints in the tracery, articulates both legitimacy and ideals of kingship.[99] These sequences have parallels with sculptural cycles of English kings; two of the most notable, on the pulpitum screens at York, *c.*1440-50, and Canterbury, *c.*1450, which both articulate Lancastrian legitimacy, slightly post-date the St Cuthbert Window.[100] The latter's display combines the interest in the church's role

[93] Brown, *Stained Glass*, 51-52.
[94] Norton, "Sacred Space," 172-173.
[95] Marks, *Stained Glass*, 143.
[96] Ibid., 88, 143.
[97] Ibid., 88.
[98] Ibid.; Netta Clavner, "The Great East Window of Gloucester Cathedral and its Heraldic Glass," *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 171 (2018): 112-116.
[99] Caviness, *Canterbury*, 232-233, 238-239.
[100] Brown, *York Minster*, 233-234; Francis Woodman, *The Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral* (London: Routledge, 1981), 188-196.

within national and universal hierarchy, evident in York Minster's clerestory glazing, with the articulation of lineage, legitimacy and association seen in purely monarchic series.[101]

Nevertheless, there are few comparable two-tier commemorations of kings and ecclesiastics. The closest example may have been the lost chapel cycle at All Souls, Oxford, *c.*1441-5; the south windows contained a sequence of English kings, from the conquest to Henry VI, in the lower registers, with saints in the upper registers.[102] On the north side, the apostles were depicted in the upper register, with church fathers, including Bede, in the lower register.[103] The extant antechapel windows give some indication of their appearance (Figure 3.36 and Figure 3.37). The use of Anglo-Saxon saints in cycles articulating legitimacy is of interest given the concurrent resurgence of interest in English saints evident within hagiography, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.[104] Additionally the library glazing, also *c.*1441-5, which is now located in the ante-chapel (Figure 3.38, Figure 3.39 and Figure 3.40), contained thirty-two figures of church fathers, kings and archbishops of Canterbury (some canonised), depicted in pairs within single-register, two-light windows.[105] The similar focus and arrangement of these cycles may not be coincidental, as, in addition to being contemporaneous with the St Cuthbert Window, Richard Marks has argued that the iconography was devised by Archbishop Henry Chichele, a key proponent of the Lancastrian regime who co-founded the college with Henry VI.[106] Likewise, a sequence at St Mary's Hall, Coventry, *c.*1451-61, which depicts local dignitaries alongside English kings, Lancastrian nobles, including Gloucester, and local dignitaries, including Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick (1403-39), one of Langley's executors.[107]

---

[101] Marks, *Stained Glass*, 88-89.
[102] F. E. Hutchinson, *Medieval Glass at All Souls College: A History and Description* (London: Faber, 1949), 13-14, 17; Marks, *Stained Glass*, 89; Brown, *York Minster*, 233.
[103] Hutchinson, *All Souls*, 14; Roger Rosewell, "Fifteenth-century Stained Glass at All Souls College, Oxford: Medieval Building Accounts and New Photography," *Vidimus*, no. 51 (May 2011), https://vidimus.org/issues/issue-51/feature/, accessed 10 August 2017.
[104] Lewis, "History, Historiography," 130-133; Lepine, "Orthodox Reform," 180-181.
[105] Rosewell, "All Souls."
[106] Ibid.; Hutchinson, *All Souls*, 43; Marks, *Stained Glass*, 89.
[107] Marks, *Stained Glass*, 88-89; Christian D. Liddy, "Urban Politics and Material Culture at the End of the Middle Ages: The Coventry Tapestry in St Mary's Hall," *Urban History* 39, no. 2 (2012): 217-219; Joan

Therefore, the arrangement and iconography of section D created a multifaceted symbolism, which integrated Lancastrian legitimacy within the more universal message of the fifteenth-century choir glazing. This provides evidence of the interests of those responsible for the scheme, which will be considered in Chapter 3.3. The modes of representation employed within section D provide further evidence of its dynastic focus, and raise additional questions regarding the selection of the figures. In particular, the focus upon dynastic legitimacy and the prioritisation of visual unity may explain the notable absence of heraldic devices in the St Cuthbert Window. It is possible that the five small stone shields beneath the window (Figure 3.41) would have been painted with the arms of Langley or other figures depicted in the window, like those beneath the St William Window (Figure 3.42). The use of heraldry in the other narrative windows of the choir (Figure 3.17, Figure 3.34, Figure 3.43) not only expresses patronage, but links to the extensive use of heraldry in both stone and glass throughout York Minster. In particular, the sequences of shields in the spandrels of the main arcade and clerestory glazing created visual cohesion between the eastern arm (Figure 3.3) and the earlier nave (Figure 3.44 and Figure 3.45), articulating continuity.[108]

Within this proliferation of heraldry, the lowest section of the St Cuthbert Window appears anomalous. Moreover, the lack of heraldry cannot be seen as the personal preference of Langley, whose arms appeared elsewhere in York Minster,[109] as well as in both stone (Figure 3.46 and Figure 3.47), and at least four lost windows, at Durham.[110] Heraldry would potentially have disrupted the visual cohesion created by the costume and settings of the figures in the St Cuthbert Window. The consistency of dress amongst figures of the same status reinforces the unity of the group. This is enhanced by the striped background hangings, which alternate in colour across the lower register, but are consistent across the upper register (Figure 3.1). While the colour choices are undoubtedly intended to heighten the figures' visibility by contrasting with their costume, the consistency across the upper register

---

Cadogan Lancaster, *St. Mary's Hall, Coventry: A Guide to the Building, its History and Contents*, 2nd ed. (Coventry: City of Coventry, 1981), 38, 39-41.

[108] Brown, *York Minster*, 180; Brown, *Apocalypse*, 13.

[109] They survive in S9, and were also recorded in the library windows. Brown, *York Minster*, 211, 286.

[110] Fowler, *Rites*, 49-50, 110, 118, 119.

heightens this visual cohesion. Nevertheless, the absence of heraldry alters the emphasis of the commemorative section's iconography.[111] The combination of costume and inscription enables a viewer in close proximity to identify the figures. Yet, from a distance, the inscriptions are not legible, so only their status, elucidated by their clothing, remains apparent. Consequently, this shifts the focus from the individual identity of the figures depicted to their roles as part of a single dynastic group. A comparable focus is apparent in the extant glass of the All Souls library cycle, which also lacks heraldic devices. [112] In contrast, the chapel glazing incorporated various arms, including those of the kings and Chichele, commemorating patronage alongside dynastic display.[113]

The apparent individualisation of the heads of the kings, Gaunt and Gloucester raises the possibility that their likenesses were used to identify them.[114] This is supported by a crayon sketch after a lost drawing of Gloucester, which bears similarities to his appearance in the window (Figure 3.48). Physiognomic likenesses were increasingly employed in figural depictions, particularly of royalty, from the late fourteenth century.[115] These were not intended to function as portraits in the modern sense, and often provided somewhat sanitised, idealised representations, due to the belief that physical traits revealed the condition of the soul.[116] Instead, these standardised physiognomic likenesses were employed alongside other "established iconographic codes",[117] including heraldry, costume, gesture and inscriptions, to represent individuals.[118] Their possible use in the window, therefore, alongside costume and

---

[111] The heraldic shields now in 1a are not original, Catalogue: 1-2a.
[112] London, BL, Harley MS 964, printed in Andrew Clark, ed. *Lincoln College Chapel, 1631*, Collectanea IV (Oxford: Clarendon Press for Oxford Historical Society, 1905), 134.
[113] Ibid., 133-134.
[114] Catalogue: 1-2c, 3-4a, 3-4b, 3-4d, 3-4e.
[115] Stephen Perkinson, *The Likeness of the King: A Prehistory of Portraiture in Late Medieval France* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009), 8-9, 21-22, 25, 146, 203, 207, 252-253; Hans Belting, *Likeness and Presence: a History of the Image Before the Era Of Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 377-384.
[116] Perkinson, *Likeness*, 206-208, 214, 271-272; Dominic Olariu, "Thomas Aquinas' Definition of the Imago Dei and the Development of Lifelike Portraiture," *Bulletin du Centre d'études médiévales d'Auxerre* 17, no. 2 (2013): 5-6.
[117] Perkinson, *Likeness*, 211.
[118] Ibid., 25, 146, 203, 207, 211-212, 252-253; Rosemary Horrox, "Images of Royalty," in *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, ed. Richard Marks, Paul Williamson, and Eleanor Townsend (London: V & A

name labels, suggests the careful crafting of the figures' symbolic representation, to present idealised and recognisable evocations of the Lancastrian elite. Limited evidence of such representational trends has been found in stained glass of this date, although Brown has observed similarities between the figure of a king in N11 and Henry IV's tomb effigy (Figure 3.49 and Figure 3.50).[119] While further research is required, the status and artistic patronage of the individuals potentially involved in the window's creation may explain its adoption within the St Cuthbert Window.

The impact of these representational choices upon the depiction of Gloucester raises questions regarding the intended articulation of his status. His central location helps to integrate him within the group, masking his lack of a direct counterpart, and providing a possible explanation for the arrangement of the figures. Yet his depiction in blue robes visually aligns him with Bowet and Langley, emphasising his separation from his purple-robed royal ancestors in the register above. Furthermore, it appears that the importance of the two cardinals,[120] Henry VI,[121] and possibly Henry IV,[122] was highlighted through their selective embellishment using costly fused-glass 'gems' (Figure 3.51),[123] which, within the window, is applied in greatest number to St Cuthbert's vestments (Figure 3.19).[124] Although the loss of Henry IV's head prevents comparison, the crowns of Henry V and John of Gaunt were clearly designed without gems.[125] Their limited use serves to elevate the importance of Henry VI and the cardinals, perhaps indicating their particular importance to the designer.

Publications, 2003), 170-171; Hans Belting, *An Anthropology of Images: Picture, Medium, Body* (Princeton: University Press, 2011), 62-83.

[119] Brown, *Stained Glass*, 76.

[120] Catalogue: 1-2b, 1-2d.

[121] Catalogue: 3-4b.

[122] Catalogue: 3-4e.

[123] Megan Stacey, "'A Veritable Tour de Force of Mechanical and Artistic Dexterity': An Investigation into the Medieval Techniques of Inserting 'Jewels' in Stained Glass" (Unpublished MA Dissertation, The University of York, 2015), 41-42. It is likely that the stars and flowers in the hangings were originally leaded insertions, another costly technique, although this cannot be confirmed without physical examination of the glass.

[124] Catalogue: 3-4c.

[125] Catalogue: 3-4a, 3-4d.

Both John of Gaunt and Henry VI appear to be given additional significance through the presence of scrolls on their *prie-dieus*. Unlike the other figures, whose open books have minims simulating lettering (Figure 3.52), the scrolls have actual text (Figure 3.53 and Figure 3.54).[126] Both texts are the openings of different penitential psalms: Gaunt's has psalm 6 and Henry VI's psalm 50, in the vulgate numbering.[127] Additionally, despite the damage and loss of glass in panels 2b and 2d, the surviving evidence suggests that at least Kemp (Figure 3.55), if not both cardinals, also had specific texts identifying psalms or other devotional texts upon their *prie-dieus*.[128] The choice of penitential psalms has obvious spiritual significance, particularly due to their special intercessory function.[129] Given the contemporary belief in the need to activate the psalms by performing them,[130] it seems odd that the text is not legible to a viewer from the ground without binoculars. However, it is possible that the act of viewing the window was intended to activate the psalms, regardless of their legibility. Indeed, Madeline Caviness has proposed that verses in stained glass, including those in the Great East Window, were potentially activated by both their physical illumination and their vocalisation in the liturgy.[131] As the penitential psalms were a key element of the liturgy,[132] the inscriptions may therefore have been intended to be activated by the reading of the psalms at the high altar, which the window illuminated.

Lynn Staley has linked the depiction of psalm 6 before Gaunt to his performance of public and private penitence in the last decade of his life.[133] She argues Gaunt's actions, and

---

[126] Catalogue: 3-4b, 3-4d.
[127] Annie Sutherland, "Performing the Penitential Psalms in the Middle Ages," in *Aspects of the Performative in Medieval Culture*, ed. Manuele Gragnolati and Almut Suerbaum, *Trends in Medieval Philology* (Mouton de Gruyter, 1999), 19.
[128] Catalogue: 1-2b, 1-2d.
[129] Sutherland, "Penitential Psalms," 21-22; Lynn Staley, "The Penitential Psalms: Conversion and the Limits of Lordship," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 37, no. 2 (2007): 221-222; M. Jane Toswell, "Structures of Sorrow: the Lament Psalms in Medieval England," in *Laments for the Lost in Medieval Literature 19*, ed. Jane Tolmie and M. Jane Toswell, *Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 39.
[130] Sutherland, "Penitential Psalms," 15-16, 22-23, 26, 36-37.
[131] Madeline Harrison Caviness, "Could Inscriptions in Stained Glass be Read, and Did it Matter?," in *Word and Image: Proceedings of the Corpus Vitrearum 27th International Colloquium, York, 7-11 July 2014* (York: Corpus Vitrearum, 2014), 5-6.
[132] Sutherland, "Penitential Psalms," 20-23.
[133] Staley, "Penitential," 250-252.

by extension their evocation in the window, were intended to demonstrate his "moral authority" and "acceptance of his subservient relationship to God and his ministers", thereby validating his secular power.[134] Staley's interpretation may equally be applied to the presence of psalm 50 before Henry VI. Moreover, it aligns with the articulation of Lancastrian legitimacy created by the arrangement of figures within the commemorative section. Yet this was arguably one dimension of the significance intended by the depiction of specific psalms. Due to their intercessory function, and established place in the liturgy, the penitential psalms became increasingly popular among devout medieval layfolk; in addition to their necessary inclusion in Books of Hours, they were also the subject of numerous vernacular commentaries and paraphrases.[135] Furthermore, there is evidence of a local trend for the depiction of penitential psalms, among other devotional texts, in commemorative stained glass. One of three such examples at All Saints, North Street, has the first line of the same psalm (6) as Gaunt (Figure 3.56).[136] Similarly, in the St Martin Window, the donor Robert Semer's book has the first line of the same psalm (50) as Henry VI (Figure 3.57).[137] The inclusion of these two penitential psalms in the St Cuthbert Window may therefore have been intended to articulate Lancastrian legitimacy by employing contemporary models of piety.

The identification of the use of costly fused gems reveals both the prestigious status of the window as an artwork, and potentially indicates wider craft connections. Additionally, the examination of the structure and modes of representation in section D has demonstrated that visual and technical devices were employed both to create a coherent display, while simultaneously distinguishing individuals and establishing hierarchies within the group. It is apparent that section D can be interpreted as a dynastic display, expressing Lancastrian legitimacy by framing the government within the divinely-sanctioned hierarchies of Church and Crown. Yet, questions have been raised regarding the selection and depiction of figures.

---

[134] Ibid., 252.

[135] Sutherland, "Penitential Psalms," 17, 21-24; Staley, "Penitential," 222; Toswell, "Structures," 40.

[136] Window 1, panel 1a. The other two are in windows n4 and s6. Eric A. Gee, "The painted glass of All Saints' Church, North Street, York," *Archaeologia* 102 (1969): 155, 164, 174.

[137] "misere/ te mei/ deus/ se(un)d(u)m/ magnam mi(seriscordi)am/ tua/ et se(un)d(u)m/ multitu/dine(m)/ misera/c(i)o(num) m(ea)m tua(rum)", formerly window w1, panel 2c, St Martin's, Coney Street.

Consequently, the final part of this chapter will examine questions of authorship and agency raised so far.

3.3 Authorship and Agency

3.3.1 Donor of the St Cuthbert Window: The Evidence

The inscription beneath Thomas Langley, "Pray for Thomas Longley, bishop of Durham, who [caused] this window [to be made]",[138] clearly identifies him as the donor of the window. However, this apparently straightforward identification belies the true complexity of the window's patronage and authorship. As discussed above, Langley's position within the window is unusual and, beyond the inscription, he is not afforded special visual significance. This raises questions about the degree of Langley's agency in the commissioning of the window, which are heightened by the secure dating of the window to between 1439 and 1447, postdating Langley's death. The phrasing of the inscription does little to answer these questions, as it follows the common formulae of contemporary dedicatory inscriptions.[139] As such, it does not reveal the extent of Langley's involvement in the conception or execution of the window. Nor do the extant documentary sources provide clear evidence of Langley's involvement in the commissioning of the window. No provision for the window is apparent in his will, nor can expenses in his accounts be conclusively linked to the St Cuthbert Window.[140] This is not wholly surprising, as documentary sources survive for very few medieval windows and references in wills are not particularly common.[141] Similarly, the surviving fifteenth-century fabric account rolls for York Minster do not appear to record payments for new windows, although they do list donations to the fabric.[142] The rolls for 1424-

---

[138] "[ora]te/ [pr]/o/ [anim]a /Th(om)/[as]/ longley /E/pi(scopus)/ d/un/elm(ensis)/ q[ui]/ [i]s/tam/ fenestr/a(m) f/i[eri fecit]", Catalogue: 1-2e.
[139] Marks, *Stained Glass*, 17.
[140] BIA, AR 19, f.501r-v; DUL, CCB B/82/3 (190015), 10 May 1429.
[141] Richard Marks, "Wills and Windows: Documentary Evidence for the Commissioning of Stained Glass Windows in Late Medieval England," in *Glas. Malerei. Forschung: Internationale Studien zu ehren von Rüdiger Becksmann*, ed. Hartmut Scholz, Ivo Rauch, and Daniel Hess (Berlin: Deutsche Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 2004), 245.
[142] YMLA, E3/6-32.

32 and 1435-41 have been lost and no record of a donation by Langley can be found in those which survive.[143] Consequently, it is necessary to interrogate what little material the extant sources do provide, and to draw inferences from the absence of information.

The lack of mention in Langley's will probably points to his provision for the window during his lifetime. Moreover, the likelihood that the window had been funded, but not executed, when Langley drafted his will in 1436, may be supported by some of the gifts and attendant stipulations. In leaving twenty pounds to the fabric fund of York Minster, he specifies that the resident canons must be "friendly and benevolent to my executors in the execution of my testament".[144] A bequest to York Minster is expected; indeed, Langley also bequeaths vestments.[145] Yet, Langley's stipulation that the canons should assist his executors contrasts with the immediately preceding bequests to other institutions, in return for which he requests prayers for his soul.[146] Consequently, the phrasing of the stipulation could indicate that work on the window was planned or ongoing, and required cooperation from those overseeing the process, or in a position to delay it.

Langley's extensive experience in executing wills likely guided his actions and attitudes to both patronage and bequests.[147] Consequently, such deviations from the customs and conventions of bequests in wills appear significant.[148] In particular, in a bequest to York Minster, the same stipulation was made by Skirlaw, who had presumably provided the funding for the Great East Window before his death, and wanted to ensure its completion.[149] Similarly, Harriss has argued that Beaufort's careful bequests to Henry VI were intended to

---

[143] YMLA, E3/6-32.

[144] "dum tamen Canonici ibidem residentes sint amici et benevoli executoribus meis in executione Testamenti mei.". BIA, AR 19, f.501r.

[145] BIA, AR 19, f.501v.

[146] BIA, AR 19, f.501r.

[147] Storey, *Langley*, 222.

[148] Christopher Michael Woolgar, *Testamentary Records of the English and Welsh Episcopate, 1200-1413: Wills, Executors' Accounts and Inventories, and the Probate Process* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011), xix.

[149] The wording of Skirlaw's will is identical: "dum tamen Canonici ibidem residents sunt amici et benevoli executoribus meis in executione testamenti mei." James Raine, ed. *Testamenta Eboracensia: A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York*, 6 vols., vol. 1, Surtees Society (London: Nichols & Son, 1836), 308.

ensure the king would repurchase jewels forfeited when he defaulted on a loan to Beaufort.[150] It is tempting to interpret Langley's bequests of a copy of Augustine's *de Civitate Dei*, along with a silver cup with a pommelled cover, to Archbishop John Kemp in a similar vein.[151] Yet, the long-standing relationship between the two men must also be considered, and will be explored below.

The extensive loss of Langley's accounts prevents conclusive identification of his provision of funds or materials during his lifetime.[152] Two entries record payments in 1429 for fifteen hundred pieces of glass of various colours, and their transport to Hedon, a town five miles upriver from Hull, and 19 ells[153] of Brabantian linen painted with the history of St Cuthbert:

> And Thomas Chalton for 19 ells (11s 1d) woven of Brabantian linen, at 7d [per ell], for marking/pricking the story of St Cuthbert in the same [and] making, sewing together (8d) and binding the whole of the same linen and the same painter staying near the Augustinian Friars of London for painting the same (60s). [Total:] 71s. 9d.[154]

However, as the records lack any mention of the intended use of these materials, Storey's proposal that these purchases were connected with the commissioning of the St Cuthbert Window cannot be proven.[155] Indeed, although the transportation of glass to Hedon makes York the most likely destination for such a large quantity of glass, the painted linens may be connected to commissions at Durham. Moreover, the diverse use of painted cloths in the fifteenth century means that they may have been ecclesiastical or household hangings, rather

---

[150] G. L. Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort: A Study of Lancastrian Ascendancy and Decline* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 380-381.
[151] BIA, AR 19, f.501v-502r.
[152] DUL, CCB B/82/1-4 (190012-5); Storey, *Langley*, 263-264.
[153] The ell of Brabant was around 69.6cm, so 19 ells would be a little over 13 metres. But without the width of the fabric, the area of the finished painted linen cannot be estimated. Jo Kirby, "The Trade and Import of Painted Cloths in Fifteenth- to Sixteenth-century London," in *Setting the Scene: European Painted Cloths from the Fourteenth to the Twenty-first Century*, ed. Nicola Costaras and Christina Young (London: Archetype, 2013), 65.
[154] "Et Thome chalton p(ro) xix /xi s i d\ uln(i) tele linee braban(tum) p(ro) historia s(an)c(t)i Cuthberti in eadem pungend(us) ad vij d facturo consuctur(e) /viii d\(et) ligature(e) omn[ia?] li(n)o euisdem et eiu(s)d(e)m pictori co(m)moranti iux(ta) fretr(rus) augustin(um) london(ium) p(ro) /lx s\pictur(us) eiusd(e)m xxi s ix d. [Total:] lxxi s ix d." DUL, CCB B/82/3 (190015), 10 May 1429.
[155] Storey, *Langley*, 96.

than designs for other media.[156] If they could be more conclusively linked to the St Cuthbert Window at York, they would provide evidence of Langley's agency. Moreover, they would also indicate that the commissioning of the window began around a decade earlier than its actual production, a timescale comparable to the Great East Window, as discussed in Chapter 3.1. Consequently, although firm conclusions cannot be drawn, the implications these records have for the longevity of the project and Langley's role should not be ignored completely.

The likelihood that the St Cuthbert window was initially conceived much earlier in the fifteenth century, but ultimately executed forty years later, demonstrates the need to look beyond the potential influence and intentions of a single patron. It is notable that, in 1405, when the indenture for the Great East Window was drawn up, Langley was Dean of York (1401-1405). The extent of his involvement in its commissioning is uncertain, as his governmental work frequently kept him away from York, and Brown has argued persuasively that a core of residentiary canons would have been responsible for day-to-day management of the project.[157] Nevertheless, as dean, Langley would certainly have been responsible for approving the project. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 2, while bishop of Durham, Langley completed, and expanded upon, building and glazing projects initiated by Skirlaw, acting both as the latter's executor and co-patron in several schemes.[158] At a practical level, these experiences may well have informed Langley's approach when commissioning the St Cuthbert Window. Moreover, his connections with Skirlaw and Scrope, who were both involved in plans for the glazing of the eastern arm of York Minster,[159] also raise the possibility of Langley's early involvement and agency. More broadly, these connections provide evidence of a pattern of patronage, whereby glazing and building projects were brought to fruition through the efforts of successive prelates, who had formed connections throughout

[156] Kirby, "Painted Cloths," 58-59; Nicola Costaras, "The Ownership of Painted Cloths in Late Medieval England," 16-17, 19-22; Katja von Baum, "The Legend of St Bruno and Painting Cycles on Canvas in Late Fifteenth-century Cologne," 77, 81-83.
[157] French, *East Window*, 6; Brown, *East Window*, 30.
[158] Norton, "Richard Scrope," 151.
[159] Ibid., 150.

their ecclesiastical and secular careers.[160] Within this context, Langley's patronage cannot be seen as a guarantee of his influence over the content of the window.

Instead, the window's posthumous execution positions Langley as one of a succession of men potentially involved in the commissioning of the window, but reliant upon his successors to realise it.[161] As the extent of plans for the design, both before and after his involvement, is unclear, questions abound regarding the degree to which Langley, and those who ensured the window's completion, affected its final form. As discussed in Chapter 3.1, it is likely that the Dean and Chapter retained a degree of iconographic control over the window, at least to the extent of stipulating that it must depict the Life of St Cuthbert, to complete the scheme envisioned for the fifteenth-century glazing. Indeed, depending upon when the initial plans were conceived, as dean, Langley himself may have been involved in setting this requirement. Yet the scale of the commemorative section, as well as elements of the iconography of the window itself, suggest that the individuals involved in its conception may have exercised some influence over its design. Additionally, while the window's iconography as ultimately executed in *c.*1440 potentially realised the original intentions, it is also possible that Langley, or his agents, did not have identical agendas to the instigators of the broader glazing scheme and so augmented the window's iconography.

Consequently, the remainder of this chapter will address four key strands of enquiry. In Chapter 3.3.2 and 3.3.3, Langley's career, connections and involvement in contemporary politics will be examined. By exploring Langley's relationships with the men depicted in section D, and involvement in their various interactions, the questions raised regarding the selection of figures, and Langley's agency, will be considered. This examination will also identify individuals who potentially acted as Langley's posthumous agents. Further investigation of the connections and artistic interests of Langley's executors will be discussed in Chapter 3.3.3, to establish how they might have exercised Langley's, or their own, agency in commissioning the window. Given the likelihood that the Dean and Chapter retained a degree of control over the glazing's iconography, the role of York Minster's canons and their

[160] Ibid., 149.
[161] Ibid., 152.

connections with Langley and his potential agents will be examined in Chapter 3.3.4. This exploration will enable the evidence for the commissioning of the St Cuthbert Window to be reconsidered, as well as providing broader insights into fifteenth-century stained-glass patronage at York Minster.

3.3.2 Langley's Civil and Ecclesiastical Career

In addition to the various records of Langley's devotional and artistic patronage, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive, there is a wealth of documentary evidence for Langley's episcopacy. Together, these enable Langley's career and connections to be sketched. In what remains the pre-eminent biography of Langley, R.L. Storey skilfully compiled evidence from these sources to provide a comprehensive account of his life.[162] Yet, as his attempts to picture Langley 'the man' demonstrate, there are limitations to the insights which can be gained into Langley's abilities, relationships intentions and actions, from studying what are primarily administrative documents. The chronological distance from the events of the fifteenth century makes it difficult to judge personal motives and the true nature of relationships. Nevertheless, from the evidence available, it is possible to sketch a rough understanding of the roles played by the figures depicted within the window, as well as those who may potentially have acted as agents in its creation. For example, the period of time over which relationships were sustained, particularly once the individuals concerned were no longer in contact as a result of their official duties, may be indicative of their significance. Of particular value are the evidence of testamentary bequests, which, although they may also have functioned as incentives to the recipients, can be seen to indicate gratitude, affection or esteem.[163] Consequently, although conclusions may often be tentative, the accumulation of circumstantial evidence can often be suggestive. Thus, an understanding of Langley's connections, alongside his other patronage, discussed in Chapter 2, can be set against the evidence of the St Cuthbert Window, to assess the extent of his involvement. Furthermore,

---

[162] Storey, *Langley*.

[163] Rosemary Hayes, "The 'Private Life' of a Late Medieval Bishop: William Alnwick, Bishop of Norwich and Lincoln," in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1992 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Nicholas Rogers (Stamford, Lincolnshire: P. Watkins, 1994), 16; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 195.

individuals who may have been involved in the commissioning and execution of the window can be identified and the likelihood of their willingness to fulfil Langley's wishes gauged.

It is apparent that Langley, born to a respectable Lancashire family around 1360, advanced to a position of great wealth and power through both the patronage of the Lancastrian dynasty, as well as his skill and expertise as an administrator and diplomat.[164] When he first entered the service of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster (1340-1399), is uncertain, although Storey suggests a date as early as 1385.[165] As Gaunt's clerk, Langley developed his administrative and diplomatic skills, being rewarded with benefices and prebends which advanced his ecclesiastical career concurrently, as was common in the period.[166] Langley's service of Gaunt, and loyalty to the Lancastrians, not only led to the advancement of his career under Gaunt's son, who became Henry IV, and his successors, but also put him into contact with other members of the ecclesiastical elite, including those who are represented in the St Cuthbert Window.[167] Langley first became acquainted with the Bishop of Winchester, Henry Beaufort, another of Gaunt's sons, when he was a clerk in Gaunt's service.[168] Similarly, it was his service of Henry IV, if not Gaunt, which put him into contact with Henry Bowet (Archbishop of York, 1406-1423), who worked in the Duke's service from 1392, and followed his son Henry into exile in 1398.[169] Both Langley and Bowet played significant roles as Henry IV's close counsellors, being employed on diplomatic missions and receiving prestigious ecclesiastical appointments.[170] As was common, his ecclesiastical preferments reflected secular promotions and responsibility; in 1401 Henry IV appointed Langley Keeper of the Privy Seal and Dean of York.[171] While Archbishop Richard Scrope approved Langley's appointment as

---

[164] Storey, *Langley*, 2-4, 219-223.
[165] Ibid., 3.
[166] Ibid., 3-4, 9, 14.
[167] Ibid., 4, 8, 28.
[168] Ibid., 28, 47.
[169] T. F. Tout, rev. J. J. N. Palmer, "Bowet, Henry (d. 1423)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, January 2008), https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/3062, accessed 14 March 2017.
[170] Ibid.; Storey, *Langley*, 19-26.
[171] Storey, *Langley*, 11.

dean in 1402, disputes between the king and Pope Boniface IX prevented Langley from occupying the post until 1403.[172]

Tensions between Pope Innocent VII and Henry IV lay behind two further rejections of Langley for high ecclesiastical offices.[173] The Pope rejected the king's nomination of Langley for promotion to Bishop of London, a position which ultimately went to Beaufort; Langley instead replaced him in the prestigious secular position of Chancellor.[174] Henry next tried to promote Langley to the Archbishopric of York, following his controversial execution of Richard Scrope for treason in 1405.[175] Unsurprisingly, given the circumstances, the Pope refused the king's nomination, while the king rejected the Pope's candidate, Robert Hallam.[176] The seat remained vacant until after the accession of a new Pope, Gregory XII, when Henry Bowet was appointed, holding the seat until his death in 1423.[177] Pope Innocent VII did, however, allow Langley to be elected Bishop of Durham in 1406, following the death of Walter Skirlaw.[178] There is no indication that this sequence of events caused tensions between Bowet and Langley, indeed, Bowet was archbishop of York for a substantial period of Langley's episcopacy at Durham, roles which required frequent contact and cooperation.[179]

Having attained the office he was to hold for the rest of his life, Langley resigned as Chancellor at the beginning of 1407, remaining a member of the King's Council.[180] In a pattern which was to continue throughout his episcopate, Langley continued to be involved in royal service, as councillor and diplomat, serving not only Henry IV, but his son Henry V, and grandson Henry VI.[181] It was perhaps during Henry V's reign that Langley first came into contact with John Kemp, who was appointed to the archdeaconry of Durham in 1417 and was

---

[172] Ibid., 9, 13.
[173] Ibid., 15.
[174] Ibid.
[175] Ibid., 17-18.
[176] Ibid.
[177] Ibid., 18-19; Tout, "Bowet,"
[178] Storey, *Langley*, 20.
[179] Ibid.
[180] Storey, *Langley*, 21.
[181] Ibid., 21-47.

increasingly involved in royal diplomacy in France.[182] Like Langley, Kemp worked closely with John, Duke of Bedford (1389–1435), third son of Henry IV and brother of Henry V and Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, both during the reigns of Henry V and VI.[183] Following Bowet's death in 1423, Kemp became Archbishop of York in 1425, bringing them into close contact in both their secular and ecclesiastical roles.[184] Storey drew attention to Langley's appointment of Kemp as a referee during a dispute as evidence of their close working relationship.[185] More significantly, Kemp benefitted from bequests in Langley's will, as noted above.[186]

Throughout his life there is evidence that Langley employed men with similar political, geographical and educational backgrounds to his own, and of him repaying the assistance and loyalty of those who furthered his career.[187] While, as noted above, it is difficult to judge the true nature of these relationships, Langley's thoroughly Lancastrian circle and repeated role as mediator for the elite indicates both his loyalty to his patrons, as well as his diplomatic skills.[188] Langley was involved in the reconciliation of Henry IV with his son before his death, and acted to secure the succession of the infant Henry VI in 1422.[189] During Henry VI's infancy, Langley also mediated between Beaufort and Gloucester.[190] Storey has argued that Langley was diligent in his various offices, highlighting that, when Bishop of Durham, his non-residency was not as lengthy as some of his contemporaries; although he was in London for most of the year, he usually spent time within his diocese over the summer and at Christmas.[191] He seems to have executed his duties as bishop with a comparably conscientious approach, protecting the interests of the diocese, effecting reform and attempting to enforce

---

[182] Ibid., 178, 209; R. G. Davies, "Kemp , John (1380/81–1454)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2011), https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/15328, accessed 14 March 2017.
[183] Davies, "Kemp"; Jenny Stratford, "John , Duke of Bedford (1389–1435)," (2004; online edn, September 2011), https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14844, accessed 20 April 2017; Storey, *Langley*, 32, 35, 37-38.
[184] Davies, "Kemp"; Storey, *Langley*, 209.
[185] Storey, *Langley*, 209.
[186] BIA, AR 19, f.501r-v.
[187] Storey, *Langley*, 2-4, 78-79.
[188] Ibid., 21, 28, 47, 223.
[189] Ibid., 30, 44-45.
[190] Ibid., 47, 48.
[191] Ibid., 16, 20, 167, 222.

appropriate behaviour, as well as ensuring the maintenance and renewal of properties within his jurisdiction.[192] Despite his absences from Durham, Langley's skills as an administrator and close scrutiny of his episcopal administration apparently ensured that he maintained careful control of his many deputies.[193] Consequently, Langley's employment of numerous men who shared his Lancastrian origins may have been a response to his need for trusted deputies. Storey has suggested that the frequent demand for Langley's services as a supervisor or executor of wills is evidence of his reputation for integrity and conscientiousness.[194] Moreover, contemporary commentators support Storey's interpretation of Langley's patience and fairness in resolving matters of conduct and principle in his diocesan administration.[195] Christian Liddy has drawn attention to comments by the author of the Durham chronicle, the *Gesta Episcoporum Dunelmensium,* who not only praised Langley's support of the Lancastrian kings and the defence of the rights of Durham and Cuthbert, but also his use of power for the public good.[196]

An understanding of Langley's relationships with his clerical and ecclesiastical colleagues may help to identify individuals who could have been involved in commissioning the St Cuthbert window.[197] As discussed in Chapter 2, Langley's patronage of Cuthbertine cycles was linked with both his predecessor, Walter Skirlaw, as well as Durham's prior, John Wessington (1416-46). Based on a diverse range of evidence, including Wessington's support of Langley during local legal disputes, Storey has suggested that the two men had at least a good working relationship.[198] Nevertheless, while Wessington may have provided hagiographical advice, the discussion of the glazing in Chapter 3.1 suggests that an individual with closer York connections would have been best placed to ensure the commissioning and completion of the window. The following sections will investigate Langley's various

[192] Ibid., 221-223.
[193] Ibid., 88, 167, 175, 195.
[194] Ibid., 222.
[195] Ibid., 223.
[196] Liddy, *Bishopric*, 175.
[197] Storey, *Langley*, 127, 199, 208-209; Dobson, *Durham*, 2, 222-223.
[198] Storey, *Langley*, 108, 200-201.

connections and political interactions, focusing particularly upon the men depicted in the window, as well those whom Langley appointed as his executors.

3.3.3 Connections and Conflicts

As highlighted above, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester's presence in the commemorative section is arguably one of the most puzzling elements of the Cuthbert Window's iconography. As Henry IV's son and Henry V's brother, he was a member of the Lancastrian elite. Yet, as neither a monarch nor a prelate, he does not appear to fit neatly into either the upper or lower tiers of figures, divided according to their divinely sanctioned offices. This suggests that section D's iconography articulates, more broadly, the legitimate governance of England. As noted above, Bowet, Beaufort, Kemp and Langley had all played significant roles in the councils of the Lancastrian kings. The practice of drawing high-ranking governmental officials from the clerical elite, and of rewarding close councillors of the crown with ecclesiastical preferments, was ubiquitous in English government throughout the fifteenth century.[199] Indeed, Gwilym Dodd has argued that clerical chancellors' dual roles in the spiritual and temporal government of the realm became increasingly important to "add legitimacy and a sense of divine sanction" to royal authority, following the Lancastrian usurpation.[200] Consequently, Gloucester's status, particularly as Protector, which secured him a place on Henry VI's minority council,[201] was equivalent to the secular roles of the prelates who flank him. Yet, the image of a cohesive hierarchy, ensuring dynastic continuity, conveyed by the arrangement of the figures belies the fractious reality of Gloucester's relationship with the prelates. Gloucester's actions during Henry VI's minority have been discussed at length by numerous scholars.[202] A brief summary, particularly of his disputes with Beaufort and his

---

[199] Dodd, "The Clerical Chancellors of Late Medieval England," 22, 24-25, 40-41, 43; Richard G. Davies, "The Attendance of the Episcopate in English Parliaments, 1376-1461," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 129, no. 1 (1985): 36.

[200] Dodd, "The Clerical Chancellors of Late Medieval England," 43.

[201] Harriss, *Beaufort*, 165; G. L. Harriss, "Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (1390–1447)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2011), https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14155, accessed 22 Nov 2017.

[202] Harriss, *Beaufort*; Ralph A. Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, 2nd. ed. (Stroud: Sutton, 2004); C. T. Allmand, *Henry V* (London: Historical Association, 1968).

supporters, and of Langley's role as mediator, provides evidence of Langley's possible involvement in the window's design.

Humphrey was first given public employment, titles and endowments as Chamberlain of England, Duke of Gloucester and earl of Pembroke, following Henry V's accession in 1413, but his autonomy was limited.[203] In May 1422, Henry V appointed Gloucester Keeper of the Realm while he was in France, but required him to consult the council on all matters.[204] Upon Henry V's death, in August 1422, Gloucester and the council became responsible for ensuring the transfer of power to the infant Henry VI.[205] However, Gloucester argued that he should be Regent of England during his nephew's minority, while the council moved to establish conciliar rule.[206] Gloucester was induced to accept the well-remunerated position of Protector and Defender of Henry VI, and a pre-eminent role within the council, but was required to cede seniority to his elder brother, John, Duke of Bedford, who had become regent of France, whenever he returned to England.[207] Gloucester participated in the council's rule over the following two decades, but his dissatisfaction with his position and conciliar rule, over which Beaufort quickly gained influence, lay behind repeated disputes with his uncle, as well as his military actions on the continent.[208] Gloucester and Beaufort's relationship fluctuated between animosity and outright political attacks, with the threat of physical violence.[209] However, Beaufort's superior wealth, diplomacy and political allies, most notably Bedford, enabled him to weather charges brought by Gloucester on several occasions between 1422 and the 1440s, and to recover from the damage to his influence and reputation.[210]

The depiction of Beaufort and Gloucester side by side suggests that the design of Section D was intended to transcend this political reality, to present an idealised vision of

---

[203] Harriss, "Gloucester."
[204] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 13; Storey, *Langley*, 37-38.
[205] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 12-13.
[206] Harriss, *Beaufort*, 116-119; Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 15, 19-23; Harriss, "Gloucester."
[207] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 13, 21.
[208] Alessandra Petrina, *Cultural Politics in Fifteenth-century England: The Case of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 115-119; Harriss, "Gloucester."; Harriss, *Beaufort*, 119-121, 132-133; Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 33-40.
[209] Harriss, "Gloucester."
[210] Harriss, *Beaufort*, 148-151, 215-222, 227-228, 236-238, 308-309; Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 78-79.

England's Lancastrian government. Furthermore, it indicates that the individual(s) responsible for this design choice had close ties with the other figures in the window, yet remained neutral in the disputes between Beaufort and Gloucester. This increases the likelihood that it was indeed Langley who stipulated Section D's design, given both his reputation as mediator and diplomat, discussed above, and his dedication to the Lancastrian kings. Moreover, further examination of the individuals connected both to the council and the window supports this theory. Langley had been appointed Chancellor by Henry V in 1417 and, having symbolically resigned upon Henry's death in 1422, he was swiftly reappointed, playing an important guiding role in the continuity of government; after resigning the chancellorship in 1424, he remained on the council until 1435.[211] Likewise, Kemp was retained after Henry V's death, serving as Chancellor from 1426-1432.[212] The appointment of Henry V's secretary, William Alnwick, to Keeper of the privy seal in 1422 is also of particular interest, given his role as Langley's executor, and Christopher Norton's suggestion of Alnwick's involvement in the execution of the Cuthbert Window, which will be discussed below.[213]

Despite Langley's longstanding relationship with Beaufort,[214] he remained neutral during Gloucester's first major dispute (1424-6) and, along with Alnwick, was one of the nine councillors appointed as arbiters.[215] At the same time, the reconciliatory measures retained Alnwick as Keeper of the Privy Seal, while Kemp, who succeeded Bowet as Archbishop of York in 1425, replaced Beaufort as Chancellor.[216] However, while Langley appears to have maintained a publicly neutral stance in the Gloucester-Beaufort disputes, Kemp and Alnwick's allegiances changed over the course of the 1420s and 1430s.[217] Gloucester's dismissal of both Kemp and Alnwick from these offices during his attack on Beaufort in 1432

---

[211] Storey, *Langley*, 36; Harriss, *Beaufort*, 118-119; Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 33.
[212] Harriss, *Beaufort*, 118-120; Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 33-40; Davies, "Kemp."
[213] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 32-33; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 193-195.
[214] Storey, *Langley*, 28; Harriss, *Beaufort*, 80.
[215] Storey, *Langley*, 47-48; Rosemary Hayes, "William Alnwick, Bishop of Norwich (1426-1437) and Lincoln (1437-1449)" (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Bristol, 1989), 296; Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 78-79.
[216] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 37; Davies, "Kemp."
[217] Storey, *Langley*, 47-48; Hayes, "Alnwick," 296; Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 78-79.

indicates that he now considered them to be Beaufort's supporters.[218] Firm evidence of Alnwick's attitude to Gloucester is lacking.[219] However, Kemp's close relationship with Beaufort is indicated by Beaufort's precautionary legal decision to gift his goods and chattels to Kemp, as well as his nephew, Edmund, Lord Cromwell, during the 1432 dispute.[220] Moreover, Gloucester brought charges against both Beaufort and Kemp in 1439-40.[221]

Consequently, although Alnwick's position is more ambiguous, neither he nor Kemp were likely to be in favour of Gloucester by the date of the window's execution. Nevertheless, Kemp, like Beaufort, appears next to Gloucester in the commemorative section of the window. Moreover, Gloucester's location beneath St Cuthbert, as well as the overall aesthetic and symbolic unity of section D, strongly suggest a designer focused upon dynastic display rather than partisan politics. There are precedents at York Minster, such as the fourteenth-century nave windows and sculpture, whose unified heraldic display, which projects a comparable vision of harmony between crown, nobility and church, masks dissentious reality.[222] However, given the selection of figures in section D, it seems more likely that Langley, rather than the Dean and Chapter, initiated the design.

If, as argued above, Archbishop Henry Bowet is depicted in panels 1-2a, this would be consistent with Langley's agency, as he worked closely with Bowet in both ecclesiastical and royal service.[223] As the careers of Kemp and Langley's executors progressed once Bowet had become increasingly elderly and infirm, they would have had limited contact with him, reducing the likelihood that they would select him for depiction.[224] Moreover, Bowet's inclusion contributes to the symbolic representation of the strength and coherence of Lancastrian rule. In addition to his governmental roles in the early years of the Lancastrian regime, Brown has argued that Bowet must have been instrumental in mediating tensions at

---

[218] Harriss, *Beaufort*, 216-217.
[219] Hayes, "Alnwick," 302-303, 306.
[220] Harriss, *Beaufort*, 219.
[221] Petrina, *Cultural Politics*, 150; Harriss, *Beaufort*, 308-312, 321-322, 330, 349-350.
[222] Brown, *Stained Glass*, 46.
[223] Tout, "Bowet."; Storey, *Langley*, 29-30, 208.
[224] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 15; Tout, "Bowet,"; Davies, "Kemp."

York following Scrope's execution by Henry IV in 1405.[225] He may therefore have shared Langley's reputation and role as mediator. Indeed, one wonders whether Langley saw him as a role model, or predecessor, in striving to uphold Lancastrian unity.

From this perspective, the harmonisation in image of Beaufort and Gloucester's fraught relationship, focusing instead upon their significant support of the Lancastrian government, and their links to John of Gaunt, in whose service Langley began his career, makes sense. Thus, while the assemblage of individuals, which undoubtedly reflects the choices and allegiances of Langley, may have been augmented by his posthumous agents, the political tensions in the years surrounding the window's execution are not reflected in the final design. Consequently, it is necessary to consider who may have acted on Langley's behalf. As has been discussed above, it is likely that Langley had commissioned the project before his death and this would have given substantial control to the Dean and Chapter, as will be considered in Chapter 3.3.5. Yet Langley may also have entrusted the window's completion to other agent(s) who could be relied upon to fulfil his wishes. When attempting to identify these individuals, men close to Langley are of interest, particularly those who potentially shared his vision, or had their own reasons for ensuring the execution of a harmonised dynastic display.

From the above discussion, it is clear that Kemp, as Langley's longstanding colleague and Archbishop of York, may have been able to use his influence at York to ensure the window's completion. Kemp's Lancastrian service closely paralleled Langley's,[226] while Langley's testamentary bequests to Kemp may be interpreted either as indicators of esteem or to curry favour.[227] On the other hand, Langley's actions as Skirlaw's executor, completing projects commenced by his predecessor,[228] probably taught him the importance of entrusting such projects to individuals who were both committed to his memory and had posthumous access to his finances. Consideration of the potential role of Langley's executors reveals a network of connections between men who may all have shared, or supported, Langley's

[225] Tout, "Bowet."; Brown, *York Minster*, 217-218.
[226] Davies, "Kemp,"
[227] BIA, AR 19, f.501r-v.
[228] Snape, "Documentary," 29; Storey, *Langley*, 222.

desire for an idealised projection and commemoration of his patrons and colleagues as a unified, and divinely sanctioned, ruling elite.

3.3.4 Langley's Executors

Langley enlisted several members of his household, two bishops and two earls, as his executors.[229] Of the latter group, little is known of William Heyworth (Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, 1419-1447), who does not appear to have been involved in non-ecclesiastical affairs.[230] However, the other three, William Alnwick (Bishop of Norwich, 1426-1436, and Lincoln, 1437-1449), Richard Beauchamp (1382–1439, Earl of Warwick) and Richard Neville (1400–1460, Earl of Salisbury) all developed careers in the service of the Lancastrian kings and played key roles in Henry VI's minority government.[231] Salisbury was Beaufort's nephew, while Warwick was another supporter of Beaufort.[232] Yet he was probably not involved in executing Langley's will; he had been appointed lieutenant-general and governor of France and Normandy in July 1437, and spent the final two years of his life in France.[233] Consequently, it is Alnwick and Salisbury who are of greatest interest when considering the St Cuthbert Window, as they, along with members of Langley's household, were active in their roles as his executors.[234] Additionally, they both appear to have had particularly close relationships with Langley and Beaufort and, in Alnwick's case, Kemp.[235]

---

[229] Storey, *Langley*, 179. BIA, AR 19, f.502v.

[230] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 15; R. N. Swanson, "Heyworth, William (d.1447)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. , (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2011), https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/95154, accessed 12 July 2017.

[231] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 33-40; Storey, *Langley*, 27; A.J. Pollard, "Neville, Richard, Fifth Earl of Salisbury (1400–1460)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, January 2008), https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/19954, accessed 12 July 2017; Christine Carpenter, "Beauchamp, Richard, Thirteenth Earl of Warwick (1382–1439)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004; online edn, October 2013), https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/1838, accessed 14 March 2017; Harriss, *Beaufort*, 48, 118-119; Allmand, *Henry V*, 45.

[232] Carpenter, "Warwick"; Harriss, *Beaufort*, 121; Storey, *Langley*, 106-107.

[233] Carpenter, "Warwick."

[234] Storey, *Langley*, 6, 108; Hayes, "Alnwick," 317; *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry VI, 1436-1441*, Searchable text ed. (TannerRitchie Publishing in collaboration with the Library and Information Services of the University of St. Andrews, 2013), 399.

[235] Hayes, "Private Life," 6-11; Hayes, "Alnwick," 300.

Langley's relationship with Salisbury grew from a long-standing association with the Neville family. He had served alongside Salisbury's father, Ralph Neville, first Earl of Westmorland, on Henry IV's council and as John of Gaunt's co-executor.[236] Salisbury's mother was Ralph's second wife, Joan, daughter of Gaunt and sister of Beaufort.[237] As the Nevilles were a powerful and influential Durham family, involved in both national government and the defence of the north, Langley worked closely with both Salisbury and his father.[238] Langley's appointment as one of Salisbury's feoffees when the latter undertook military service in France, and support of Salisbury during inheritance disputes, demonstrate the solidity of their relationship.[239] Reciprocally, Salisbury, along with Warwick and Kemp, acted as arbiter for Langley during a significant legal dispute in 1434.[240] Moreover, Storey has highlighted Salisbury's diligence in swiftly undertaking administration of Langley's will.[241]

Indeed, it seems likely that Salisbury was responsible for encouraging his brother, Robert Neville, to borrow YT26 in 1438, most probably for use in the final design of the St Cuthbert Window, as suggested in Chapter 1.[242] There is little evidence regarding Langley's relationship with Robert Neville, who swiftly succeeded him as Bishop of Durham, although he did collate Robert to his first prebend in 1413.[243] By contrast, Dobson suggests that, before 1429, Salisbury had also established a close relationship with Durham's prior, Wessington, who granted the loan of YT26 in 1438.[244] Moreover, Salisbury was appointed keeper of the temporalities following Langley's death, and became Robert's chief lay counsellor upon his election as bishop.[245] He therefore provided a point of contact through which YT26 could be borrowed for use at York. Certainly, there is no evidence for YT26's use as an artistic source

---

[236] Storey, *Langley*, 106; *CPR: Henry VI, 1436-1441*, 399.
[237] Storey, *Langley*, 106-107.
[238] Ibid., 106-108; Dobson, *Durham*, 187-189.
[239] Storey, *Langley*, 106-108.
[240] Ibid., 129, 209.
[241] Ibid., 108.
[242] DCL, Misc. Ch. No.2352, 19 July 1438; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 193.
[243] Storey, *Langley*, 106; A.J. Pollard, "Neville, Robert (1404–1457)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, January 2008), https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/19962, accessed 12 July 2017.
[244] Dobson, *Durham*, 187-188.; DCL, Misc. Ch. No.2352, 19 July 1438.
[245] Ibid., 188.

at Durham at this date; the known Cuthbertine cycles had been completed in the 1420s and Robert's patronage does not appear to have included Cuthbertine narrative imagery.[246] Salisbury's activity as one of Langley's executors, and links to YT26, therefore place him as a powerful potential supporter of the window's execution.

Alnwick's potential involvement is based upon circumstantial, but cumulatively convincing, evidence. Norton has previously suggested Alnwick's involvement in the commissioning of the St Cuthbert Window due to his connections to both Langley and Stephen Scrope, who is depicted in S6.[247] Indeed, further investigation of Alnwick's career demonstrates close connections not only with Langley, but also with several of the figures in the commemorative section. Alnwick was first patronised by Stephen Scrope, a protégé of Bowet's and nephew of the executed Archbishop Richard Scrope.[248] Alnwick developed a career as an ecclesiastical lawyer and quickly entered into royal service; he became Henry V's secretary in 1421 and was present when the king died in France in 1422.[249] As discussed above, his prominent role in Henry VI's minority government brought him into close contact with Beaufort, Gloucester, Langley and Kemp, as well as Scrope and Salisbury, who were also members of the minority council.[250] Alnwick became Henry VI's confessor, *c.*1432-3,[251] and Rosemary Hayes has drawn attention to Henry VI's Christmas gift of a gold tablet to Alnwick, in 1437, as an indication of the "level of intimacy between the Bishop and Henry VI at this time", noting that he was the only cleric other than Beaufort to receive a gift that year.[252]

Hayes has suggested that Alnwick and Langley's involvement in the founding of a hostel for Benedictine monks studying at Cambridge in 1428 might be evidence of their friendly relationship by this date.[253] Considered alongside Alnwick's role as Langley's executor, and his receipt of Gregory's *Moralia* as a testamentary bequest, this points to a

---

[246] Pollard, "Neville, Robert,"; Snape, "Documentary," 29; Haselock and O'Connor, "Stained Glass," 111.
[247] Norton, "Richard Scrope," 193-195.
[248] Ibid., 192; R. B. Dobson, *Church and Society in the Medieval North of England* (London: Hambledon Press, 1996), 213; Hayes, "Alnwick," 14, 359.
[249] Hayes, "Alnwick," 14.
[250] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 32-33; Hayes, "Alnwick," 296.
[251] Hayes, "Alnwick," 310-311; Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 72.
[252] Hayes, "Private Life," 13.
[253] Hayes, "Alnwick," 299.

relationship which spanned at least a decade.[254] Hayes' identification of the continued relationship between Alnwick and another of Langley's executors, his chamberlain Thomas Holden, whose will Alnwick supervised, suggests the proximity of their households.[255] Similarly, while Kemp was Chancellor and Alnwick Keeper of the Privy Seal, both often stayed at St James' Hospital, Westminster, providing the opportunity for contact outside of their official roles.[256] Kemp was a patron of Alnwick's, supporting his elevation to the bishopric in 1426.[257] Like Langley, he appointed Alnwick as one of his executors.[258] As noted above, there is little evidence of Alnwick's relationship with Beaufort, but his relationship with Beaufort's brother, Thomas, Duke of Exeter, is indicated by the latter's testamentary bequests to Alnwick.[259]

While Alnwick funded several building and glazing projects, the loss of much glass prevents closer analysis of his iconographic interests. For example, his testamentary bequest to glaze the west window of Norwich cathedral is known to have been fulfilled, but no details of its design survive.[260] Yet Alnwick's stained-glass patronage at Lincoln's episcopal palace and his manor at Lyddington is of particular interest, as there are significant similarities with Langley's wider patronage, as well as the commemorative section of the St Cuthbert Window. The lost windows of a chapel, which Alnwick built at Lincoln's episcopal palace, contained inscriptions of his prayers to the Virgin.[261] The eighteenth-century descriptions record only the inscriptions, but it is likely that some imagery would have accompanied them;[262] Hayes' suggestion that Alnwick's portrait was depicted is plausible.[263] Two extant figural sculptures on the complex's gatehouse are probably representations of the bishop and Henry VI, as they

---

[254] BIA, AR 19, f.501v-502r.
[255] Storey, *Langley*, 93; Hayes, "Alnwick," 317.
[256] Hayes, "Private Life," 6.
[257] Hayes, "Alnwick," 300.
[258] Hayes, "Private Life," 11.
[259] Hayes, "Alnwick," 302-302; Hayes, "Private Life," 11; Harriss, *Beaufort*, 216-217.
[260] Hayes, "Alnwick," 79-80.
[261] Ibid., 75-76; Francis Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa: Or, a Collection of Divers Scarce and Curious Pieces (Relating Chiefly to Matters of English history) in Six Books*, 6 vols., vol. 2 (London: Thomas Evans, 1732), 321.
[262] Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, vol. 2, 321.
[263] Hayes, "Alnwick," 75-76.

accompany their arms.[264] Likewise, the great chamber windows at Alnwick's manor of Lyddington still contain his arms, motto and a possible portrait.[265] The chapel inscriptions themselves suggest that Alnwick considered stained glass an important medium for ensuring remembrance. Indeed, it must be questioned whether he intended the inscriptions, written in the first person from him to the Virgin,[266] to function as perpetual prayers, performed by a 'proxy', whether his image or the viewer. More significantly, Alnwick glazed a "large, high window"[267] in the great west hall of Lincoln's episcopal palace, with figures of English kings accompanied by verses.[268] While the full sequence was not recorded, it included at least Henry I and William II.[269] This interest in historical dynasty has close parallels both with section D of the St Cuthbert Window, as well as the glazing of All Souls, Oxford, discussed above. Moreover, these three projects appear closely contemporary, in the late 1430s and early 1440s.[270] While it seems likely that Langley selected the figures depicted in section D, it is possible that Alnwick was equally invested in its message, or was inspired by it to create his own glazing schemes elsewhere.

In any case, Alnwick's apparent diligence in fulfilling Langley's testamentary wishes suggests that he would have been willing to complete projects discussed with Langley during his lifetime.[271] Indeed, in his role of executor, along with Salisbury and three of Langley's clerks, Alnwick founded a chantry for Langley at the church of Middleton, which Langley had rebuilt, and where he had founded an altar during his lifetime.[272] Whether this represented the completion of plans discussed with Langley, or an appropriate commemoration by his closest executors, it suggests that both Alnwick and Salisbury were committed to ensuring the fulfilment of Langley's wishes. Moreover, Alnwick's commemoration of Stephen Scrope

---

[264] Hayes, "Private Life," 5.
[265] Ibid., 7; Charmian Woodfield and Paul Woodfield, "The palace of the bishops of Lincoln at Lyddington," *Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society Transactions* 57 (1983): 12; Hayes, "Alnwick," 93-94.
[266] Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, vol. 2, 321.
[267] Ibid., 320.
[268] Hayes, "Private Life," 7; Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, vol. 2, 320.
[269] Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, vol. 2, 320.
[270] Brown, *York Minster*, 233.
[271] Hayes, "Alnwick," 298-299.
[272] *CPR: Henry VI, 1436-1441*, 399; Hayes, "Alnwick," 317; Storey, *Langley*, 6.

decades after his death, in his own testamentary chantry foundation, demonstrates his devotion to former patrons.[273] This suggests Alnwick may have been particularly diligent in ensuring the fulfilment of Langley's wishes, because of his close relationship with both Langley and Scrope, and the intersection of their interests in the glazing of S6 and the St Cuthbert Window.

Alnwick's connections to Stephen Scrope, the donor of S6, provides insights into the possible mechanism for the commissioning of the St Cuthbert Window.[274] As noted in Chapter 3.1, S6 (Figure 3.58) and S7 (Figure 3.59) appear coeval with the St Cuthbert Window, and potentially represent a co-ordinated, if not co-operative, effort of construction. Previous scholarship has highlighted the apparent opposition between the donors of S6 and S7 and the Lancastrian display of section D.[275] Brown has sketched the connections between Wolveden and Scrope, who in addition to being canons of York Minster, were both members of the Corpus Christi Guild, along with Scrope's mother, Margery, and Sir William Gascoigne, whose arms appear in S7.[276] While she has emphasised the role of the Guild in promoting the cult of Richard Scrope, Brown has also demonstrated that this was not problematic from the 1420s.[277] Nevertheless, despite the clear intercessory role which Richard Scrope is intended to perform, his image in S6 does not fully promote him as a saint. Although depicted with a nimbus, he is labelled as "D(omin)us Ricard(us) Scrope" (Figure 3.60) and addressed by Stephen as "O Ricarde…" (Figure 3.61) rather than "sancte" (Figure 3.62), although Brown has noted that the full prayer mimics that of the feast of St William, and prayers to St Peter.[278]

Furthermore, Norton has elegantly refuted the apparent opposition between Langley, as staunch Lancastrian, and Archbishop Richard (S6) and Robert Wolveden (S7), as members of the 1405 rebellion against Henry IV, arguing that their proximity can be seen as a

[273] Norton, "Richard Scrope," 195.
[274] Hayes, "Private Life," 16; Hayes, "Alnwick," 359-360; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 193-195.
[275] Barnett, "Cuthbert Window," 51-57.
[276] Brown, *York Minster*, 230-231.
[277] Ibid., 231.
[278] Ibid., 230. Interestingly, Wolveden's prayer to St William does not use the feast prayer. Norton, "Richard Scrope," 192.

reconciliation between the clergy divided by the conflict and its aftermath.[279] Indeed, Wolveden was among the York clergy who received a pardon following Scrope's execution in 1405, and Brown has suggested that Bowet successfully secured reconciliations.[280] Additionally, consideration of Stephen Scrope's agents suggests the comparable absence of factionalism in the 1430s and 1440s. Both of the donors had died some years before the execution of S6 and S7, Scrope in 1418 and Wolveden in 1432. [281] Yet, as Norton notes, both can be linked to Alnwick, while the arms of Scrope's brother, John, 4th Lord Scrope of Masham, who lived until 1451, appear in S6.[282] As John Scrope was a supporter of Gloucester,[283] his potential involvement adds further evidence to the non-partisan sentiment evident in the St Cuthbert Window's commemorative section. Norton has suggested Scrope's support may have been somewhat guided by his own agendas, as he was planning a magnificent tomb in the Scrope chapel and probably donated n2, also glazed *c.*1440.[284] As n2 includes a standing figure of St Stephen, with a selection of his narrative scenes,[285] it may be that this was another commission by John to commemorate his brother. Nevertheless, John Scrope was a member of Henry VI's minority council, working closely with Langley, Alnwick and Salisbury on securing Scottish truces in the 1420s and 1430s and accompanying Warwick to France in 1437.[286] Additionally, Scrope, Beaufort and Alnwick appeared together as founders of a college at Tattershall in 1439-1441, a project begun with Langley's support in the early 1420s.[287]

This cooperation in the creation of the St Cuthbert Window, and in the commemoration of Scrope and Wolveden, can therefore be seen to transcend perceived political divides. This aligns with the message of section D of the window, which maintains neutrality in the Gloucester-Beaufort conflict, instead evoking dynastic unity, continuity and

---

[279] Norton, "Richard Scrope," 194-196.
[280] Ibid., 192; Brown, *York Minster*, 217-218.
[281] Norton, "Richard Scrope," 192, 195; Hayes, "Alnwick," 359.
[282] Norton, "Richard Scrope," 195-196.
[283] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 35-36, 71, 94, 98.
[284] Norton, "Richard Scrope," 197.
[285] Brown, *York Minster*, 281; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 197. Stephen and the Virgin flank a crucifixion scene.
[286] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 35-36, 38, 117, 157, 159, 291; Storey, *Langley*, 156.
[287] Hayes, "Alnwick," 271.

legitimacy. Moreover, it supports the theory that, if Kemp or Langley's executors were involved in commissioning the window, they implemented Langley's design. It has been shown that both Salisbury and Alnwick would have been active in supporting the window's completion, and that, as devoted Lancastrian servants, they would probably have identified with its message. This discussion, and the consideration of S6 and S7, reignites questions regarding the degree of agency which Langley and his agents could exercise within York Minster. Consequently, the role of canons and their connections with Langley's possible agents will now be explored.

3.3.5 Ecclesiastical Networks: The Canons of York Minster and Patterns of Patronage

The involvement of York Minster's canons in the control of and contribution to glazing patronage was highlighted in Chapter 3.1. Consideration of their careers and networks of patronage can reveal both insights into the mechanism of glazing patronage at York and identify individuals potentially involved in the commissioning of the St Cuthbert Window. The canons had variously risen through careers in ecclesiastical, and often also royal, administration, in which they would have occupied similar supporting roles to the prelates depicted in the window.[288] They may have recognised this parallel and been keen to promote the message evoked by section D. Moreover, many owed their careers as clerks and lawyers to the patronage of prelates.[289] For example, both Archbishops Richard Scrope and Henry Bowet were the protégés of Archbishop Thomas Arundel, and both fostered the careers of the next generation of canons.[290] Likewise, many of York's canons in the 1430s and 1440s had benefitted from the support of Archbishop Kemp and bishops Langley and Beaufort.[291] Thus, they may have had personal connections with some of the individuals depicted in section D,

---

[288] Simon Walker, "Between Church and Crown: Master Richard Andrew, King's Clerk," *Speculum* 74, no. 4 (1999): 979 n.122; Barrie Dobson, "The Residentiary Canons of York in the Fifteenth Century," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 30, no. 2 (1979): 156.

[289] Dobson, *Church*, 202, 212-213; Barrie Dobson, "The Later Middle Ages: 1215-1500," in *A History of York Minster*, ed. G.E. Aylmer and Reginald Cant (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 106.

[290] Dobson, *Church*, 213.

[291] BIA, AR 19, f.501v; Walker, "Church and Crown," 978-979; Dobson, "Later Middle Ages," 106; James Raine, ed. *Testamenta Eboracensia: A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York*, 6 vols., vol. 3, Surtees Society (Durham: George Andrews, 1864), 3, 105n, 106n; T.D. Hardy and J. Le Neve, eds., *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, 3 vols., vol. 3 (Oxford: University Press, 1854), 212, 215, 217, 223, 161; Dobson, "Residentiary Canons," 161.

as well as those involved in commissioning the window. Chantry bequests and burial requests provide evidence both of the canons' loyalty to one another and their devotion to their royal and ecclesiastical patrons, some of whom were depicted in the window.[292] Langley's long track record of donation to York Minster's glazing, if not wider fabric, may also have fostered relationships with the canons, or garnered their favour; Langley's arms survive in the choir clerestory (S9), and also appeared in the lost library glazing alongside the arms of Skirlaw, Bowet and the canons Stephen Scrope and Thomas Haxey.[293] It therefore seems likely that many members of the higher clergy of York Minster would potentially have been in favour of both the iconography of the St Cuthbert Window, and fulfilling Langley's wishes.

The residentiary canons are of particular interest to this study because of the intersection of their interests and personal connections. Barrie Dobson characterised the men who committed to residency as nearly always "senior and experienced ecclesiastical administrators who either believed they had no prospects of promotion to a bishopric or who had no desire for such elevation".[294] As a result, they were typically already wealthy and well-established figures within the ecclesiastical hierarchy, who were particularly invested in the church of York, being prepared to spend the rest of their lives in its service.[295] As has been seen in Chapter 3.1, many of these men were donors both to the fabric fund and the glazing of York Minster, although there is very little evidence for how glazing projects were overseen once payments had been provided to the fabric fund.[296] However, if, as proposed above, the Dean and Chapter retained ultimate control over the iconography of the fifteenth-century glazing, their administrative positions would have enabled them to influence the glazing.[297] While most residentiary canons contributed to the fabric of the Minster, those in the office of

[292] Raine, *Testamenta Eboracensia*, vol. 3, 115-116; Dobson, "Residentiary Canons," 168-169; Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, 278.
[293] Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.74v; Brown, *York Minster*, 211, 287. Langley also bequeathed books to York Minster's library. BIA, AR 19, f.501r-v.
[294] Dobson, "Residentiary Canons," 152.
[295] Dobson, *Church*, 202-203.
[296] Brown, *East Window*, 25, 30-31.
[297] Dobson, *Church*, 214; Brown, *East Window*, 30-31; Dobson, "Later Middle Ages," 57-58, 63.

dean, who, as head of the chapter, had ultimate control, and treasurer, who at York Minster was closely associated with fabric benefactions, are of particular interest.[298]

Wolveden's donation of S7 may shed light on both the mechanism and dating of the St Cuthbert Window's creation. As noted above, Langley's payments for glass, and possibly the pictorial linen cycle of Cuthbert's life, potentially indicate that planning for the window commenced in 1429.[299] He may therefore have been in discussion with Wolveden, who was Treasurer of York Minster until his death in 1432,[300] as well as William Alnwick, and possibly John Scrope, regarding the simultaneous glazing of S6 and S7. As discussed above, Alnwick's close relationship with Langley and role as Stephen Scrope's executor make it likely that he provided a key point of contact. In addition, Alnwick probably had connections with the other canons of York Minster, having held the prebend of Knaresborough 1421-6.[301] John Barnyngham succeeded Wolveden as treasurer in 1432, holding the post until his death in 1457.[302] John Scrope apparently had connections with Barnyngham, whom he enlisted as an executor.[303] This, combined with Barnyngham's prolific activity in funding and supervising building work at York Minster, makes his involvement in the production of the St Cuthbert Window likely.[304]

The involvement of the two men who held the deanship during the 1430s is less clear, although both would arguably have supported Kemp's wishes, had he exerted his influence. Robert Gilbert, Dean of York, 1426-36, perhaps knew Langley, as he was previously Archdeacon of Durham (1419-25).[305] He was certainly close to Kemp, and had previously served as warden of Merton College, Oxford, 1417-21, during which time Kemp funded a

---

[298] Dobson, "Residentiary Canons," 171, 174.
[299] DUL, CCB B/82/3 (190015), 10 May 1429.
[300] Dobson, "Residentiary Canons," 174.
[301] Hayes, "Alnwick," 365; Hardy and Le Neve, *Fasti*, vol. 3, 197.
[302] Dobson, "Residentiary Canons," 174.
[303] James Raine, ed. *Testamenta Eboracensia: A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York*, 6 vols., vol. 2, Surtees Society (Durham: George Andrews, 1855), 192.
[304] Dobson, "Residentiary Canons," 171; Brown, *York Minster*, 212.
[305] Storey, *Langley*, 178-179, 186.

window, containing the Life of St Joseph, in the new transept, *c.*1419-22.[306] Gilbert may have been Dean of York while initial plans for the St Cuthbert Window were developed, but he resigned upon his appointment as Bishop of London in 1436.[307] Consequently, it was likely his successor, William Felter, Dean 1436-51, who approved the ultimate execution of the window.

Both Felter's and Barnyngham's connections are suggestive of their involvement in securing the installation of the window. Both counted Kemp as their patron and played key roles in his administration.[308] Felter bequeathed Kemp a gold cross and included him in prayers at a chantry founded by his executors, one of whom was Barnyngham.[309] Furthermore, in addition to Barnyngham's connection to John Scrope, Felter may also have had links with Langley, as both were appointed to the committee established to treat for peace with Scotland in 1435.[310] These connections suggest that the two men in the posts with the most control over York Minster's glazing had multiple motives for ensuring the installation of the St Cuthbert Window, S6 and S7.

3.3.6 The Commissioning of St Cuthbert Window

The evidence discussed in this chapter enables the commissioning of the St Cuthbert Window to be sketched. While essentially conjectural, the scenario proposed highlights the number of individuals involved, and indicates those men who might have exercised agency over its design. The window's initial planning was undertaken by or for Archbishop Richard Scrope, who borrowed YT26 at some date before his execution in 1405.[311] Norton has convincingly argued that Scrope intended to give the St Cuthbert Window as part of a collaborative scheme, in which the Great East Window would be given by Walter Skirlaw,

---

[306] Ayers, *Merton*, Part 2, 303-308; Tim Ayers, "Collegiate Identity and the Art of Lancastrian Reform: The Stained Glass of Merton College, Oxford in the early Fifteenth Century," in *Image, Memory and Devotion: Liber Amicorum Paul Crossley*, ed. Zoë Opačić and Achim Timmermann (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 243, 246; Dobson, "Residentiary Canons," 161.
[307] Griffiths, *Henry VI*, 103; Dobson, "Residentiary Canons," 174.
[308] Walker, "Church and Crown," 979 n.122; Dobson, "Residentiary Canons," 163.
[309] Raine, *Testamenta Eboracensia*, vol. 3, 115-116; Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, 278.
[310] Dobson, "Residentiary Canons," 167; David Macpherson, John Caley, and William Illingworth, eds., *Rotuli Scotiae*, 2 vols., vol. 2 (London: George Eyre and Andrew Strahan, 1814), 294.
[311] DCL, MS B.IV.46, f.41v; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 149, 193.

then bishop of Durham.[312] A large quantity of glass was purchased in 1399 and the contract for the Great East Window was drawn up in 1405. [313] It is plausible that the iconographic scheme for the choir had been devised in the preceding years, and that, with work on the principal window underway, the iconographic design of the St Cuthbert Window commenced. As Dean of York, Langley would have been involved in approving, if not devising, these plans. This also raises the possibility that John Thornton, creator of the Great East Window, was intended to design and glaze the St Cuthbert Window, and there is a small chance that he had already outlined some elements of the design.

However, a combination of factors delayed the progression of the project. Most significantly, Scrope's execution in 1405 would have required a new patron to be found. Brown has argued that, if Scrope had originally been planning to fund both the St Cuthbert and William windows, the saint's connections with the de Ros family would explain their stepping in as donors of the latter.[314] Given Skirlaw's role as bishop of Durham, and evident devotion to St Cuthbert, he would appear the natural candidate to assume responsibility for the St Cuthbert Window.[315] However, it seems likely that, even if Skirlaw had considered funding the window, his generous testamentary bequests to the fabric were diverted, by the Chapter or his executors, to the more urgent issues of repair and rebuilding occasioned by the fall of the crossing tower in 1405.[316] Indeed, Norton and Harrison have argued that the stonework of the south choir transept was capped at aisle level at this point, and not resumed until *c.*1430.[317]

This date coincides with Langley's purchase of the Life of Cuthbert painted on linen, and a large quantity of glass, which he had shipped to Hedon, near York, in 1429.[318] While it

---

[312] Ibid., 147-150, 153.
[313] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 24. Torre, "Antiquities", YMLA, L1/7, f.7.
[314] Brown, *East Window*, 28-29.
[315] Skirlaw founded at least three chantries to Cuthbert, and cited Cuthbert's exhortation for unity in his will. Raine, *Testamenta Eboracensia*, vol. 1, 312; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 149; Jarratt, *Walter Skirlaw*, 154, 156-157, 164.
[316] Raine, *Testamenta Eboracensia*, vol. 1, 308; Harrison and Norton, *York Minster*, 42. YMLA, E3/7 (1415-16) records the donation of £52 from Skirlaw's executors, to pay six masons per year.
[317] Harrison and Norton, *York Minster*, 42.
[318] DUL, CCB B/82/3 (190015), 10 May 1429.

is possible that he was still acting in his capacity as Skirlaw's executor, this seems unlikely, as the iconography of the works he completed on Skirlaw's behalf at Durham recognised the latter's contribution, as has been seen in Chapter 2. Instead, the close coincidence in dates suggests that Langley was now putting into action a plan agreed at a much earlier date, but which could not progress until after the completion of the stonework. Indeed, it is possible that the earlier Cuthbertine cycles at Durham, of *c.*1420, were originally intended to have been designed and made alongside the York window. This might explain the retention of YT26 at York until after 1416, particularly if Thornton was retained as the designer for the cycles. Indeed, while it is also possible that Langley prioritised the glazing and building projects at Durham, leaving the St Cuthbert Window at York until these were complete, his refurbishment of the Galilee, including the installation of his tomb, was not complete until *c.*1435; its windows were not begun until 1433.[319]

The evidence suggests that Langley's plans for the St Cuthbert Window were underway in the 1430s, probably involving discussion and collaboration with Wolveden, John Scrope and probably Alnwick, regarding S6 and S7, as well as Wolveden's successor, Barnyngham, and Dean William Felter, as representatives of the chapter. Given Langley's role as dean during Scrope's episcopacy, he would probably have known of the archbishop's plans, and it is tempting to suggest that Scrope's depiction in S6 commemorated this early involvement, just as Langley commemorated Skirlaw's contributions at Durham. In any case, it seems likely that plans for at least section D had been agreed before 1437, and that after Langley's death, Salisbury and Alnwick assumed control of the project on his behalf, presumably remaining in contact with Felter and Barnyngham.

While further details of the commissioning process can only be speculated upon, the evidence discussed within this chapter raises several questions. If Neville did borrow YT26 for Salisbury, does this suggest that the linen cycle purchased by Langley in 1429 was not connected to the window? It is possible that the cycle was intended for multiple functions, and was referred to during the design process in the 1430s, but then employed as a hanging; or, if intended as a design source, that YT26 was used as an additional, 'authoritative',

---

[319] DCL, Loc.II:19(1, 10); Storey, *Langley*, 197; Snape, "Documentary," 31.

iconographic source from the cult's locus. Multiple pictorial sources are known to have been used for the Great East Window.[320] Equally, as noted above, it may be that elements of an early fifteenth-century design, drawing upon YT26, had been begun, possibly by John Thornton, under Scrope's supervision. The master glazier who resumed (or began) the process in the 1430s may have considered it necessary, or simply desirable, to consult the original manuscript again. This would have been particularly necessary if any earlier designs were only *vidimuses*, rather than cartoons, or if a different narrative structure was required. Such considerations also raise questions regarding how these pictorial sources, along with textual sources, would have been interpreted, and by whom. Chapter 2 highlighted Wessington's possible involvement in the design of the Cuthbertine cycles at Durham and, if a member of the Durham community were consulted at York, he would be the most obvious candidate, due to his expertise and personal connections with both Langley and Salisbury. However, the familiarity of the glaziers with the practice of devising complex narratives from sources in other media must also be considered, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.

While the scenario outlined above is inherently conjectural, the evidence discussed within this chapter strongly suggests that the St Cuthbert Window was planned as an integral part of the eastern arm's glazing from the early fifteenth century. Nevertheless, the iconography of section D indicates that, by the 1430s at the latest, Langley had assumed a significant degree of iconographic control, and it seems likely that his choices were retained in the executed design. Yet, Langley's executors, most likely Salisbury and Alnwick, as well as the dean, William Felter, the treasurer, John Barnyngham, the residentiary canons, and possibly Archbishop Kemp, may all have had the opportunity to augment or adapt the design of the window as a whole. This has broader implications for understanding stained-glass patronage, particularly monumental schemes. In particular, it highlights the difficulty of distinguishing a patron's, or his agent's, wishes from the control exercised by the institution and its representatives. Yet, the discussion has also suggested that a degree of iconographic freedom was retained by the patron, and hints at compromises between institutional and individual agency. These questions and conclusions also have implications for the conception

[320] Brown, *East Window*, 44-45.

of the St Cuthbert Window's narrative, and will be considered further in the exploration of the narrative construction and themes in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4: Reading the St Cuthbert Window

As the previous chapter has shown, the long genesis of the St Cuthbert Window, combined with the potentially diverse interests of the individuals involved in its creation, complicate analysis of its intended iconographic significance. Nevertheless, it represents a rare survival of fifteenth-century hagiographic narrative glass on a monumental scale. Consequently, it presents the opportunity to analyse the way in which narrative windows were conceived and constructed in the later middle ages, comparable to the extensive studies of monumental narrative glazing from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In addition, the survival of so much of the Minster's choir glazing provides an opportunity to analyse the original setting for the St Cuthbert Window.

The significance of the window's relationship with the flanking figures in S6 and S7 has been discussed in Chapter 3. Furthermore, the presence of the monumental St William Window and the Great East Window provide opportunities to consider the extent to which their designs respond to one another, and to the wider coherent scheme. Through exploration of the ways in which the window's design and iconography responds to its devotional, architectural and socio-political contexts, this investigation can also shed light on contemporary narrative windows more widely.

The first half of this chapter will address the way in which the narrative was constructed, considering the medieval approach to narrative design, in so far as it is understood by modern scholarship, and analysing the use of sources, narrative devices and visual conventions. In the second half, the iconographic themes of the window will be identified, and their potential significance discussed. This analysis will provide not only a new interpretation of the St Cuthbert Window, but also wider insights into fifteenth-century narrative design.

4.1 Pictorial Narrative Analysis

4.1.1 Pictorial Narrative Analysis: Approaches to Stained-Glass Narratives

This study's reconstruction of the St Cuthbert Window's narrative, detailed in Chapter 1, has enabled a substantial proportion of the glass and its probable original arrangement to be identified (Figure 4.1, Appendix 5.1 and 5.2). While the loss of six panels, as well as the damaged and disarranged state of the extant panels, means that a full reconstruction is out of

reach, it has been possible to propose a plausible reconstruction of the original narrative. In doing so, significant new insights into the narrative and its construction have been gained.

When analysing the narrative construction of the St Cuthbert Window, this study has attempted to move beyond past assumptions regarding medieval artistic practice, and to explore the window as a unique and original artwork.[1] As the reconstruction of the narrative in Chapter 1 has shown, previous attempts to understand the window as having a simple source-copy relationship with earlier Cuthbertine texts and pictorial cycles have led to the misidentification, and misinterpretation, of many scenes.[2] This is exemplified by previous assessments of the relationship between the window and YT26. Bertram Colgrave, while acknowledging the presence of YT26 in York, disputed the theory that it was actually used as a source for the window, due to the dissimilarity of the iconography.[3] He argued that only one panel, 10d (Figure 4.2), "bears the least resemblance to the miniature", the illustration for Chapter 5 (Figure 4.3).[4] This example arguably presents one of the closest compositional relationships between a YT26 illustration and the St Cuthbert Window, revealing Colgrave's expectation of near-exact replication. Moreover, it demonstrates how such approaches can overlook nuanced uses of visual sources. Colgrave stresses the strong resemblance between YT26 and the Carlisle paintings, which are much more closely modelled on YT26, without realising how the contrasting use of the manuscript demonstrates the originality and creativity of the St Cuthbert Window.[5]

Malcolm Baker recognised the use of YT26 as a source for the St Cuthbert Window iconography in his 1978 study of the extant Cuthbertine cycles: Univ. 165, YT26, Trinity, the St Cuthbert Window and the Carlisle paintings.[6] Yet, he was arguably still constrained by the contemporary preoccupation with establishing linear source-copy relationships, as he aimed to show that the extant cycles were related, and represented the "evolution of the saint's

---

[1] Kemp, *Narratives*, 221; Caviness, "Biblical Stories," 135, 141-132, 145; Morgan, "St Katherine."; Koopmans, "Becket."; Brown, *Apocalypse*.
[2] Fowler, "Cuthbert Window."; Fowler, "Additional Notes."
[3] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 32; Colgrave, "Cuthbert Paintings," 17.
[4] BL, Yates Thompson 26, f.14r (hereafter cited as YT26); Colgrave, "Cuthbert Paintings," 17.
[5] Ibid.; YT26, f.14r.
[6] Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 22-24.

iconography".[7] This led him to omit from his discussion scenes which only appeared in the York window.[8] Baker argued that instances of "agreement in error" between the two cycles, combined with the differences in distribution of imagery through the conflation or expansions of scenes, pointed to the existence of a "more extensive twelfth-century model" used by the creators of YT26 and the St Cuthbert Window.[9] As discussed above, there were undoubtedly other pictorial cycles present in Durham both during the twelfth and fifteenth centuries, yet by focusing on proving their existence, he missed the opportunity to explore the relationship between the extant cycles. In particular, Baker did not consider whether differences in iconography might have been intentional, whether attributable to the creativity of the glaziers in adapting the imagery to the medium, or creating a different focus.

Comparably problematic approaches can be found in studies of pictorial narratives in a range of media, including other stained-glass cycles. For example, Stephen Nichols' brief consideration of the Charlemagne window at Chartres, as part of his investigation of the creation and evolution of medieval narratives in relation to scriptural models, exemplifies the past tendency to interpret narrative glass only as a version of a text.[10] While recognising that the narrative was based upon anagogic and Christological paradigms, he did not explore the particular articulation of these within the narrative, instead attempting to read meaning within the form and structure of the armatures, ignoring their relationship to the scenes which they framed.[11] Wolfgang Kemp argued persuasively against Nichols' interpretation, while recognising that relationships between the glass and support structure should be considered.[12] Indeed, Kemp's study demonstrates both the need to contextualise pictorial narrative analyses and to adopt holistic approaches. Studies which do not adopt such approaches reduce stained glass narratives to simple copies, ignoring the skill and creativity of the glazier, often commenting on perceived deviations from the 'source', or the inclusion of 'unusual' elements,

---

[7] Ibid., 17.
[8] Ibid., 40.
[9] Ibid., 24.
[10] Stephen G. Nichols, *Romanesque Signs: Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 95-101.
[11] Ibid., 100-104; Elizabeth Sears, Review of Romanesque Signs: Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography, Stephen G. Nichols Jr., *The Art Bulletin* 70, no. 2 (1988): 350.
[12] Kemp, *Narratives*, 8, 11.

without realising their significance or considering them within their contemporary context.[13] As a result, they generally fail to identify the uniqueness of the design and its intended meanings. In her review of Nichols' study, Elizabeth Sears questioned his understanding of the manufacturing process for stained glass, highlighting that, while the creators of medieval art undoubtedly created multiple layers of meaning, the investigation of narrative and symbolic devices must take into account the practical aspects of production.[14] Similarly, Kemp stressed the need to consider each artwork's design challenges, and the ways in which narrative might work in combination with formal structure.[15]

Differences between the intended functions and audiences, as well as technical challenges posed by various media, must be recognised. In stained glass narratives, imagery is presented to the viewer in its entirety, enabling multiple readings.[16] Consequently, as Caviness cautioned, it is naïve to think of windows as comparable to manuscript illuminations, or substitutes for books, where the reading order is shaped in a different way.[17] Instead, while visual narratives can have a "literary foundation",[18] in stained glass in particular, they move beyond the reproduction of a specific text to produce new narratives.[19] It is unsurprising, therefore, that attempts to tie Cuthbertine imagery directly to texts have previously failed to grasp intended nuances of meaning.[20] Consequently, this study re-examines the relationship between text and image in light of contemporary attitudes to narrative creation, recognising the agency of the designers.[21] By identifying the complex relationships which existed between written, oral and pictorial versions of stories, whether

---

[13] Nichols, *Romanesque Signs*, 100; Fowler, "Cuthbert Window," 277-278, 281-272, 284, 307; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 24.
[14] Sears, Review, 347, 349.
[15] Kemp, *Narratives*, 10.
[16] Caviness, "Biblical Stories," 126.
[17] Ibid., 122.
[18] Kemp, *Narratives*, 221.
[19] Ibid., 220-222; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 45.
[20] Fowler, "Cuthbert Window"; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 22-23, 40-42.
[21] Michael Baxandall, *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 58-62.

hagiographical or otherwise, the analysis of sources can be reframed to recognise their creative use and acknowledge the originality of individual narrative cycles.

In particular, when considering the relationships between hagiographic cycles in diverse media, the various ways in which audiences were intended to, and actually did, interact with them must be explored. Caviness emphasised the "equal autonomy" of text and image in the medieval mind, arguing that the oral nature of twelfth- and thirteenth-century culture fostered variant readings and retellings of pictorial cycles by their audiences.[22] As a result, the public setting of many windows potentially enabled them to influence vernacular texts and oral narratives, as well as vice versa.[23] Similarly, Colette Manhès-Deremble raised the possibility that oral traditions directly influenced image-making in the narratives at Chartres.[24] As the St Cuthbert Window's cultural landscape was populated by a markedly more literate audience, the richness of oral, textual and pictorial traditions available to the individuals involved in the window's design must be recognised.[25] The plethora of Cuthbertine texts, visual cycles and oral traditions which existed by the fifteenth century provided an opportunity for greater depth of meaning within narrative cycles. Moreover, the increasingly learned ecclesiastical audience, particularly the prelacy, among whom the patron and his executors could be counted, were expected to approach both text and image with a greater appreciation of, and capacity for, complexity of meaning.[26]

As scholars of pictorial narratives in a range of media have moved beyond analyses which primarily assess them in relation to texts, they have increasingly recognised the capacity of pictorial cycles to reshape and refocus hagiographic narratives in response to their

---

[22] Caviness, "Biblical Stories," 145, 146.
[23] Ibid., 146.
[24] Ibid.; Manhès-Deremble and Deremble, *Vitraux Narratifs*, 79-80, 261.
[25] Martin Heale, ed. *The Prelate in England and Europe, 1300-1560* (York: York Medieval Press, 2014), 8; James G. Clark, "An Abbot and his Books in Late Medieval and Pre-Reformation England," in *The Prelate in England and Europe, 1300-1560* (Boydell and Brewer, 2014), 101-103; Miriam Gill, "Monastic Murals and Lectio in the Later Middle Ages," in *The Culture of Medieval English Monasticism*, ed. James G. Clark (Studies in the History of Medieval Religion 30: Boydell & Brewer, 2007), 58-59; David Bell, N., "What Nuns Read: The State of the Question," ibid., 120.
[26] Clark, "Abbot," 101-103; Friedman, *Northern English*, 4-5, 203, 205-209, 214; Gill, "Monastic Murals," 57.

temporal, social and spatial contexts.[27] Broader studies of pictorial narratives have provided little investigation of stained glass.[28] However, in the same period, stained-glass scholars have built upon the insights provided by Wolfgang Kemp and Madeline H. Caviness in their landmark studies of twelfth- and thirteenth-century stained-glass cycles, which recognised their status, not as interpretations or illustrations of texts, but as independent versions of the narratives.[29] For example, Caviness demonstrated that, even when surveying the multitude of French Joseph cycles only briefly, it was apparent that their individuality, in terms of narrative content and structure, gave them entirely different foci and meanings.[30]

Therefore, it is necessary to recognise the multiple functions that may have been intended for any given narrative, whether textual or pictorial, as recent hagiographic scholarship has increasingly demonstrated.[31] Stephen Wilson's grouping of the various functions of saints' cults into three broad, but intertwined, clusters, "universal assistance, patronage, and political functions", is particularly helpful in demonstrating which key aspects should be considered when unpicking hagiographical narratives, while acknowledging the underlying diversity of potential functions.[32] The various agendas of the individuals potentially involved in the St Cuthbert Window's conception raise the possibility for tensions between the narrative's role as an expression of the Cuthbertine cult, and the articulation of the York Chapter's interests. This will be explored in light of recent discussions regarding the extent to which cults and their manifestations, especially hagiographic narratives, were expressions of the power and authority of the ecclesiastical elite, rather than popular devotion.[33] André Vauchez and Claire Waters have argued that cults required both popular

---

[27] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 33-34; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 45-46.
[28] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 325-331. Abou-el-Haj focuses on manuscript illustrations; Hahn considers other media, but addresses stained glass only briefly in her epilogue.
[29] Kemp, *Narratives*, 221; Caviness, "Biblical Stories," 135, 141-132, 145; Morgan, "St Katherine."; Koopmans, "Becket."; Brown, *Apocalypse*.
[30] Caviness, "Biblical Stories," 135, 141-142.
[31] Stephen Wilson, "Introduction," in *Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore, and History*, ed. Stephen Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 16; Anthony Paul Bale, "Introduction: St Edmund's Medieval Lives," in *St Edmund, King and Martyr: Changing Images of a Medieval Saint*, ed. Anthony Paul Bale (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2009), 21, 23.
[32] Wilson, "Introduction," 16.
[33] André Vauchez, *Sainthood in the later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 48-51, 137-138; Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400-c.1580*, 161; Bale,

and official ecclesiastical support, so that the creation of hagiographical narratives was not only to restrict what the audience could follow, but was to some degree dictated by the cult and the audience itself.[34] Nevertheless, scholars have also provided examples of hagiography being used to further social, ecclesiastical and political expressions of power and authority, particularly in times of upheaval and uncertainty.[35] Such discussions also highlight the dynamic nature of hagiographic narratives, and their continual adaptation in response to their physical, social and temporal environments.[36]

Similarly, in Caviness' discussion of the distribution of narrative complexity within individual cathedrals, she points to several examples where the choice and complexity of subjects and arrangements was apparently tailored to the audiences who could access those locations.[37] For example, within the Canterbury Cathedral glazing, she suggests that the more "straightforward" narratives of the Becket miracles were a response to the lay audience at which they were targeted, while the more complex typological windows were designed with clerical and monastic viewers in mind.[38] Likewise, in her reassessment of the thirteenth-century St Katherine narrative window in the Chapter House of York Minster, Chloe Morgan demonstrated that the unique narrative construction created unusual emphases which can be seen as a response to its context.[39] She argues that, by representing an "idealised version of debate", the window served not just as an example to the canons, but articulated the intended function of the chapter.[40] Whether the St Cuthbert Window's iconography articulated a comparable intention will be considered in sections 4.3. and 4.4.

"Introduction: St Edmund's Medieval Lives," 20; Matthew Woodcock, "Crossovers and Afterlife," in *A Companion to Middle English Hagiography*, ed. Sarah Salih (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 2006), 145; Sarah Salih, "Introduction: Saints, Cults and Lives in Late Medieval England," ibid., 5.

[34] Claire M. Waters, "Power and Authority," ibid., 83; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 142.

[35] Wilson, "Introduction," 31-33, 36; Waters, "Power," 71, 78, 86.

[36] Bale, "Introduction: St Edmund's Medieval Lives," 19, 21; Rebecca Pinner, "Medieval Images of St Edmund in Norfolk Churches," ibid., 131-132; Richard Marks, *Image and Devotion in Late Medieval England* (Stroud: Sutton, 2004), 25; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 148-151, 284, 292-143.

[37] Caviness, "Biblical Stories," 109, 111, 122.

[38] Ibid., 109.

[39] Morgan, "St Katherine," 169-170.

[40] Ibid., 169.

By developing a more nuanced understanding of medieval approaches to narrative creation and reception, it is possible to identify the existence, and use, of textual and pictorial sources and analyse them alongside the glass in ways which elucidate the peculiarities of the window's editorial choices as a unique artwork. As demonstrated in Chapter 1, most of the scenes depicted in the St Cuthbert Window are clearly related to two texts: the *Libellus de nativitate* (*Libellus*) and Bede's *Vita Prosaica* (VP), as well as a pictorial cycle illustrating the latter text in YT26. Yet it is evident that the St Cuthbert Window was not intended as a simple 'representation' or 'translation' of a single, static version of the narrative in glass. In order to identify the individuality of the window's narrative, it is necessary first to identify the way in which such individuality is expressed in hagiographic narratives.

4.1.2 Pictorial Narrative Analysis: Identifying Topoi and Iconographic Themes

Hagiographic narratives in all media ultimately rely upon paradigmatic structures to demonstrate sanctity.[41] All saints' Lives were modelled on Christ's, with Christo-mimetic events functioning as metaphors of the events which they evoke. [42] As a result, saints' Lives also mimic and are connected to each other through Christ.[43] This concept was articulated both in the bible and by early medieval theologians, such as Gregory the Great, whose works remained influential in the fifteenth century.[44]

The use of models drawn from earlier saints was often explicit. For example, on four occasions in VP, Bede names the saints whose miracles Cuthbert "imitated" and explains or compares how he followed their examples.[45] He also weaves earlier exemplars into the narrative by borrowing text verbatim, most frequently from the parts of Gregory's *Dialogues* detailing St Benedict's life, but also from St Sulpicius Severus' *Vita S. Martini*, Possidius' *S.*

---

[41] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 39.
[42] Ibid.; Benedicta Ward, *The Venerable Bede*, Repr. 1998 ed. (London: Continuum, 2002), 89; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 466-467, 467 n.477; Nichols, *Romanesque Signs: Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography*, 101.
[43] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 40; E. Ann Matter, "The Bible in Early Medieval Saints' Lives," in *The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era*, ed. Celia Chazelle and Burton Van Name Edwards, *Medieval Church Studies 3* (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2003), 155-157.
[44] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 40; Matter, "The Bible in Early Medieval Saints' Lives," 156; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 285-286; Friedman, *Northern English*, 4-5.
[45] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 200-203, 220-221, 222-223, 280-283.

Augustini Vita and Evagrius' *Vita Anthonii*.[46] As hagiographers also employed biblical models and quotations, they created multiple connections between the saints and biblical and Christological precedents.[47] This practice was comparable to the borrowing from, and quotation of, earlier thinkers such as the Christian Fathers in other writing, particularly exegetical texts, and would have been familiar and recognisable to ecclesiastical scholars.[48]

The recognition of paradigms and their role in the construction of sanctity has led scholars to develop typologies for identifying the various elements and structures of pictorial hagiographic narratives.[49] Recognising the underlying structures of the hagiographical narratives of different 'types' of saints can enable differences in their use, omission and treatment to be identified; this may then reveal the uniqueness of each cycle, and enable possible emphases or themes to be discerned. However, the value of attempts to codify and define the elements which make up saints' Lives of various 'types' is variable. Barbara Abou-El-Haj, expanding upon the model of a typologically-devised "core of imagery" proposed by Victor Elbern in his study of the altar of S. Ambrogio, Milan,[50] outlined a typology of core scenes for the pictorial lives of saints found in manuscripts of the tenth to fourteenth centuries.[51] Yet, while she acknowledged that many events were unique to individual saints, the rigidity of her definitions did not easily accommodate these elements.[52] Moreover, they can make it difficult to acknowledge trends and changes in episodes, particularly within types, over time.[53]

---

[46] Ibid., 11, 176-177, 192-173, 200-171, 202-173, 240-171, 252-173, 284-175, 296-177, 298-179; 198-199, 300-301; 258-259, 282-173

[47] Matter, "The Bible in Early Medieval Saints' Lives," 155-156. For a selection of examples in Bede's VP, see Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 178-179, 180-183, 240-245, 252-255.

[48] Scott DeGregorio, "The Venerable Bede and Gregory the Great: exegetical connections, spiritual departures," *Early Medieval Europe* 18, no. 1 (2010): 45; Daniel Anlezark, "Gregory the Great: Reader, Writer and Read," *Studies in Church History* 48 (2016): 25, 27-28.

[49] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 34-57; Victor H. Elbern, "Der Ambrosiuszyklus am karolingischen Goldaltar zu Mailand," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 7, no. 1 (1953).

[50] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 33-34; Elbern, "Ambrosiuszyklus," 7-8.

[51] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 34-60.

[52] Ibid., 34.

[53] Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 387-388.

Hahn has argued that the definition of core scenes gives a false sense that such events must occur within saints' Lives and that other narrative elements "are superfluous".[54] While the rigidity of the notion of core scenes is indeed problematic, the typology as outlined by Abou-el-Haj does not necessarily discount the value of other narrative elements; in acknowledging the proliferation of events which do not fit with her core-scene definitions, she proposes that such elements should be discussed for their "historical specificity".[55] The contemporary relevance of events included in pictorial narratives is indeed a key facet of their significance. Yet, there is a danger that, in dividing narrative elements into core and 'individual' scenes, only the latter will be examined for their contemporary relevance, or, conversely, their formulaic or Christo-mimetic significance will not be considered. Indeed, as Hahn cautions, attempting to define fixed elements fails to identify the Lives' complexity and nuance.[56]

As an alternative to core scenes, one which provides scope for variation within the repetition of the elements that make up a saintly type, Hahn proposes borrowing and adapting the literary term *topos*.[57] She defined *topoi* as non-original "narrative elements that make use of recognisable visual formulas but that adjust those formulas to their surroundings".[58] This definition is particularly valuable for the study of narrative composition in hagiographic stained glass, where visual formulas and conventions can be derived from a range of sources, rather than being tied to textual versions of Lives. Consequently, it has been adopted by this study for analysis of the narrative in the St Cuthbert Window and the identification of thematic emphases.

Hahn stresses the flexibility of form and length of *topoi*, and suggests that "longer *topoi*, composed of multiple episodes, can more conveniently be called sequences".[59] Exploration of the way in which narrative devices, such as paradigms, juxtapositions and contrasts, are used

---

[54] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 177.
[55] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 34-35.
[56] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 32.
[57] Ibid., 41, 177.
[58] Ibid., 177.
[59] Ibid., 42.

within these sequences can reveal the structure of the narrative as a whole.[60] It should be noted that, while these approaches present a departure from assessing pictorial cycles in relation to text, their terminology is nonetheless derived from textual analysis, and is consequently heavily reliant upon literary rhetorical structures.[61] However, as such terminology often aptly describes visual narrative devices too, it can be usefully employed when analysing stained glass narratives. In this study, these terms are used as tools for the discussion of devices, rather than to indicate or imply a textual origin. Crucially, Hahn's model, identifying *topoi* and sequences, provides greater scope for interpreting the potential significance of variation, and does not prevent the identification of contemporary significance in key narrative events. As a result, it encourages a nuanced assessment of the structure and content of pictorial hagiographic narratives. Consequently, it can be used to identify thematic emphases and attempt to distinguish their significance. The preceding two chapters have identified some of the contemporary interests of the Cuthbertine cult, and the architectural and socio-political context within which the window was created. Consideration of these insights alongside trends in hagiographical narrative construction and visual conventions, can identify possible reasons for thematic emphases.

Chapter 4.2 analyses the construction of the narrative in the St Cuthbert Window, considering the arrangement of scenes within the window's architectural framework, as well as the treatment of sources and narrative devices. Following this, in Chapter 4.3 the ways in which the window combines underlying hagiographical structures with distinctive or unique constructions will be explored, discussing the resulting themes. Where particular thematic emphases are detected, potential links to contemporary interests and individuals will be identified, for further consideration in Chapter 4.4.

4.2 Narrative Construction

Due to the damaged and disarranged state of many fifteenth-century narrative windows, much scholarship has focused upon establishing their subjects and iconography, as

[60] Ibid., 42-43.
[61] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 33.

well as stylistic links between cycles.[62] However, following the precedents set in late twentieth-century studies of high medieval glass, more attention has been paid to narrative construction in the past twenty years. Research by Jill Rickers, Sarah Brown and Nigel Morgan upon the Great East Window, York Minster, and David King's study of the windows of St Peter Mancroft have looked in more depth at iconographic design and stained glass practice.[63] Their research has identified complex narrative design, as well as the range of sources drawn upon by medieval designers.[64] Similarly, Heather Gilderdale-Scott's broader study of the glazing scheme at Great Malvern Priory has highlighted its designers' creativity, particularly noting the adaptation of typological source-material to create non-typological sequences.[65]

The rare survival of a known pictorial source for the St Cuthbert Window, combined with the evidence of its original arrangement and conception, have enabled this study to contribute to this burgeoning body of research, by undertaking a more detailed examination of its narrative construction. This section will consider the factors which affected and supported the structuring of the narrative, followed by the range of sources and their treatment, in order to shed further light on fifteenth-century approaches to narrative design. In particular, the treatment of themes and the creation of emphases within the narrative will be highlighted for further discussion in Section 4.3.

4.2.1 Narrative Construction: Structuring the Story

The role of both stonework and visual devices in structuring the narrative has been highlighted in Chapter 1. This section will look more closely at how the stonework (Figure 4.1) and narrative complexity necessitated the use of visual devices, in order to gain insights into the concerns and sensitivities of the designers. As Chapter 3 has shown, the window was likely conceived at the beginning of the fifteenth century, but the stonework was only completed by *c.*1420-30 and the stained glass was not installed until *c.*1439-47.[66] The limited

---

[62] French, *William Window*, 2-23; French, *East Window*, 2-13.
[63] Rickers, "Glazier," 266-277; King, *Mancroft*, lxxxiii-cxxiii; Brown, *Apocalypse*, 23-43; Brown, *East Window*, 23-25, 30-47, 51-66.
[64] Rickers, "Glazier," 266-277; Brown, *Apocalypse*, 23-43; King, *Mancroft*, lxxxiii-cxxiii.
[65] Gilderdale-Scott, "Great Malvern," 103-107.
[66] Norton, "Richard Scrope," 194.

evidence suggests that the glass was designed to fit the stonework, rather than the two being conceived together, as in the Great East Window, whose stonework was altered close to its glazing date to create numerological symbolism and structure.[67] In particular, the similarity between the stonework in the St Cuthbert Window (s7) and its counterpart, the St William Window (n7), completed *c.*1414, suggests that their superstructures were designed together (Figure 4.4).

While the two windows share the form of their stonework, there are differences in their distribution of iconography within the stained glass. While it is possible that the St Cuthbert Window's narrative structure was adapted from an earlier design, potentially conceived alongside the stonework, no definitive evidence survives to support this theory. Thus, some of these differences may respond to issues detected in the St William Window, given its earlier date. Consequently, the following discussion will focus both upon evidence that the design of the glass responds to the framework provided by the stonework, as well as possible engagement with the earlier choir glazing. Consideration of these editorial choices can provide insights into the concerns of the designers, as well as how, and by whom, they intended the window to be read.

The design of the commemorative section, occupying the entirety of section D, may have responded to the near-invisibility of the donors in row 1 of the St William Window when viewed from the choir (Figure 4.5). In the St Cuthbert Window, the lower register of figures begins halfway up the lowest panel, ensuring that they are not obscured by the sill. This indicates an awareness of the degree of visibility of the window from the choir, and suggests that the window was primarily intended to be viewed from a position directly in front of the high altar (Figure 4.6). Additionally, it suggests that the designers were at least familiar with the design of the earlier choir glazing. Further concerns regarding visibility are evident elsewhere in the window, demonstrated by the plain-glazing of row 13, which is obscured by the triforium bridge. There are similar plain-glazed rows in other fifteenth-century Minster windows, including the St William Window (row 14) and the western choir clerestory glazing

[67] Norton, "Sacred Space," 174-177; Rickers, "Glazier," 270; Brown, *Apocalypse*, 37-38.

(row 1 of windows N8-N11 and S8-S11).[68] A comparable phenomenon is evident at Wells Cathedral, whereby the lowest row of the choir clerestory windows were filled in with stone; Tim Ayers has suggested that this responded to the obscuration of the east window's lowest row.[69] It seems likely that the plain-glazed rows at York Minster also responded to issues of visibility evident in the Great East Window; indeed, while its numerological scheme prevented plain-glazing as a solution, recent conservation has revealed that row 7 has taller panels, pushing the narrative scenes higher and increasing their visibility.[70]

Stonework often plays an integral role in the structuring of late-medieval stained glass. For example, in Lincoln's South Rose window and in the tracery of window n2 at Wells, stained-glass iconography has been shown to respond to the number of apertures created by the stonework.[71] At York, the altered design of the Great East Window's stonework ensures that the transoms underline the iconographic divisions of the main lights.[72] However, in the St Cuthbert Window, only the lowest transom, between the commemorative section (D) and the rest of the narrative (A, B & C), underlines a division evident in the iconography of the glazing (Figure 4.1).

The upper two transoms, which divide the narrative into three sections, do not appear to have served as visual punctuation in the manner proposed by Clara Barnett in her 1991 reconstruction. She suggested that they divided the narrative into three equal chronological sections, so that A, B and C, respectively depicted Cuthbert's childhood, monastic and episcopal years.[73] Barnett's reconstruction was flawed due to the understandable misidentification of several damaged and displaced panels; yet it also contradicts the divisions she proposed, by placing monastic scenes in the lower two rows of section A.[74] The present study reveals that such clear-cut divisions of thematic chronology across the sections did not

---

[68] Ayers, *Wells*, xcii-xciii; French, *William Window*, 10.
[69] Ayers, *Wells*, xci-xcii.
[70] I am grateful to Sarah Brown for drawing my attention to this.
[71] David King, "The Glazing of the South Rose of Lincoln Cathedral," in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Lincoln Cathedral BAA Conference Transactions 8* (London: British Archaeological Association, 1986), 135-136; Ayers, *Wells*, 9, 17, 20-21.
[72] Norton, "Sacred Space," 174-177; Rickers, "Glazier," 270; Brown, *Apocalypse*, 37-38.
[73] Barnett, "Cuthbert Window," 17, 159.
[74] Ibid., 17, 118, 122, 125, 128-130, 149, 150, 159.

exist (Appendix 5.2). However, there are noticeable differences in the narrative structure between the upper two sections (A & B) and the lower section (C); within both A and B, there is a greater tendency to expand events across multiple panels (Appendix 5.4), while greater compression of the narrative is seen in C. Given the evidence of the designers' awareness of visibility, it is possible that their arrangement of the narrative within the stonework responded to the restricted visibility of the upper two sections caused by the triforium bridge of the choir arcade. Section C predominantly depicts Cuthbert's episcopal years, while section D shows royals and prelates. Consequently, the iconography of these two sections may have been considered of greatest relevance to the elite ecclesiastical audience, suggesting a motive for the placement of this iconography in the most visible section of the window. The thematic and structural differences between the sections will be considered in more depth in Chapter 4.3.

It is clear that, in crafting and adapting the narrative to fit within the stonework, the designers were both responding to, and exploiting, the structure it provided. The framing of each panel, not only laterally by the stonework, but also by microarchitectural borders in the glass, is common in fifteenth-century windows. Yet, while this creates the appearance of a regularised grid, the action of episodes is not always restricted within each panel. Consequently, the narrative was not uniformly distributed within it; although each panel typically represents a moment of later chronology to the preceding panel, reading left to right along each row, multiple episodes were sometimes compressed into single panels, while other single episodes were depicted across several panels. Comparable compression and expansion of the narrative is evident in both the Great East Window and St William Window at York Minster.[75] In this way, the designers worked within the constraints of the stonework, as well as exploiting the structure it provides. Each row is limited to five panels, necessitating narrative compression for sequences of more than five scenes in a single row. Yet the row can also be used to structure the narrative, or create emphases through the depiction of single subjects or themes across an entire row. This is evident in the St William Window, where a key miracle featured in the papal bull declaring William's canonisation is spread across all

[75] Brown, *East Window*, 45-47.

five panels of row 12.[76] Like the St William Window, the St Cuthbert Window has more episodes expanded across multiple panels than compressed scenes (Appendix 5.4). Yet it has a greater variation in the form and function of both single- and multi-panel episodes. As in the St William Window, many panels depict a single key moment from the narrative.[77] But there are also many panels which depict or evoke multiple moments from a single episode.[78] Consequently, these panels are intended to be read in a greater variety of ways; the complexity and varied narrative structure is therefore closer to that seen in the Great East Window than the St William Window.[79] In most multi-panel episodes within the St Cuthbert Window (fourteen instances out of seventeen in total), the expansion provides sequential, chronological depiction of the narrative, moving from left to right. In some of these multi-panel scenes, a single moment is depicted in each panel.[80] However, many of this type are more complex, with multiple moments depicted in one or more panels; some elements were intended to be read sequentially, and others simultaneously.[81]

This complexity and variety of structure can be challenging to read and there is evidence that stained-glass designers used both the stonework and visual devices within the glass to guide the viewer. Both rows and mullions can reinforce or punctate the distribution of the narrative. Like the Great East Window, subjects are rarely divided across rows in the St Cuthbert Window; each window has only one instance of an episode continuing onto a subsequent row (Appendix 5.4, A).[82] In the St Cuthbert Window, this editorial choice may indicate the importance of the themes evoked separately by the two panels. Within rows, the mullions can also be used to underline iconographic groupings. In the Great East Window, multi-panel scenes are often grouped as triplets and set within one of the three-light subdivisions of the nine main lights, which are created by two thicker mullions (Figure 4.7).[83] Although there are fewer opportunities for a similar solution in the five-light St Cuthbert

---

[76] French, *William Window*, 16.
[77] Catalogue: 7b, 11d, 13a.
[78] Catalogue: 7a, 13b, 14b, 16d, 17a, 17b.
[79] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 40-43.
[80] Catalogue: 9d, 20a & 9e.
[81] Catalogue: 19e and 14b, in comparison with 13b and 13c.
[82] Catalogue: 22b & 11c; Brown, *Apocalypse*, 27.
[83] Ibid., 41.

Window, two-panel scenes rarely occupy the central light, instead being paired at either the start or end of a row (Appendix 5.4). Moreover, the presence of a central light (c), bordered by thicker mullions on either side, presents the opportunity for an emphasis upon subjects located in this light, or the creation of a central axis. While it appears that the same structure in the St William Window was actively disrupted in favour of an eastward focus upon light e, Sarah Brown has argued that the Great East Window's axial light has particular significance.[84] This also appears to be the case in the St Cuthbert Window, where key scenes predominantly appear in the centre light (Appendix 5.5).

While the stonework was undoubtedly used to guide the viewer, additional visual devices were needed to articulate the intended structure because the narrative flow did not always correspond to this framework. The discussion in Chapter 1 highlighted the importance of gesture, figures and setting in guiding narrative flow and making the subject of scenes clear.[85] The same visual devices are also used to construct thematic emphases; the precise manner and distribution of *topoi* can be used to rhetorical effect, articulating and heightening Cuthbert's sanctity as the narrative progresses.[86] Repetition, which lies at the heart of all hagiographic narratives, is the basis of this structure, functioning as both a semiological and rhetorical device. Scholars such as Kemp, Jordan and Davis have discussed the various forms of repetition and their roles in structuring and articulating meaning in high medieval narrative glass, stressing their importance for creating and emphasising thematic connections.[87] As a visual medium, stained glass provides the iconographer and glazier with the opportunity to reinforce narrative repetitions visually, through the added repetition of forms. Kemp has demonstrated the use of this device to emphasise both repetitions and oppositions in the Prodigal Son window at Bourges.[88]

---

[84] Ibid. I am grateful to Christopher Norton for providing insights into the structure of the St William Window ahead of the publication of his research on the subject. Christopher Norton, discussion, 15/01/2019.
[85] Kemp, *Narratives*, 27, 150, 152; Davis, "Frames of Vision: Architecture and Stained Glass at Clermont Cathedral," 211; Caviness, "Images," 115-116; King, *Mancroft*, lxxxix, xci.
[86] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 40-41; Jordan, "More is Better," 147, 149, 151.
[87] Kemp, *Narratives*, 32-33, 36-38; King, *Mancroft*, lxxxix, xci; Davis, "Frames of Vision: Architecture and Stained Glass at Clermont Cathedral," 200, 211; Jordan, "More is Better," 146-147, 149, 151.
[88] Kemp, *Narratives*, 32, 33.

This device is also evident in the St Cuthbert Window, where repetition and mirroring are used both to underline iconographic parallels between individuals and episodes (Figures 4.8-10),[89] as well as contrasting actions through juxtaposition (Figure 4.11).[90] This plays out across the narrative structure, to create thematic emphases, which are sometimes reinforced by alignment within the stonework or the domination of entire rows. In addition to the heightening of narrative episodes through small differences within a repetitive sequence, [91] reversals or breaks in a pattern can indicate changes in theme or focus (Figure 4.12), or reinforce the importance of an action.[92] The ubiquity of these devices within hagiographic narratives, specifically pictorial cycles, in a range of media, means that the audience would have been sensitive to their significance, enabling them to discern the intended narrative structure. Recognition of these devices in the St Cuthbert Window has enabled the identification of its structure and themes, which will be discussed in Section 4.3.

4.2.2 Narrative Construction: Treatment of Sources

As the discussion of authorship and agency in Chapter 3 has shown, the window was probably conceived and executed through a creative partnership, involving representatives of the Dean and Chapter, Langley and his executors, iconographers and glaziers. Investigation into the use of sources, and comparisons with other cycles, can provide insights into the intended significance and messages of the St Cuthbert Window's iconography, as well as revealing the creativity of the iconographers and glaziers. The survival of YT26 presents a rare opportunity to compare a narrative window with a known pictorial source. Yet, the discussion of the treatment of sources is necessarily limited by the loss of all other pictorial cycles depicting scenes from the *Libellus*, including the windows known to have existed at Durham, glazed *c.*1416-25.[93] These also depicted scenes from Bede's VP, and were potentially influenced by the same pictorial sources as the St Cuthbert Window; it is also likely that other

[89] Catalogue: 16a & 19a; 23b & 21a; 9e & 22b.
[90] Catalogue: 13b & 13c, 15a & 16b; Kemp, *Narratives*, 32-33, 36-37; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 42-43.
[91] Catalogue: 20e & 21d,15a, 17d & 17c; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 41-42; Jordan, "More is Better," 147, 149.
[92] Catalogue: 15b.
[93] DUL, DCD-Sacr.acs 1416-7; DUL, Loc.XXVII:1a; DUL, Misc.Ch. 5719-21; DUL, Misc.Ch. 5727a; DUL, CCB B/82/3 (190015), 10 May 1429.

pictorial and textual cycles would have been available to the designers.[94] Their loss prevents a wider comparison of editorial and iconographic choices within the same medium. As the examples of other hagiographic narratives discussed earlier in this chapter demonstrate, pictorial cycles had the capacity to vary their content and emphases.[95] Consequently, it should not be assumed that the lost cycles at Durham would have been identical to the St Cuthbert Window in content and symbolism, as some past studies have suggested.[96]

Chapter 1 has shown that, when designing the imagery, the hagiographers and glaziers were drawing upon at least one pictorial source, YT26, and two textual sources: the *Libellus* and Bede's VP. Yet the potential use and impact of wider hagiographic conventions and pictorial tropes must also be considered. The following section examines the known sources, in order to establish how they were used by designers of the window. Evidence of less tangible sources of inspiration will also be explored, to understand the wider artistic and iconographic context. The flexibility and selectivity with which source material was treated not only indicates attitudes to the sources, but also sheds light on the designers' iconographic intentions. Consequently, editorial choices can provide insights into both the expression of the Cuthbertine cult and the role of the window within its architectural and devotional setting at York Minster.

4.2.1.1 *Libellus*: Streamlining Textual Confusion

The relationship between the *Libellus* analogues and the Libellan scenes in the window can reveal significant insights into fifteenth-century attitudes to this group of miracles, the contemporary focus of Cuthbert's cult and its expression within York Minster. It is clear that the St Cuthbert Window, despite only depicting roughly one third of the events in the text of the *Libellus*, created a more coherent narrative flow. As we have seen, the *Libellus* is a collection of stories from Scottish and Irish sources, probably first compiled in the 1190s.[97] However, beyond arranging the texts into rough groups, the compiler of the *Libellus* made no attempt to unify the narrative or tackle contradictions in the information provided by the different

[94] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*.
[95] Caviness, "Biblical Stories," 135, 141-142, 145; Morgan, "St Katherine," 169-170; Kemp, *Narratives*, 221.
[96] Knowles, *Essays*, 11; Baker, "Medieval Illustrations," 43.
[97] Crumplin, "Cuthbert," 126; Dodds, "The Little Book of the Birth of St Cuthbert," 64-66.

stories.[98] Consequently, the text lacks a clear narrative thread and is characterised by a meandering chronology. The reconstruction of the narrative in Chapter 1 has shown that the disorganised structure of the *Libellus* is not reflected in the scenes depicted in the St Cuthbert Window. The glass streamlines the narrative, showing a more direct progression from Cuthbert's birth and baptism, to his miraculous displays in front of the bishop, his flight with his mother and resulting miracles, merging into Bede's life through Panel 9b (Appendix 5.1).[99] This is achieved both through the absence of contradictory and confusing elements, including all of the Libellan scenes relating to Cuthbert's adulthood, and through the powerful symbolism of the events chosen.

It is evident that the creation of coherent narratives based on multiple sources was a familiar practice for those responsible for York Minster's monumental choir glazing. There is evidence of such an approach in the Great East Window, which Nigel Morgan has shown to combine iconographic elements from at least two apocalypse manuscript groups in innovative and creative compositions.[100] Moreover, during the most recent conservation of the St William Window, Christopher Norton established that its narrative was carefully constructed by weaving together episodes from diverse textual sources, including chronicles and liturgical material, as well as more official hagiographic material relating to William.[101] Consequently, it is possible that the designers of the St Cuthbert Window combined the Libellan and Bedan narrative sources independently. Nevertheless, there is some evidence that the streamlining of the Libellan narrative in the window parallels its contemporary treatment in other media, suggesting that the designers were responding to wider trends in the Cuthbertine narrative. As discussed above, the lost pictorial cycles at Durham probably included scenes from both the Libellan and Bedan narratives, although no evidence of how the lost cycles combined the two sources survives. However, as we have seen, the fifteenth-century vernacular collection of Cuthbertine hagiography, BL, Egerton 3309, also joins the Libellan and Bedan narratives by

---

[98] Oxford, Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.1r; Dodds, "The Little Book of the Birth of St Cuthbert," 76.
[99] Catalogue: 9b.
[100] Nigel Morgan in Brown, *Apocalypse*, 38-41.
[101] Norton, *St William*, 180-192, 200-202. Christopher Norton, discussion, 15/01/2019. I am extremely grateful to Christopher Norton for discussing his methodology and findings with me, ahead of the publication of his research.

omitting the Libellan events ascribed to Cuthbert's adulthood.[102] This raises the possibility that contemporary pictorial cycles which combined both the *Libellus* and VP could also have merged the narratives at the same juncture as the St Cuthbert Window and Egerton 3309.

Egerton 3309 was probably written in Durham by a member of the monastic community during the first quarter of the fifteenth century, although Christiania Whitehead has recently suggested that it was written for an aristocratic, secular audience.[103] Consequently, it is unlikely, although not impossible, that it was used as a source for the St Cuthbert Window. Nevertheless, Egerton 3309 can provide evidence of contemporary perceptions of the relationships between the various Cuthbertine narratives. Moreover, as Caviness and Manhes-Deremble have cited examples of stained glass potentially influencing vernacular texts, it is possible that the lost cycles at Durham may have affected the structure and content of Egerton 3309.[104] The broader treatment of the source narratives in Egerton 3309 is also comparable to that seen in the St Cuthbert Window, suggesting that both follow contemporary practices, particularly the compiling and refocusing of material of diverse age and provenance.[105] Both Whitehead and Liddy have shown that the presentation and adaptation of the source material, as well as didactic instructions to the reader, were used to express contemporary regional agendas in Egerton 3309.[106] In particular, Liddy highlights how material was edited and omitted to give the impression "that the *Haliwerfolc* accompanied the saint throughout his wanderings and were his constant companions".[107] This is comparable to the omission of Libellan events from the St Cuthbert Window, in order to create a more streamlined narrative.

The selection of the Libellan events in the St Cuthbert Window suggests that the designers used the text as a source creatively; they were not simply 'translating' the texts into images. Instead, they generated effective iconography through their choice of details, not only

---

[102] London, BL, Egerton 3309, f.15r.
[103] Liddy, *Bishopric*, 193; Whitehead, "Regional," 117.
[104] Caviness, "Biblical Stories," 146; Manhès-Deremble and Deremble, *Vitraux Narratifs*, 261.
[105] Whitehead, "Regional," 119.
[106] Ibid., 122-127; Liddy, *Bishopric*, 193-196, 206-207.
[107] Liddy, *Bishopric*, 195.

those drawn from the text, but also inventions, extrapolations and the inclusion of details given elsewhere in the text.[108] The depiction of Cuthbert's birth in the window is arguably the clearest example. Panels 7a and 9c (Figure 4.13 and Figure 4.14) present a sophisticated and visually dense depiction of Cuthbert's birth and related events, conveying the simultaneity of three key aspects more effectively than the textual version:

> For in the cradle where the infant, ***already born***, had been placed, ***brightness of such great brilliance surrounded the whole of the place itself***, which, because of the light's excessive brilliance, hardly anyone had the power to look at. ***For the whole household was believed to be consumed by flames by everyone who was nearby and beside the place.*** And so they ran to help, so that they could extinguish the greedy fire. ***But, arriving there and beholding the property carefully, they found it all untouched and uninjured by fire. At the same time, the bishop was standing alone in the oratory, keeping watch, and was raising himself up in most devoted prayer in the oratory throughout the night. Then the revelation of God, concerning the birth of the boy was impressed upon him*** and suddenly light of astonishing brilliance was pouring over him...[109]

Although the action of both panels is contained within the architectural frames, the scenes have been conceived as a continuous landscape, in order to convey the simultaneity of the action.[110] Panel 7a depicts Cuthbert's birth on the left, with God looking down amidst rays of light, focusing the viewer's eye upon the infant Cuthbert. On the right, the bishop stands with hand raised and gaze directed to the birth; he was originally set within a cloister,[111] conveying his distant location and the simultaneity of his divine enlightenment, as described in the text. By placing the bishop in panel 7a, rather than 9c, the importance of his vision is emphasised, and contrasted with the misinterpretation of the laypeople who mistake the light of God for fire in panel 9c.

---

[108] Catalogue: 8d, 9b.

[109] Author's italics. Oxford, Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.2v. "Nam in cunis ubi infans iam natus collocatus est tantus fulgor claritatis omnem locum ipsum circumdederat. quod pre lucis nimio splendore vix quisquam aliquid intueri preualeret. Nam vicinis quibusque et secus positis tota domus putabatur flammis absumi. Accurrunt itaque ut ignes edaces extinguerent. Sed illuc pervenientes et rem diligencius contuentes omnia integra et ab igne illesa invenerunt. Eo tempore episcopus solus pervigil in oratione substiterat et in oratorio pernox in orationibus devotissime se supra se elevabat. Dei igitur revelatione de pueri nativitate commonitus et luminis repentini admirabili claritate perfusus…"

[110] Catalogue: 7a, 9c.

[111] Catalogue: 7a.

Both panels also demonstrate that the designers were not intending to depict every detail of the text, whether due to other iconographic influences, or to make the action comprehensible to the audience. Cuthbert is not depicted in the cradle, which is nevertheless included in the lower left corner of panel 7a, but is on the bed between his mother and grandmother. This arguably emphasises their roles, as well as creating a stronger visual focus upon the saint. In addition, the two scenes suggest familiarity with the text beyond the key events depicted. Cuthbert's grandmother is not explicitly mentioned in the text, but her presence is evident from both the preceding and subsequent events.[112] Similarly, the setting of the monastery in pastureland with a river and trees accords closely with the description of Cuthbert's birthplace, attributed to Archbishop Matthew, which appears in a later section of the *Libellus*.[113]

There is nuanced and careful engagement with the Libellan source. In particular, the selectivity with which the details of Cuthbert's childhood have been used points to the adaptation and reshaping of the Libellan events as described in the text, to create distinctly different foci in the stained glass.[114] The question of whether the inclusion of scenes from Cuthbert's early life was intended primarily to give greater weight to his childhood within the narrative, or to contribute to Cuthbert's sanctity or the themes of the window, by depicting events which foreshadow his later miracles, will be explored in Section 4.3.

4.2.1.2 Bede's VP: Text and Image

The survival of YT26 presents a rare opportunity to consider a narrative window alongside a known pictorial source. By considering the selectivity and sensitivity with which both narrative episodes and devices were used as sources of inspiration, new insights can be gained into the use and adaptation of sources to fit specific devotional and architectural contexts. As we have seen in Chapters 2 and 3, YT26 was made in Durham *c.*1175-1200 and remained in the priory's possession throughout the medieval period. A notation in the Durham book catalogue of 1416 indicates that it was lent to Archbishop Richard Scrope before

[112] Oxford, Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.2r-3r.
[113] Oxford, Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.3v
[114] Catalogue: 7a, 7b, 7c, 8b, 8d, 9b, 9c, 11b, 21c.

his death in 1405, probably remaining in York until at least 1416 when the catalogue was written.[115] The manuscript was then borrowed by Bishop Neville, who succeeded Langley as bishop of Durham, and whose brother was one of Langley's executors.[116] Consequently, it seems that the manuscript was intended to be used as a source from an early stage. The close relationship between many of its illustrations and the compositions of the St Cuthbert Window panels confirms that the glaziers and iconographers had access to it during the design process. In particular, the repeated borrowing of YT26 suggests that the design work was undertaken at York, marking the window as the point of creative synthesis between sources.

Comparison of the conflation and expansion of scenes in the two cycles not only reveals the creativity with which the YT26 illustrations were used as a source, but can also provide wider insights into the various ways in which glaziers and iconographers drew inspiration from cycles in other media. As we have seen, the depiction of multiple scenes from the same episode, whether within single or multiple panels, is intended to augment the viewer's perception of time and moments within the narrative.[117] In many cycles, including YT26, there is no set formula; each composition is tailored to the requirements of the narrative and intended audience. Despite a predominance of single-page illustrations, there are also instances of multiple-scene and two-page illustrations, as well as the evocation of multiple moments. As discussed in Chapter 2, YT26's selective use of different iconography and compositional arrangements to Univ. 165 was a conscious choice, intended to refocus the narrative to create specific emphases. This is apparent in the extant single-page illustrations which effectively employ a multi-scene structure, clearly showing at least two key moments from an episode.[118] Each can be shown to convey narrative flow and stasis differently, and their densely detailed iconography was used to evoke multiple moments. Only two depict Cuthbert twice, probably because he needed to be shown performing two separate actions for

[115] DCL, MS B.IV.46, f.41v; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 193 n.173.
[116] Ibid., 193; DUL, Misc. Ch. No.2352.
[117] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 46-47; Carrasco, "Construction," 52, 57-58; Pächt, *Pictorial Narrative*, 14-15.
[118] YT26, f.24r, 33v, 39r, 41r, 42v, 44r, 45v, 54r.

the intended emphases to be achieved, rather than to convey the passage of time.[119] For example, in the illustration for Chapter 17, Cuthbert is shown building with the assistance of an angel in the foreground, and banishing the demons from Farne in the background (Figure 4.15).[120]

This illustration was clearly used as a source for panels 15e and 16a (Figure 4.16 and Figure 4.10), where each of the two events are depicted on single panels. Yet it is evident that some elements of the iconography in the panels are also drawn from the text of VP. For example, while the pose of Cuthbert in panel 15e is closely modelled on the illustration, the panel has an outdoor setting which situates the action on Farne, as the text describes.[121] In panel 16a, the glaziers have not copied the exact composition of the illustration; Cuthbert and the angel mirror one another in posture, as in YT26, but their positions are reversed. More significantly, instead of lifting a heavy block, as the illustration shows, they are using a bow compass and set square to measure a portion of stonework between them (Figure 4.10).[122] This may indicate a different interpretation of the text, which describes how Cuthbert moved heavy stones "with angelic aid, and… placed them in the wall", showing the wall rather than the lifting. However, it was common for medieval depictions of creation to show a bow compass, such as in panel 4a, window s27, York Minster (Figure 4.17).[123] This suggests that the glaziers were not only selecting compositional and iconographic details from YT26, but also drawing upon contemporary visual conventions. As we will see, many of the panels whose compositions were inspired by illustrations in YT26 appear to have visually updated their imagery.[124]

---

[119] Ibid., f.24r, 39r.
[120] Ibid., f. 39r.
[121] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 214-215.
[122] Ibid., 216-217.
[123] John Block Friedman, "The Architect's Compass in Creation Miniatures of the Later Middle Ages," *Traditio* 30 (1974): 422; Mary Désirée Anderson, *Drama and Imagery in English Medieval Churches* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 141. s27 4a was originally made for St Martin-le-Grand, Coney Street. Katie Harrison, "'"There is no trace of it in the Minster glass now": An Investigation into the East Window of St. Martin's Coney Street and its Eighteenth-Century Acquisition by York Minster," *York Historian* 32 (2015).
[124] See Chapter 4.2.1.3.

Multi-panel scenes frequently draw iconographic details from the corresponding YT26 illustrations, but often depict different moments to their manuscript counterparts; they divide the narrative sequences differently, or include wholly new iconography.[125] The same selectivity can be seen in the treatment of other illustrations. Many of the panels in the window appear to have drawn elements of their iconography or composition from the corresponding illustration in YT26, although they are never directly copied. Moreover, several panels depict iconography based upon events described in the text of VP, but not shown in the illustrations to YT26.[126] For example, panel 19d (Figure 4.18) shows Cuthbert giving clothing and bread to the poor and disabled, as described in VP, Chapter 26: "He gave food to the hungry, clothing to the suffering".[127] Although the illustration for Chapter 26 has been lost from YT26, the depiction of Cuthbert's consecration at Carlisle probably indicates the subject, if not the composition of the lost illustration.[128] Consequently, the subject of panel 19d appears to have been devised by the glaziers and iconographers as a result of reading of the text. Comparably close textual reading to create iconography not present in the known manuscript sources has been observed in the Great East Window, which drew upon at least two illustrated apocalypse manuscripts.[129] The window's unique compositions have been attributed to John Thornton, the master glazier, probably working with a theological advisor.[130]

In the St Cuthbert Window, a similar close partnership between iconographer and glazier might be indicated by the close textual reading evident in the unique composition of panel 22c (Figure 4.19). Cuthbert is shown being carried into a building by monks, and placing his hand on the head of a monk who kneels alongside him. This corresponds closely with Bede's description:

> And when his illness increased and he saw that the time of his departure was at hand, ***he commanded that he should be carried back to his little***

---

[125] Catalogue: 9d, 20a & 9e; 22b & 11c; 15c & 13d; 15a, 17d & 16b; 13b & 13c; 17c & 20c; 16c & 16d; 17a & 17b; 14b & 19e; 19b, 9a & 20b.
[126] Cross-ref catalogues of other examples.
[127] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 142-143.
[128] Catalogue: 19b. Between fourteen and twenty lines of text are missing, indicating that the leaf lost after f.54v in YT26 contained only a single illustration.
[129] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 40, 42.
[130] Ibid., 38, 40, 43.

> ***dwelling-place and oratory***; it was now the third hour of the day. ***So we carried him thither*** because, owing to the pain of his disease, he could not walk. ***But when we came to the door***, we asked him that he would allow one of us to enter with him to minister to him; although for many years no one except himself had entered it. And looking round us all, he saw the brother whom I mentioned before, who suffered from diarrhoea, and he said: ***'Let Walhstod' (for that was the brother's name) 'enter with me***.'[131]

In contrast, the illustration for Chapter 38 in YT26 (Figure 4.20) shows Cuthbert standing in a boat, touching Wahlstod's sleeve. Consequently, it seems likely that the iconography of panel 22c was devised with reference to the text, rather than following the illustration. Yet, multiple moments are evoked in the panel, by showing Cuthbert being carried, but also touching Wahlstod's head. This thereby shows the moment of his cure, as Bede goes on to report that, after entering the oratory with Cuthbert, it was at the moment the saint touched him that Wahlstod recovered from his affliction.[132] In condensing the two moments into a single image, the designers have employed an approach that is closely comparable to the treatment of the multi-scene, single-page illustrations in YT26.

The comparable complexity of the iconography suggests that the glaziers and iconographers of the St Cuthbert Window were inspired by the YT26 illustrator's use of compression and expansion of the narrative. Indeed, in addition to the similar compression of imagery, there are also many instances within the window where single illustrations in YT26 are expanded across multiple panels in the window, as we have seen. In Chapter 2, it was argued that the proliferation of single-page illustrations in YT26 established a norm which enabled greater emphases to be created when double-page illustrations were used. Consequently, it is possible that the designers of the St Cuthbert Window were inspired by this idea when creating multiple panel scenes, using them in the same way to create emphases within the narrative. This is supported by the use of both iconographically dense illustration, where multiple moments are evoked, and the expansion of scenes across multiple panels, in the Libellan scenes within the window. It suggests that the glaziers and iconographers of the window drew inspiration from YT26 and applied similar techniques across the entire

---

[131] Italics are author's own. Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 280-281.
[132] Ibid.

narrative. This demonstrates the independent creativity of the designers and is indicative of wider stained-glass design practices. As noted above, Nigel Morgan and Sarah Brown have demonstrated comparable selectivity of devices, ideas and iconography in the design of the Great East Window.[133] A comparable augmentation of pictorial and textual narrative sources, to adapt narratives to the medium, is evident in other windows across Europe.[134] Consequently, while the designers of the St Cuthbert Window were inspired by YT26, it is also likely that they were already used to working in such a way. This is also indicated by the editorial treatment of the Bedan narrative. Although most of the events described by Bede are depicted in the window, there is evidence of the selection, omission or summarisation of some elements, most notably posthumous episodes from chapters 41 to 45 of VP. Consequently, it is apparent that the Bedan, like the Libellan, narrative was used selectively and creatively.

4.2.1.3 Established, Evolving and Emerging *Topoi*

In addition to the known sources discussed in the previous two sections, the designers of the St Cuthbert Window would also have drawn upon iconography, ideas and visual conventions which they shared with contemporary practice and narratives in other media. This is particularly evident in their updating of ancient paradigms, and the emergence of new *topoi*, which necessarily drew upon contemporary sources. Links with diverse visual and intangible sources, such as plays or customs, can be difficult to demonstrate, as they may be conceptual as well as iconographical. However, the attempt to trace wider sources can reveal the window's relationship with its contemporary context, and can provide evidence of the interests and concerns of the designers, as well as the intended audience.

As discussed previously, hagiographic narratives rely upon the viewer's recognition of their underlying paradigmatic structures. Therefore, while narratives must follow ancient paradigms to demonstrate how the saint conforms to Christological and hagiographical

---

[133] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 38-41.

[134] Ibid., 40, 42-43; Elena J. Kozina, "Das Bildprogramm der Chorverglasung der Marienkirche in Frankfurt (Oder) und seine historischen Voraussetzungen," in *Glasmalerei im Kontext: Bildprogramme und Raumfunktionen: Akten des XXII. Internationalen Colloquiums des Corpus Vitrearum, Nürnberg, 29. August - 1. September 2004*, ed. Rüdiger Becksmann (Nürnberg: Germanisches Nationalmuseum, 2005), 151; Gill, "Monastic Murals," 68.

models, they must also relate and appeal to contemporary interests. Awareness of this issue is evident in the writing of medieval scholars and hagiographers, such as Gregory the Great, who recognised the need for continued renewal of hagiographic narratives to maintain their efficacy.[135] This was particularly important for pictorial narratives, as a key justification for the creation of religious imagery was its perceived ability to better engage the viewer and inspire their devotion.[136] Indeed, throughout the medieval period, concerns were expressed regarding the ability of images to convey the significance of the narratives they depicted.[137] Consequently, pictorial hagiographic traditions were effectively 'updated' over time, as each iteration of a pictorial cycle visually contemporised paradigms and *topoi* using current conventions, just as the underlying narratives were renewed and updated to ensure their continued efficacy.[138] The St Cuthbert Window employs both contemporised ancient visual *topoi*, as well as newly-emerged visual conventions. The range of potential sources for such devices can provide insights into the connections between narratives and visual language in a variety of media.

The adaptation and aesthetic updating of historic visual *topoi* can be found throughout the window.[139] For example, the composition of panel 13a, which shows Cuthbert preaching (Figure 4.21), can be linked to an ancient paradigm of preaching, where the preacher stands on the left, sometimes with companions, making a gesture of blessing or talking to the audience, who stand on the right, often arguing amongst themselves (Figure 4.22).[140] Hahn

---

[135] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 35; Anlezark, "Gregory the Great: Reader, Writer and Read," 28; Odo John Zimmermann, trans, *Gregory the Great: Dialogues* (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1959), I:1, 6; I:7, 30.
[136] Herbert L. Kessler, *Studies in Pictorial Narrative* (London: The Pindar Press, 1994), 33-34; Lawrence G. Duggan, "Was Art Really the 'Book of the Illiterate'?," in *Reading Images and Texts, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy* (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2005), 67-71, 77-80; Celia Chazelle, "Memory, Instruction, Worship: "Gregory's" Influence on Early Medieval Doctrines of the Artistic Image," in *Gregory the Great: A Symposium*, ed. John C. Cavadini (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995), 183-185.
[137] Celia M. Chazelle, "Pictures, books, and the illiterate: Pope Gregory I's letters to Serenus of Marseilles," *Word & Image* 6, no. 2 (1990): 145-147; Kessler, *Studies*, 34-35; Duggan, "'Book of the Illiterate'," 67.
[138] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 35, 41; Kemp, *Narratives*, 222; Bugslag, "St. Eustace and St. George: Crusading Saints in the Sculpture and Stained Glass of Chartres Cathedral," 458.
[139] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 274-275; Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 46-47, 349-354; Manhès-Deremble and Deremble, *Vitraux Narratifs*, 88-90, 108-109.
[140] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 142-143.

suggested that this was one of several specific compositions, drawn from early cycles of the Lives of Christ and the apostles, which were retained through successive depictions due to the importance of the key saintly actions they evoked.[141] This arrangement can be found in pictorial hagiographic cycles in a wide range of media, including Univ. 165 and YT26, and windows at Le Mans Cathedral (Figures 4.23-5).[142] The evolution of this *topos* and closely-related variations can be linked to changes in preaching practices over time. For example, a tenth-century manuscript illustration of St Kilian preaching (Figure 4.26) and a thirteenth-century image of St Martin preaching in Window 20 at Chartres (Figure 4.27) both show the saint centrally, raised above the congregation on a platform.[143] Claudine Lautier identified this as a pulpitum, noting similar depictions in other French glass and the use of a pulpitum at Chartres from at least 1210.[144] The importance of portraying contemporary practice, in combination with the enduring value of the historic paradigm, is indicated by thirteenth- and fourteenth-century versions of both forms at Chartres (Figure 4.28) and at St Ouen, Rouen (Figure 4.29).[145] Likewise, panel 13a (Figure 4.21) closely resembles near-contemporary depictions of preaching in both stone and glass at York Minster (Figure 4.30-2), indicating both the recognisability of the image and the contemporary proliferation of the archetype.

The representations of charity within the window may provide insights into its relationship with other media and contexts. Panels 19c and 19d (Figure 4.33 and Figure 4.18) represent a common textual *topos* of the charitable saint.[146] There is no single visual model, perhaps because charity was variously conveyed: St Martin halves his cloak, St Nicholas gives coins, and St Lucy distributes food and her possessions.[147] While many depictions have similar structures, with the saint on the left, proffering alms to the poor or sick on the right, they are otherwise diverse. Yet, while the composition of panels 19c and 19d (Figure 4.33 and Figure

---

[141] Ibid.
[142] Ibid., 142-143, 145-146; Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 75, 330-331 397, 402, 406, 412.; Oxford, University College, MS 165, p.43 (hereafter cited as Univ. 165); YT26, f.22v.
[143] Manhès-Deremble and Deremble, *Vitraux Narratifs*, 330; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 148.
[144] Lautier, "Sacred Topography," 180-181.
[145] Ibid., 180; Manhès-Deremble and Deremble, *Vitraux Narratifs*, 340-341.
[146] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 201, 241.
[147] Manhès-Deremble and Deremble, *Vitraux Narratifs*, 330-331, 356; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 33, 94, 109-111, 234, 225-228, 225, plate 106.

4.18) follows ancient paradigms, with Cuthbert on the left and the needy on the right, panel 19d is iconographically closer to contemporary depictions of lay charity; for example, the corporal acts of mercy window at All Saints, North Street, employs similar details such as the clothing and bread basket (Figures 4.34-6). These were themselves appropriations of Christological imagery, with their own charitable *topoi*, which reached new prominence in the later middle ages.[148] As contemporary episcopal models of charity included similar requirements, such as the giving of money, food and bread, the imagery employed in the St Cuthbert Window may have drawn inspiration from popular contemporary depictions of lay charity.[149] This may indicate that the glaziers were drawing upon imagery from subjects which they commonly depicted elsewhere.

Similarly, the depiction of a birth attendant, or midwife, in panel 7a, at Cuthbert's birth (Figure 4.13), may indicate how narrative elements drew upon contemporary interests and imagery evident in other narratives and media. The increasing inclusion of midwives in depictions of the Nativity can be linked to an apocryphal account of the doubting and believing midwives, which was popularised as part of the Virgin's cult and featured widely in art and drama.[150] Brett Rothstein has argued that the two midwives in Robert Campin's Dijon *Nativity*, *c.*1425 (Figure 4.37), were intended to serve a didactic function, by both paralleling the possible responses of viewers and guiding them by demonstrating the ideal engagement.[151] The midwives in the window do not appear to perform this function. Yet, the popularity of this tradition may have driven the increasing inclusion of midwives in narratives relating saints' births and their miracles, including the St Cuthbert Window, where

---

[148] Sarah Pedersen, "Piety and Charity in the Painted Glass of Late Medieval York," *Northern History* 36, no. 1 (2000): 40-42.

[149] James William Brodman, *Charity and Religion in Medieval Europe* (Catholic University of America Press, 2009), 5, 12, 16; Pedersen, "Piety and Charity in the Painted Glass of Late Medieval York," 40-42; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 188; David Lepine, "Cathedrals and Charity: Almsgiving at English Secular Cathedrals in the Later Middle Ages," *The English Historical Review* CXXVI, no. 522 (2011): 1069, 1080-1081; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 303.

[150] Fiona Harris-Stoertz, "Midwives in the Middle Ages? Birth Attendants, 600–1300," in *Medicine and the Law in the Middle Ages*, ed. Wendy J. Turner and Sara M. Butler, *Medieval Law and Its Practice 17* (Leiden: BRILL, 2014), 60, 65, 67-68; Bret Louis Rothstein, *Sight and Spirituality in Early Netherlandish Painting* (Cambridge: University Press, 2005), 23-26.

[151] Rothstein, *Sight*, 24-30. I am grateful to Jeanne Nuechterlein for drawing my attention to representations of midwives in fifteenth-century Netherlandish painting.

they are clearly not intended to evoke the apocryphal episode, but are shown performing caretaking tasks (Figure 4.13, Figure 4.14 and Figure 4.38).[152] Depictions including such figures were not aimed solely at lay audiences, as demonstrated by examples in a manuscript known to have been made for an Augustinian canon.[153] Indeed, the range of media in which they appear suggests they were not inspired solely by literary sources, or specific pictorial models. Instead, it appears that they were also drawn from wider trends in narrative presentation, including plays and cycles in other media, with which the glaziers, iconographers and commissioners of the window would have been familiar, albeit to different extents.

The same may be true of figures who appear to guide the viewer's response through their reactions to the narrative episodes; they not only indicate the scene's significance, but also the ideal, perhaps even prescribed, reaction to the miracles they witness.[154] For example, in panel 20c (Figure 4.39), the monk who witnesses Cuthbert healing Hildmer's wife crosses his hands across his chest in pious reaction.[155] As noted above, Rothstein has argued that comparable figures in fifteenth-century Netherlandish paintings provide a didactic function, as their status as witnesses to events parallels the viewer's.[156] Similar interpretations have been proposed for the reactions of Peter the Deacon in Gregory's *Dialogues*.[157] Furthermore, as the figures reacting are usually either monks or high-status laymen it may be that their status was intended to support their role as exemplars by making them recognisable and relatable to the audience. For example, the vicars choral might be expected to relate to the monks, while the elite clerical audience would be in frequent contact with high-status laymen, as Langley's career shows.[158] Prelates not only came from, or served in, noble households, but maintained

---

[152] Elizabeth L'Estrange, *Holy Motherhood: Gender, Dynasty and Visual Culture in the later Middle Ages* (Manchester: University Press, 2008), 1-4, 8, plates 1, 2, 5; Harris-Stoertz, "Midwives in the Middle Ages? Birth Attendants, 600–1300," 68, 70; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 446-448; King, *Mancroft*, 30; Christopher Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 16, 18.
[153] L'Estrange, *Holy*, 8.
[154] Catalogue: 11d, 15c, 14a, 15d, 20c, 21a.
[155] Catalogue: 20c.
[156] Rothstein, *Sight*, 26-30.
[157] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 38; Matthew Dal Santo, *Debating the Saints' Cult in the Age of Gregory the Great*, Oxford Studies in Byzantium (Oxford: University Press, 2012), 28, 30-31, 86-89. Dal Santo disputes that Peter should be interpreted solely as a literary device, but acknowledges his essential role in enabling Gregory to explore the themes in which he is interested.
[158] Storey, *Langley*, 219-224.

their own sizeable retinues, which included secular clerks; these figures may therefore have been intended to provide Cuthbert with a comparable 'household'.[159] For example, the figure accompanying Cuthbert in panel 10d (Figure 4.2) would potentially have been readily identifiable to the fifteenth-century clerical elite, who were often required to travel, and for whom solo travel would have been incomprehensible, given its dangers.[160] Not only does this suggest the intended audience of the window, it may also reveal sensitivity to the increasing opulence of episcopal lifestyles in the later middle ages, which was at odds with Cuthbert's asceticism.

These 'reactionary' figures also suggest a link with drama, as they are similar to members of the chorus in medieval plays, who comment upon the action, often providing didactic or moral messages.[161] The popularity of the mystery plays in York would have provided the opportunity for exchange of ideas, formats and visual *topoi*. [162] The relationship between medieval drama and narratives in various media has been considered by a number of scholars.[163] However, specific iconographic links have proved difficult to demonstrate due to drama's ephemerality, as both Kemp and King have observed.[164] For example, both the Hosiers' Corpus Christi pageant and the Great East Window employ the same unusual iconography of Moses (instead of Aaron) holding a serpent-headed staff.[165] Richard Beadle

---

[159] Catalogue: 9d, 9e, 20a, 21d.Woolgar, *Great Household*, 47, 14-15, 46-47; Storey, *Langley*, 92-93, 95-98.
[160] Woolgar, *Great Household*, 8, 15-16, 19, 34, 41, 188; Margaret Wade Labarge, *Medieval Travellers: the Rich and Restless* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1982), 119, 137-138, 140, 148.
[161] Patrice Pavis, *Dictionary of the Theatre: Terms, Concepts, and Analysis* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 54; Baxandall, *Painting*, 71-73.
[162] William Tydeman, "An Introduction to Medieval English Theatre," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Theatre*, ed. Richard Beadle (Cambridge: University Press, 1994), 2, 35; Friedman, *Northern English*, 7, 178.
[163] Anderson, *Drama and Imagery in English Medieval Churches*, 59, 107, 122-123, 135-137, 140-141; Meg Twycross, "The Theatricality of Medieval English Plays," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Theatre*, ed. Richard Beadle (Cambridge: University Press, 1994), 45; Kemp, *Narratives*, 145-153; Lynn F. Jacobs, *Early Netherlandish Carved Altarpieces, 1380-1550: Medieval Tastes and Mass Marketing* (Cambridge: University Press, 1998), 70; Alan J. Fletcher, "The N-Town Plays," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Theatre*, ed. Richard Beadle (Cambridge: University Press, 1994), 180-181; King, *Mancroft*, lxxxvi, lxxxviii.
[164] Jacobs, *Carved Altarpieces*, 71; Kemp, *Narratives*, 149-150, 152-153; King, *Mancroft*, lxxxvi, lxxxviii, 20, 30.
[165] Brown, *East Window*, 59; Richard Beadle, ed. *The York Plays: A Critical Edition of the York Corpus Christi Play as Recorded in British Library Additional MS 35290*, 2 vols., vol. 1, Early English Text Society,

has demonstrated that the play derives this detail from the fourteenth-century *Middle English Metrical Paraphrase of the Old Testament*.[166] Yet it is unclear whether the Great East Window drew upon the play or the paraphrase.

King has suggested that links with drama might explain "unusual" additional figures in the glass at St Peter Mancroft, and that theatrical sets may have inspired architectural and structural imagery, but he also notes the latter's similarity to continental panel paintings.[167] The cutaway scenes that King highlights are similar to those in the St Cuthbert Window, but they had also been employed by YT26 (Figure 4.38, Figure 4.40 and Figure 4.41).[168] Consequently, it may be more productive to consider the comparable approaches to narrative construction between these various media, than to seek specific visual relationships. For instance, the comparable emphasis upon the importance of settings in theatrical productions and continental painting may provide evidence of connections between diverse media and the conception of stained glass. Lynn Jacobs has argued persuasively that mystery plays and early Netherlandish carved altarpieces exhibit comparable approaches to narrative construction and presentation.[169] In particular, she links the increase in figures and density of narrative in carved altarpieces to comparable trends in plays.[170] Moreover, she suggests that the comparable narrative presentation and complexity, as well as the ubiquity of plays, would have made these similarities evident to audiences.[171] It is possible that a comparable link can be suggested for some of the narrative devices in the St Cuthbert Window, including the addition of figures and their function. Indeed, as the mystery plays were organised and performed by the guilds, they would certainly have been accessible to the glaziers, who might have taken inspiration for elements of their own narrative design.[172]

Supplementary Series, 23 (Oxford: University Press, 2009), 72-73; Richard Beadle, ed. *The York Plays: A Critical Edition of the York Corpus Christi Play as Recorded in British Library Additional MS 35290*, 2 vols., vol. 2, Early English Text Society, Supplementary Series, 24 (Oxford: University Press, 2013), 68, 70, 75.

[166] Brown, *East Window*, 59; Beadle, *York Plays*, vol. 2, 70, 75.

[167] King, *Mancroft*, lxxxvi, lxxxviii, 20, 30.

[168] Ibid., lxxxvi.

[169] Jacobs, *Carved Altarpieces*, 70-71.

[170] Ibid.

[171] Ibid.

[172] Twycross, "Theatricality," 39-42; Tydeman, "Introduction," 2-3, 20, 25.

In the absence of clearer evidence, these comparisons are most valuable for their demonstration of the complexity of narrative construction, and the potential for the exchange of ideas between media. Moreover, they intersect with evidence, discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, that the patron and his agents engaged with and commissioned narratives in a range of media. Recognising these multiple avenues for connection and exchange supports a more nuanced analysis of the themes of the St Cuthbert Window, one which recognises the diversity of individuals involved in its design, and the potentially complex and multivalent meanings intended.

4.3. Iconographic Themes

It is evident that the narrative was skilfully designed, with multivalent iconography which could articulate not only Cuthbertine hagiography, but also contemporary interests. The identification of underlying hagiographic paradigms will both establish their functions, and elucidate additional meanings and agendas. As discussed above, episcopal saints' lives were modelled upon Christ and the apostles, particularly St Peter, the first bishop, in order to establish them as worthy successors.[173] Consequently, Cuthbert's life contains numerous *topoi* and themes consistent with the episcopal type.[174] Yet, as conceptions of the ideal bishop evolved over time, these ideas were also naturally articulated in hagiographic iconography.[175] Moreover, thematic emphases and iconographic choices can also articulate contemporary socio-political agendas, as well as specific devotional interests. As discussed above, the number of individuals potentially exercising agency in the window's design raises the possibility that it expressed a range of agendas. This section will consider the extent to which themes are evident in the iconography of the St Cuthbert Window, raising questions as to whether they express local, national or devotional agendas, which will then be explored in Section 4.4.

The following discussion approaches the narrative thematically, and broadly chronologically, to enable the themes and their distribution within the window to be more

[173] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 40, 170; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 466-467, 467 n.477; Ward, *Bede*, 89.
[174] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 131, 141; Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 37-38.
[175] Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 284, 292-283.

effectively identified and analysed. Many panels have multiple meanings, or contribute to more than one hagiographic theme. Consequently, the categories within which specific panels are discussed should not be interpreted as their only narrative significance.

4.3.1 Propitious Childhood

By beginning with Cuthbert's birth, depicted across two panels, and dedicating three rows to scenes from Cuthbert's childhood, the designers established childhood as a key theme. Childhood episodes, which demonstrated sanctity through noble parentage, auspicious births and propitious actions, increased in number as episcopal and high-born saints became more common.[176] Yet, while hagiographic interests changed over time, they also varied between individual cults. Consequently, childhood episodes were not included in every episcopal saint's life, nor were they always reduced to standardised images, although *topoi* were often employed. Instead, pictorial hagiographers, including designers of stained glass, responded to the interests of specific cults by creating multivalent images which evoked their archetypal significance in combination with the 'personalised' symbolism of the saint.

As we have seen, Cuthbert's cult first exhibited a specific interest in his childhood in the twelfth-century *Libellus*, which complements the Bedan narrative with an auspicious birth and notable childhood miracles.[177] The date at which these narrative scenes first appeared in pictorial cycles is uncertain; none of the extant Libellan manuscripts are illustrated, and no evidence survives of thirteenth- or fourteenth-century cycles. However, this development corresponds with wider trends in hagiographic stained glass, as it appears that the rising importance of birth and childhood episodes, which is apparent in other media from the twelfth century, was not immediately mirrored in stained glass.[178] Broad analysis is limited by the partial and total loss of many stained-glass cycles of comparable scale to the St Cuthbert Window.[179] However, based on extant examples, prior to the fifteenth century very few

---

[176] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 37; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 173-174, 177-178, 181, 507-509.
[177] Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.1r-7v; Crumplin, "Cuthbert," 126; Clancy, "Magpie Hagiography," 216-217.
[178] Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 177-179, 507-508; Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 37, 154-155.
[179] Hebgin-Barnes, *Lincolnshire*, 304-305, xxxix; Caviness, *Canterbury*, 158, 175; James, *Abbey of S. Edmund*, 186, 190–183, 199, 203; Darlington, *Vita Wulfstani*, 4-5; Engel, *Worcester Cathedral*, 200; Flower, "Wulftan," 123-129.

hagiographic narratives began with birth or extensive childhood sequences.[180] For example, in twelfth- and thirteenth-century cycles, only the life of St Nicholas regularly began with his birth.[181] Manhès-Deremble has argued that the elaboration of his infancy and childhood miracles at Chartres creates a unique emphasis, although she notes that the St Lubin window also includes childhood scenes with episcopal significance.[182] At both Chartres and Bourges, the windows for other bishop saints, such as St Martin and St Thomas Becket, lack the childhood episodes that are present in their textual *vitae*.[183]

By the fifteenth century, it is clear that Cuthbert's birth and childhood scenes were considered crucial narrative elements in stained-glass cycles of his life at Durham. Two monumental narratives began with Cuthbert's birth, and presumably childhood miracles, while his birth was selected as one of three scenes set in the window above Cuthbert's altar in the Chapel of the Nine Altars.[184] The possibility that the designers at York followed precedents established in the Durham cycles must be acknowledged, given their shared patronage and the authority of Cuthbert's resting place. However, they also express wider contemporary trends in hagiographic narrative construction. The extant fifteenth-century examples indicate that childhood scenes became more common in stained glass cycles, although the particular character of each cult was a significant factor in determining content. For example, it is unsurprising that the Life of St Andrew at Greystoke began with his calling by Christ.[185] However, in contrast to the thirteenth-century French cycles, the St Martin Window at St

---

[180] For example, Bourges Cathedral, window 19; Chartres Cathedral, window 39 and possibly originally window 14, whose lower panels, where childhood scenes might have been located, have been lost; Manhès-Deremble and Deremble, *Vitraux Narratifs*, 356, 320; Kurmann-Schwarz, "Seeing and Understanding Narrative and Thematic Method in the Stained Glass of the Choir of Konigsfelden ca.1330-40," in *The Four Modes of Seeing: Approaches to Medieval Imagery in Honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness*, ed. Evelyn Staudinger Lane, Elizabeth Carson Pastan, and Ellen M. Shortell (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), 264.

[181] Bourges, window 19; Chartres, windows 14 and 39; Manhès-Deremble and Deremble, *Vitraux Narratifs*, 124.

[182] Ibid., 103, 124.

[183] Ibid., 328, 330.; Bourges Cathedral, window 7.

[184] Fowler, *Rites*, 3, 76-77, 118.

[185] Chadwick, "The Ancient Glass in the East Window of the Church of St Andrew, Greystoke, Cumbria," 27-28; Procter and Wordsworth, *Breviarium Sarum*, 6; Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, trans. William Granger Ryan, 2 vols., vol. 1 (Princeton: University Press, 1993), 13.

Martin-le-Grand, York, *c.*1432, begins with the saint's birth.[186] As this window was likely made by the same workshop as the St Cuthbert Window, this choice may reflect a local, or possibly national, trend. Indeed, while the panel's *titulus* suggests that it was inspired by details of Martin's birthplace provided in both his *vita* and breviary reading, near-contemporary extant continental cycles in other media begin with Martin's childhood decision to become a catechumen rather than his birth.[187]

The possibility of a national trend is supported by evidence that a number of English cults increasingly emphasised and elaborated propitious childhoods, in both textual and pictorial narratives, during the fifteenth century.[188] This coincided with growing interests in English, and particularly Anglo-Saxon, saints and the revitalisation of their cults, often to political ends.[189] The few extant examples of late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century stained glass cycles also indicate an increasing interest in childhood episodes. This can be linked to the popularity of the early life of Christ himself, but also demonstrates the importance of family as a locus of sanctity, which was also expressed by the growing popularity of the Holy Kindred.[190] Nevertheless, these later cycles demonstrate that the selection of narrative scenes was still guided by the popular conception of each cult. The life of St Helen, at Ashton-under-Lyne, began with her birth, education and marriage,[191] while scenes of St Thomas Becket's parentage, birth and education are among the surviving panels from St Michael-le-Belfrey, York, *c.*1525-35.[192] In both cases, the saint's popular cult exhibited a specific interest in their

---

[186] John A. Knowles, "The West Window, St Martin-le-Grand, Coney Street, York," *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* XXXVIII (1955): 161; Manhès-Deremble and Deremble, *Vitraux Narratifs*, 330.
[187] Clare Stancliffe, *St. Martin and his Hagiographer: History and Miracle in Sulpicius Severus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 87, 112; Margaret B. Freeman, *The St. Martin Embroideries: A Fifteenth-Century Series Illustrating the Life and Legend of St. Martin of Tours* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1968), 9-10, 16, 23; Colin Eisler, "Two Early Franco-Flemish Embroideries - Suggestions for Their Settings," *The Burlington Magazine* 109, no. 775 (1967): 578.; Paris, BNF, Latin 17294, f.638r. The *titulus* in panel 5d, window n2, St. Martin-le-Grand reads "Ortus sabarie martinus prodit ad esse R S"; I am grateful to Amanda Daw for her help in establishing this detail.
[188] Lewis, "History, Historiography," 128.
[189] Ibid., 128-133.
[190] Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 507-509; Waters, "Power," 83-84.
[191] Reddish, "The St Helen Window, Ashton-under-Lyne: A Reconstruction," 152.
[192] Koopmans, "Becket," 1049, 1063, 1060.

parentage, providing likely motives for the choice of scenes.[193] In particular, the elaboration of Becket's childhood in the York glass includes scenes known only from Caxton's *Golden Legend*, compiled in 1483.[194]

The St Cuthbert Window's emphasis on childhood may therefore fit within a national hagiographic trend. Comparison with the St William Window underlines the importance of each cult's specific interests, demonstrating that a combination of factors affected narrative construction, but also highlighting potential motives for some of the editorial choices in the St Cuthbert Window. The St William Window is striking in its focus on the posthumous miracles of the saint, and is notably scant in its treatment of William's early years. The lowest row of the window begins with the marriage of William's parents (2a) and his baptism (2b), and then jumps to William's clerical career.[195] This reflects the lack of elaboration of William's childhood within his cult, with the exception of an emphasis upon his noble parentage, which may respond to his parents' illegitimacy.[196] Yet, it may also articulate the growing importance of aristocratic ancestry as a saintly *topos*.[197] Indeed, William's mother wears a crown, highlighting her royal status, while the clothing of his father and the attendants also emphasise their nobility (Figure 4.42). Moreover, Oliver Fearon has observed a comparable emphasis in the late fifteenth-century alabaster depicting William's birth, where the royal figures surrounding the bed dominate the scene.[198] The existence of birth scenes for William

---

[193] Reddish, "The St Helen Window, Ashton-under-Lyne: A Reconstruction," 151-152; Koopmans, "Becket," 1060. There is similar evidence in continental examples. See for example, the life of St Bernard from Altenberg Abbey, c.1505-20 in Dagmar R. Täube et al., *Rheinische Glasmalerei: Meisterwerke der Renaissance*, 2 vols., vol. 2: Katalog (Regensburg: Schnell + Steiner, 2007), 23-34.

[194] Koopmans, "Becket," 1062-1063.

[195] Although rearranged at various times, this seems to largely reflect the original order. Only panel 2d, which was inserted into the window in 1955, is out of place in this row. Christopher Norton has suggested that a panel depicting William's deanship would originally have occupied this location. Christopher Norton, discussion, 15/01/2019; Torre, James, "The Antiquities of York Minster Collected out of the Records of the Said Church and Some Other Authorities", 1691, York, Minster Library, L1/7, f.35r-39r; James Fowler, "On a Window Representing the Life and Miracles of S. William of York, at the North End of the Eastern Transept, York Minster," *Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal* 3 (1875): 210; French, *William Window*, 35.

[196] Norton, *St William*, 5, 181.

[197] Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 507-508.

[198] Oliver Fearon, "Pieces from Peaseholme: Six Medieval Alabasters and their Context in Fifteenth Century York" (Unpublished MA Thesis, The University of York, 2013), 17-18.

in other media also highlight the deliberate emphasis on his parentage, rather than birth, in n7.

While there is no comparable emphasis on Cuthbert's parentage, the royal status of his mother and grandmother is similarly indicated by their clothing (Figure 4.43). This may demonstrate the importance of the *topos* within his cult; indeed, two centuries later, the author describing the lost Durham glazing stressed Cuthbert's pedigree: "he was come of a princly race, for his father was a prince \king/, and his mother a princes \kings/ daughter", suggesting the importance of his parentage continued to be transmitted.[199] The emphasis upon Cuthbert's birth corresponds with the Durham cycles, demonstrating its importance to his contemporary cult. Yet comparison with the St William Window also highlights the specific representation of Cuthbert's birth at York, particularly the careful representation of his parentage, as well as suggesting motives for these choices. The designers selected and combined Libellan events to create distinctly different foci in the stained glass. This is evident in the careful editing of the circumstances of Cuthbert's birth in order to emphasise his royal heritage, and the Christological overtones of the scenes, while avoiding elements which would have detracted from other themes of the window. In particular, while Cuthbert's mother and grandmother feature prominently in both his birth and baptism scenes (Figure 4.13 and Figure 4.43), his father is notably absent.[200] Other cults have placed comparable emphases on virtuous female relatives, with little reference to arguably 'unproblematic' fathers.[201] However, the decision to begin with Cuthbert's birth, omitting details of the rape by which he was conceived, likely indicates that, while his royal provenance was desirable, the depiction of an ignoble king was less so. Indeed, the relationship between kings and bishops conveyed by Cuthbert's interactions with King Ecgfrith, as well as the royal display in the commemorative section, suggest a compelling motive for the omission of Cuthbert's father.

---

[199] DUL, Cosin B.II.11, f.75v; Fowler, *Rites*, 77.
[200] Catalogue: 7a, 7b.
[201] Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 508.

Cuthbert's father is effectively replaced by bishops, as holy forebears, providing more propitious symbolism. In particular, the bishop's role in Cuthbert's birth appears intended to foreshadow his episcopacy, evoking the divine prophecy received by the bishop in the textual analogue.[202] Furthermore, within the scenes depicting Cuthbert's childhood, a series of bishops take on the role of male guardian, in an exaggeration of this theme as it occurs within the textual analogue. This emphasis is achieved through the selection of scenes which feature either bishop-guardians or Cuthbert's mother, ensuring that they accompany the saint in all but the last of the Libellan scenes. While perhaps also intended to evoke parallels with the commonly depicted education of Mary by priests, this editorial choice contributes to both the royal and episcopal themes of the wider window. The bishops authenticate both Cuthbert's suitability for his future office and his sanctity, through the recognition of his worthiness by high-ranking clerics. This is made explicit by panel 9b, which merges two events of comparable significance from the *Libellus* and Bede's VP: Cuthbert's robes protecting his holy honour and an infant scolding Cuthbert for playing in a manner unbefitting a future bishop (Figure 4.44).[203] The merging of the two events joins the two narrative sources, while, strikingly, the child's prophecy echoes the bishop's at the start of the narrative. Additionally, the visual *topos* of Cuthbert's robes draws parallels with the first bishop, St Peter, whose robes similarly remain upright in depictions of his head-down crucifixion (Figure 4.45).[204]

Such echoes and repetitions provide emphases and enhance the sense of foreshadowing that defines a propitious childhood. This is also evident in the presence of God at Cuthbert's birth and death (Figure 4.13 and Figure 4.46). The alignment of the panels, placing Cuthbert's death directly beneath his birth, in the final row of the narrative (Appendix 5.6), suggests that the close visual echo was intended to add significance beyond the use of a common *topos*. Moreover, God's presence at Cuthbert's earthly and heavenly births can be seen to emphasise Cuthbert's special relationship with God. As we shall see, this key theme of Cuthbert's life is further articulated through other miracles within the window. Indeed, the

[202] Oxford, Bodleian, Fairfax 6, f.2v.
[203] Catalogue: 9b.
[204] Earlier examples can be seen in York Minster, CHs2 8e, and in continental examples, such as Chartres St Pere, window 221, and Le Mans Cathedral, window 108 5d.

miracle scenes selected for Cuthbert's childhood appear to have been chosen because they prefigure later miracles, demonstrating Cuthbert's power of prophecy (panels 8b, 10b and 22a) and receipt of divine support (panels 8d, 9d, 20a and 9e).[205] Consequently, in a common hagiographic construction, they foreshadow these themes on a more specific level, just as the propitious childhood prefigures Cuthbert's rise to sanctity in adulthood.[206]

4.3.2 Visions and the Power of Prophecy

Cuthbert's visions and power of prophecy occur throughout his life and have been identified as a key theme within both textual and pictorial versions of the narrative.[207] Although these themes are closely related, it is unclear whether the viewer was intended to distinguish symbolic differences between the miraculous ability to witness geographically distant events and the miraculous foresight of future events. Consequently, both will be discussed in this subsection. As common *topoi* of sanctity, depictions of visions and prophecy within the window provide fundamental evidence of Cuthbert's holiness.[208] Yet, the precise selection and treatment of such episodes within the window suggests that they also contribute to other themes and contemporary interests, so that their emphasis within the window is not solely due to their importance to Cuthbert's cult.

All three vision episodes from the Bedan narrative are depicted in the St Cuthbert Window: Cuthbert's visions of Aidan's soul (panels 7d and 10a), of the death of Ecgfrith (panels 9a and 20b) and of a man dying in a fall (panel 21b).[209] This study rejects Zoe Dumelow's interpretation that Cuthbert praying in the sea (panel 13d) can be considered a true vision scene; her arguments for its Christological parallels provide a more persuasive interpretation.[210] However, Cuthbert's childhood vision of an unborn calf (panel 8b) can arguably be added to this group; it prefigures his adult visions as it involves immediate miraculous sight of a concealed object.[211] Consideration of the arrangement of the four vision

---

[205] Catalogue: 8b, 8d, 9d, 9e, 10b, 20a, 22a.
[206] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 41.
[207] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 99; Dumelow, "Seeing," 13.
[208] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 54-56, 274-275; Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 43, 46-47.
[209] Catalogue: 7d & 10a, 9a & 20b, 21b; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 164-167, 242-245, 260-263.
[210] Catalogue: 13d; Dumelow, "Seeing," 34-35.
[211] Catalogue: 8b.

scenes suggests that they were given particular emphasis within the window (Appendix 6.1). Two are depicted across two panels and appear at the start of their respective rows, the other two are single panels, one at the start of its row, the other in the central light. Dumelow noted that Cuthbert's visions followed apostolic, rather than Christological, models.[212] Consequently, the designers may have emphasised Cuthbert's visions to articulate his prowess and conformity as an episcopal saint.

In addition to their significance as demonstrations of Cuthbert's spiritual power, both of the two-panel scenes may have been emphasised for other reasons. The first vision, of St Aidan's soul, prompts Cuthbert's commitment to monasticism.[213] The vision of holy souls ascending to heaven is a common hagiographic *topos*, attesting to the sanctity of both the visionary and the viewed.[214] Its importance as an authenticator of Cuthbert's sanctity may be inferred from its presence in the liturgy for his feast day, as well as its inclusion in the much shorter pictorial cycles at Carlisle Cathedral (Figure 4.47), and the illustrations of the readings for Cuthbert's feast day in the Salisbury Breviary (Figure 4.48).[215] The emphasis upon the second vision, of Ecgfrith's death, however, seems specific to York.[216] The episode does not appear in breviary readings, nor is it depicted at Carlisle. More significantly, neither of the extant manuscript cycles depict Ecgfrith in their illustrations of Cuthbert's vision.[217] Consequently, the expansion of the scene across two panels, which both highlights the miracle and includes Ecgfrith, may be intended to demonstrate the close relationship between bishop and king, a theme which will be considered in more depth below.

Likewise, the comparable expansion of episodes of prophecy can potentially be linked to local agendas, as well as the interests of the Cuthbertine cult. All of Cuthbert's acts of prophecy are depicted within Section B, indeed, almost every miracle within rows 17 and 16 involves a prophecy of some kind,[218] and rows 15 and 14 probably had one such episode each

---

[212] Dumelow, "Seeing," 15, 19, 24-25, 42, 50-51.
[213] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 164-167.
[214] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 274-275.
[215] BNF, Latin 17294, f.434r-434v; Procter and Wordsworth, *Breviarium Sarum*, 3: cols. 217-224, 765-766.
[216] Catalogue: 9a & 20b.
[217] YT26, f.55v; Univ. 165, p.89.
[218] Catalogue: 13b, 14a, 15a, 17c, 17d,

(Appendix 6.2).[219] It is likely that the section did not originally omit any chapters from VP, covering events described in chapters 11 to 21. Rather than simply reflecting the textual source, the selection of imagery and the expansion of scenes makes this emphasis specific to the window. For example, both events depicted in the uppermost row (17) include additional imagery and different divisions of the narrative when compared to YT26, enabling three moments of prophecy and fulfilment to be depicted.[220] Similarly, row 16 begins with a panel depicting Cuthbert foreseeing that demons would create a false fire to distract the people to whom he was preaching, a scene which is not derived from YT26.[221] Yet scenes involving prophecy often appear to have been intended to evoke multiple meanings, and can be seen to contribute to a number of the window's themes, as will be discussed below. Consequently, like vision scenes, they potentially articulate additional interests.

Indeed, both visions and prophecies arguably demonstrate Cuthbert's power of sight across temporal, spatial and spiritual distances. As the York administration may not have wanted to inspire pilgrimage to Durham, given the presence of St William in the immediate vicinity of the window, it is tempting to suggest that the elaboration of these episodes was intended to emphasise the saint's efficacy from a distance, to encourage the audience to express their devotion locally. Indeed, the presence of the altar to St Cuthbert at York Minster would have facilitated local devotion or offerings.[222]

4.3.3 Articulating Virtue and Intercessory Power

It was believed that sanctity was achieved through virtues, rather than miracles, which merely manifested and validated the former, and that it was the saint's virtue which enabled them to act as intercessors for those who prayed to them.[223] Consequently, it was necessary to articulate this virtue and Cuthbert's intercessory powers to encourage devotion to his cult. Within the Cuthbertine narrative, the saint's virtue and special relationship with God were particularly emphasised through episodes detailing his contact with angels and receipt of

[219] Catalogue: 14e, Location 14e/15d.
[220] Catalogue: 15a, 17d & 16b, 13b & 13c.
[221] Catalogue: 14a.
[222] Turner, "New Contexts," 116-117.
[223] Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 498-499; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 15.

divine assistance.[224] This may explain the emphasis upon such episodes within the window, where they are often depicted across multiple panels, and occupy prominent positions (Appendix 6.3).[225] In particular, in Section A, row 21 is filled with two multi-panel episodes: an angel healing Cuthbert's knee and Cuthbert praying for divine assistance to calm a storm.[226] The whole row thereby highlights Cuthbert's close relationship with God, and the saint's virtue and power as intercessor.[227] The emphasis upon Cuthbert's contact with angels, as a way to demonstrate his sanctity, has been identified in other pictorial cycles, including the illustrations in Univ. 165.[228] Yet, there is a particular focus on these themes at York, especially in comparison to YT26, where only one of the three episodes involving angels is accompanied by a two-page illustration.[229] Indeed, the depiction of Cuthbert in conversation with an angel (Figure 4.49) is apparently unique to the window.[230]

Like the depictions of visions and prophecies, these episodes have multivalent significance, which can be linked to contemporary interests and agendas beyond the establishment of Cuthbert's sanctity. For example, in panels 22b and 11c (Figure 4.50 and Figure 4.40), Cuthbert washes an angel's feet and offers bread, which the angel miraculously provides. These actions have Christological significance and are fundamental *topoi* of sanctity. The demonstration of pious hospitality articulates Cuthbert's humility and virtue, both directly through his actions, and typologically, by evoking similar actions by Abraham which themselves prefigure the mass.[231] Yet Cuthbert's hospitality also carries a didactic message, as hospitality is emphasised in the Rule of St Benedict, which stipulates that brethren should greet guests, particularly strangers and the poor, as if they were Christ, requiring both the washing of feet and the provision of food.[232] This message potentially originated within

---

[224] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 99.
[225] Catalogue: 9d, 20a & 9e, 10d, 11c, 16b, 13b & 13c, 16a, 14e, Location 14e/15d, 16b.
[226] Catalogue: 9d, 20a & 9e, 10b & 22a.
[227] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 15, 87.
[228] Lawrence-Mathers, *Manuscripts*, 99.
[229] YT26, f.17v-18r.
[230] Catalogue: 20a.
[231] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 39, 188.
[232] Saint Benedict, *RB 1980: The Rule of St. Benedict in Latin and English with Notes*, ed. Timothy Fry (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1981), Rule 53:51-15, pp. 257-259; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 188.

Cuthbert's cult at Durham, which the Benedictines had controlled and developed since the eleventh century; they created comparable emphases in the manuscript cycles they produced, including YT26.[233] Nevertheless, this didactic message in the St Cuthbert Window can be linked to wider contemporary interests, particularly relating to the actions of bishops, as will be discussed below.

Similarly, didactic messages evident in scenes of Cuthbert's receipt of divine assistance can be linked to both the Benedictine cult and wider interests in appropriate ecclesiastical behaviour, illustrating the intersection of interests among the individuals and institutions involved in the window's design.[234] Two episodes which articulate Cuthbert's faith in God's provision through his prophecies are emphasised by their expansion across multiple panels, filling row 17; the message is reinforced by the repetition of the 'prophecy – intercession – provision' sequence occurring three times within the row (Appendix 6.4).[235] Consequently, it appears that row 17 was intended to articulate the importance of faith in God's provision of both physical and spiritual sustenance.[236] Hahn has argued that faith in God's provision "lies at the core of monastic and Benedictine spirituality", and has drawn attention to numerous examples within the Life of Benedict.[237] As discussed above, in VP, Bede frequently uses Gregory's *Dialogues*, particularly the material relating to Benedict, as models.[238] Indeed, Hahn highlighted Cuthbert's Life as having an exceptional number of episodes related to monastic sustenance.[239] While this emphasis is thus present in the textual and pictorial sources, and potentially at Durham, the existence of a greater emphasis at York appears to indicate a local interest in this message. Paradigms of divine provision can also be found in the Old Testament and apostolic lives.[240] Therefore, their presence in the window may not solely indicate Benedictine interests, but might have been intended to evoke apostolic models of behaviour which were particularly appropriate for an elite clerical audience. Furthermore, it is also

---

[233] YT26, f.17v-18r.
[234] Catalogue: 10b, 15a & 16b, 13b & 13c, Location 14e/15d.
[235] Catalogue: 17d, 15a & 16b, 13a & 13b.
[236] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 188-189.
[237] Ibid.
[238] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 11.
[239] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 185.
[240] Ibid., 189.

possible that a more complex message was intended. Indeed, the two scenes from VP Chapter 12 show the prophecy and miraculous provision (panel 13b), but also the sharing of the fish (panel 13c), an emphasis absent from the illustration in YT26.[241] This latter aspect relates back to the Benedictine tenets of hospitality and humility articulated by VP Chapter 7, discussed above. Moreover, as noted in the previous section, these scenes also emphasise Cuthbert's power of prophecy, a notable theme within Section B.

That these interconnected themes were intended to be read together may be indicated by their emphasis across entire rows in both Sections A and B. This has been suggested above in relation to row 21 in Section A (Appendix 6.4), and is also apparent in row 17, at the top of Section B, which depicts prophecy, divine provision, humility and hospitality (Appendix 6.5). This strengthens the interpretation of a York interest in these themes. Moreover, further examination reveals additional themes within both row 17 and Section B more widely. The expression of multiple interconnected themes suggests the articulation of both local and national agendas.

4.3.4 Ideals of Obedience: A Monastic or Dynastic Interest?

One such theme, which was potentially intended to evoke both cult-centred and national interests, is obedience, which appears in scenes in Section A but is particularly emphasised in Section B (Appendix 6.6). It is articulated in combination with themes which express Benedictine ideals, including those discussed above. Yet, its representation alongside other themes, particularly preaching, suggests that it was also intended to articulate contemporary national concerns.

Hahn has linked Univ. 165's illustrations of VP Chapter 12 (Figure 4.51) to the Rule of St Benedict's requirement of complete and immediate obedience, which she argues was the "foremost virtue of the monk or nun".[242] Similarly, Olga Gusakova, in her analysis of Cuthbert's encounters with the natural world in his Anonymous and Bedan lives, observed that Bede emphasised the eagle's role as God's servant, reinforcing the message through the

---

[241] Catalogue: 13b & 13c; YT26, f.28v.
[242] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 179, 181-182; Benedict, *RB*, Rule 5:1-19, pp. 187-189.

obedience demonstrated by the boy, who follows Cuthbert's instruction to share the fish.[243] Her interpretation that this augments the concept of faith in God's provision, to stress that both faith and obedient servitude is required, appears to have been intended in the window; both Cuthbert's prophecy and provision are shown, as well as the sharing of the fish (Figure 4.11).[244] Gusakova argued that Bede's versions of the narrative were intended not only to emphasise their didactic messages, but also to articulate explicitly the relationship between saints and nature within "a wider hierarchical model of world order where human beings who obey God receive obedience from the rest of creation".[245] In addition to episodes focused on obedience, which will be discussed below, comparable articulations of obedience can be identified in the instances of Cuthbert's intercessions through prayer;[246] as well as the episodes of prophecy and provision discussed above, where Cuthbert's companions are shown as obediently following his guidance, patiently serving God and trusting in his provision.[247] Consequently, it appears that an emphasis on obedience was intended to be read in a range of scenes within the window.

The interest in obedience within the Cuthbertine cult was almost certainly due to the Benedictine community at Durham, who were required to promise obedience before God, according to their rule.[248] However, the specific treatment of, and emphasis upon, the theme at York suggests an additional agenda. This is supported by an analysis of the representation of VP chapter 10; like the textual and pictorial narratives (Figure 4.52), panel 13d (Figure 4.53) contrasts the obedient servitude of animals (otters) with human disobedience (the spying monk).[249] An additional panel (15c) emphasises the monk's swift reparations for his disobedience, and new obedience to the saint (Figure 4.54).[250] The description of a lost window

---

[243] Gusakova, "Saint," 45.
[244] Ibid.
[245] Ibid., 48. Catalogue: 13b & 13c.
[246] Catalogue: 8d, 10b & 22a, 10d.
[247] Catalogue: 15a, 17d & 16b, 13b & 13c, 14a & 14d, 17c & 20d, 14e & 16e.
[248] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 332; Benedict, *RB*, Rule 5:1-19, pp. 187-189.
[249] Gusakova, "Saint," 44-45.
[250] Catalogue: 13d, 15c; Benedicta Ward, "The Spirituality of St Cuthbert," in *St. Cuthbert: His Cult and His Community to AD 1200*, ed. Gerald Bonner, David Rollason, and Clare Stancliffe (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989), 72-73.

depicting the same miracle at Durham suggests a different focus to the York panels, as only the details seen in panel 13d appear to have been present there.[251] Consequently, while the St Cuthbert Window's emphasis upon obedience can be clearly linked to the interests of the Benedictine-led cult at Durham, it likely also responded to wider concerns. This is supported by the specific emphasis in Section B of the window, where many of the panels articulate ideals of obedience (Appendix 6.6).[252] While the scenes in the upper two rows convey the importance of obedience alongside Cuthbert's preaching and powers of prophecy and healing, the lower two rows focus increasingly on obedience alone.[253] Additionally, the narrative chronology appears to have been augmented to enable an obedience-focused miracle, VP 21, to be depicted across the final two panels in row 15, suggesting its importance.[254]

Significantly, VP chapter 21 contrasts human disobedience with nature's obedience. Similarly, the two extant episodes in row 14, drawn from VP chapters 19 and 20, both depict the obedience and repentance of birds.[255] Gusakova argued that Bede's adaptation of the anonymous hagiographer's versions of these two chapters was "purposely aimed at strengthening its pedagogic message", establishing them as a model for human obedience and repentance.[256] This is further expanded in the window, where the use of two panels for each episode enables obedience and repentance to be highlighted and comparisons drawn between human and avian obedience.[257] As the use of animals as exemplars increased in frequency and sophistication throughout the medieval period, by the fifteenth century these contrasts would have been recognisable to the window's audience.[258] This emphasis on obedience may have been inspired by the treatment of these scenes in YT 26, where chapters 19, 20 and 21 are all illustrated with multi-scene, single-page illustrations (Figure 4.55 and Figure 4.56 and Figure

---

[251] Fowler, *Rites*, 115.
[252] Catalogue: 15a, 17d & 16b, 13b & 13c, 14a, 15b, 14e, 16d, 17a & 17b.
[253] Catalogue: 16c & 16d, 17a & 17b, Location 14e/15d.
[254] Catalogue: 15b, 14e & 16e; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 210-211.
[255] Catalogue: 16c & 16d, 17a & 17b.
[256] Gusakova, "Saint," 46.
[257] Catalogue: 16c & 16d, 17a & 17b.
[258] Joyce E. Salisbury, *The Beast Within: Animals in the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 1994), 128-130, 133-136.

4.57).[259] Yet, the appearance of the theme in the later cycle at Carlisle indicates a wider interest in the fifteenth century. As discussed in Chapter 2, although the cycle is closely modelled on YT26, it has fewer scenes, suggesting that those included were chosen for their particular iconographic significance.[260] As Appendix 9.1 shows, the cycle includes scenes derived from YT26 illustrations for chapters 10, 12 and 20, which Christiania Whitehead has argued emphasise Cuthbert's eremitic life, and contact with animals.[261] Nonetheless, these episodes all evoke didactic messages of obedience, suggesting it was an intentional theme at Carlisle, as well as York.

The emphasis upon obedience in both cycles may be related to wider fifteenth-century efforts to enforce orthodoxy through ecclesiastical reform. David Lepine has characterised these national reforms and the reassertion of orthodoxy as responses to a number of crises at the turn of the fifteenth century, including Lollardy, and instability in both the monarchy and the church.[262] There is evidence that several Benedictine communities, including Durham, believed that increased devotion to traditional saints' cults would increase orthodoxy.[263] Furthermore, the use of imagery in various media to support and articulate these concerns and reforms has been shown at numerous sites.[264] In addition to the particular focus upon obedience, one of the scenes at York specifically depicts Cuthbert's involvement in promoting the monastic reforms of his day (Figure 4.12).[265] Moreover, other narrative themes can be linked to orthodox reform, including preaching, a key focus of fifteenth-century ecclesiastical reforms.[266]

---

[259] YT26, f.42v, 44r, 45v.
[260] Park and Cather, "Paintings," 214-215.
[261] Whitehead, "Carlisle Paintings," 23, 26-27.
[262] Lepine, "Orthodox Reform," 180.
[263] James G. Clark, "The St Albans Monks and the Cult of St Alban: the Late Medieval Texts," in *Alban and St Albans: Roman and Medieval Architecture, Art and Archaeology*, ed. Martin Henig and Phillip Lindley, *The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 24* (Leeds: Maney Publishing, 2001), 221; Gilderdale-Scott, "Great Malvern," 86-87; Rollason, "Northern Saints," 340.
[264] Gilderdale-Scott, "Great Malvern," 86-87; Rollason, "Northern Saints," 340; Marks, *Image*, 90.
[265] Catalogue: 15b.
[266] Lepine, "Orthodox Reform," 180; Clark, "St Albans," 221; Clark, *Monastic Renaissance*, 253.

4.3.5 Preaching and Orthodoxy

Like the theme of obedience, depictions of preaching within the window can be linked to both local and national agendas. Cuthbert's preaching is central to three episodes of Bede's VP, all of which are depicted in prominent locations in the window (Appendix 6.7).[267] Their distribution not only uses repetition to emphasise preaching, but the increasing status of the congregations and the different contexts of the scenes create a sense of progression.[268] This culminates with Cuthbert preaching to high-status laypeople shortly before his episcopal election, reinforcing the importance of preaching to his role as bishop, an emphasis which is explicitly underlined in the textual analogue.[269]

The significance of preaching as a key apostolic *topos* for episcopal saints explains its prominent role in authenticating Cuthbert's sanctity.[270] However, the emphases evident within the window, particularly in close proximity to Cuthbert's episcopal election, likely also articulated contemporary concerns regarding the pastoral roles of bishops.[271] Vauchez noted the increasing importance of holy bishops' pastoral roles in the high and late medieval period, including duties such as visitations and defence of the rights of the church and laity, as well as preaching.[272] As noted above, similar concerns can be identified at the heart of fifteenth-century pedagogic and pastoral reform, which placed increased emphasis upon both preaching and the importance of a learned prelacy, capable of contributing to theological debates and transmitting doctrine.[273] Ecclesiastical reformers considered preaching an essential method of reasserting orthodoxy, both because Lollard preachers spread heterodox beliefs and because a key Wycliffite objection to the celebration of mass was that it limited preaching.[274] The emphasis on preaching in the St Cuthbert Window may therefore have been

---

[267] Catalogue: 13a, 14a, 13e.
[268] Catalogue: 13a, 14a, 13e.
[269] Catalogue: 13e; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 230-231.
[270] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 131, 141-142; Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 37-38; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 298-305.
[271] Catalogue: 13e.
[272] Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 298-300.
[273] Clark, "Abbot," 101-104, 107; Harriss, *England*, 324-325; Wendy Scase, "Prelates and the Provision of Books Bishop John Carpenter's Carnary Library," in *The Prelate in England and Europe, 1300-1560* (Boydell and Brewer, 2014), 128; Lepine, "Orthodox Reform," 167, 178, 184.
[274] Lepine, "Orthodox Reform," 180-182; A. J. Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509* (New York: Longman, 2000), 223; Rollason, "Northern Saints," 340.

intended to convey its importance for maintaining devotional orthodoxy, and to cast Cuthbert as an ideal contemporary bishop. Depictions of obedience, discussed above, potentially supported this didactic emphasis, as panels articulating these themes appear in close proximity (Appendix 6.8). Notably, a similar link is apparent at Carlisle, where Cuthbert is shown preaching above and adjacent to three obedience-focused scenes (Appendix 9.1).[275] Moreover, at York, the inclusion of panel 14a, which appears to show Cuthbert preventing his congregation from being distracted from his sermon by a phantom fire, shown in panel 14d, ensures that the episode focuses equally upon the importance of Cuthbert's preaching and the obedience of his congregation;[276] this contrasts with YT26, which shows only the events depicted in panel 14d.[277]

As noted above, these interconnected ideals can be linked to revivals in several English saints' cults, which have been interpreted as responses to heresy and the need for ecclesiastical reform.[278] Lynda Rollason has recently suggested that the fifteenth-century glazing at Durham was part of the priory's response to heresy through revitalisation and promotion of both Cuthbert's cult and Benedictine monasticism, alongside an increased focus on preaching and processions.[279] As she argues that the glass was "presumably devised by Prior Wessington and supported by Bishops Skirlaw and Langley", there is the potential for similar agendas to have been articulated at York.[280] Consequently, while the didactic significance of preaching and obedience potentially articulated national agendas, the emphases can also be linked to the patron's personal interests in promoting them. Langley and his agents were members of the Lancastrian elite, who promoted orthodoxy as part of their political policy.[281] Moreover, as prelates themselves, they were part of the elite clerical audience whom the window addressed. As the emphasis on preaching underlined the expected role of the clerical elite in enacting ecclesiastical reform and upholding episcopal models, it seems likely that this

---

[275] Appendix 9.1.
[276] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 198-199.
[277] YT26, f.30r. Cuthbert is, however, shown holding this congregation back in Univ. 165, p.53; Catalogue 14a, 14d.
[278] Clark, "St Albans," 221; Gilderdale-Scott, "Great Malvern," 86-87; Rollason, "Northern Saints," 340.
[279] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 340-341; Dobson, *Durham*, 73, 377.
[280] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 341.
[281] Allmand, *Henry V*, 416-417; Lewis, "History, Historiography," 130-131.

symbolism was not solely driven by the interests of the York Chapter, or national concerns, but was also intended to support the idealised depiction of the elite ecclesiastics in the commemorative section.

The careers of these prelates were dominated by secular, rather than ecclesiastical service, hardly conforming to the pastoral ideals prescribed by saint-bishops, as their royal service took them away from their diocesan responsibilities.[282] However, following election to episcopal office, they variously attempted to fulfil their responsibilities to ecclesiastical reform.[283] For example, Langley supported education through foundations and bequests, as well as defending the rights of his see.[284] More significantly, the involvement of Langley and the other prelates in both ecclesiastical and royal service placed them at the heart of fifteenth-century reforms aimed at preventing heresy and Lollardy.[285] These orthodox reforms were closely associated with the political agendas of the Lancastrian dynasty.[286] The combined action of Church and Crown against Lollardy had begun in the late fourteenth century, but was periodically revitalised by additional legislation and campaigns during the reigns of Henry IV and Henry V.[287] By both creating and enforcing ecclesiastical and secular laws, the clerical elite fulfilled their pastoral duties as defenders of the faith.[288]

The emphasis upon preaching, in combination with obedience, helps to convey a model of the shared role of Church and Crown in maintaining orthodoxy. This was probably intended to be read alongside the vision of unity of the Lancastrian elite created by the commemorative section, thereby representing the prelates as pious supporters of divinely sanctioned monarchs, jointly defending religious orthodoxy.[289] Tim Ayers has identified a comparable message in the early fifteenth-century glazing of Merton College, Oxford, a scheme which, significantly, was undertaken while Robert Gilbert (Dean of York 1426-36) was

---

[282] Dodd, "The Clerical Chancellors of Late Medieval England," 37, 39, 48-49; Harriss, *England*, 323-324.
[283] Harriss, *England*, 325.
[284] Ibid., 325-326; Storey, *Langley*, 116, 122, 218, 225.
[285] Dodd, "The Clerical Chancellors of Late Medieval England," 40.
[286] Allmand, *Henry V*, 416-417; Lewis, "History, Historiography," 130-131.
[287] Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, 214; Ian Forrest, *The Detection of Heresy in Late Medieval England* (Clarendon Press, 2005), 24-25, 30, 32, 34; Harriss, *England*, 395, 397.
[288] Harriss, *England*, 397; Forrest, *Detection of Heresy*, 29, 35.
[289] Lepine, "Orthodox Reform," 180-181; Harriss, *England*, 395, 402.

warden of the college (1417-21), and when John Kemp (Archbishop of York 1426-52) donated a Life of St Joseph.[290] As we have seen, both men were potentially involved in the planning of the St Cuthbert Window, during the 1430s. Moreover, as at York, many of the donors at Merton were central to the Lancastrian government, and were actively involved in combating Lollardy.[291] Ayers has argued convincingly that the iconography of the windows at Merton articulated the role of these individuals, as well as the college, in upholding orthodoxy, as a key facet of their political identity.[292] Consequently, the comparable articulation of these ideas within the St Cuthbert Window can not only be linked to the donor and his agents, but can also be seen as the expression of a concept of identity held by the Lancastrian elite more widely.

4.3.6 Episcopal Emphasis

Within the St Cuthbert Window, there is an overt focus upon Cuthbert's episcopal status and sanctity, which appears to be intentionally multivalent in meaning, articulating both Cuthbert's sanctity and contemporary didactic messages. While the other themes and *topoi* discussed above serve to authenticate and enhance Cuthbert's episcopal sanctity, these are concentrated and reach their zenith in section C. Rows 10 and 11, at the top of section C, depict episodes drawn from six chapters of VP, all of which are linked to Cuthbert's election as bishop (Appendix 6.9).[293] In addition, rows 9 and 10 contain scenes which are key authenticators of his episcopal sanctity, as well as contemporaneously pertinent behavioural models.[294] However, there is a striking contrast in the compression and expansion of scenes, both to create emphases and to fit the entirety of Cuthbert's episcopal episodes within section C. In the upper half of the section, scenes are expanded across multiple panels, but in the lower half, episodes are compressed or omitted (Appendix 5.4, C). Furthermore, greater

[290] Ayers, *Merton*, Part 2, 303-308; Ayers, "Collegiate Identity," 243, 246, 249, 252.
[291] Ayers, "Collegiate Identity," 239, 241-244, 246-247, 250-253.
[292] Ibid.
[293] Catalogue: 13e, 14b & 19e, 15d, 19a, 19b, 19c & 19d, Location 10b, Location 11b; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 228-243.
[294] Catalogue: 9a & 20b, 20e, 21d, 21e.

manipulation of narrative chronology is evident in section C, compared with the rest of the narrative.

These editorial choices reveal the hagiographic and didactic messages intended by the designers. By beginning row 11 with a preaching scene, which also alludes to Boisil's prophecy of Cuthbert's episcopate, and ending row 10 with Cuthbert's charitable acts, the designers created a 'bookend' effect which encourages the reading of the panels as a group (Appendix 6.9).[295] A similar effect is created in rows 8 and 9 of the St William Window, as well as earlier in the St Cuthbert Window, where Cuthbert's propitious birth and the first prophecy of his episcopate are presented in rows 23 and 22. Here, however, the prophecy is both alluded to and fulfilled. Moreover, the central location of Ecgfrith handing Cuthbert his crozier in row 11, set directly above Cuthbert's consecration in row 10 (Figure 4.58 and Figure 4.59), not only emphasises the king's role, but also creates a central focus which encourages the viewer to read the flanking panels in relation to Cuthbert's episcopate. By doing so, Cuthbert's preaching and healing in row 11 and his humility and charity in row 10 articulate his worthiness as both a bishop and saint. This arrangement is in part achieved by the manipulation of the narrative chronology; Cuthbert's interactions with the synod occur later than in the textual analogues, at the beginning of row 10.[296] Likewise, in rows 8 and 9, non-chronological arrangements are used to accommodate the two-panel depiction of Ecgfrith's death, and to group healing miracles thematically.[297] This latter choice reveals their importance as authenticators of Cuthbert's episcopal sanctity. This is supported by the depiction of Cuthbert's first episcopal healing across two panels.[298] Additionally, although the other healing episodes in section C were compressed into single panels, only one is omitted. Moreover, as in YT26, there is also an apparent focus upon Cuthbert's agency as a healer, perhaps intended to highlight his efficacy as an intercessor. In panel 20e, Cuthbert's agency is signified by the depiction of the priest administering the blessed water in a mitre (Figure 4.60),

[295] Catalogue: 13e, 14b & 19e, 15d, 19a, 19b, 19c & 19d, Location 10b, Location 11b; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 228-243.
[296] Ibid., 238-239. Catalogue: 15d.
[297] Catalogue: 9a & 20b, 20e, 21d, 21e, 23b, 21a, 21b.
[298] Catalogue: 14b & 19e.

a similar strategy to that employed in YT26 (Figure 4.61).[299] Moreover, Cuthbert is neither present, nor the instigator, in the only healing miracle omitted from the window.[300]

Healing miracles were considered the most prestigious authenticators of episcopal sanctity because they overtly imitated Christ's own actions: curing paralysis and blindness, exorcising the possessed and raising the dead; the latter was considered "the true sign of apostolicity" by many hagiographers, including Sulpicius Severus and Gregory the Great.[301] Cuthbert's actions reflect this belief: he heals by exorcism (VP chapter 15), cures a paralytic (VP chapter 23) and heals the dying (VP chapters 25, 29, 31, 32 and 33).[302] In the textual *vitae*, only two of these miracles occur before Cuthbert is elected bishop. The rest authenticate his episcopal sanctity, increasing in frequency as the narrative progresses towards its climax, to reinforce how closely Cuthbert echoes Christ at this critical point in the construction of his holiness. In the window, Cuthbert's healing scenes broadly follow the textual chronology, with one in Section B and the rest in Section C. However, as noted above, the progression evident in the texts is heightened through the augmentation of narrative order and the exploitation of the window's visual and structural format. For example, the foreshadowing of Cuthbert's healing of Sibba's servant with his pre-episcopal healing of Hildmer's wife is underlined not only by visual repetition, as discussed above, but also by physical alignment within the window (Figure 4.8 and Appendix 6.10).[303] Likewise, the iconographic pairings of healing miracles in rows 8 and 9 are reinforced by visual mirroring, emphasising the relationships between the episodes. The healings are grouped in two pairs, one in each row, divided only by Cuthbert's liturgically and Christologically symbolic transformation of water to taste like wine (panel 21e, VP chapter 35) (Appendix 6.10). This emphasises the liturgical significance of the healings, with blessed water and oil, in row 9 and the Christological parallels of the revivals of dying youths in row 8.[304]

---

[299] Catalogue: 20e; YT26, f.61r; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 252-255.
[300] Ibid., 254-257.
[301] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 153, 170.
[302] Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 202-207, 230-235, 238-241, 252-261. Cuthbert also cures the less lethal sickness of two others (VP chapters 30 and 38), ibid., 254-255, 280-283.
[303] Catalogue: 17c & 20c, 14b & 19e.
[304] Catalogue: 20e, 21d, 23b, 21a.

While the overt focus upon healing miracles within section C evidently follows hagiographic conventions for authenticating episcopal sanctity, contemporary messages can also be detected. In particular, the depiction of Cuthbert's first episcopal healing across two panels in row 11 amplifies the liturgical significance of Cuthbert blessing water, by depicting it separately from the healing (Figure 4.62 and Figure 4.63).[305] Moreover, in contrast to the illustration in YT26 (Figure 4.64), Cuthbert, in a frontal pose commonly used to depict bishops celebrating mass, dominates the panel and engages the viewer directly (Figure 4.62).[306] The liturgical prerogatives of bishops during the medieval period were key expressions of their power and pivotal position within the church, consequently liturgical symbolism was an essential aspect of the episcopal image.[307] Indeed, it is only after he becomes a bishop that Cuthbert effects cures using holy water. Hahn has argued that four of Cuthbert's episcopal healings were intended to reinforce the bishop's role as "celebrant of the Eucharist", a textual allusion frequently amplified in pictorial cycles.[308] As we have seen, despite the limited space, the iconography and arrangement of the subsequent healing scenes reinforced both liturgical symbolism and Cuthbert's agency as much as possible. Consequently, panel 14b appears intended to articulate Cuthbert's liturgical role as a facet of his episcopal sanctity. This emphasis upon the liturgical role and prerogatives of bishops can also be linked to contemporary concerns regarding orthodoxy and the idealised models of episcopal behaviour evoked elsewhere in the window. Likewise, contemporary didactic messages can be read in the panels surrounding Cuthbert's consecration, which depict preaching, humility and charity. In particular, as has been discussed above, the iconography of the two panels depicting Cuthbert's charitable acts was not derived from YT26; instead it more closely resembles both contemporary secular images of charity, as well as the scenes selected to illustrate Cuthbert's lessons in the Salisbury Breviary (Figure 4.65).[309]

---

[305] Catalogue: 14b & 19e.
[306] Catalogue: 14b; YT26, f.54r; Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 99.
[307] Eric Palazzo, "The Image of the Bishop in the Middle Ages," in *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 86-87; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 159.
[308] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 159.
[309] Catalogue: 19c & 19d; Appendix 8.1; BNF, Latin 17294, f.437r.

The giving of bread and clothing to the poor evokes the symbolic link between spiritual and physical food, and follows the Rule of St Benedict, but they were also key actions encouraged in contemporary models of ecclesiastical charity.[310] Charitable acts were expected of both saintly and earthly bishops, but were also required from other ranks of the clergy, including the residential canons, a key subsection of the window's audience.[311] Moreover, as panel 15d, and probably also the lost panel from row 10, conveyed Cuthbert's humility, a key requirement of both Benedictine monks and bishops, Cuthbert's consecration would have been flanked by paired models of episcopal behaviour.[312] Consequently, the upper two rows of section C not only authenticate Cuthbert's sanctity, but also provide a model for the window's elite clerical audience. Furthermore, like the behavioural models discussed above, this display was potentially intended to enhance the idealised depiction of the prelates in section D.

The augmentation of narrative chronology and the expansion of scenes in section C also appears to be intended to highlight and idealise royal-episcopal relationships. As noted above, Cuthbert's vision of Ecgfrith's death is unique among the extant cycles, while its depiction across two panels led to the compression and omission of other scenes. This suggests that its prominent display was intended to highlight the interaction between bishop and king, the saint's vision of the king's death demonstrating his worthiness. Furthermore, the arrangement of the panels and the movement of synod scenes later in the sequence emphasises King Ecgfrith's role in Cuthbert election. In the centre of row 11, the king is the first to approve Cuthbert's election officially; he leads a group that includes monks, thereby signifying his authority (Figure 4.58).[313] This *topos* can be observed in eleventh- and twelfth-century pictorial cycles of episcopal lives, commonly in response to the contemporary investiture disputes between kings and the papacy.[314] By augmenting the depiction of neutral

---

[310] Brodman, *Charity and Religion in Medieval Europe*, 5, 12, 16; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 188; Lepine, "Almsgiving," 1069, 1080-1081; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 303.
[311] Lepine, "Almsgiving," 1067, 1069, 1081-1082.
[312] Catalogue: 15d, Location 10b; Hahn, *Portrayed*, 163-164; Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 39; Benedict, *RB*, 191-203.
[313] Catalogue: 19b.
[314] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 38-40.

investitures, these pictorial cycles politicised narratives conceived before the investiture controversy.[315] Given the papal rejection of Langley as Henry IV's candidate for the archbishopric of York in 1405,[316] it is possible that King Ecgfrith's involvement was emphasised to make a similar political point.

On the other hand, Cuthbert and Ecgfrith appear as equals in both the window (Figure 4.58) and YT26 (Figure 4.66), unlike the hagiographic cycles discussed by Abou-El-Haj, which are earlier and typically show the saint in subordination to the monarch.[317] Moreover, as Hahn suggests, the involvement of kings in episcopal elections more realistically represents medieval practice.[318] The Salisbury Breviary depicts Cuthbert and Ecgfrith kneeling together, instead of Cuthbert's consecration (Figure 4.67).[319] Consequently, panel 19a likely represented contemporary practice, in order to signify the harmonious relationship between king and clergy. This reinforces the expression of royal and ecclesiastical unity in Section D, by articulating historical and saintly precedence. However, royal and ecclesiastical authority is expressed separately, through the omission of Bishop Trumwine from panel 19a (Figure 4.58), and Ecgfrith from Cuthbert's consecration (panel 19b, Figure 4.59).[320] The composition of panel 19a was likely inspired by a now lost illustration in YT26. Yet, comparison of panel 19b with the same scene at Pittington and Carlisle (Figure 4.68 and Figure 4.69) suggests that the St Cuthbert Window's designers chose to focus upon ecclesiastical authority by omitting Ecgfrith.[321] This may be a local convention, as a similar separation of royal endorsement and ecclesiastical authority is evident in the St William Window, where the King supports William's ultimate receipt of the pallium in a scene beneath his enthronement (Figure 4.70 and Figure 4.71). In any case, the iconography of panels 19a and 19b points to a deliberately nuanced representation of royal and episcopal relations, which corresponds with that seen in the commemorative section.

---

[315] Ibid., 38.
[316] Storey, *Langley*, 18-19.
[317] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 38-39.
[318] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 136.
[319] BNF, Latin 17294, f.436v.
[320] Catalogue: 19a, 19b.
[321] Catalogue: 19b; Park and Cather, "Paintings," 221.

The composition of panel 19b is close to other fifteenth-century depictions of consecrations, including examples in the St William Window (Figure 4.71 and Figure 4.72).[322] The elaboration of ceremonies, particularly the consecration and investiture of bishops, was common in pictorial hagiographies compared to their textual analogues.[323] This is evident in pictorial Cuthbertine cycles from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries, all of which depict Cuthbert's consecration, despite the absence of the ceremony itself from the textual narratives, which instead elaborate upon the events leading up to his election.[324] Moreover, at Carlisle the narrative sequence was augmented to emphasise the panel depicting Cuthbert's consecration.[325] Consequently, the emphasis in the St Cuthbert Window can in part be attributed to contemporary hagiographic conventions.

Nevertheless, the focus upon Cuthbert's consecration may also be a response to the window's setting, which flanks the high altar, where consecrations and enthronements were performed. Furthermore, as Cuthbert was believed to have been consecrated at York,[326] this location links him both to the audience, and the sequence of York's pre-conquest (arch)bishops depicted in the clerestory glazing.[327] Perhaps significantly, the six ecclesiastical figures surrounding Cuthbert strikingly outnumber those depicted in other extant examples, which typically have between two and four. In combination with the omission of Ecgfrith, this may have been intended to emphasise Cuthbert's integration in the structure of the Church.[328] Indeed, panel 19b, set in the central axis of the window, was aligned above the standing figure of St Cuthbert, which visually links the saint to the clerestory (arch)bishops (Appendix 5.5).

---

[322] See also St Martin-le-Grand: n2 3c; York Minster: n7 5b and 9e, n8 3b, n9 2b and 2c. St Augustine's consecration at Carlisle, which is contemporary to the St Cuthbert paintings there, shows the saint flanked by two archbishops, one blessing him, the other placing the mitre on his head.
[323] Abou-El-Haj, *Saints*, 38-39.
[324] Ibid., 39; Colgrave, *Two Lives*, 110-113, 238-241.
[325] Park and Cather, "Paintings," 219; Whitehead, "Carlisle Paintings," 29.
[326] Christopher Norton, "The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral at York and the Topography of the Anglian City," *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 151, no. 1 (1998): 18, 30, 31, 35; Norton, *St William*, 158.
[327] Norton, "Sacred Space," 172-173.
[328] Hahn, *Portrayed*, 136.

As the tracery was populated by saints, the apex of this axis also aligns Cuthbert with the heavenly kingdom.[329]

The iconography of Cuthbert's consecration also emphasises adherence to ecclesiastical customs through visual details which would have been easily recognisable to the audience. In contrast with YT26, where he is shown in episcopal attire, in the window Cuthbert remains dressed as a monk until his consecration.[330] A similar consistency of clothing is evident the St William Window, in the panels between William's receipt of the pallium and his enthronement, which is depicted as a consecration. He is shown wearing the pallium, along with a mitre, on his journey back from Rome and prophecy of his successor (Figure 4.73 and Figure 4.74),[331] where they are necessary for articulating the meanings of the scenes. Yet he then does not wear either again until he is enthroned (Figure 4.71).[332] As a result, neither saint is shown wearing episcopal attire in depictions of key miracles performed after their elections, but before their consecration/enthronement (Figure 4.75 and Figure 4.62).

In the St Cuthbert Window, the prioritisation of adherence to ecclesiastical customs, rather than elevation of the saints' status, parallels the extensive depiction of the events surrounding William's disputed first election to the episcopacy. These dominate the lower half of the narrative in the St William Window and emphasise William's obedience to vacillating papal authority. Moreover, the St Cuthbert Window's emphases upon obedience and episcopal models of behaviour, discussed above, complement these didactic messages. In combination with the idealised depictions of episcopal-royal relationships evident in the window, this suggests a clear focus upon hierarchical models and orthodox ideals which can be linked to contemporary politics as well as the interests of the Chapter.

4.3.7 Life and Death

The St Cuthbert Window is notable for its extensive depiction of Cuthbert's life, in comparison to posthumous events, which are almost entirely omitted. The treatment of

[329] Catalogue: Tracery.
[330] YT26, f.54r; Catalogue: 14b, 15d.
[331] York Minster, n7 8c and 8d.
[332] York Minster, n7 8d-9d.

Cuthbert's death and posthumous scenes in the St Cuthbert Window can be linked to his contemporary cult. Yet it is likely that the window's architectural and devotional context, the choir of York Minster, and particularly the window's relationship with the St William Window, also affected these editorial choices.

In contrast with the frequent expansion of narrative episodes relating to Cuthbert's life, the compression of events relating to his death, to present a distilled and summarised account, is striking. The compression of the narrative in section C was undoubtedly due to the limited number of panels available, exacerbated by the decision to confine Cuthbert's episcopal years to this section. By omitting depictions of specific posthumous miracles, the designers of the window focused firmly upon his life.[333] Yet, as expected, the selection of scenes indicates that conscious editorial choices were made to prioritise the scenes which were considered essential for conveying Cuthbert's sanctity and status. The designers were careful to include the events leading up to his death, depicting scenes from chapters 37 to 40 of Bede's VP across the same number of panels (22d, 22c, 23a and 23d respectively).[334] The remaining three panels are concerned with establishing the veneration of Cuthbert: panel 23c probably shows his first tomb (Figure 2.75), the panel missing from location 7d probably depicted the discovery of his incorrupt body eleven years after his death, and panel 23e (Figure 2.76) shows the shrine into which he was translated.[335] These scenes are, in essence, the key events related to Cuthbert's establishment as a saint.[336] These choices have parallels in the Sarum Use breviary readings for St Cuthbert's feast day,[337] as well as the selection of scenes at Carlisle, *c.*1478-95, where Cuthbert's death and the discovery of his incorrupt body are the final scenes depicted.[338] Consequently, the selection of scenes at York likely demonstrates popular perceptions of the Cuthbertine narrative.

---

[333] Catalogue: 23c, 23e.
[334] Catalogue: 22d, 22c, 23a, 23d.
[335] Catalogue: 23c, 23e, Location 7d.
[336] Michael Goodich, "The Death of a Saint: a Hagiographical Topos," in *Hoping for Continuity: Childhood, Education, and Death in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. Katariina Mustakallio and Jussi Hanska, *Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 33* (2005), 227, 233.
[337] BNF, Latin 17294, f.436v-437v; Procter and Wordsworth, *Breviarium Sarum*, vol.3, 221-224.
[338] Appendix 9.1.

The omission of posthumous scenes from the window arguably casts Cuthbert more effectively in the role of primary, and archetypal, northern saint. As many of Cuthbert's posthumous episodes are associated specifically with Durham, their absence enables Cuthbert to be depicted as a national saint and more universally relatable figure, as the narrative is instead focused upon his exemplary life and intercessory powers. This vision of Cuthbert as a national saint also corresponds with the articulation of concerns regarding orthodoxy, as well as the display of royal figures and leading prelates in the commemorative section beneath. Yet, this may not have been the only motive for the exclusion of posthumous episodes. The focus upon Cuthbert's life contrasts with the St William Window, which dedicates twelve rows to William's death and posthumous events, almost double the seven rows depicting his life. These choices were ultimately guided by the much smaller quantity of hagiographic material associated with William's cult, which particularly emphasised his posthumous miracles.[339] Nevertheless, Christopher Norton has established that multiple sources were carefully combined to create the narrative, and editorial choices were made.[340] The bulk of the St William Window's posthumous scenes are focused upon his shrine, emphasising his efficacy as an intercessor and healer. Dated to *c.*1414, the window was intended to enhance William's presence in the renewed choir, where his shrine had been located since 1284, and would have become more accessible as building work neared completion.[341] Sarah Brown has suggested that the focus upon William's intercessory efficacy may also have responded to the increasing devotional popularity of Richard Scrope, whose tomb was located near to William's shrine.[342]

Similar attempts to promote William's cult may also have been factors in the design of the St Cuthbert Window, given Cuthbert's wider appeal and greater status. Both its completion around twenty-five years after the St William Window, and the likelihood that it was originally planned contemporaneously with the latter, make it possible that the St Cuthbert Window's design was sensitive to the needs of the local cult. By omitting Cuthbert's

---

[339] Norton, *St William*, 180-192, 200-202.
[340] Ibid; Christopher Norton, discussion, 15/01/2019.
[341] Brown, *York Minster*, 228-229, 236-237; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 172-173.
[342] Brown, *York Minster*, 228-229, 236-237; Norton, "Richard Scrope," 173-176.

posthumous miracles it allowed St William's to take centre stage. Furthermore, the omission of any posthumous miracles or events set in Durham, avoided directing pilgrims to the locus of Cuthbert's cult. Instead, as highlighted above, the window emphasises the long range of Cuthbert's intercessory powers, arguably affirming the efficacy of local devotion at St Cuthbert's altar within York Minster.

4.4 Re-reading the St Cuthbert Window

The narrative themes, and their articulation within the window, reveal that multiple layers of meaning were intended by the designers. In the broadest sense, the window was intended to convey St Cuthbert's sanctity. However, it is clear that the iconography was specifically tailored to the setting of the window, and also responded to wider hagiographic trends. Moreover, the above analysis has demonstrated that diverse contemporary motives can be suggested for the thematic emphases. This section will show how these new discoveries enable a re-reading of the St Cuthbert Window. The implications for its design and intended significance will be considered, and wider insights into fifteenth-century hagiographic narrative design will be proposed.

4.4.1 Representing the Cuthbertine Cult and Contemporary Agendas

The narrative authenticates Cuthbert's sanctity, employing devices and themes evident in hagiography more widely, such as the elaboration of Cuthbert's childhood. This contributes to wider understanding of the development and adaptation of saints' cults over time, and demonstrates the ability of pictorial hagiographic narratives to articulate shifts in focus and representation. Additionally, the window's iconographic relationship with both older narrative and iconographic traditions, and more recent innovations, provides further evidence of the role of contemporary culture in the ongoing adaptation of hagiography.

Significantly, the above analysis demonstrates that the narrative themes were intended to be read in combination with the commemorative section, both to draw parallels with the figures as a group, and with Langley as the donor. It seems likely that the greater tendency to expand events across multiple panels in sections A and B and the compression of the narrative in section C can be linked not only to the articulation of the narrative themes, but also to the creation of a specific emphasis upon Cuthbert's episcopate. This indicates that the designers were not only working to fit the narrative within the structure of the stonework, but were also

responding to the restricted visibility of the upper two sections caused by the triforium bridge of the choir arcade. In particular, the apparently conscious effort to locate significant themes in the lowest narrative section (C), where they would be visible directly above the commemorative section (D), suggests that the audience was intended to recognise parallels between the two sections.

Moreover, it is evident that the selection, depiction and elaboration of individual episodes, as well as their distribution, was intended not only to authenticate Cuthbert's sanctity, but also to articulate contemporary agendas. The number of key scenes and themes located in the axial light (c) may indicate that it was intended to function in a similar manner to the axial light of the Great East Window.[343] As well as aligning with the uppermost tracery lights, the axial light can be used to trace Cuthbert's baptism, his spiritual birth, down through key episodes evoking all of the themes discussed above, including his consecration, to his entombment, and, in section D, the standing figure of the saint himself (Appendix 5.5). This again highlights the potential significance of the depiction of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester directly beneath the saint, given that the equivalent location in the Great East Window is occupied by the donor, Walter Skirlaw.[344] However, none of the narrative themes can be linked to Gloucester, supporting the theory proposed in Chapter 3, whereby the figures were grouped by status, and as the 'odd one out' Humphrey was placed in the central light.

It is also evident that, while the underlying narrative was arguably controlled by the Durham community, as promoters of the cult's locus, the flexibility of pictorial hagiographic design enabled the iconography of the St Cuthbert Window to be tailored to its setting, as well as Langley's interests and agendas. Consequently, while the window provides insights into the Durham-led development of the Cuthbertine cult, the themes emphasised also provide evidence of local interests. The designers augmented Cuthbert's sanctity specifically to serve the window's function within York Minster. While the commemorative display establishes Cuthbert as a national saint, the narrative works to emphasise his efficacy at a distance, as well as omitting specific links to Durham. Thus, Cuthbert is integrated within the Christian

[343] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 41.
[344] Ibid.

hierarchy evoked by the choir glazing, and local veneration is encouraged, without overtly promoting pilgrimage to Durham. Yet it is reductive to assume that this indicates a rivalry between the two institutions, beyond the natural prioritisation of their own interests. The interests of the Durham community and the York Chapter intersected, particularly in relation to national concerns, as the above discussions of model ecclesiastical behaviour and anti-heretical reforms have shown. Moreover, individuals with both York and Durham associations, including the donor Thomas Langley, were involved in the window's conception, as well as the wider benefaction of the Minster fabric. Consequently, it is likely that the iconography of the window reflected this cooperation. In particular, it would increase the likelihood of multivalent iconography, intended to convey several layers of meaning.

This is especially relevant when analysing the models for episcopal behaviour which permeate the St Cuthbert Window. At the most literal level, they authenticate Cuthbert's episcopal sanctity. Yet three additional layers of meaning can be proposed. First, as a didactic model of behaviour for the window's elite ecclesiastical audience; secondly, to highlight the associations between Langley and St Cuthbert, through their shared episcopal roles; and thirdly, in combination with the commemorative section, as an idealised display of the relationship between Church and Crown in upholding and defending the Christian faith. All of these interpretations can be linked to Langley's life and interests, but also to those of the intended audience, as the discussion of his circle and the canons of York Minster in Chapter 3 have demonstrated. Indeed, this latter interpretation integrates the St Cuthbert Window within the hierarchical vision of the northern church in the fifteenth-century choir glazing, which Norton has argued was intended to articulate "York Minster as the mother-church of the whole northern province" and express "the relationship of the Northumbrian church to the church universal".[345] While these interpretations are necessarily speculative, given that no documentary evidence of the designers' intentions survives, they both indicate Langley's involvement in the design and support the theory that the St Cuthbert Window was originally conceived earlier in the fifteenth century, as part of the wider glazing scheme. This has implications for the authorship and agency of the window.

---

[345] Norton, "Sacred Space," 170.

4.4.2 Relationship with the St William Window

Although further comparison with the iconography of the St William Window, and exploration of the nuances of its narrative design, must await the publication of Christopher Norton's research, there is evidence that the two windows demonstrate comparable technical and iconographic approaches. This supports the theory that the two windows were originally conceived together and that aspects of the St Cuthbert Window's design had been considered earlier in the fifteenth century. More significantly, further similarities are evident in the other fifteenth-century choir and western transept aisle windows, suggesting the transmission of knowledge, skills, and possibly pattern books, between generations of glaziers working within York, and specifically the Minster.

Comparison of the similarities and differences in their iconographic programmes suggests that the two windows were intended to articulate a more direct relationship between their saints. Several aspects of the arrangement, as well as the choice of themes in the St Cuthbert Window complement and correspond with those in the St William Window. Although the differences in the iconographic choices between the windows are, to some extent, attributable to the divergent interests of the two cults, the opposing emphases of the windows appear deliberately complementary. Most notably, the St William Window is dominated by the saint's posthumous miracles, emphasising the saints' potency at his cult's locus, while the St Cuthbert Window focuses almost exclusively upon his life. Similarly, the lack of elaboration of William's childhood, as well as his episcopal behaviour, despite details being provided in the textual analogues, contrasts with the extensive and carefully choreographed display of these themes in the St Cuthbert Window. Thus, while both saints are promoted as symbols of the northern church, Cuthbert's universal appeal and exemplary episcopal life are amplified, while St William's local connections and intercessory powers are emphasised.

These complementary readings of the windows are encouraged by their different reading orders. The focus on the easternmost light (e) in the St William Window does not override its verticality, as it reads from bottom to top. As the St Cuthbert Window was read from top to bottom, this encourages a viewer standing before the high altar to read the two windows dynamically: the progression of William's life upwards, towards heaven, on the

north side, then the progression of Cuthbert's life down, to the earthly realm of kings and prelates, on the south. Both windows thereby create strong vertical links between viewers and the saints. This articulation of saints linking heaven and earth, and the integral role of (arch)bishops, and kings, in upholding ecclesiastical hierarchy, contributes to the wider message within the choir glazing. Moreover, the display of both saints' episcopates in the most visible sections of each window not only supports this function, but also indicates the multiple levels at which the iconography of the windows was intended to function.

4.4.3 Insights into Authorship and Agency

The conscious crafting of the narrative to create potentially multivalent iconography provides further insights into the status, and likely identity, of the individuals involved in the commissioning and design of the window. In Chapter 3, Thomas Langley was confirmed as the window's donor. Yet, due to his death at least two years before the earliest possible completion date of the window, the involvement of his executors in the commissioning and execution was considered. It was concluded that the figures depicted in the commemorative section are best explained as Langley's choices, suggesting that the window's design had been specified, at least in iconographic outline, before his death in 1437. Moreover, while consideration of the commissioning process indicated that the Dean and Chapter probably retained ultimate control over the iconographic programme, donors were clearly involved in the selection of iconography.[346] The exploration of the narrative themes supports this interpretation, as it demonstrates that the iconography can be linked not only to the window's setting and the wider glazing scheme, but also to Langley. Moreover, the analysis of the narrative strongly suggests that Langley was involved as both patron and designer. His status, not only as a bishop, but Bishop of Durham, provides a clear motive for the episcopal emphasis within the St Cuthbert Window. Likewise, the articulation of orthodox ideals, and the role of Church and Crown in upholding the Christian faith, can be closely linked to Langley, through his role as a Lancastrian administrator.

[346] Ibid., 170, 172-173.

Nevertheless, the range of sources and their creative synthesis suggest that the window was designed through a creative partnership between the institution, donor (and/or their agents), iconographers or theologians, and glaziers. This aligns with the evidence of the commissioning process for the Great East Window, as well as the evidence of narrative design in both the St William and Great East Windows.[347] The need for guidance in the formulation of the narrative sequence would have required input from individuals familiar with both textual and pictorial Cuthbertine traditions; this would suggest a learned cleric, potentially a member of the community at Durham. As discussed in Chapter 3, John Wessington, Prior of Durham for much of Langley's episcopacy, was probably involved in the conception of hagiographic schemes at Durham, and seems the most likely candidate for iconographic advisor.[348] Such collaboration between individuals from York and Durham had precedents in the apparent collaboration between Langley's predecessor, Skirlaw, and Archbishop Scrope, in the planning of York Minster's choir glazing, probably including the St Cuthbert Window. Indeed, given Langley's funding of at least two Cuthbertine narrative cycles at Durham, probably with Wessington's support, his involvement in commissioning the York window may have been predicated upon the availability of individuals, or materials, involved in these Durham schemes.

4.4.4 Wider Insights into Narrative Design

The evidence of the creative partnership through which the St Cuthbert Window was designed, and of the integration of the window's iconography within a wider scheme, sheds light upon the complexity of such projects, as well as the collaborative efforts involved in their creation. The crafting of complex, multivalent schemes, implemented by successive generations of patrons and craftsmen, highlights intergenerational patterns of patronage, whereby individuals honoured and remembered their patrons and supporters. The extensive network of individuals involved in the conception, design and commissioning of the St Cuthbert Window provided the opportunity for exchange of iconographic and hagiographic expertise. The St Cuthbert Window's commissioners were elite, highly-educated and well-

[347] Brown, *Apocalypse*, 67; Brown, *Stained Glass*, 37, 39-40; Rickers, "Glazier," 270.
[348] Rollason, "Northern Saints," 337-338, 339; Dobson, *Durham*, 381-383.

travelled, making them arguably familiar with multivalent iconography and diverse English and European artistic programmes. Additionally, the design of the St Cuthbert Window undoubtedly benefitted, whether directly or indirectly, from the decision, probably by Archbishop Scrope, to bring John Thornton to York for the creation of the Great East Window at the beginning of the fifteenth century.[349] Moreover, the complexity and multivalency of its narrative design indicates that its creation probably also involved scholars familiar with Cuthbertine hagiography. The latter were most likely drawn from Durham, like the manuscript that is known to have been borrowed from there on at least two occasions. These findings have wider relevance to current understanding of narrative design in the fifteenth century. In particular, they raise the possibility that intergenerational and collaborative design may have been a characteristic of great church schemes more widely, which has perhaps been obscured by the loss of evidence elsewhere.

The examination of the construction of the narrative, and iconographic themes, within the St Cuthbert Window's broader hagiographical context has revealed its individuality. It is evident that the designers, while drawing inspiration from sources and using *topoi* to accurately communicate meaning, were also working creatively. This corresponds with the evidence of individualised constructions and messages in the exploration of Cuthbertine narratives in Chapter 2. Consequently, this suggests that medieval narrative design was characterised by this creative approach to its construction. Moreover, medieval commissioners and designers clearly recognised that monumental stained-glass narratives had the capacity to articulate multifaceted iconography. The St Cuthbert Window is a clear example of the deliberate use of a monumental narrative to convey complex multiple messages, both individually, and as part of a wider scheme. By revealing the multivalency and careful design of the window's narrative, this study has demonstrated that, while structurally and symbolically different from high medieval narrative windows, fifteenth-century cycles are not necessarily simpler in their iconographic design. This has implications for the analysis of late medieval monumental narratives in other media, such as wall-paintings. Consequently, analyses of narratives must take into account their architectural and

[349] Brown, *East Window*, 28.

socio-political contexts, to enable meaningful wider conclusions to be drawn. In particular, the possibility of multivalency and complexity should be considered.

Conclusion

This study has succeeded in identifying a substantial portion of the St Cuthbert Window's original design and narrative structure. This has underpinned significant new insights into its relationship with both the glazing of York Minster's eastern arm and other Cuthbertine hagiography. More broadly, it has elucidated the complex combination of factors which affected the design and execution of monumental stained-glass narratives. Their flexibility and capacity to convey multiple meanings has been demonstrated and proposals have been made about the role of individuals and institutions in crafting the narrative to convey these messages. Exploration of the patronage process has also proven the continuation of glazing projects by successive generations. This has underlined the importance of patronage and institutional networks for the commissioning and completion of both individual windows and wider schemes.

In contrast with many reconstructions, both of the St Cuthbert Window and other stained-glass narratives, this study has drawn upon a wider, interdisciplinary, range of approaches. This innovative methodology has resulted in significant contributions to knowledge in several fields. As detailed in Chapter 1, this research was founded upon recognition of the need to base analysis upon a thorough examination of the window itself, in recognition of the material qualities of the medium and their implications for interpretation. In particular, the various strands of visual, physical and documentary evidence for past interventions have been analysed. This contrasts with previous studies, whose technological and methodological limitations led in many cases to interpretations based upon comparison with textual, and to a lesser extent, pictorial analogues, and the assumption of source-copy relationships. While these remain important sources, this study's significant findings underline why the examination and reconstruction of the window had to come first within the structure of this thesis.

The approach adopted has not only enabled an authoritative reconstruction of the St Cuthbert Window's narrative, but has demonstrated that all previously published accounts of the subject and arrangement have significant errors, despite the many insights they provide. This study has revealed the substantial negative impact which Fowler's misreading has had a upon the legibility and coherence of the narrative, most notably its complete

rearrangement to read from bottom to top, as well as the additional damage and loss of material occasioned by Milner-White. Just as Norton's study of the St William Window had a fundamental impact upon its conservation and appreciation, so these findings have profound value for future conservation, not only of the St Cuthbert Window. This study's methodology is applicable to stained glass and monumental narratives more widely. It is evident that research must be based upon a clear understanding of the medium and must draw upon the full range of evidence available.

Chapter 2 undertook the first detailed interdisciplinary investigation of all Libellan and Bedan Cuthbertine hagiography. This has provided significant new insights into the use and creation of both textual and pictorial narratives. The chapter aimed to address substantial gaps in the literature, which were especially apparent in relation to cycles from the late medieval period. It is evident that the monumental scale of these cycles, as well as their damage and loss, continue to pose barriers to study and require researchers with diverse skill-sets, or collaborative approaches. The profound new insights into Durham's lost Cuthbertine glazing, and its significance, demonstrate the value of this study's methodology. Avenues for future research have also been identified, most notably exploration of the role played by John Wessington in creating both Durham histories and devising pictorial Cuthbertine narratives, and the implications this has for their construction. The current study's findings have also revealed the importance of stained-glass cycles as an expression of the cult, and therefore their value for understanding the agendas and interests of its proponents. Furthermore, the breadth of the study has provided significant new insights into fifteenth-century narrative construction, with implications beyond Cuthbertine hagiography. The degree of dynamism in Cuthbertine narratives is particularly striking. While many earlier sources continued to resonate with designers and audiences, it is clear that the narratives produced using these sources were substantially new and specific to their location, and devotional and socio-political contexts.

These findings supported the conclusions drawn in Chapter 3, which reassigned the iconographic agency of the St Cuthbert Window to Thomas Langley, revealing that the dedicatory inscription can and should be taken at face value. The iconography of the commemorative section (D), when considered alongside Langley's patronal activities at

Durham, clearly identifies him as a key actor in the selection of the window's iconography. Interpretation of the commemorative section has supported Chapter 4's analysis of the narrative themes, demonstrating that the iconographic choices can be linked to both Langley's personal agenda and national agendas, as well as the window's location in the heart of York Minster. The exploration of patterns of patronage at York revealed both instances of the posthumous execution of glazing, and the continuation of building projects by successive generations. This not only supports the conclusions drawn regarding Langley's agency, but also provides an unusually deep insight into the complexity of commissioning and patronage spanning generations. Consequently, this study has profound implications for understanding massive medieval architectural and glazing projects, which, once begun, could be continued and adapted over long periods of time by successive generations. The glazing of the choir of York Minster can potentially serve as a model for the kinds of networks that could be involved in monumental building and glazing schemes elsewhere.

The reassessment of narrative construction and analysis of the St Cuthbert Window's iconographic themes in Chapter 4 has further emphasised the value of interdisciplinarity. While there is a growing recognition of the individuality of each narrative cycle, the historiographical review highlighted the issues which the size and condition of many monumental windows pose for researchers. This new analysis of the St Cuthbert Window's narrative demonstrates how interdisciplinary methodologies can overcome these challenges, to uncover the true creativity and nuance of medieval narrative design. It is evident that the window's narrative is not simply a copy of a textual or pictorial analogue, but uses sources creatively to generate a new, unique artwork. This not only underlines the dynamic nature of the Cuthbertine narrative, but contributes to a wider understanding of narrative construction, particularly on a monumental scale. The complexity of the narrative, with its multiple meanings and structures, challenges previous approaches which have defined complexity only in terms of reading structure; while the reading order presented by the window is easier to follow than most high medieval narratives, its layers of meaning are arguably no less complex. Further research to investigate the potential explanations for this shift in structure and complexity can be suggested. Most notably, the possibility that the superficially 'logical' reading structures, imbued with several levels of significance, can be linked to medieval

experiences of reading, warrants exploration in monumental narratives, not only in stained glass, but also other media, such as wall-painting.

Furthermore, Chapter 4's reconsideration of the commemorative section as an integral part of the window has demonstrated the value of moving beyond any compartmentalised assessment of iconography. The apparent repurposing of St Cuthbert as a model for Lancastrian behaviour by Langley, in response to wider reforms and ideals, has reframed the window as a cultural product of the challenges in contemporary society, and the responses of the church in the Lancastrian period, rather than a piece of propaganda. In particular, it refutes the oppositional images of the Lancastrian south and rebellious north perpetuated in previous scholarship. This interpretation, combined with the scale, complexity and creativity evident in the St Cuthbert Window's narrative design, highlights the sheer ambition of fifteenth-century stained glass projects. These findings therefore have implications for understanding the design of other monumental narratives, both individually and as part of coherent schemes.

Additionally, the evidence of a relationship with the St William Window not only confirms the integration of the St Cuthbert Window within the choir glazing scheme, but also contributes to an understanding of the three monumental choir windows as a group. The commitment of three generations of clergy to the completion of the scheme, underlines both the ambitiousness and prestige of the project. Moreover, the fifteenth-century choir glazing's remarkable survival as a coherent scheme, which places it on par with the high medieval cycles at Chartres or the Sainte Chapelle, demonstrates its international significance as an artwork.