

Antiquarianism, Fragmentation, and Ornament:
Continental Stained Glass in East Anglia,
c. 1800-1850

Catherine A. Spirit

Two Volumes
Volume I

PhD

The University of York

History of Art

September 2021

Abstract

Studies of continental stained glass in England have previously focused on the iconography and origins of imported panels. This thesis extends the earlier scholarship by offering an exploration of these panels within English composite windows of an early nineteenth-century date. Through close analysis of remaining schemes and archival materials, this thesis considers the essential role of this glazing style to the development of the Georgian Gothic aesthetic. This study employs a unique multi-disciplinary approach, which contrasts the use of the fragment in literary Gothic and stained-glass design. Additionally, this thesis considers how stained glass became a powerful vehicle of self-expression for landowners and patrons in both domestic and ecclesiastical spaces. Using historic continental glass fragments, these windows were designed to fabricate narratives of inherited power, lineage, and paternalism in homes and parish churches. This thesis will also consider how in a period of increased religious pluralism, composite windows were used to create a medievalised interior in historic Anglican churches and some private Catholic chapels. This study emphasises the role of this glazing style in the debate regarding the role of different Churches in the national religious landscape. As well as considering broad cultural and religious themes, this work will examine the stained-glass trade, with reference to the role of antiquaries and the sale of glass by auction. This thesis also employs close visual analysis of existing schemes and historic restoration records to reflect on the complex and intricate designs of composite windows in this period and the technical innovations which these represent, including the transference of skills from other crafts and the development of kiln technology. The significant role of lesser-known glaziers, glass painters, importers, and other cultural figures is considered. These approaches provide a new vantage point through which to consider the development of nineteenth-century stained-glass practice.

Contents

Volume I

List of Tables.....	v
Volume I	v
Volume II	v
List of Figures	vi
Acknowledgements.....	xvii
Author’s Declaration	xix
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Georgian Goths.....	25
Horace Walpole, Strawberry Hill, and the Gothic Fragment	26
Horace Walpole and Defining Gothic.....	26
Stained Glass at Strawberry Hill	32
Fragmentation and the Literary Gothic	45
East Anglian Goths	54
Norwich: A Cosmopolitan City	54
Fraternity of United Friars.....	56
Foreign Glass and “Liberation”	71
Conclusion	80
Chapter Two: Domestic Schemes	83
Lineage, Heraldry, and Power	83
Contemplation and Study	96
Staircases and Concealment of the Unsightly	109
Conclusion	119
Chapter Three: Continental Stained Glass, Patronage, and National Religion.....	121
Church Building in the Early Nineteenth Century: The Impact of Nonconformity	122
Beyond the Church Commissioners: East Anglian Patronage.....	139
Conclusion	189
Chapter Four: Stained-Glass Import Networks: The Influence of Traders, Agents, and Auction Houses on Composite Scheme Designs	191
Trade Routes and Dealers: Established Routes of Importation.....	195
Rushbrooke: Agent Importer	195
Hampp: The Large-Scale Importer	202

Stained-Glass Auctions and their Influence on Collecting	211
Illuminating and Spectacle: Advertising Stained Glass	211
Auction Catalogues: The Importance of Scale	217
Stonework and the Importance of Panel Size in Practice	228
Conclusion	232
Chapter Five: Workshop Networks and the Development of Glass Painting in Early Nineteenth-Century Norwich.....	233
Terminology: Glaziers, Glass Painters, and Glass Stainers.....	233
The State of Glass Painting and Staining in the Early Nineteenth Century: The Question of Networks.....	243
Glass Painting and Firing at Yarrington’s Workshop	249
Establishing a Glass Staining Business	249
Robert Allen: Stained-Glass Supplier	253
James George Zobel: Glass Painter and Kiln Technician.....	259
The Hierarchy of Yarrington’s Workshop	271
Yarrington’s Workshop: Production Methods and Techniques.....	275
Mass Production of Border Glass.....	275
Reproduction: Engravings and Glass Painting.....	279
Conclusion	291
Conclusion	292

Volume II

Appendix I: Biographies: Key Glaziers, Glass Painters, Dealers, and Traders	299
Allen, Robert (1745-1835).....	299
Betton, John (1765-1849) and David Evans (1793-1861)	301
Dixon, John (1783-1857)	304
Hampp, John Christopher (1750-825), William Stevenson (1741-1821), and Seth William Stevenson (1784-1853)	309
King, James and Sons	318
John Middleton (1791-1848)	319
Winter Family: William Winter (c. 1755-1806), R. M. Winter (m. 1833, ill health 1840), John Winter (1791-1867) and Cornelius Jansen Winter (1820-1891)	319
William Winter	320
R. M. Winter	320

John Winter	321
Cornelius Jansen Walter Winter	324
Yarrington, Samuel Carter (1781-1846)	326
Zobel, James George (1791-1879)	330
Appendix II: Glazing Scheme Gazetteer	333
Abbreviations	372
Bibliography	373
Unpublished Primary.....	373
Published Primary	374
Theses.....	387
Secondary.....	388
Websites.....	402
Figures	409

List of Tables

Volume I

Table 1: Stained-glass auctions and the number of lots available	218
Table 2: "Long Historical Lights" category, 1804 sales catalogue.....	220
Table 3: "Tablets, Ovals, Squares and Roundels [...] and Circles" category, 1808 sales catalogue.....	221
Table 4: Lots assigned to specific places of origin across sales catalogues.....	223
Table 5: Glazing and glass painting professional titles in trade directories of the 1830s and 1840s	238
Table 6: Number of glazing and stained-glass businesses in Norwich listed in trade directories, 1783-1845	239
Table 7: Skills according to profession in glazing and glass painting during the early nineteenth century	240
Table 8: Robert Allen panels in schemes attributed to the workshop of S. C. Yarrington .	258
Table 9: Zobel's firing log for S. C. Yarrington's workshop, December 1844-December 1846	267
Table 10: Allen's demi-figures at Lowestoft and their use in other Norfolk schemes	280
Table 11: Allen panels across East Anglian schemes and their visual sources.	281

Volume II

Table 1: Robert Allen panels used in stained glass schemes by S. C. Yarrington	301
Table 2: Robert Dixon key glazing schemes	306
Table 3: Winter glaziers family tree	319
Table 4: Churches with panels in the style of C. J. W. Winter which may have been painted by John Winter	323
Table 5: Locations of stained glass painted by C. J. W. Winter.....	325

List of Figures

Figure 1: Thurton (Norfolk), Church of St Ethelbert, window sV. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 11, 2021, http://www.norfolkstainedglass.org/Thurton/home.shtm	409
Figure 2: Earsham (Norfolk), All Saints Church, window sV, pre-restoration. Stained and painted glass. KNG 3/7/1/1/27 Earsham, NRO, Norwich.....	410
Figure 3: Earsham (Norfolk), All Saints Church, window sV, stonework alteration plans, 1952. KNG 3/7/1/1/27 Earsham, NRO, Norwich.....	411
Figure 4: Earsham (Norfolk), All Saints Church, window sV. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014	412
Figure 5: Earsham (Norfolk), All Saints Church, window sVI, pre-restoration. Stained and painted glass. KNG 3/7/1/1/27 Earsham, NRO, Norwich	413
Figure 6: Earsham (Norfolk), All Saints Church, window sVI, stonework alteration plans, 1952. KNG 3/7/1/1/27 Earsham, NRO, Norwich.....	414
Figure 7: Earsham (Norfolk), All Saints Church, window sVI. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014	415
Figure 8: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, East window. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2021	416
Figure 9: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, East Window detail showing historic arrangement of lower window panels, 1965. RK&S, Folder KNG 3/2/7/42 Nowton, NRO, Norwich	417
Figure 10: Denton (Norfolk), St Mary the Virgin, East window. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Mar 20, 2022, http://www.norfolkstainedglass.org/Denton/home.shtm#	418
Figure 11: John Carter, <i>View from the Hall at Strawberry Hill</i> , 1788. Pen, ink and watercolour on laid paper, h27.7xw20.4cm. The Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University, New Haven, Folio 49 3582 fol. 24. Accessed Nov 29, 2019, https://libsvcs1.its.yale.edu/strawberryhill/oneitem.asp?i=1&id=522	419
Figure 12: Coddendam (Suffolk), Church of St Mary, East window, 1894. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2021.....	420
Figure 13: <i>Lowestoft, St Margaret's Church Interior</i> , c. 1860. Photograph. 1300/72/10/49, Suffolk Records Office, Lowestoft.....	421
Figure 14: Lowestoft (Suffolk), Church of St Margaret, window sII, remains of Robert Allen's East window scheme of 1819. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2017.....	422
Figure 15: Herringfleet (Suffolk), Church of St Margaret, East window, c. 1826-32. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2017	423
Figure 16: Strawberry Hill. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2019	424
Figure 17: Francis Grose, <i>View of Strawberry Hill (East Front)</i> , c. 1787. Watercolour. The Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University, New Haven. Accessed Aug 22, 2019, http://images.library.yale.edu/strawberryhill/etour_07.asp	424
Figure 18: Strawberry Hill, view of the lantern and Staircase. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2019.....	425
Figure 19: Strawberry Hill, view of the Hall and Great Parlour Vestibule from the Staircase. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2019	425

Figure 20: Strawberry Hill, view of the Staircase from the second floor. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2019	426
Figure 21: Strawberry Hill, view of the Great Parlour Lobby window from the Hall. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2019	426
Figure 22: Strawberry Hill, Little Parlour overdoor window recreated by Paul San Casciani (original design by William Price the Younger). Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2019	427
Figure 23: Strawberry Hill, Staircase quatrefoil windows from the Hall. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2019	427
Figure 24: Strawberry Hill, Staircase quatrefoil windows from the second floor, 1924. Photograph. Future Content and Brand Licensing, Country Life. Accessed Nov 26, 2019, https://www.futurecontenthub.com/product/1000547963	428
Figure 25: <i>Gothic Lantern</i> , 1755. Coloured, stained and enamelled glass set in an iron, lead and painted tin frame, h109.2xw35.6xd36.2cm. The Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University, New Haven. Accessed Nov 28, 2019, https://libsvcs-1.its.yale.edu/strawberryhill/oneitem.asp?id=144	428
Figure 26: Strawberry Hill Library windows. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2019.....	429
Figure 27: John Carter, <i>View of the Library at Strawberry Hill</i> , 1788. Watercolour, h24.7xw31cm (including border, not reproduced). The Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University, New Haven, Folio 49 3582 fol. 74. Accessed Nov 29, 2019, https://libsvcs-1.its.yale.edu/strawberryhill/oneitem.asp?id=524	429
Figure 28: John Carter, <i>Sketch-View of Library</i> , 1788. The Huntington Library, San Marino, California. Peover and Rogers, "New Light on Strawberry Hill," 33	430
Figure 29: Johann Heinrich Müntz, <i>Walpole Seated in his Library</i> , c. 1755-59. Pen and wash. Private Collection. Wainwright, <i>The Romantic Interior</i> , 91.....	430
Figure 30: Strawberry Hill Library central window detail. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2019	431
Figure 31: Portrait of Bartlett Gurney, late eighteenth century. Oil on canvas. Barclays Group. Accessed Nov 29, 2019, https://www.archive.barclays.com/items/show/696	431
Figure 32: Rosary of the Fraternity of United Friars, c. 1785-1828. Printed card. The Coleman Manuscript Collection, COL 9/32, NRO, Norwich	432
Figure 33: Crown Court, Norwich. Entrance with sixteenth-century lintel bearing the Merchant's mark of Augustine Steward (left) and the Arms of the Mercer's Company (right). Photograph: David Spirit, 2020	432
Figure 34: Worshipful Company of Mercers Arms, lintel over the entrance to Crown Court, Norwich. Photograph: David Spirit, 2020	433
Figure 35: Merchant's mark of Augustine Steward, lintel over the entrance to Crown Court, Norwich. Photograph: David Spirit, 2020	433
Figure 36: Anthony Norris, notes on the stained glass at Carrow Abbey, 18 th century. Ink on paper. Norris, Anthony. <i>The History of Diverse Towns and Villages in the County of Norfolk: Consisting of the Funeral Monuments, Arms, etc., Inscriptions in the Churches, some Account of the Families there Seated, of the Manors, and of the Foundations of Several Monasteries and Religious Houses</i> . Collected 1730-33, 1730-1733, Walter Rye Collection, RYE 6, iii, NRO, Norwich.	434

Figure 37: Robert Pranker, “To the Honourable & Right Revd The Lord Bishop & To the Revd the Dean & Chapter of Exeter, This Engraving of the Great West Window in their Cathedral Church,” after 1767. Etching with hand colouring, sheet h62.5xw42.3cm. King George III’s Personal Coloured Collection, British Library, London. Accessed July 31, 2019, http://george3.splrarebooks.com/collection/view/To-the-Honourable-Right-Revd-The-Lord-Bishop-To-the-Revd-the-Dean-Chapter-o	435
Figure 38: Thomas Gainsborough, <i>Ignatius Sancho</i> , 1768. Oil on canvas, h73.7xw62.2cm, National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa. Accessed Aug 22, 2019, https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/portrait-of-ignatius-sancho-by-thomas-gainsborough-1768	436
Figure 39: Felbrigg Hall (Norfolk), Great Hall, c.1840. Accessed Aug 30, 2021, http://www.norfolkstainedglass.org/Felbrigg_Hall/home.shtm	437
Figure 40: George Cattermole, view of the oriel window at Fonthill Abbey, early-nineteenth century. Alexander, <i>Life at Fonthill 1807-22</i> , facing 121	438
Figure 41: Frances Dorothea Hoare (?), view of the Drawing Room at Luscombe Castle (Devonshire), showing the French doors to the veranda, c. 1825. Watercolour. Hussey, <i>English Country Houses</i> , 62	438
Figure 42: Felbrigg Hall (Norfolk), Great Hall, upper window sl, c. 1840. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Aug 30, 2021, http://www.norfolkstainedglass.org/Felbrigg_Hall/home.shtm	439
Figure 43: Felbrigg Hall (Norfolk), Great Hall, upper window sII, c. 1840. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Aug 30, 2021, http://www.norfolkstainedglass.org/Felbrigg_Hall/home.shtm	439
Figure 44: Felbrigg Hall (Norfolk), Great Hall, upper South Bay window, c. 1840, digitally altered to show all panels. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Aug 30, 2021, http://www.norfolkstainedglass.org/Felbrigg_Hall/home.shtm	440
Figure 45: Felbrigg Hall (Norfolk), Great Hall, upper West Bay window, c. 1840. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Aug 30, 2021, http://www.norfolkstainedglass.org/Felbrigg_Hall/home.shtm	440
Figure 46: Wragby (North Yorkshire), Church of St Michael and Our Lady, window nIV, 2013. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Aug 22, 2019, http://www.cvma.ac.uk/jsp/record.do?mode=LOCATION&photodataKey=25702&sortField=WINDOW_NO&sortDirection=ASC&rowsPerPage=20&selectedPage=3&recPagePos=2	441
Figure 47: Examples of windows suitable for a picturesque cottage. Atkinson, <i>Views of Picturesque Cottages with Plans</i> , figures 1-5.....	442
Figure 48: Swannington (Norfolk) The Swannington Lawn Estate, first floor window I. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2018.....	443
Figure 49: Swannington (Norfolk), The Swannington Lawn Estate, first floor window II. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2018.....	443
Figure 50: Swannington (Norfolk), The Swannington Lawn Estate, ground floor window I upper panels. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2018.....	444
Figure 51: Swannington (Norfolk), The Swannington Lawn Estate, ground floor window II upper panels. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2018.....	444

Figure 52: Swannington (Norfolk), The Swannington Lawn Estate, ground floor window III upper panels. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2018.....	444
Figure 53: The Swannington Lawn Estate, Swannington (Norfolk), ground floor window II upper panels, dating detail (1821). Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2018.....	445
Figure 54: The Swannington Lawn Estate, Swannington (Norfolk), ground floor window II upper panels, Edmund Bartell signature. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2018	445
Figure 55: Swannington (Norfolk), Church of St Margaret, East window, c. 1848. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2018.....	446
Figure 56: Swannington (Norfolk), Church of St Margaret, window sVIII tracery, c. 1848. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2018.....	447
Figure 57: Hedenham (Norfolk), Church of St Peter, window sIV tracery, 1827. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014	447
Figure 58: Kimberley (Norfolk), Church of St Peter, window sII tracery detail, c. 1825. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2018.....	448
Figure 59: Edward Davis, East-west section through the Monk's Parlour to show the stained-glass window, c. October 1825. Watercolour on paper. Dorey, "Exquisite Hues and magical effects'," 18.....	449
Figure 60: John Soane's Museum (London), Monk's Parlour external window. Painted and stained glass. Dorey, "Exquisite Hues and magical effects'," 18	449
Figure 61: George Bailey, Plan of Light 1, external window, Monk's Parlour, John Soane's Museum (London), c. 1837. Helen Dorey, "The History of the Installations of Stained Glass at 13 Lincoln's Inn Fields since John Soane's Death in 1837," <i>The Journal of Stained Glass</i> XXVII (2003): 51.....	450
Figure 62: George Bailey, Plan of Light 2, external window, Monk's Parlour, John Soane's Museum (London), c. 1837. Dorey, "The History of the Installations," 51.....	450
Figure 63: George Bailey, Plan of window from entrance door to the Monk's Parlour, John Soane's Museum (London), c. 1837. Dorey, "The History of the Installations," 52	451
Figure 64: George Bailey, Plan of window on the north side of the recess/aperture, Monk's Parlour, John Soane's Museum (London), c. 1837. Dorey, "The History of the Installations," 53	451
Figure 65: George Bailey, Plan of window on the south side of the aperture, Monk's Parlour, John Soane's Museum (London), c. 1837. Dorey, "The History of the Installations," 54	452
Figure 66: George Bailey, Plan of window from door on north side of the aperture, Monk's Parlour, John Soane's Museum (London), c. 1837. Dorey, "The History of the Installations," 55	452
Figure 67: Henry Stisted, <i>Sir Walter Scott in his Armoury</i> , 1826. Wainwright, <i>The Romantic Interior</i> , 173.....	453
Figure 68: Norwich Guildhall council chamber glazing, c. 1835-50. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014.....	454
Figure 69: Great Yarmouth (Norfolk), 4 South Quay, staircase window. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David King, 2021	455

- Figure 70: Ketteringham (Norfolk), Ketteringham Hall, staircase window. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David King, 2021456
- Figure 71: Stained glass panel depicting an infant baptism scene, formerly from Langley Hall (Norfolk), mid-twentieth century. Photographic glass plate negative, h15.24xw10.16cm. Records of G. King & Son (Lead Glaziers) Ltd of Norwich, KNG 3/2/1/581, NRO, Norwich, mid-twentieth century457
- Figure 72: Blickling Hall (Norfolk). Accessed Aug 22, 2019, <https://www.explorenorfolkuk.co.uk/blickling-hall.html>457
- Figure 73: Ground floor plan of Blickling Hall (Norfolk) during the seventeenth century, before the movement of the staircase. Note the placement of the Brown Staircase against the north external wall of the room labelled “hall” (now home to the Grand Staircase). Stanley Millson, “Blickling Hall: The Building of a Great House,” 68.....458
- Figure 74: William Ivory, Album No. 12. Ceiling plan and elevation for the remodelling of the Great Hall as a stair hall, Blickling Hall (Norfolk), 1765. Pen and ink on paper. National Trust. Accessed Aug 20, 2019, <http://www.nationaltrustcollections.org.uk/object/353776>459
- Figure 75: Blickling Hall (Norfolk), Grand Staircase window. Stained and painted glass. National Trust. Accessed May 20, 2019, <http://www.nationaltrustcollections.org.uk/object/354901>460
- Figure 76: John Chessell Buckler, *The Great Hall*, 1820. Watercolour on paper. National Trust, *Illustrated Picture List* (Swindon: National Trust, 2010), 2461
- Figure 77: Blickling Hall (Norfolk), grand Staircase from the ground floor. Accessed May 28, 2019, <http://www.tournorfolk.co.uk/blicklinghall.html>.....462
- Figure 78: James Sillett, *The Octagon Chapel*, n.d. Monochrome on paper, h13.5xw21.6cm. Norfolk Museums Collection, Norwich. Accessed Dec 31, 2020, <http://norfolk museums collections.org/collections/objects/object-1937469579.html#!/?q=octagon%2Bchapel>.....463
- Figure 79: Oldham Street (Manchester), Wesleyan Methodist chapel, 1807. Accessed Dec 30, 2020, <https://www.genuki.org.uk/big/eng/LAN/Manchester/CentralHall>.....464
- Figure 80: Francis Bedford, *St John, Waterloo Road, 1823-24*. Port, *600 New Churches*, 97464
- Figure 81: Chelsea (London), St Luke's Church. Accessed Sept 23, 2021, <http://www.speel.me.uk/chlondon/stlukeschelsea.htm>465
- Figure 82: Map detail, illustrating the urban development of Chelsea around St Luke's Church, 1822. John Cary, *Cary's New Plan of London and its Vicinity* (London: Cary, 1822). Accessed Dec 31, 2020, http://tudigit.ulb.tu-darmstadt.de/show/Sp_London1822/0001466
- Figure 83: Map detail, illustrating the urban development of Chelsea around St Luke's Church, 1874 (surveyed 1865). National Library of Scotland, “London (First Editions c1850s) LIII (Battersea; Chelsea; Kensington),” *OS 25 inch England and Wales, 1841-1952*, n.d. Accessed Dec 31, 2020, <https://maps.nls.uk/view/103313072>466
- Figure 84: Herringfleet (Suffolk), Church of St Margaret, East window and widows sII and sIII, Herringfleet St Margaret (Suffolk). Photograph: David Spirit, 2017467

Figure 85: John Francis Leathes standing with gourd. Thomas Picken, <i>Gourd, 196lb. in Weight & 7ft. 3 ins. In Circumference, raised in the garden of John Francis Leathes Esq^r. Herringfleet Hall, Suffolk, 1846, from seeds from the Horticultural Society, c. 1846.</i> Lithographic print, h19.3xw16.2cm. British Museum, London. Accessed Sept 10, 2021, https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1859-0528-145	467
Figure 86: Redenhall (Norfolk), Church of St Mary, window nII, 1825. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2014	468
Figure 87: Herringfleet (Suffolk), Church of St Margaret, window nII, c. 1825-32. Stained and painted glass, Accessed Sept 7, 2021, https://flic.kr/p/4UvVUH	468
Figure 88: Herringfleet (Suffolk), Church of St Margaret, window sII, c. 1825-32. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2017	469
Figure 89: Herringfleet (Suffolk), Church of St Margaret, window sIII, c. 1825-32. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2017	470
Figure 90: Bristol, Church of St Mary Redcliffe, window nXIX. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, https://flic.kr/p/gzFHeJ	471
Figure 91: Thurton (Norfolk), Church of St Ethelbert, window sVI, panel 2a, stained-glass panel depicting a female saint in the style of Robert Allen, pre-1826. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2014	472
Figure 92: Thurton (Norfolk) Church of St Ethelbert, East window detail. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2014	472
Figure 93: Thurton (Norfolk), Church of St Ethelbert, East window tracery, 1826. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2014	473
Figure 94: Buckenham (Norfolk), Church of St Nicholas, East window upper lights (lower window plain glazing), 1823. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014.....	473
Figure 95: Langley (Norfolk), Church of St Michael, West window. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2014	474
Figure 96: Mulbarton (Norfolk), St Mary Magdalen, East window. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Mar 20, 2022, https://www.cvma.ac.uk/jsp/record.do?mode=LOCATION&photodataKey=13083&sortField=WINDOW_NO&sortDirection=ASC&rowsPerPage=20&selectedPage=1&recPagePos=4	475
Figure 97: <i>Joseph's Brethren Discover Money in their Grain Sacks</i> , c. 1530. Stained and painted glass. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Accessed Aug 20, 2018, https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/195778	476
Figure 98: Ditchingham (Norfolk), Church of St Mary, window sII, 1822. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014	477
Figure 99: Ditchingham (Norfolk), Church of St Mary, window sIII, 1822. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014	478
Figure 100: Ditchingham (Norfolk), Church of St Mary, window sII, 1822. Photograph: Catherine Spirit	479
Figure 101: William Fowler, <i>Sir William de Berdwell</i> , 1805. Hand coloured engraving, h82xw58.5cm. Accessed Sept 10, 2021, https://www.christies.com/en/lot/lot-5580723	480

Figure 102: Worthenbury (Wrexham), Church of St Deiniol, East window detail, Betton & Evans, <i>Sir Roger de Puleston Miles</i> , 1823. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 10, 2021, http://stainedglass.llgc.org.uk/image/7719#largeimage	480
Figure 103: Bardwell (Suffolk), Church of St Peter and St Paul, <i>Sir William de Berdewell</i> , 15 th century. Accessed Sept 10, 2021, https://flic.kr/p/4uRNkR	481
Figure 104: Ditchingham (Norfolk), Church of St Mary, window sIII detail, <i>Lady Margaret Beaufort</i> , 1822. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014	481
Figure 105: Meynart Wewyck, <i>Lady Margaret Beaufort</i> , c. 1510. Oil on panel, h180xw122cm. St John's College, Cambridge. Chen and Bolland, "Meynart Wewyck and the Portrait of Lady Margaret Beaufort"	482
Figure 106: Edwin Dalton Smith, <i>Orbell Ray Oakes</i> , 1835. Watercolour on ivory, in h12.5xw10cm red leather case. Accessed Mar 24, 2019, https://www.the-saleroom.com/en-gb/auction-catalogues/cheffinsfineart/catalogue-id-srche10138/lot-b9fda8da-8003-41c2-810c-a88f011ecb35	483
Figure 107: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, Oakes family pew back, pre-1838. Photograph: David Spirit, 2021	484
Figure 108: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, Oakes family pew, pre-1838. Photograph: David Spirit, 2021	485
Figure 109: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, window nII, c. 1816-21. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2021	486
Figure 110: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, window sII, design c. 1816-21. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2021	487
Figure 111: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, memorial to O. R. Oakes. Photograph: David Spirit, 2021	488
Figure 112: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, window sV. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2021	489
Figure 113: Thomas Gainsborough, <i>John Plampin</i> , c. 1752. Oil on canvas, h50.2xw60.3cm. National Gallery, London. Accessed Sept 10, 2021, https://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/thomas-gainsborough-john-plampin	490
Figure 114: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, vestry east window upper panels. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2021.....	490
Figure 115: Costessey Hall and the chapel of St Augustine. J. P. Neal, <i>Joans' View of the Seats, Mansions, Castles etc. of Noblemen and Gentlemen in England</i> (London, 1829), 2	491
Figure 116: Costessey Hall (Norfolk), chapel window. Stained and painted glass. Shepard, "Our Fine Gothic Magnificence," 197	491
Figure 117: Burton Constable Hall (East Yorkshire), chapel window, 1844. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 19, 2021, https://www.vidimus.org/issues/issue-136/features/chapel-window-burton-constable-hall/	492
Figure 118: Burton Constable (East Yorkshire), Long Gallery window scheme. Digitally composed image. Lauren Healy, "Catholic Collecting in Nineteenth-Century England," 134	493
Figure 119: Interior of Lakenham, St Mark (Norfolk) looking East, c. 1895. Photograph courtesy of Revd. Erik West Lindell, 2019.....	493

Figure 120: Depden (Suffolk), Church of St Mary, East window, 1842. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014.....	494
Figure 121: Unsigned, Frontispiece of Queen Eleanor and Henry III, 1765, engraving. Royal Academy of Arts, London. Accessed Mar 24, 2020, https://www.royalacademy.org.uk/art-artists/work-of-art/frontispiece-of-queen-eleanor-and-henry-iii	495
Figure 122: Lichfield Cathedral (Staffordshire), Lady Chapel glazing. Accessed Sept 20, 2021, https://www.barleystudio.co.uk/portfolio/c16th-lichfield/	496
Figure 123: Cockayne Hatley (Bedfordshire), Church of St John the Baptist, East window, 1829. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 12, 2021, https://www.cvma.ac.uk/jsp/invNo.do	497
Figure 124: James Pearson, <i>Portrait of George III</i> , 1793. Stained and painted glass, h24.38xw14.99cm. Stained Glass Museum, Ely. Accessed Sept 10, 2021, https://stainedglassmuseum.com/catshow.php?func=show&seq=0&collno=ELYGM%3AL1992.6#mainimage	498
Figure 125: Chedgrave (Norfolk), All Saints Church, East window. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014.....	499
Figure 126: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, East window, panel 2c with arrows indicating repeated decorative panel, c.1816-21. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2013	500
Figure 127: Great Saxham (Suffolk), Church of St Andrew, East window, 1847. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014	501
Figure 128: Ann Mills, <i>Chancel of the Church of St Andrew, Great Saxham</i>), 1815. Print of original watercolour. Church of St Andrew, Great Saxham. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014.....	502
Figure 129: Hingham (Norfolk), St Andrew, East window. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2014	503
Figure 130: John Rowell tradecard. Bodleian Library, Oxford. Davis, "John Rowell," 179	504
Figure 131: Apethorpe (Northamptonshire), Church of St Leonard. John Rowell, East window detail, <i>The Last Supper</i> , 1732. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, https://flic.kr/p/J1gGYd	505
Figure 132: The Vyne, Sherborne St John (Hampshire). John Rowell, Tomb Chapel window detail, <i>The Adoration of the Shepherds</i> , c. 1731. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, https://flic.kr/p/fMFuvY	505
Figure 133: York Minster, window sXXIV. William Peckitt, <i>St Peter</i> , 1768. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2012	506
Figure 134: Winston (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, window nII. C. J. W. Winter, <i>St James the Apostle</i> , c. 1840. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2017	507
Figure 135: Winston (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, window nII. C. J. W. Winter, <i>St Matthew</i> , c. 1840. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2017	507
Figure 136: Winston (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, window sII. C. J. W. Winter, <i>St Andrew</i> , c. 1840. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2017	508

Figure 137: Winston (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, window sIII. C. J. W. Winter, <i>St Andrew</i> , c. 1840. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2017	508
Figure 138: Winston (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, window sIV. C. J. W. Winter, <i>St Bartholomew</i> , c. 1840. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2017	509
Figure 139: Winston (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, window sIV. C. J. W. Winter, <i>St Andrew</i> , c. 1840. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2017	509
Figure 140: Thurton (Norfolk), Church of St Ethelbert, window sVI, panel 1b detail. Floral decorative panel in the style of Robert Allen, pre-1826. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014	510
Figure 141: Thurton (Norfolk), Church of St Ethelbert, window sVI, panel 1a detail. Floral decorative panel in the style of Yarrington, pre-1826. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 11, 2021, http://www.norfolkstainedglass.org/Thurton/home.shtm	510
Figure 142: Lowestoft Porcelain Factory, <i>Ink-Pot</i> , c. 1757-1802. Soft-paste porcelain with blue underglaze paint, h5.33xd6.86cm. British Museum, London. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/H_1887-0307-XI-18	511
Figure 143: Lowestoft Porcelain Factory, <i>Flask</i> , 1782. Soft-paste porcelain with blue underglaze paint, h14.48xd11.43cm. British Museum, London. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/H_1887-0307-XI-16	511
Figure 144: Lowestoft Porcelain Factory, <i>Mug</i> . c. 1790. Porcelain with blue underglaze paint, h13.46cm. British Museum, London. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/H_1938-0314-20-CR	512
Figure 145: Thorpe Market (Norfolk), Church of St Margaret, East end screen detail. Robert Allen, <i>Arms of George III</i> . 1819. Previously Lowestoft (Suffolk), Church of St Margaret, East window. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, https://flic.kr/p/Udans5	513
Figure 146: Thurton (Norfolk), Church of St Ethelbert, window nIV, panel 1a detail. Arms of George IV in the style of Robert Allen, c. 1820-26. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014	513
Figure 147: Thurton (Norfolk), Church of St Ethelbert, window sII, panel 3a detail. Decorative panel in the style of Robert Allen, pre-1826. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014	514
Figure 148: Lowestoft Porcelain Factory, <i>Mug</i> , c. 1757-1802. Soft-paste porcelain with enamel paint, h7.1xd11.4cm. British Museum, London. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/H_1887-0307-XI-6	514
Figure 149: Robert Allen, <i>Mug</i> . c. 1790. Soft-paste porcelain painted with enamels and gilded, h13.9xd10.2cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Accessed Aug 22, 2017, https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O337038/mug-allen-robert/	515
Figure 150: Little Plumstead (Norfolk), Church of St Protase and St Gervase, window sII, post-WWII. RK&S, Folder 199D Little Plumstead + Great Plumstead KNG 2/2/5/198, The Archive of G. King and Son (Lead Glaziers), NRO, Norwich	516
Figure 151: Little Plumstead (Norfolk), Church of St Protase and St Gervase, window sII, post-restoration. RK&S, Folder 199D Little Plumstead + Great Plumstead.....	516

- Figure 152: Benjamin Zobel, *Tiger and Crocodile*, . 1810. Marmotinto, h50xw68cm. Peter Nahum at the Leicester Galleries, London. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, <http://www.leicestergalleries.com/metadot/index.pl?isa=Metadot::SystemApp::AntiqueSearch;op=detail;id=10972>517
- Figure 153: James George Zobel, *Sketch*. Ink sketch. Notebook of James George Zobel...517
- Figure 154: Great Hospital (Norwich), Church of S Helen, James George Zobel, fragment from *Transfiguration*, 1826. Originally Norwich Cathedral, East window. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, http://www.norfolkstainedglass.org/St_Helen/home.shtm518
- Figure 155: James George Zobel, *Sketches of male heads*, c. 1813-14. Pencil on paper. Notebook of James George Zobel519
- Figure 156: Little Plumstead (Norfolk), Church of St Gervase and St Protase, window sII, panel 4a. Yarrington workshop roundels, c. 1834. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Jan 20, 2018, <http://www.geograph.org.uk/photo/911565>520
- Figure 157: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, East window, panel 2c detail, c. 1816-21. Photograph: David Spirit, 2013520
- Figure 158: Lowestoft (Suffolk), Church of St Margaret, window sII, panel 1b detail. Robert Allen, *St James*, 1818. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2017.....521
- Figure 159: Lowestoft (Suffolk), Church of St Margaret, window sII, panel 1c. Robert Allen, *Healing the Blind*, c. 1818-19. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2017.522
- Figure 160: Thurton (Norfolk), Church of St Ethelbert, West window, panel 2a detail. Robert Allen, *St Matthew*, pre-1826. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2014.....523
- Figure 161: Little Plumstead (Norfolk), Church of St Gervase and St Protase, window sII, panel 2a detail. Robert Allen, *St Matthew*. c. 1818-35, photograph. KNG2/2/5/198, Little Plumstead and Great Plumstead, NRO, Norwich523
- Figure 162: Egbert van Panderen, Apostel Thomas. c. 1590-1637, engraving on paper, h45.9xw32.2cm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, <http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM0001.COLLECT.160338>524
- Figure 163: Lowestoft (Suffolk), Church of St Margaret, window sII, panel 2a detail. Robert Allen, *Bartholomew*, 1819. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2017524
- Figure 164: Langley (Norfolk), Church of St Bartholomew, window nV, panel 2c detail. Robert Allen, *St Bartholomew*, c. 1819-35. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014524
- Figure 165: Egbert van Panderen, Apostel Matteüs. c. 1590-1637, engraving on paper, h456mmxw322mm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Accessed Aug 24, 2017, <http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM0001.collect.160340>525
- Figure 166: Thurton (Norfolk), Church of St Ethelbert, West window, panel 3b detail. Robert Allen, *St Gregory*, pre-1826. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2014.....525

Figure 167: Langley (Norfolk), Church of St Michael, West window, panel A3. Robert Allen, <i>St Matthew the Apostle</i> , 1819-35. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2017.....	525
Figure 168: Loddon (Norfolk), Church of the Holy Trinity, East window. Stained and painted glass. Photograph: David Spirit, 2014.....	526
Figure 169: Loddon (Norfolk), Church of the Holy Trinity, window nIII. James George Zobel, <i>Holy Trinity</i> , 1842 (removed from East window). Stained and painted glass. Photograph: Catherine Spirit, 2014.....	527
Figure 170: William Cave, <i>St Peter</i> , 1677. Etching. Cave, <i>Apostolici</i> , 1.....	528
Figure 171: James George Zobel, <i>Saint Peter</i> , 1813. Pencil on paper. Notebook of James George Zobel.....	529
Figure 172: Loddon (Norfolk), Church of the Holy Trinity, East window, panel A1. James George Zobel, <i>St Peter</i> , 1842. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, http://www.norfolkstainedglass.org/Loddon/home.shtm	529
Figure 173: James George Zobel, <i>Saint James Major</i> , 1813. Pencil on paper. Notebook of James George Zobel.....	530
Figure 174: Loddon (Norfolk), Church of the Holy Trinity, East window, panel A10. James George Zobel, <i>St James</i> , 1842. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, http://www.norfolkstainedglass.org/Loddon/home.shtm	530
Figure 175: James George Zobel, <i>Saint Mattias</i> , 1813. Pencil on paper. Notebook of James George Zobel.....	531
Figure 176: Loddon (Norfolk), Church of the Holy Trinity, East window, panel A9. James George Zobel, <i>St Mattias</i> , 1842. Stained and painted glass. Accessed Sept 7, 2021, http://www.norfolkstainedglass.org/Loddon/home.shtm	531
Figure 177: Great Snoring (Norfolk), Church of St Mary. <i>Sir Ralph Shelton and Lady Shelton</i> , 1423. Sepulchral brass. Accessed Aug 25, 2017, http://www.norfolkchurches.co.uk/greatsnoring/greatsnoring.htm	532
Figure 178: John Sell Cotman, <i>Sir Ralph Shelton and Lady Shelton</i> , 1815. Etching on paper. Cotman, <i>Engravings of Sepulchral Brasses in Norfolk</i> , plate XIX.....	532
Figure 179: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, window nV, 1843. Photograph: David Spirit, 2021.....	533
Figure 180: Nowton (Suffolk), Church of St Peter, window nVI, 1843. Photograph: David Spirit, 2021.....	534
Figure 181: <i>Ralph Shelton</i> , removed from Yelverton (Norfolk), Church of St Mary, porch window. RK&S, Folder H330 Yelverton KNG 2/2/6/321, NRO, Norwich.....	535
Figure 182: <i>Robert Attelath</i> , removed from Yelverton (Norfolk), Church of St Mary, porch window, RK&S, Folder H330 Yelverton KNG 2/2/6/321.....	536

Acknowledgements

I am most grateful to Sarah Brown for her support and guidance throughout the process of researching and writing this thesis, as well as the MA dissertation which came before it. Her enthusiasm for the study of stained glass and generosity of spirit are an inspiration to me, and her advice has been invaluable to my research. I would also like to thank Tim Ayres, who offered suggestions and knowledge at crucial moments during the process of writing this thesis. His contributions helped shape this project and having his help has been an honour. I am also most grateful to David King and Ivo Rauch for their insightful and useful comments.

I would like to acknowledge the History of Art department at the University of York for awarding me a departmental scholarship which enabled me to begin working on this thesis. I have been most fortunate to be surrounded by many other researchers in the department who have motivated me throughout the ups and downs of research and writing. I am grateful to all who have given me feedback on this project over the years from within the University. I would also like to offer thanks to the International CVMA who awarded a scholarship for me to attend their conference in Antwerp in 2018.

I am grateful for the tireless work of the many records offices and institutions which I have visited to conduct research. I am particularly indebted to the staff of the Norfolk Records Office in Norwich, as well as the staff at the Bury St Edmunds and Lowestoft branches of the Suffolk Records Office. I am looking forward to visiting the new consolidated Suffolk Records Office in Ipswich soon. I would also like to thank staff at the British Library and the Fitzwilliam Museum for being so accommodating.

Thanks also go to the many keyholders working to keep East Anglian churches open for visitors. Special thanks go to churchwarden Adrian Potter at Nowton, and Revd. Erik West Lindell at Lakenham for information communicated regarding the history of their churches. I am also grateful to the owners of Swannington Manor for allowing me access to their home to view and photograph the windows.

I have been lucky to have tremendous support from family and friends, particularly my parents and brother, who have been real bricks throughout the whole process. Special thanks to David Spirit for letting me use so many of his fantastic photographs to illustrate this work, your patience has been much appreciated. Thanks also to the people of indomitable spirit who I am fortunate enough to be able to call on for care and friendship, namely Katherine, Dawn, Nadia, Rachel, Sarah L, and Sarah R. Their presence has been particularly valuable through the pandemic and associated lockdowns. Finally, I would like to thank my four-legged friends, who have generally

shown utter disregard for my work, including Sebastian, Regulus, Lily B, Freddie, Hester, Molly, Rosie, Pippin, Flea, Sunny, Cooper, Percy, Ali, Lily W, Willow, and Honey who started it all.

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.

Catherine Spirit, 29 September 2021

Introduction

The dawn of the nineteenth century saw an influx of historic continental stained-glass panels and fragments entering the English antiquarian market. Dislocated from their original schemes in continental churches, monasteries, and residences, English collectors were keen to purchase these fragmentary panels to include in new window settings for both secular and ecclesiastical spaces. In the study of stained glass, the term “fragment” is most often used to describe pieces of glass which have been broken or cut from larger panels. In this thesis, the definition of this term has been extended to include whole stained-glass panels which have been removed from their original schemes. These panels will be considered as fragments of the larger windows from which they originated. This state of dislocation is particularly relevant for Continental panels which were also removed from their countries of origin for sale on the English market. The new composite schemes which were built around this imported material became an integral aspect of English Gothic design in the early decades of the nineteenth century. These windows were characterised by their integration of disparate fragments of painted, stained, and coloured glass. Continental stained-glass panels became the focal point of these brightly coloured and geometrically organised schemes, which were completed with the addition of historic English fragments and newly made nineteenth-century stained-glass pieces. Although this style of composite glazing emerged in the mid-eighteenth century, the large quantities of continental stained glass imported in this later period allowed this type of glazing to truly flourish.

Despite the prevalence of this glazing style, the role that composite schemes played in the development of a Georgian Gothic design aesthetic and stained-glass history

has received little academic attention to date. Many of these windows have suffered from the loss of most of the nineteenth-century surround glass, including the extensive scheme at the Church of St Ethelbert, Thurton (Norfolk). Samuel Carter Yarrington (1781-1846) installed thirteen windows at this church in 1826 at the behest of Sir Thomas Beauchamp-Proctor (1756-1827) and Lady Mary Beauchamp-Proctor (née Palmer, 1760-1848) of Langley Hall.¹ The Beauchamp-Proctor family gave church to multiple churches in the area, and the windows at Thurton included a mixture of medieval English, renaissance continental, and nineteenth-century English glass paid for by the family.² The majority of the nineteenth-century glass was stripped from the nave windows, which now feature individual roundels and panels against a clear diapered background (figure 1). This restoration style, which prioritised individual panels of historic stained glass over the design of the assemblage, was common in the mid-twentieth century.

The damage sustained by many of these schemes was extensive, as demonstrated by the 1953 treatment of windows sV and sVI at All Saints Church, Earsham (figures 2-7). The stonework of these windows was so changed that they are no longer recognisable when compared to pre-conservation photographs. The following drastic alterations were proposed by architect J. Fletcher Watson after consultation with the incumbent Reverend A. L. Max, churchwarden Major W. Meade, and glazier D.G. King:

The perpendicular window which contains it [Joseph panel] has been badly cut about, the two side mullions having been cut out to accommodate it, and thus **the**

¹ John Chambers, *A General History of the County of Norfolk, intended to Convey all the Information of a Norfolk Tour, with the more Extended Details of Antiquarian, Statistical, Pictorial, Architectural, and Miscellaneous Information; including Biographical Notices, Original and Selected*, vol. 3 (Norwich: Printed by and for John Stacy. London: Sold by Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green: 1829), 1039.

² Other Norfolk churches which the Beauchamp-Proctor family donated stained glass to include: St Nicholas, Buckenham; All Saints, Chedgrave; St Michael, Langley and Holy Trinity, Loddon.

whole design has been spoilt [window sV]. It is suggested that [...] the panel of Joseph and his Brethren should be removed from this window altogether, and that two new vertical stone mullions are re-introduced to their proper positions, restoring the window to its original state and glazing it in clear glass. The highly coloured Victorian glass, which is predominantly bright orange, could be removed altogether. Having done this, it is suggested that the adjoining window to the west [window sVI], which has Victorian stone mullions and **is not a good design, could be redesigned**, spacing the stone mullions in such a way that the panel of Joseph and his Brethren is suitably incorporated [emphasis added by current author].³

This quotation has been included here to demonstrate the reasoning behind the extreme changes which were made to the stonework and glass. Although completed in part thanks to post-war recovery funding, the work undertaken here and at many churches across East Anglia went far beyond repairing war damage.⁴ As in this example, it was common to find parish churches putting forward funds on top of this government grant to accomplish more invasive alterations to the church fabric. In terms of composite windows of the early nineteenth century, this often led to the redistribution of stained glass to fit with twentieth-century tastes. The reversal of the early nineteenth century stonework changes, and the removal of the Joseph panel from window sV to sVI, ensured that the original significance of the Joseph panel to patron Joseph Windham (1739-1810) can now only be perceived in twentieth-century photographs.⁵ Even relatively minor alterations have had a drastic impact on the overall design of composite windows, as at the Church of St Peter, Nowton (Suffolk), where the bottom row of the East window was replaced in 1965. In this example, early nineteenth-century panels were replaced with historic glass

³ J. Fletcher Watson, Letter to The Rector and Churchwardens at Earsham Rectory, RK&S, Folder Earsham KNG 2/2/13/34, NRO, Norwich.

⁴ Architect Fletcher Watson recorded that the “damage to this church from falling bombs in the close vicinity appears to be confined to the glazing of windows, some of the stone window mullions, and pointing.” (J. Fletcher Watson, All Saint’s Church, Earsham: Report on War Damage,” Feb 14, 1952, RK&S, Folder 2/2/13/34 Earsham, NRO, Norwich, 1). The damage to window sV which is recorded in photographs taken in 1952 was likely caused by this bombing.

⁵ See chapter three for further analysis of this scheme and the role of the patron.

from another source, and consequently the original colour balance of the window was lost (figures 8&9).⁶

In previous studies, the perceived value of these schemes has largely been restricted to individual historic roundels, fragments, and panels. This has obscured the significance of the fragment windows, and consequently the alteration of these schemes has not been prevented. This thesis will consider the significant role of these fragile composite schemes to the development of the Georgian Gothic aesthetic to ensure their better preservation in the future.

Stained Glass and Gothic Spectacle

The re-use of stained-glass fragments and panels to construct new windows has been common across history, both for aesthetic and practical reasons as windows were constructed, damaged, repaired, and replaced over time. This was quite different from the very deliberate use of fragments seen in composite windows which were formed round collections of stained glass in the Georgian period. Norfolk is home to one of the earliest of these Georgian schemes. The East window of the Church of St Mary, Denton was originally installed by Joshua Price in c. 1716-1719 (figure 10).⁷ Although some nineteenth-century insertions were added to this window, large sections of the original scheme remain and are comprised of English fragments and panels dating from the

⁶ The scheme at Nowton was the subject of the author's MA dissertation (Catherine Spirit, Catherine Spirit, "St Peter, Nowton: Deciphering an Early Nineteenth-Century Glazing Scheme," Masters dissertation (University of York, 2014)). Also see Catherine Spirit, "Symmetry, Colour and Antiquity: Nineteenth-Century Use of Continental Roundels in the East Window of St Peter, Nowton (Suffolk)," *Vidimus* 96, no. 2 (2016), accessed Sept 27, 2021, <https://www.vidimus.org/issues/issue-96/feature/>.

⁷ Birkin Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass* (Norwich: Geo Books and Centre of East Anglian Studies, 1984), Denton S Mary gazetteer entry.

fourteenth to the eighteenth centuries.⁸ This culture of re-use, which was increasingly fuelled by the greater availability of imported continental material as the period progressed, became an integral aspect of Gothic design. Despite this, many of the resulting glazing schemes remain significantly under-researched. Horace Walpole's (1717-1797) use of continental stained-glass panels at Strawberry Hill House is emblematic of the essential relationship between composite stained-glass windows and mid-eighteenth-century Gothic (figure 11). Built between 1749 and 1776, Walpole's summer residence became synonymous with the Georgian Gothic from the mid-nineteenth century, when the title "Strawberry Hill Gothic," was coined as a derisive term for this architectural and design style. At the time of the Strawberry Hill sale in 1842, a critic described Walpole's style of architecture as one in which "doors, windows, chimney-pieces, &c. [...] had been picked up at auctions, and afterwards patched up against the walls in the best manner they could. To say the truth, the old-curiosity-shop taste seems to have taken [...] hold of Walpole."⁹ This same article describes Walpole's "Strawberry Hill Gothic" using various other terms in order to ensure the reader understands the distaste which the author felt

⁸ David King, *Stained Glass Tours around Norfolk Churches* (Norwich: The Norfolk Society, 1974), 26.

⁹ Anon. "STRAWBERRY HILL," in *The Civil Engineer and Architect's Journal, Scientific and Railway Gazette* 183 (1842): 183.

for the style, including “‘bird-cage’ Gothic,” “Batty-Langley Gothic,”¹⁰ “Guildhall-front Gothic,” “starvation-Gothic style,” and “cockney or carpenter’s Gothic.”¹¹

The derision of the Georgian Gothic aesthetic became an increasingly common attitude throughout the nineteenth century, which had a direct impact on how composite windows were perceived. The years immediately preceding the Strawberry Hill sale saw the publication of A. W. N. Pugin’s (1812-1852) prominent works on architectural history and trends in the modern practice of architecture, as well as the formation of the Cambridge Camden Society in 1839.¹² In his influential publication, Pugin clearly positioned his ambitions for architecture in the future by separating the aspirational Gothic of the pre-Reformation from Georgian iterations of the style. For his contrast of house fronts Pugin used the façade of architect John Soane’s (1753-1837) house at Lincoln’s Inn Fields, which had a substantial collection of continental stained-glass panels installed in its windows, and the historic Rue de l’horloge in Rouen. By using Soane’s house in this way, Pugin was able to extend his attack more broadly to the architectural

¹⁰ Batty Langley (baptised 1696-1751) was a landscape gardener and architectural writer. He was a proponent of Gothic design in the mid-eighteenth century as expressed in the architectural guide which he co-authored with engraver Thomas Langley (1702-c.1751) (Batty Langley and Thomas Langley, *Ancient Architecture, Restored, and Improved, by a Great Variety of Grand and Usefull Designs, Entirely New in the Gothick Mode for the Ornamenting of Buildings and Gardens Exceeding Every Thing thats Extant. Exquisitely Engraved on LXIV Large Quarto Copper Plates and Printed on Superfine Royal Paper* (1742). This work was later republished with a new title which explicitly refers to Gothic design: *Gothic Architecture, Improved by Rules and Proportions. In many Grand Designs of Columns, Doors, Windows, Chimney-Pieces, Arcades, Colonades, Porticos, Umbrells, Temples, and Pavillions &c. with Plans, Elevations and Profiles; Geometrically Explained* (London: Printed for John Millan, near Whitehall, 1747) (Eileen Harris, “Langley, Batty (bap. 1696, d. 1751),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Sept 23, 2004, accessed June 28, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/16022>)).

¹¹ “STRAWBERRY HILL,” 182-183.

¹² Augustus Webley Northmore Pugin, *Contrasts; Or, A Parallel between the Noble Edifices of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, and Similar Buildings of the Present Day; Shewing the Present Decay of Taste: Accompanied by Appropriate Text* (London: Printed for the Author, and Published by Him, at St. Marie’s Grange, Near Salisbury, Wilts., 1836).

profession and its practices in the early nineteenth century.¹³ He was of the opinion that architectural design, and related crafts including stained glass production, had “attained a most extraordinary degree of excellence in this country” in the period immediately preceding the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII.¹⁴ Ultimately, Pugin blamed what he considers to be the degeneration of English architectural design on a shift in motive, where the role of the craftsman has moved from artistry to manufacture.¹⁵ As these ideas became more widespread, the Georgian interpretation of Gothic design, was increasingly scorned for their lack of authenticity. In terms of stained glass, this led to the removal of some composite windows. These were replaced with stained-glass windows more in line with the stylistic requirements of the Cambridge Camden Society, as was the case with the 1832 East window at the Church of St Mary, Coddanham (Suffolk). This armorial window had been installed by Yarrington in 1832 before being replaced in 1894 (figure 12).

More recent academic endeavours have re-examined the Georgian Gothic and particularly Walpole’s Strawberry Hill to great effect.¹⁶ Despite this, Walpole’s use of stained glass has yet to receive the same level of scrutiny as other aspects of his collection. The studies that have been undertaken have largely focussed on iconography and provenance of individual pieces at the expense of considering the aesthetic of their arrangements. Peover and Rogers have looked at the placement of windows, including

¹³ Rosemary Hill, “Reformation to Millennium: Pugin’s Contrasts in the History of English Thought,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 58, no. 1 (1999): 30.

¹⁴ Pugin, *Contrasts*, 4

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 35.

¹⁶ *Horace Walpole’s Strawberry Hill*, ed. Michael Snodin and Cynthia Roman (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009).

composite schemes, as they pertain to the hierarchy of space at Strawberry Hill. Their focus was on tracing the history of alterations at the house to discover the original arrangement of glass in aid of the major restoration project.¹⁷ For Walpole, the use of Gothic architecture was the logical choice for his small-scale structure as Grecian “[c]olumns and all their beautiful ornaments look ridiculous when crowded into a closet or cheesecake house.”¹⁸ He went on to argue that Gothic architectural form allowed one to incorporate “variety” and “charming irregularities” into the overall design. This style remained popular throughout the Georgian period and the effects of this can be found in all aspects of architectural and interior design, including stained-glass schemes. Continental stained-glass panels, removed from their original contexts and set against brightly coloured glass, created kaleidoscopic composite windows which epitomised this fragmentary approach to design.

The disjointed glazing style of Walpole’s composite windows was designed to mimic the age and decay associated with ancient buildings. Although the concept of the fragment has been understood to be a significant aspect of Gothic literature, and separately in relation Walpole’s architectural decisions at Strawberry Hill, this concept has not been fully explored in relation to the glazing. This thesis approaches the role of the composite stained-glass windows at Strawberry Hill through the lens of the Gothic fragment, with a comparison to literary expressions of fragmentation, for the first time.

¹⁷ Michael Peover and Kevin Rogers, “New Light on Strawberry Hill: Walpole’s Display of Glass and the Representation of the Ancient Abbey,” *The Journal of Stained Glass* 34 (2010): 10-12.

¹⁸ Horace Walpole to Horace Mann, Feb 25, 1750, in *Horace Walpole Correspondence, Yale Edition*, vol. 20, ed. Lewis Walpole Library and Yale (New Haven: Yale University Library, 2011), 127, accessed Apr 20, 2021, <http://images.library.yale.edu/hwcorrespondence/default.asp>.

This approach allows the intention of Walpole's schemes to be fully understood and by extension creates a new framework through which to consider the early nineteenth-century composite windows which followed. By this later period the link between composite historic stained-glass windows and the Gothic was so engrained that it had transformed into a trope to be parodied. The Gothic novel obsessed heroine of Jane Austen's (1775-1817) *Northanger Abbey* (written in 1803, first published posthumously in 1817), Catherine Morland, was particularly disappointed with the glazing at the eponymous Abbey:

The windows, to which she looked with peculiar dependence, from having heard the General talk of his preserving them in their Gothic form with reverential care, were yet less what her fancy had portrayed. To be sure, the pointed arch was preserved — the form of them was Gothic — they might even be casements — but every pane was so large, so clear, so light! To an imagination which had hoped for the smallest diversions, and the heaviest stone-work, for painted glass, dirt and cobwebs, the difference was very distressing.¹⁹

Despite Strawberry Hill presumably also being as disappointingly free of “dirt and cobwebs” as *Northanger Abbey*, one presumes that the various fragments of stained glass presented in numerous windows at Walpole's house would have been satisfactorily Gothic for Catherine. The association between extravagant Gothic design and stained glass presented here became an integral aspect of the Gothic interior for both ecclesiastical and secular architecture into the nineteenth century, within which period imported continental stained glass became a defining aspect of developments in stained-glass practice.

¹⁹ Jane Austen, *Northanger Abbey*, in *Northanger Abbey, Lady Susan, The Watsons, Sanditon*, ed. James Kinsley and John Davie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 118.

English collectors, traders, and dealers of stained glass were keen to purchase historic stained glass to create the appearance of a historic Gothic interior. In late eighteenth-century revolutionary France, secularisation led to the removal of portable objects and artwork from religious houses across the country. Belgium was also annexed by the French revolutionary army in 1795, and edicts nationalising church property were then extended to these regions.²⁰ Sales of Belgian church goods and portable objects, including stained glass, continued from this time until 1803. Not only were goods made available due to this period of secularisation enforced by the French revolutionary army, but the period of peace which followed the signing of the Treaty of Amiens on 27 March 1802 provided ideal conditions under which traders and dealers were able to bring this material onto the English antiquarian market. The ready availability of continental stained glass created an opportunity for the composite style of glazing to be used in numerous secular and ecclesiastical settings throughout the early decades of the nineteenth century.

Reconsidering the composite windows of this period, those who created them, and those for who they were made within the context of Georgian Gothic will allow for a more complex reading of these schemes than has been possible previously. This thesis aims to explore the ways in which the designs of these windows are inextricably linked to key concepts of the Georgian Gothic, particularly in relation to the concepts of fragmentation and constructions of historic narrative. By grounding this study in

²⁰ Kim Woods, *Imported Images: Netherlandish Late Gothic Sculpture in England: c. 1400-c. 1550* (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2007), 143.

eighteenth-century concepts of the Gothic, this thesis will widen the understanding of the implementation of the Gothic in nineteenth-century stained-glass history.

The Lost Art of Glass Painting: Revival through Reconstruction

Although continental stained-glass panels and fragments formed a central aspect of

composite schemes in the early nineteenth century, the use of such historic components did not preclude the development of innovative glass painting practices in this period.

The early decades of the nineteenth century were a period in which great technical strides were rediscovered in relation to the firing of stained glass and the development of larger-scale stained-glass workshops. Norwich offers a particularly useful case study as a city which went from having no stained-glass workshops at the start of the nineteenth century to being a hub for composite window production by the 1820s.²¹ The Gothic Revival of the mid-nineteenth century is recognised as a period during which there was an increased demand for church building according to principles of the ecclesiologist movement. Jim Cheshire has argued that this can account for the initial growth in stained-glass production at this time, however the increased affordability of stained glass significantly contributed to the longevity of this change.²² These windows, produced by major firms such as Clayton and Bell (founded 1855), were designed to mimic the mosaic style of the pre-Reformation English Church. This was a major development from the painterly style of glass considered typical of the eighteenth century, as exemplified by the work of William Peckitt of York (1731-1795), one of the glaziers employed by Walpole.

²¹ The city did have numerous glaziers in 1800, however none of these were producing painted and fired stained glass, as will be discussed in chapter five.

²² Jim Cheshire, *Stained Glass and the Victorian Gothic Revival* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 166.

There have been some significant works regarding the period between these two styles of glazing, however these have tended to be biographical studies.²³ This thesis will explore the transitional period of stained-glass practice between the acknowledged painterly style of the eighteenth century and the Victorian Gothic Revival with a focus on the technical practice of key glaziers.

In terms of technical developments, the links between stained-glass practice and other artisanal trades is one which has been suggested by Birkin Haward, however the full significance of this has not been explored in previous studies.²⁴ This thesis will establish the importance of artisans in other media to the development of stained-glass techniques. The production of enamel-painted ceramics had a direct impact on the revival of fired painted glass in East Anglia through the work of the Lowestoft artisan Robert Allen (1745-1835). Other tradespeople working in the decorative arts, particularly plumber-glaziers and decorative painters, were also able to make the transition to stained-glass production in this period. Prolific glazier Yarrington was the main producer of composite window schemes at the national level in the early nineteenth century. This was likely due to the proximity of his Norwich based workshop to stained glass trader John Christopher Hampp (1750-1825). Yarrington's ability to develop his plumber-glazier's business into a large-scale stained-glass workshop will be fully considered for the first time in this thesis. His capacity to build relationships with technically skilled stained-glass

²³ For example see Geoffrey Lane, "A Fine Window at Price's': Sanderson Miller, William Price the Younger and the Uses of Stained Glass in the Mid-Eighteenth Century," *The Journal of Stained Glass*, 36 (2012): 10-37 and Michael Kerney, "John Beare of Salisbury (1735-1837) and the Hall of John Halle; with some Remarks on the Revival of Canted Lettering in 19th-Century Glass," *The Journal of Stained Glass*, 36 (2012): 38-55.

²⁴ Birkin Haward, *Notes on the Stained Glass of Robert Allen (1745-1835)* (published by the author, 1979), Suffolk Public Library Reference Collection, 748.59426/Stack/Oversize, Suffolk Records Office, Lowestoft.

producers Allen and James George Zobel (1791-1879) was integral to his practice. An exploration of these business relationships offers a fascinating insight into the way in which collaboration between different tradespeople paved the way for the widespread development of stained-glass practice in the nineteenth century.

The act of re-setting continental panels within new composite schemes was transformational, and this thesis will consider how these historic panels were used to form a glazing style which acted as an expression of Georgian Gothic design. The approach taken in this thesis will allow the glaziers and glass painters of this period to be viewed as artisans making stylistic and artistic choices rather than as craftspeople simply collaging together windows from the remains of historic glazing schemes. The decorative and geometric arrangement of panels, although not aligned with the later “archaeological” Gothic Revival approach, was still an expression of the mosaic style of glazing associated with pre-Reformation stained-glass windows. There was a clear desire to create complex schemes which harked back to pre-Reformation forms of stained-glass design. The arrangement of glass was complicated further by the desire to not only reflect a pre-Reformation glazing style, but to make the windows appear as if they had survived centuries of damage, repair, and alteration. Newly painted panels were used alongside historic English and continental panels to create narratives informed by this approach. The planning and execution of such intricate schemes would have been the work of highly skilled professionals. This approach was a clear shift away from the grid-like windows more commonly seen in the eighteenth century, where the design was painted across rectangular glass panels. This style continued to be used by some glaziers into the early

decades of the nineteenth century, as exemplified by Allen's 1819 East window for the Church of St Margaret, Lowestoft (Suffolk, figures 13-14). Both in terms of the stylistic and technical developments, the period of glazing which emerged from the trade in continental stained-glass panels laid the groundwork from which stained-glass workshops of the Gothic Revival emerged. By considering nineteenth-century arrangements as consciously designed schemes, informed by specific views on history and the Gothic object, this thesis will offer a unique framework for considering the use of continental stained glass in England.

Twentieth-Century Scholarship Reconsidered

The majority of research on nineteenth-century stained glass in England has focussed on the Victorian period, including books by Martin Harrison and Jim Cheshire.²⁵ The more recent scholarship of Jasmine Allen, Marie-Helene Groll, and Veronica Smith has progressed the study of glass in this period and into the early twentieth century.²⁶ Through explorations of the display, manufacture, design, and collection of stained glass in a progressively industrial global marketplace, these researchers have opened exciting new lines of enquiry for study. This thesis aims to contribute to this developing scholarship by offering an investigation into the early decades of the nineteenth century,

²⁵ Martin Harrison, *Victorian Stained Glass* (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1980); Cheshire, *Stained Glass and the Victorian Gothic Revival*.

²⁶ Jasmine Allen, *Windows for the World: Nineteenth-Century Stained Glass and the International Exhibitions, 1851-1900* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018); Allen, "Stained Glassworlds: Stained Glass at the International Exhibitions 1851-1900" (PhD thesis, University of York, 2013); Marie-Helene Groll, "Thomas and Drake, and the Transatlantic Trade in Stained Glass 1900-1950" (PhD thesis, University of York, 2016); Veronica Smith, "Stained Glass and the Victorian Town: Rochdale Library, Museum, and Art Gallery," *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century* 30 (2020), accessed Aug 25, 2021, <https://19.bbk.ac.uk/article/id/2898/>.

during which imported continental stained glass played an instrumental role in the development of stained-glass production and design.

Twentieth-century approaches to the study and care of continental stained glass in early nineteenth-century schemes can be measured both by the scholarship of the period and by the treatment of the windows themselves. The scholarly focus in this period was directed towards the continental stained-glass panels at the direct expense of the composite schemes within which these panels had been set. This approach began with Bernard Rackham's 1927 article on English importations of foreign glass in the early nineteenth century, which included a transcription of J. C. Hampp's stained-glass accounts.²⁷ In 1937 Ernest A. Kent published a biographical article on Hampp, which focussed on where he may have purchased glass on the continent.²⁸ A year after this article was published, Woodforde's work on the foreign stained glass in Norfolk was printed in *Norfolk Archaeology*. As in Kent's earlier work, this publication also made references to Hampp, in this case as the primary source of imported continental glass in the county.²⁹ Woodforde remarked that the majority of foreign glass in Norfolk was originally German or Flemish in origin.³⁰ These two early articles focussed on the origins of the continental panels and how they were imported into England. This method of study

²⁷ Bernard Rackham, "English Importations of Foreign Stained Glass in the Early Nineteenth Century," *JBSMGP* 2, no. 2 (1927): 86-94.

²⁸ Ernest A. Kent, "John Christopher Hampp of Norwich, an Importer of Ancient Glass," *Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society* 26, no. 2 (1937): 192-96

²⁹ Christopher Woodforde, "Foreign Stained Glass in Norfolk," *Norfolk Archaeology* 26: no. 1 (1938): 80.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 76.

was later continued by Jean Lafond in his 1964 article on the traffic of continental stained glass in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.³¹

This initial focus on the routes of importation developed as scholars continued to explore the origins of the continental glass in England. William Cole's 1991 catalogue of roundels from the Netherlands and Northern Europe in Britain illustrated the scale of the stained-glass trade.³² The emphasis of this book was on identifying the subject matter and potential origins of these small-scale panels. David King's work on the Steinfeld Abbey glazing demonstrates how one can effectively recover a lost glazing scheme through tracing the sale of continental stained glass.³³ The study of the stained-glass trade was further expanded by Peter Martin in his 2012 MPhil thesis concerning the trade in Rhenish stained glass between 1794 and 1835.³⁴ These works offer an important context for exploring the introduction of continental stained glass to the English marketplace, however they do not focus on how this glass was then integrated into English settings. Scholarship relating to the trade in portable church artwork in the early nineteenth century also referred to the importation of other media. Charles Tracy's 2001 publication offers an insight into the market for and re-use of continental furniture in this

³¹ Jean Lafond, "The Traffic in Old Stained Glass from Abroad during the 18th and 19th Centuries," *Journal of the British Society of Master Glass Painters* 24: 1 (1964): 58-67.

³² William Cole, *A Catalogue of Netherlandish and Northern European Roundels in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991);

³³ David King, "The Steinfeld Cloister Glazing," *Gesta* 37 (1998) 2: 201-10; David King and Roger Rosewell, "The Recent Discoveries from Steinfeld Abbey," *Vidimus* 35 (2009), accessed Sept 14, 2021, <https://www.vidimus.org/issues/issue-35/features/#the-recent-discoveries-from-steinfeld-abbey>.

³⁴ Peter Martin, "The European Trade in Stained Glass, with Special Reference to the Trade between the Rhineland and the United Kingdom 1794-1835" (MPhil thesis, University of York, 2012), 121.

period, and he also looks more widely at the appeal of imported artwork for English collectors, including the popularity of stained glass.³⁵

Some studies have begun to look beyond the trade and origins of continental glass in English settings, however these tend to focus on specific case studies. Richard Marks' 1998 article considered the display of continental roundels using three case studies, including Walpole's Strawberry Hill.³⁶ He began to explore the concept of these roundels as signifiers of the historic within the Georgian Gothic, however the scope of this study was limited due to the number of case studies. To date, the most comprehensive study of continental stained glass in England during the early nineteenth century is centred on the collection of John Soane at Lincoln's Inn Fields. *The Journal of Stained Glass* (2003) published essays by Helen Dorey, Michael Peover, and Martin Harrison.³⁷ These offer insight into this unique collection, which includes continental stained-glass panels. This volume included a full catalogue of the stained glass in addition to a fascinating analysis of the use of glass and lighting effects within Soane's extraordinary house museum. Although this journal offers some context for the specific use of glass by Soane, and shows the potential of such a contextualised approach, much remains to be considered in relation to this style of glazing within the context of the Georgian Gothic at a wider level. Birkin Haward's catalogues of nineteenth-century stained-glass schemes in Norfolk and Suffolk are particularly valuable as a resource due to the inclusion of early nineteenth-

³⁵ Charles Tracy, *Continental Church Furniture in England: A Traffic in Piety* (Woodbridge: Antique Collectors' Club, 2001).

³⁶ Richard Marks, "The Reception and Display of Northern European Roundels in England," *Gesta* 37, no. 2 (1998): 217-24, accessed May 27, 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/767262>.

³⁷ *The Journal of Stained Glass* 27 (2003).

century case studies and stained-glass practitioners.³⁸ Although largely biographical in nature, Haward's dedication to cataloguing the work of early nineteenth-century glaziers working with continental imports is unique.

By the time of Haward's research, the vast majority of composite schemes had undergone alteration or replacement in the preceding decades, as explored above in relation to churches at Thurton, Earsham, and Nowton. The limited study of composite glazing schemes in recent scholarship, and the established tendency to focus on the imported continental glass, has had a major impact on the survival and preservation of these schemes to this day. The conservation recommendations made for the East window at St Margaret's Church, Herringfleet (Suffolk, figure 15) in 1955 demonstrates the link between research and treatment:

- (1) Much of the best glass is either "skied" or hidden by the new reredos and could be displayed to better advantage.
- (2) The insertions of unpainted but distracting and harsh 19th century coloured glass should be left out and replaced with lighter toned glass.
- (3) The effect of both these operations would be to let into the Chancel much needed light.³⁹

This evaluation of the East window glass demonstrates the supposed value of the different types of glass which make up the scheme, first the "best glass" and second the "unpainted but distracting and harsh 19th century coloured glass." Labelling the nineteenth-century glass as "insertions" in the window, when in fact these pieces were original to the early nineteenth-century scheme, is telling of the overall approach to

³⁸ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*; Birkin Haward, *Nineteenth Century Suffolk Stained Glass* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989); Haward, *Notes on the Stained Glass of Robert Allen*.

³⁹ Dennis King, Letter to Mr Long, May 3, 1965, RK&S, Herringfleet KNG 2/2/1/12, NRO, Norwich.

composite windows in this period. In this context, the term “best glass” here can be assumed to refer to the medieval English and imported continental panels. These panels were prioritised in the suggested plan at Herringfleet at the expense of the overall window design. Stripping coloured nineteenth-century glass from windows also offered a practical solution for congregations who wanted to increase the levels of natural light in their church buildings. As has been shown, the prevailing scholarship in this period privileged the imported elements over the nineteenth-century glass, which would have emboldened restorers to dispense with the coloured glass settings. The fact that the composite schemes were also seen as aesthetically unappealing by many in this period ensured that the removal of stained glass was not strongly opposed by some congregations in the mid-twentieth century. Through an investigation of remaining schemes and surviving documentation, this thesis explores the significance of these window designs as an expression of the Georgian Gothic. By presenting archival research which uncovers the complex histories of these schemes, intricate schemes of the early nineteenth century will be considered as they were originally designed where possible.

Approach

East Anglia has been chosen as the focal point of this study due to the importance of Norwich in the development of composite glazing schemes in the early nineteenth century. Other authors have also had success in considering specific regions in their research, through which they have been able to draw out nuanced arguments relating to variations and trends in glazing practices across the country. Notably, Cheshire’s volume on Victorian stained glass highlights the significant role of provincial glass painters in the

development of stained-glass practice and production from the mid-nineteenth century.⁴⁰

This thesis will consider the significance of Norwich as a centre for the importation of continental stained glass and for the development of glazing practices for the manufacture of composite windows. The city was a significant cultural hub in this period more generally, with close connections to both London and the Continent. In addition, the textile trade was highly profitable in the eighteenth century and connected the city to other metropolitan areas in England and to continental cities. As a worsted weaver and trader this trade was responsible for J. C. Hampp's immigration to England in the latter part of the eighteenth century. He was able to exploit trade routes established for worsted to import stained glass which was then well received by patrons looking to create schemes in the aesthetic of the Georgian Gothic. Much of the stained glass which Hampp imported from the Continent was sold either at auction in London, or directly from his warehouse in Norwich. The latter accounts for the high proportion of composite schemes in East Anglia during the early decades of the nineteenth century. Where previous studies have considered Norwich and the glass trade, Hampp has understandably been the focal point. This thesis will broaden the discussion to further consider the impact of the Stevensons, who worked with Hampp and had established cultural connections in the city.

The various periods of conservation, restoration, and removal which the stained-glass schemes in this thesis have undergone pose a challenge to those wishing to research

⁴⁰ Cheshire's study considers the work of John Toms, the Beer family, and William Wales in South West England (Cheshire, *Stained Glass and the Victorian Gothic Revival*, 170-72).

this period of glazing history. To decipher the original early nineteenth-century window designs, one must first have the skills necessary to interpret the current arrangements. As a trained stained-glass conservator, I have been able to use this training to translate the remains of in situ windows. Archival research has also provided much rich material relating to the twentieth-century interventions made to the windows, which has further illuminated the original designs of these schemes. Early nineteenth-century accounts, diaries, and notebooks have proved to be an invaluable resource for tracing both technical developments of stained-glass production and contemporaneous thoughts on the Georgian Gothic aesthetic. The diary and notebook of James George Zobel have been vitally important to this research for the unique insight which they provide into the production of stained glass in the early nineteenth century.⁴¹ These writings demonstrate the artistic and technical innovations seen in Yarrington's major stained-glass workshop, as will be established in this thesis. The work of key antiquarian writers like David Elisha Davy (1769-1851) and John Chambers (1780-1839) have also been of fundamental importance in proving the dating and arrangement of composite schemes.⁴² Other key primary resources include the records of the Fraternity of the United Friars of Norwich, an organisation which has received almost no academic attention since the nineteenth century.⁴³ These documents, which have been preserved at the Norfolk Records Office (NRO), have provided an invaluable example of how the Gothic was interpreted by

⁴¹ Notebook of James George Zobel, 1831-1851, Norwich Public Library Manuscript Collection, MS12, NRO, Norwich; Diary of James George Zobel, 1827-1858, Norwich Public Library Manuscript Collection, MS11, NRO, Norwich.

⁴² COLLECTIONS by David Elisha Davy, son of David Davy, of Rumburgh Hill, Suffolk, for a parochial history of Suffolk; including copies of charters and of inscriptions, with plans and drawings of churches, brasses, coats of arms, etc.; in alphabetical order of hundreds. In thirty-seven volumes, Add MS 19077-19113, Western Manuscripts, British Library, London; Chambers, *A General History of the County of Norfolk*.

⁴³ Society of United Friars, COL 9/1-58, The Coleman Manuscript Collection, Norfolk Records Office, Norwich.

antiquarian and intellectual circles at the turn of the nineteenth century. Archival materials, explored alongside analysis of remaining windows, provide the central material for the discussion of early nineteenth-century composite schemes in this thesis.

Thesis Structure

Little academic research has been done to demonstrate how the fragmented form of composite glazing scheme fits into the wider cultural context of the Georgian Gothic. Chapter one of this thesis addresses this issue through close analysis of the influential stained-glass schemes at Strawberry Hill with new scholarship directed at the links between eighteenth-century literary forms of Gothic and composite glazing. Strawberry Hill offers the ideal case study for this comparison as the home of Walpole, who penned the first self-proclaimed Gothic novel. This chapter also considers the importance of Norwich as a cultural centre in the Georgian Gothic period, with reference to the city's Fraternity of the United Friars, a little-researched cultural and philanthropic organisation established in 1785. An analysis of the structure and activities of this group clearly demonstrates the interest in the Gothic and antiquarian thought in Norwich at the turn of the nineteenth century.

When considering composite stained-glass schemes, there are striking differences to be found when examining secular and ecclesiastical settings across East Anglia. Chapters two and three of this thesis are dedicated to exploring how composite schemes were designed according to the requirements of specific architectural and functional spaces. Chapter two addresses domestic schemes to ascertain how composite windows were used to transform and differentiate between distinct interior spaces within the

home. Composite windows were most frequently installed in major reception rooms or rooms dedicated to private study and contemplation. The designs of these windows and the types of glass used within them were altered accordingly. Historic and modern glass panels were used to frame or obscure views and to modify the amount of natural light entering the space. This chapter will consider the purpose of these different types of composite window for patrons in the early nineteenth century. As most of the domestic schemes in East Anglia were installed in large-scale country houses, Soane's schemes at Lincoln's Inn Fields are also discussed as an urban example of this glazing style. Chapter three investigates the role of composite windows in ecclesiastical settings. The turn of the nineteenth century saw a boom in church building due to changes in the legal status of nonconformists and Catholics. Despite this, most composite window schemes in East Anglia were installed in historic churches belonging to the Established Church. This chapter considers the installation of these windows as an expression of traditional patronage and national religion in this period of challenge for the Church of England.

The final two chapters of this thesis focus on how continental stained-glass panels were transported to England and the impact this had on stained glass production in this period. Chapter four explores the networks for importation and sale of stained glass from the Continent at the turn of the nineteenth century. Although other studies have considered the routes of importation, this study aims to directly link the decisions made by traders, agents, and auction houses to the style and arrangement of composite English schemes and sheds new light on key figures such as Seth William Stevenson (1741-1853). Chapter five explores the development of stained-glass workshops established as a direct

consequence of the trade in continental stained glass. Central to Norwich's glass trade was the major workshop of S. C. Yarrington, which produced a large proportion of the composite schemes in the region. This thesis offers an examination of this workshop's structure for the first time, with particular reference to the business relationships which Yarrington established with key glass painters in the region.

Chapter One: Georgian Goths

The use of continental stained-glass panels and fragments in England originated with Gothic design of the eighteenth century. It was during this century that the language of Georgian Gothic, a style entirely distinct from the later archaeologically informed Gothic Revival of the mid-nineteenth century, was developed. This chapter will consider the role of key Gothic voices at both a national and local level, with a focus on two case studies: Horace Walpole's Strawberry Hill (1749-76) and Norwich's Fraternity of United Friars (established 1785). Walpole was one of the most influential Gothic voices of the eighteenth century, both for the international fame of the architecture and decoration of his Gothic summerhouse Strawberry Hill and for his best-selling authorship of *The Castle of Otranto* (1764). In his roles as architectural designer, collector, and author, Walpole is a prime example of the multidisciplinary nature of Gothic in the eighteenth century. His glazing scheme at Strawberry Hill, which included a series of continental stained-glass panels, set a precedent for the nineteenth-century schemes which form the focus of this thesis. Using contemporary drawings, Walpole's writings, and the restored schemes, this chapter will explore the significance of imported and fragmented stained glass as an aspect of Gothic design. Why did Walpole use continental stained-glass panels and fragments in his schemes? What did this glass contribute to his Gothic interiors over newly commissioned glass? This chapter will also consider the dissemination of Gothic style at a local level. Norwich was a cosmopolitan city in the Georgian period, with strong connections to London and mainland Europe. It was also an important centre for the importation and re-setting of continental stained glass in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Considering the artistic, literary, and antiquarian voices in Norwich in the later eighteenth century will allow for a better understanding of these later

developments in stained glass. This will be achieved by exploring the records of the Fraternity of United Friars. How were members of this group able to reconcile their medievalist monastic focus with their modern humanitarian and academic aims? The early nineteenth century saw a significant increase in the quantity of stained glass imported from the continent. English collectors justified their actions by framing their acquisitions by defining themselves as saviours of heritage at risk. Using these windows, panels, and fragments, glaziers and glass painters further developed the Georgian Gothic fragmented glazing style. Using these eighteenth-century case studies this chapter will demonstrate how the Georgian Gothic developed. The growth of a market in historic stained glass not only attracted new practitioners to the glazing business, but it also helped existing glaziers and glass painters to develop new skills using continental glass as a model for their own practice.

Horace Walpole, Strawberry Hill, and the Gothic Fragment

Horace Walpole and Defining Gothic

Gothic as a genre is difficult to define as it has been used to describe a wide range of different architectural, artistic, literary, and cultural movements over time. This was true in the late eighteenth century when Gothic could be used to describe architectural styles, print type, the Goth people, and anything dating from the medieval, or even post-Roman, period.⁴⁴ Within this broad range of applications, the genre was constantly evolving in line with wider cultural shifts. Horace Walpole is considered to be one of the early defining

⁴⁴ James Watt, *Contesting the Gothic: Fiction, Genre and Cultural Conflict, 1764-1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 14.

voices of the Georgian Gothic, both due to the construction of his “little Gothic castle” Strawberry Hill (built 1749-1776, figures 16&17) and the publication of his novel *The Castle of Otranto* (1764).⁴⁵ This section will explore the Gothic, and specifically the contribution made to it of the composite window as it developed at Strawberry Hill. The stained glass installed at the house has been understudied in the past and this analysis will offer a unique perspective on the role of the composite windows.

Walpole leased the collection of buildings which would later become Strawberry Hill in the fashionable district of Twickenham from the Charing Cross “toywoman” Elizabeth Chenevix in the fashionable district of Twickenham. The lease was initiated in 1747 and Walpole began his program of alterations just two years later.⁴⁶ Walpole designed the house to be “a model [...] of Gothic.”⁴⁷ This notion of the house as model extended beyond the architectural structure of the building, as Michael Snodin notes, Walpole “strove to make Strawberry Hill a cultural centre.”⁴⁸ He attracted architects, a resident artist Johann Heinrich Müntz (1727-98), and poet Thomas Gray (1716-71) to the house, and the addition of the Strawberry Hill Press in 1757 strengthened Walpole’s vision of the house as “cultural centre.” Writing to Horace Mann (1706-1786) in the year the Press was established, Walpole stated: “I am turned printer, and have converted a little cottage here into a printing office — My abbey is a perfect college or academy — I

⁴⁵ Horace Walpole to Horace Mann, Jan 10, 1750, in *Horace Walpole Correspondence, Yale Edition*, vol. 20, ed. Lewis Walpole Library and Yale (New Haven: Yale University Library, 2011), 88, accessed Aug 7, 2019, <http://images.library.yale.edu/hwcorrespondence/default.asp>.

⁴⁶ Michael Snodin, “Going to Strawberry Hill,” in *Horace Walpole’s Strawberry Hill*, ed. Michael Snodin and Cynthia Roman (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), 15.

⁴⁷ Horace Walpole to Horace Mann, Mar 4, 1753, in *Horace Walpole Correspondence, Yale Edition*, vol. 20, ed. Lewis Walpole Library and Yale (New Haven: Yale University Library, 2011), 362, accessed Oct 9, 2019, <http://images.library.yale.edu/hwcorrespondence/default.asp>.

⁴⁸ Snodin, “Going to Strawberry Hill,” 21.

keep a painter in the house and a printer — not to mention Mr Bentley who is an academy himself.”⁴⁹ For Walpole, Strawberry Hill was a serious artistic project designed to inspire fruitful creativity in both the literary and visual arts.

Although Walpole published several of his own works at the Press, his novel *The Castle of Otranto* was first printed in London. The second edition of this book, published in 1765, is widely considered to be the first self-proclaimed Gothic novel, as this is when the title was altered from “*The Castle of Otranto, A Story*” to “*The Castle of Otranto, A Gothic Story*.”⁵⁰ Walpole considered the writing of this novel to be inspired by and infused with his experiences at Strawberry Hill. In a letter to Reverend William Cole (1714-1782) Walpole wrote of this connection:

Your partiality to me and Strawberry have I hope inclined you to excuse the wildness of the story. You will even have found some traits to put you in mind of this place. When you read of the picture quitting its panel, did you not recollect the portrait of Lord Falkland all in white in my gallery? Shall I even confess to you what was the origin of this romance? I waked one morning in the beginning of last June from a dream, of which all I could recover was, that I had thought myself in an ancient castle (a very natural dream for a head filled like mine with Gothic story) and that on the uppermost bannister [sic] of a great staircase I saw a gigantic hand in armour. In the evening I sat down and to write, without knowing in the least what I intended to say or relate. The work grew on my hands, and I grew fond of it — add that I was very glad to think of anything rather than politics— In short I was so engrossed with my tale, which I completed in less than two months, that one evening I wrote from the time I had drunk my tea, about six o’clock, till half an hour after one in the morning, when my hand and fingers were so weary, that I could not hold the pen to finish the sentence, but left Matilda and Isabella talking, in the middle of a paragraph. You will laugh at my earnestness,

⁴⁹ Horace Walpole to Horace Mann, Aug 4, 1757, in *Horace Walpole Correspondence, Yale Edition*, vol. 21, ed. Lewis Walpole Library and Yale (New Haven: Yale University Library, 2011), 120, accessed Oct 9, 2019, <http://images.library.yale.edu/hwcorrespondence/default.asp>.

⁵⁰ Horace Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto, A Story* (Dublin: Printed by J. Hoey, J. Exshaw.P. Wilson, S. Cotter, W. Sleater, J. Potts, S. Watson, and J. Hoey, junior, 1764); Horace Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto, A Gothic Story* (London: Printed for William Bathoe in the Strand, and Thomas Lownds in Fleet Street, 1765).

but if I have amused you by retracing with any fidelity the manners of ancient days, I am content, and give you leave to think me as idle as you please.⁵¹

Walpole clearly took direct inspiration from physical elements of his Gothic residence as he makes a direct reference to the gallery and great staircase (figures 11, 18-20). Further to this the overall atmosphere of the house allowed Walpole, with his “head filled [...] with Gothic story” to imagine he was “in an ancient castle.” From this letter Walpole makes it clear that his supposed spontaneous compulsion to write the novel was due as much to the Gothic of his mind as it is Strawberry Hill.

What, then, did Walpole mean when he wrote of Gothic of the mind? He discussed his definition of and affinity for the historic Gothic architectural style in his book *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (1762). In this work he drew comparisons between this and Classical architecture, not to construct a hierarchy of styles but instead to clarify the inherent differences between the two:

The pointed arch, that peculiar of Gothic architecture, was certainly intended as an improvement on the circular; and the men who had not the happiness of lighting on the simplicity and proportion of the Greek orders, were however so lucky as to strike out a thousand graces and effects, which rendered their buildings magnificent, yet genteel, vast, yet light, venerable and picturesque. It is difficult for the noblest Grecian temple to convey half so many impressions to the mind as a cathedral does of the best Gothic taste- a proof of skill in the architects and of address in the priests who erected them. The latter exhausted their knowledge of the passions in composing edifices whose pomp, mechanism, vaults, tombs, painted windows, gloom and perspectives infused such sensations of romantic devotion; and they were happy in finding artists capable of executing such machinery. **One must have taste to be sensible of the beauties of Grecian**

⁵¹ Horace Walpole to William Cole, Mar 9, 1765, in *Horace Walpole Correspondence, Yale Edition*, vol. 1, ed. Lewis Walpole Library and Yale (New Haven: Yale University Library, 2011), 88, accessed August 7, 2019, <http://images.library.yale.edu/hwcorrespondence/default.asp>.

architecture; one only wants passions to feel Gothic [emphasis added by current author].⁵²

For Walpole the appeal of Gothic architecture resided in passion. The original builders required passion to construct Gothic buildings as did those using and visiting the buildings throughout the intervening centuries. In this extract, Walpole illustrates a dichotomy between the purposes of rational Classical architecture and the romance of the Gothic. This aligns with considerations of Gothic design in the later eighteenth century, which have been viewed as a reaction to the rationality of the Enlightenment.⁵³ The extract from Walpole's *Anecdotes* instead suggested that the rationality of Classical architecture continued to perform a specific function in architecture, but that Gothic performed a separate, and equally significant, role. The source of the passionate power which Walpole associated with Gothic architecture originated in the physical act of building these structures. The very skill of the architects and builders "infused such sensations of romantic devotion" into the structure of the Gothic cathedral itself, and one could be party to the same stream of passion and devotion when visiting these buildings. The example given above in *Anecdotes* related to the possibilities of a Gothic cathedral, however one can see clearly how Walpole saw his own projects in the same light. Similarities can be drawn between Walpole's discussion of the Gothic creators driven to build by passion and the description of his own "head filled [...] with Gothic story" in the letter to Cole. In his description of his writing style Walpole stressed the physical toll of the task and the intensity of inspiration with which he was struck. Thus, for Walpole the intensity of passion which was at the root of Gothic could be applied to both literary and

⁵² Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (London: Ward, Lock & Co., Warwick House, Dorset Buildings, Salisbury Square, E. C., 1879), 70.

⁵³ Patrick O'Malley, *Catholicism, Sexual Deviance, and Victorian Gothic Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 28.

architectural pursuits. Walpole saw an affinity between his own creations and those of the original Gothic builders, and thus he was able to consider both *The Castle of Otranto* and Strawberry Hill as continuations of the historic Gothic genre.

Walpole referred to the necessary collaboration between priests and artists in the construction of a Gothic Cathedral in the above quotation from *Anecdotes*. This is borne out in his own work with the eventual concept of Strawberry Hill as “a perfect college or academy.” Prior to this, collaborative working practices had been employed throughout the building of Walpole’s castle. The design and decoration of Strawberry Hill was the result of the joint efforts of Walpole and a number of his influential male friends, notably designers John Chute (1701-1776) and Richard Bentley (1708-1772), as well as architect Robert Adam (1728-1792). Chute and Bentley had a particularly important role in the design of Strawberry Hill as it was with these two men that Walpole formed the “Strawberry Committee,” which has become more widely known as the “Committee of Taste” in recent years.⁵⁴ The earliest mention of this group occurred in a missive from Walpole to Bentley dated 9 July 1754 and the vast majority of references to the Committee are to be found in correspondence of this year.⁵⁵ The Strawberry Committee’s biggest project was the design of Strawberry Hill and each of the three members had a distinct role to play in this.⁵⁶ Walpole established the project and completed

⁵⁴ George E. Haggerty, “The Strawberry Committee,” in *Horace Walpole’s Strawberry Hill*, ed. Michael Snodin and Cynthia Roman (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), 80.

⁵⁵ John Riely, “Horace Walpole, the ‘Strawberry Committee’ and the ‘Committee of Taste,’” in *Horace Walpole’s Strawberry Hill*, ed. Michael Snodin and Cynthia Roman (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), 349.

⁵⁶ Bentley was replaced by Thomas Pitt, later Lord Camelford (1737-93), as a member of the Strawberry Committee. Bentley did not settle in Twickenham until 1761. As a consequence, his role in the design of Strawberry Hill was minimal in comparison to earlier members (Brian Fothergill, *The Strawberry Hill Set: Horace Walpole and his Circle* (London: Faber and Faber, 1983), 59-60).

archaeological research to prove the medieval origins for the scheme, Chute drew plans and elevations and was therefore responsible for the building's external appearance, while Bentley played with "gothic forms, often with great freedom and a lack of authenticity that was later to be frowned upon by the other two."⁵⁷ Bentley's principle contributions to the house were the house's hall and stairway. Through collaboration with other influential architects, artists, and writers, Walpole and his contemporaries were able to establish a multi-disciplinary approach to Gothic for the eighteenth century. The popularity of this style had an impact on the development of Gothic architecture into the nineteenth century, with architects, designers, and writers both developing and questioning Strawberry Hill Gothic through their work.

Stained Glass at Strawberry Hill

Many studies have been published which explore the development of Gothic design at Strawberry Hill, most of which tie the publication of *The Castle of Otranto* into this narrative. Despite the wide recognition of Strawberry Hill's significance in the development of this idiom, few studies have closely explored the role of the stained-glass schemes within the wider Gothic design of the house. Where it is discussed, Walpole's glass is referenced with a focus on the origin and iconography of both the continental and contemporary panels. Individual components have been emphasised at the expense of the assemblage. Stained glass has often been read as a medieval medium, and thus the presence of it at Strawberry Hill seems to have been accepted as a natural aspect of the house's design. Because of this it has not been explored with the same rigour as other

⁵⁷ Fothergill, *The Strawberry Set*, 60.

architectural features of the building. This is illustrated by Michael Snodin and Cynthia Roman's seminal edited volume, *Horace Walpole's Strawberry Hill*, which was published in 2009 to coincide with the extensive restoration project at the house.⁵⁸ While entire chapters were dedicated to Walpole's paper collection, miniatures, ceramics, and library books, stained glass received only a single double page spread, equal to the section on Walpole's china fish tub.⁵⁹

Walpole's vast collection of stained glass, both continental imports and new commissions, formed windows which were vital to the development of Strawberry Hill's interiors. Walpole considered coloured glazing to be a fundamental form for expressing the Gothic in architecture, as exemplified by the above quotation from *Anecdotes*, where it is listed among the key components of the Gothic cathedral: "edifices whose pomp, mechanism, vaults, tombs, painted windows, gloom and perspectives infused such sensations of romantic devotion." Walpole expressed his desire to purchase stained glass fragments in correspondence with Mann in 1750: "I am going to build a little Gothic castle at Strawberry Hill. If you can pick me up any old fragments of old painted glass, arms or anything, I shall be excessively obliged to you."⁶⁰ Over the building phases of Strawberry Hill new stained glass was also commissioned from William Price the Younger (1707-65), William Peckitt (1731-95), and James Pearson (c.1711-1838).⁶¹ Despite the fact that

⁵⁸ Michael Snodin and Cynthia Roman, ed., *Horace Walpole's Strawberry Hill* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009).

⁵⁹ Michael Peover, "Stained and Painted Glass," in *Horace Walpole's Strawberry Hill*, ed. Michael Snodin and Cynthia Roman (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), 64-65; Bet McLeod, "Walpole's China Fish Tub," in *Horace Walpole's Strawberry Hill*, ed. Michael Snodin and Cynthia Roman (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), 32-33.

⁶⁰ Walpole to Horace Mann, Jan 10, 1750, 88.

⁶¹ Michael Peover, *Strawberry Hill: Renaissance Glass* (London: Scala Publishers, 2010), 46.

Walpole was clearly able to patronise contemporary glass painters, he also chose to purchase large quantities of continental stained glass. In 1750 he purchased 450 pieces of glass from an Italian trader for thirty-six guineas.⁶² Walpole described this glass in his *Book of Materials* (1759): “All this manufacture consisted entirely in rounds of scripture stories, stained in black and yellow, or in small figures in black and white, birds and flowers in colour, and Dutch and Flemish arms.”⁶³ The deeper significance Walpole placed on stained glass for the creation of the Gothic interior, and his enthusiasm for foreign examples of this artform, has not been reflected in current scholarship related to Strawberry Hill.

Where the stained glass at the house has been considered beyond the origin of the panels, the focus has been on the notion that Walpole strongly associated stained glass with the medieval. Michael Peover described the use of foreign glass alongside coloured glass as “a simplified version of medieval mosaic glass.” He argued that it was “as much the way in which the glass was displayed as the glass itself that was innovative, creating the overall effect of colourful medieval windows with the later, renaissance glass. His aim was to create a sense of richness throughout the house.”⁶⁴ This concept of stained glass as signifier of the medieval was also explored in articles by Richard Marks (1998) and Peover and Kevin Rogers (2010).⁶⁵ Both articles stressed the importance of the coloured surround glass for providing the rich colour and mosaic style which was

⁶² Peover, “Stained and Painted Glass,” 64.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 64.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 65.

⁶⁵ Richard Marks, “The Reception and Display of Northern European Roundels in England,” *Gesta* 37, no. 2 (1998): 219-20; Peover and Rogers, “New Light on Strawberry Hill,” 9-10.

associated with medieval religious interiors. This argument was articulated by Anna Eavis and Peover (1994-95), where they argued that it “was the settings, rather than the ‘old glass’ which created Walpole’s ‘Gothic’ effect.”⁶⁶ For these scholars, the use of small, coloured glass pieces as surrounds explained how renaissance continental panels, and especially monochromatic roundels, could be used by Walpole in his medieval-inspired scheme. In so far as these authors consider the significance of the settings of Walpole’s glass at all, they suggest that it was the use of colour that was the most significant factor in Walpole’s choice of window design and use of surround glass, as the majority of the continental imports were only painted with black or brown paint and silver stain. Coloured glass was viewed as a tool for unifying renaissance continental panels into windows which could then pass as medieval in style.

Although the use of coloured glass was certainly important to creating the Gothic atmosphere of Strawberry Hill, this does not fully address why Walpole chose to use foreign stained-glass panels within his glazing schemes. Windows commissioned from contemporary glaziers show that Walpole was willing to employ modern craftspeople to create bespoke pieces to his specifications. Commissioning new stained-glass windows gave Walpole the opportunity to tailor the subject and aesthetics of specific windows to his exact requirements. Imported stained glass, and particularly smaller fragments, must have therefore fulfilled an aesthetic need which could not be answered by these newer commissions. Marks began considering this issue, when he argued that the renaissance

⁶⁶ Anna Eavis and Michael Peover, “Horace Walpole’s Painted Glass at Strawberry Hill,” *JBSMGP* 19, no. 3 (1994-95): 281.

glass was considered acceptable as “the roundels were painting on glass of a period which was both familiar and acceptable to an English gentleman.”⁶⁷ Marks argued that the continental roundels were able to operate both as signifiers of contemporary taste, and thus artefacts of the time of their creation, and as signifiers of the medieval Gothic. This complex double-meaning does somewhat address the question of why continental glass specifically was used at Strawberry Hill. What it does not fully address is why Walpole was specifically looking for “old fragments,” or why he chose these over new commissions which could also have been painted in styles and with scenes “acceptable to an English gentleman.” It is also important to remember that at the time of installation many of the continental panels of stained glass could barely be classified as antique. He was most interested in the scale of the “immense cargo” of glass, and the inclusion of “Flemish arms” rather than the age of the glass.⁶⁸

Past authors have considered Strawberry Hill to be a combination of different “architectural quotations,” where Walpole combined features from different styles and periods to form a new style.⁶⁹ This has been discussed largely in relation to the notion of Strawberry Hill as an architectural plaything for Walpole.⁷⁰ The house was not Walpole’s

⁶⁷ Marks, “The Reception and Display of Northern European Roundels,” 219.

⁶⁸ Horace Walpole to Horace Mann, Oct 18, 1750, in *Horace Walpole Correspondence, Yale Edition*, vol. 20, ed. Lewis Walpole Library and Yale, 199-200, accessed Aug 07, 2019, <http://images.library.yale.edu/hwcorrespondence/default.asp>.

⁶⁹ Peover and Rogers, “New Light on Strawberry Hill,” 8; Kevin Rogers, “Walpole’s Gothic: Creating a Fictive History,” in *Horace Walpole’s Strawberry Hill*, ed. Michael Snodin and Cynthia Roman (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), 62.

⁷⁰ Matthew Reeve refers to Strawberry Hill as a villa “composed of quotations from Catholic religious architecture,” and he argued that this interest in Catholic monastic life was intrinsically linked to “a cult of homoerotic community.” Reeve’s exploration of the role of sexuality in the design at Strawberry Hill can be found in his article: “Gothic Architecture, Sexuality, and License at Horace Walpole’s Strawberry Hill,” *The Art Bulletin* 95, no. 3 (2013): 419, accessed Nov 29, 2019, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43188840>.

primary residence, and he certainly wrote of it as if it were a trinket or curiosity rather than a serious venture. Writing to Henry Seymour Conway (1721-95) on 8 June 1747, Walpole describes Strawberry Hill: “It is a little play-thing-house that I got out of Mrs Chenevix’s shop, and is the prettiest bauble you ever saw. It is set in enamelled meadows, with filigree hedges.”⁷¹ There was a sense of theatre and amusement in the freedom with which Walpole designed his house and displayed his collections, heightened by the role of the building as a place for summer entertainment rather than continual inhabitation. Focussing on the “architectural quotation” only as an expression of frivolous spectacle detracts from the way in which Walpole’s Strawberry Hill developed the notion of the Gothic fragment, which had solid foundations in literature and culture of the period. The display of stained glass at Strawberry Hill, more than any other architectural or design feature, asked the viewer to focus on the fragmentation and disparate origins of the different glass pieces, and yet it has not been approached as such by previous scholars. Walpole’s glazing style, when read within the context of the Gothic fragment in the latter half of the eighteenth century, was intended to lend credence to Walpole’s presentation of Strawberry Hill as his historic ancestral seat.

This representation of Strawberry Hill was entirely at odds with the reality of the family seat of Houghton Hall (Norfolk), although interesting comparisons can be drawn between Horace Walpole’s use of stained glass as a form of narrative building and his father’s use of sculpture at the Hall. The Palladian mansion at Houghton was

⁷¹ Horace Walpole to Henry Seymour Conway, June 8, 1747, in *Horace Walpole Correspondence, Yale Edition*, vol. 37, ed. Lewis Walpole Library and Yale, 269, accessed Nov 19, 2019, <http://images.library.yale.edu/hwcorrespondence/default.asp>.

commissioned in 1722 by Horace Walpole's father and Prime Minister of Great Britain Robert Walpole (1676-1745). The house was described as "the first house in Norfolk" by William White in the nineteenth century.⁷² The classical idiom was employed at Houghton to create a family seat fitting a Prime Minister. Jonathan Hill has stressed the significance of the bust of Robert Walpole to the creation of the Stone Hall's classical interior.⁷³ This sculpture was carved by the eminent sculptor John Michael Rysbrack (1694-1770) and combined Roman and British iconography by depicting the Prime Minister in a toga adorned with the Garter Star. This representation reflected the belief that modern Britain and ancient Rome shared a "commitment to democracy and liberty."⁷⁴ Robert Walpole's played with the classical idiom at Houghton as it allowed him to construct a personal narrative in much the same way that Horace Walpole later used the Gothic at Strawberry Hill.

Walpole's *Description of the Villa* (1774 and 1784) gives an insight into the significance of stained-glass arrangements within distinct spaces at Strawberry Hill. The Hall and Staircase formed a particularly important area of the building (figures 11,

⁷² William White, *History, Gazetteer, and Directory, of Norfolk, and the City and County of the City of Norwich, comprising, under a Lucid Arrangement of Subjects, a General Survey of the County of Norfolk, and the Diocese of Norwich; With Separate Historical, Statistical, & Topographical Descriptions of all the Boroughs, Towns, Parishes, Villages, Hamlets, Manors, and Liberties, in the Thirty-Three Hundreds; Shewing their Extent and Population; Their Agriculture, Manufactures, Fisheries, Markets, Fairs, Natural Productions &c.; their Eminent Men; the Lords of the Manors, and Owners of the Soil and Tithes; the Patrons and Incumbents of the Church Livings; the Antiquaries, Public Charities, and Institutions; the Civil and Ecclesiastical Jurisdictions; the Names and Addresses of the Principle Inhabitants; the Mediums of Public Conveyance by Land and Water; the Seats of Nobility and Gentry; Lists of Public Officers; and a Variety of other Commercial, Agricultural, & Biographical Information. In One Volume, with a Large Map of the County*, (Sheffield: Printed for the Author, by Robt. Leader, 1836), 648.

⁷³ Jonathan Hill, *A Landscape of Architecture, History and Fiction* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), 25-28.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 25.

18&19). Passing through the external doorway guests would be introduced to Walpole's Gothic interior design. Walpole recounts the design of this space in his *Description*:

You first enter a small gloomy hall paved with hexagon tiles, and lighted by two narrow windows of painted glass, representing St. John and St. Francis. This hall is united with the staircase, and both are hung with gothic paper, painted by one Tudor, from the screen of prince Arthur's tomb in the cathedral of Worcester. The balustrade was designed by Mr. Bentley; at every corner is an antelope (one of lord Orford's supporters) holding a shield. In the well of the staircase, by a cord of black and yellow, hangs a gothic lanthorn of tin japanned, designed by Mr. Bentley, and filled with painted glass; the door of it has an old pane with the arms of Vere earl of Orford."⁷⁵

John A. Knowles wrote of Walpole that his "mind as well as his house was piled up with Dresden china and illuminated through painted glass."⁷⁶ In reality, the stained glass in the Hall was used to facilitate the appropriate level of Gothic gloom, rather than to illuminate, and thus it was used liberally in the windows and lighting of this space. Using coloured glass to alter the light levels would have felt particularly dramatic to visitors entering the house from the brightness of the outside. In addition to the windows described by Walpole, two further stained-glass windows would have been viewable from the ground-floor Hall and Staircase. Firstly, the Great Parlour Lobby contained a window packed with fragments and coloured glass (figure 21), referred to in the *Description* simply as "a window of painted glass."⁷⁷ Secondly, "a shield of Mr. Walpole's arms and quarterings on painted glass, by Price," was positioned over the door to the Little Parlour (figure 22).⁷⁸ Further light would have cut through the initial gloom from the four quatrefoil sky lights in the ceiling above the staircase (figure 23). These skylights are not referred to in the *Description*, however they are original to Walpole's conception of the

⁷⁵ Horace Walpole, *A Description of the Villa of Mr. Horace Walpole, at Strawberry Hill near Twickenham, Middlesex. With an Inventory of the Furniture, Pictures, Curiosities, &c.* (London: Pallas Athene, 2010), 401.

⁷⁶ Knowles, "Horace Walpole and his Collection of Stained Glass at Strawberry Hill," 45.

⁷⁷ Walpole, *Description.*, 401.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 418.

space.⁷⁹ The current arrangement of glass in the skylight was made during the 2006-10 programme of restoration following the removal of the decorated panels of glass installed by Lady Waldegrave in the late nineteenth century (figure 24).

The sale of much of Walpole's collection in 1842 and the impact of new owners throughout the intervening centuries means that much of the original stained glass is either no longer in the house or it has been rearranged.⁸⁰ This sale, plus architectural re-organisations of 1859-63, had a significant effect on the Hall and Great Parlour Lobby windows. During this period of change the north wall of the hall, along with its windows and doors, were removed. In addition to these alterations, this same programme of works blocked the Lobby window. These modifications were later reversed in the 1958-60 repair campaign.⁸¹ Because of these changes, any surviving visual records of the house, particularly the series of drawings by John Carter (1748-1817), provide an invaluable record of the glazing in the late eighteenth century. The two windows which flanked the front door and the Great Parlour Lobby window are clearly visible in his *View from the Hall at Strawberry Hill* (1788, figure 11).⁸² This view shows the original lead line of the lobby window and this information was used in the restoration process of 2006-10. The stained glass used to fill the window at that time had been part of the original glazing scheme of the house, but the original locations of these panels are unknown (figure 21).

⁷⁹ Omitting the quatrefoil windows in the *Description* suggests that these windows were glazed with clear glass in the eighteenth century. The other skylight in the Tribune, which was painted in silver stain and paint, is explicitly described by Walpole as "a star of yellow glass that throws a golden gloom all over the room, with the painted windows gives it a solemn air of a rich chapel (Walpole, *Description*, 470)." It seems likely that had the Staircase lights been similarly coloured or painted, they too would have been mentioned in the *Description*.

⁸⁰ Eavis and Peover, "Horace Walpole's Painted Glass at Strawberry Hill," 26.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 27.

The windows flanking the external door are now filled with recent windows by abstract artist John McLean (1939-2019).

Thanks to the Carter illustration, Walpole's liberal use of fragments, coloured glass, and varied imagery in the Hall and Lobby windows is clear. Walpole wrote to George Montagu (1713-1780) to report the installation of the two south wall windows on 22 May 1753: "We emerge very fast out of shavings, and hammerings and pastings: the painted glass is full-blown in every window, and the gorgeous Saints that were brought out for one day on the festival of Saint George Montagu, are fixed forever in the tabernacles they are to inhabit."⁸³ Although these windows were among those damaged in the 1772 explosion of the Hounslow powder mill, the damage was not irreparable, as these windows are depicted in Carter's 1788 drawing.⁸⁴ Both from this letter and his *Description* it is clear that Walpole found the representations of St John and St Francis to be the most significant aspects of the Hall glazing, as is clear from this letter and his *Description*. Although these figures dominated the windows in Carter's drawing, several other fragments of heraldic, decorative, and coloured glass complete these windows which were "full-blown" with stained glass, some of which would have been imported in 1750. Heraldry was clearly a particularly significant decorative motif for Walpole throughout the house, which is filled with both historic and contemporaneous examples of heraldic devices. Carter's drawing represents these as the dominant design feature for the Vestibule window and the lower panels of the two south windows. The importance of

⁸³ Horace Walpole to George Montagu, May 22, 1753, in *Horace Walpole Correspondence, Yale Edition*, vol. 9, ed. Lewis Walpole Library and Yale, 146-47, accessed Nov 19, 2019, <http://images.library.yale.edu/hwcorrespondence/default.asp>.

⁸⁴ Eavis and Peover, "Horace Walpole's Painted Glass at Strawberry Hill," 24.

heraldry for Walpole is reflected by the fact that the heraldic arms of “the arms of Vere earl of Orford,” is the only stained-glass panel mentioned from the japanned lantern by Walpole in his *Description* (figure 25).⁸⁵ Lord Orford was Robert Walpole, father of Horace Walpole. The use of these arms within the Hall is a good illustration of how Horace Walpole was able to blend his own family history into the fictitious historic narrative which he was building at Strawberry Hill. Stained glass dominated the Hall, which is particularly important to note considering the key role of this area as an introduction to Strawberry Hill style for visitors entering the building. This reinforces the notion that stained glass was an integral aspect of Walpole’s architectural Gothic. The extensive use of stained glass was continued to other areas of the house, where more detailed contemporary documentation allows for a closer reading of glass arrangement.

Much like the other glazing schemes in the house, the library windows show signs of loss following the sale of 1842 (figure 26). The library glazing is some of the best documented of the schemes at Strawberry Hill, with contemporary drawings by Carter (1788, figures 27&28) and Johann Heinrich Müntz (1727-98, drawing 1755-59, figure 29) which show the full glazing scheme. As with the Hall glazing, Walpole named the subjects of particular panels in his *Description*, which allowed the reader to identify which glass he felt was the most significant: “The large window and the two rose windows have a great deal of fine painted glass, particularly Faith, Hope, and Charity, whole figures in colours; a large shield with the arms of England, and heads of Charles I. and Charles II.”⁸⁶ Müntz’s

⁸⁵ Walpole, *A Description of the Villa of Mr. Horace Walpole*, 401.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 442.

drawing is the most clear in terms of illustrating the scenes depicted in the individual stained-glass panels, although the “rose windows” are partially obscured. John Carter’s *East View of the Library* (after 1788), as well as sketches of the glass (1788) give a better indication of the colours used in the eighteenth-century surround glass, although the vibrancy of tone is not fully captured. During the restoration period of 2006-10 stained glass from one of the rose windows was discovered under the Library floor.⁸⁷ This included a piece of blue glass, which provided proof of the vivacity of colour used by Walpole in the glazing of these windows.

The central window, which consisted of three rows of stained glass in the heads of the lights, contained a variety of different stained-glass panels and fragments which were surrounded by eighteenth-century coloured glass (figure 30). This window was a showcase of Walpole’s approach to glazing, in which panels of vastly different iconographies and origins were combined to create new schemes. British Royal iconography was apparent in the large coat of arms for Arthur Prince of Wales (1486-1502) which dominates panel 7B as well as the portraits of Charles I (1600-1649) and Charles II (1630-1685), which were placed centrally in panels 6AB and 6BC. Roundels with religious figures were also present, including a scene of St Gregory the Great Writing, and a Samian Sybil in panel 6BC, both of which date from the seventeenth century.⁸⁸ Another seventeenth-century roundel which depicted a Dutch Burgher with an armorial was located in panel 6AB.⁸⁹ This last piece would certainly have been among the 450

⁸⁷ Eavis and Peover, “Horace Walpole’s Painted Glass at Strawberry Hill,” 38.

⁸⁸ Peover, *Strawberry Hill: Renaissance Glass*, 18 and 26.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 36.

purchased from the Continent in 1750, as were many other panels which are no longer in situ in row 5 of the scheme.

As discussed above, the main discussion around Walpole's arrangement of glass has been focussed on the unifying nature of the coloured glass surrounds. It has been argued that through using these Walpole was able to imitate the mosaic style of glazing which read as medieval to the eighteenth-century audience. Beyond acknowledging the significance of heraldry, it seems that for most scholars the actual content of the glass was of little importance to Walpole. One should question how significant this concept of unity really was for Walpole considering that Strawberry Hill is a house famed for how it combines unique "architectural quotations."

Arguably, these windows were highly fragmented, particularly in terms of his arrangement of disparate panels in new windows. The glazing of Strawberry Hill should be reconsidered within the context of the fragment. The frequent use of fragmentation in the Gothic novel of this period is particularly important to this discussion considering the fact that Walpole was a Gothic novelist. How does the use of stained-glass fragments show influence of literary models? Would such a reading offer a better explanation for Walpole's decision to purchase renaissance style continental roundels and fragments? The next section will explore the tropes of fragmentation in the literary gothic in order to answer these questions.

Fragmentation and the Literary Gothic

The concept of fragmentation has been well explored in relation to the Gothic novel, and this offers an interesting lens through which to examine the use of stained glass in this period. Anne Williams writes that a defining characteristic of this genre of writing is “Gothic defamiliarization,” in which authors revelled in the unknowable during the age of Rationality.⁹⁰ Methods for creating this “defamiliarization” included the use of framing narratives and layers of authorship as well as broken texts which highlighted the fragility of “historic” manuscripts. The widespread popularity of Gothic literature ensured that the tropes of this genre would have been well known in this period. Methods of literary fragmentation will be explored here to establish what connections can be found between literary fragmentation and the use of continental stained-glass fragments in the context of the eighteenth-century Gothic.

Williams argued that “Gothic narrative conventions (framed and embedded tales, “found” or “translated” manuscripts, many narrators) dramatize both the materiality of writing and its implicit inadequacies: its discontinuities, ambiguities, unreliabilities, silences.”⁹¹ This complex textual construction was implicit in the Gothic narrative from the earliest novel of the genre, *The Castle of Otranto*. Walpole presented his novel as an historic manuscript in translation, which was made particularly clear to the reader on the first edition frontispiece, where the title is followed by the text: “Translated by WILLIAM MARSHAL, Gent. From the Original ITALIAN of ONUPHRIO MURALTO, CANON of the

⁹⁰ Anne Williams, *Art of Darkness: A Poetics of Gothic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 71.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 67.

Church of St. Nicholas at OTRANTO.”⁹² The reader was presented with three layers of authorship: the imagined Canon Muralto, the fictitious Marshal, and the true author, Walpole. This chain of narrators distances the reader from the supposed original author, and thus this author’s intention for the text. The feeling of dislocation was further intensified in the preface which highlights the fact that the imagined original manuscript was historic and originally written in another language:

Miracles, visions, necromancy, dreams, and other preternatural events, are exploded now even from romances. That was not the case when our author wrote; much less when the story itself is supposed to have happened. Belief in every kind of prodigy was so established in those dark ages, that an author would not be faithful to the manners of the times, who should omit all mention of them. He is not bound to believe them himself, but he must represent his actors as believing them.⁹³

By creating and reinforcing this distance between reader and “writer” Walpole created an author who is akin to a mythological figure, an author who is “Other.” This technique was employed by many Gothic novelists, who built faux literary lineages for their texts to create an air of mystery around an unknowable author which also imbued their tales with a feeling of “authenticity.” The claim of an original manuscript discovered in a clandestine location, such as “in the library of an ancient Catholic family in the north of England” in the case of Walpole, would have further added to this narrative.⁹⁴ These books were advertised as being literal Gothic novels, that is manuscripts supposedly written pre-Reformation.

⁹² Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto, A Story*, frontispiece.

⁹³ Horace Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto: A Gothic Story*, ed. Nick Groom (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 1.

⁹⁴ Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto* (2014), 5.

Walter Scott (1771-1832) uses similarly complex framing techniques for his Waverley Novels, some of which bore false dedications or were published by a fictitious editor.⁹⁵ *The Monastery* (1820) exemplifies these techniques. The novel opens with an introductory epistle from one Captain Clutterbuck, an imagined character who was later used in the same manner for the framing of *The Fortunes of Nigel* (1822).⁹⁶ The letter in *The Monastery* is addressed to “THE AUTHOR OF WAVERLEY,” whose response completed the novel’s foreword. Further layers of fictitious narrative lineage for the text are given in Clutterbuck’s epistle. The original tale is supposedly taken from sixteenth-century materials which were then worked into a manuscript by two Benedictine monks. One of these monks then gave this manuscript to Clutterbuck, who passed it to “The Author of Waverley” for further alteration and final publication.⁹⁷ As with Walpole’s layers of authorship, the original author and their intent was obscured through the framing narratives for the novel. The reader is presented with “the impossibility of knowing (where ‘to see’ means also ‘to understand’),” which Patrick R. O’Malley argues was central to the Gothic aesthetic.⁹⁸

Jane Austen (1775-1817) parodied numerous Gothic tropes in *Northanger Abbey* (written 1803, first published posthumously in 1817), as referenced in the introduction. In this work the young heroine Catherine Moreland was obsessed with Anne Radcliffe’s (1764-1823) famed Gothic novel *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794). Catherine’s love of

⁹⁵ Foteini Lika, *Roidis and the Borrowed Muse: British Historiography, Fiction and Satire in “Pope Joan”* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2018), 115.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 115.

⁹⁷ Walter Scott, *The Monastery*, ed. Penny Fielding (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000), 21 and 30.

⁹⁸ O’Malley, *Catholicism, Sexual Deviance*, 28.

Gothic novels has such an influence that she is enthralled by the prospect of visiting Northanger Abbey: “Its long, damp passages, its narrow cells and ruined chapel, were to be within her daily reach, and she could not entirely subdue the hope of some traditional legends, some awful memorials of an injured and ill-fated nun.”⁹⁹ The house does not live up to these expectations, and Catherine is particularly disappointed in the windows, of which “every pane was so large, so clear, so light! To an imagination which had hoped **for the smallest divisions**, and the heaviest stone-work, **for painted glass, dirt and cobwebs**, the difference was very distressing [emphasis added by current author].”¹⁰⁰ The found manuscript trope discussed above was heavily parodied by Austen, in imitation of Radcliffe’s novel, and forms a central episode in Catherine’s visit to Northanger. In the middle of the night Catherine discovers what she assumes to be a historic manuscript in an old cabinet: “The manuscript so wonderfully found [...] — What could it contain? — to whom could it relate? — by what means could it have been so long concealed?”¹⁰¹ In the light of day these papers are found to be nothing more sinister than a collection of comparatively recent receipts.¹⁰² Austen’s *Northanger Abbey* was designed as both a parody and defence of the Gothic novel. Catherine’s obsession with castles, abbeys, and the search for a “fragmented journal” as proof of murder, reflect the incidents of contemporary Gothic novels.¹⁰³ The trope of the found manuscript, woven into a novel which so cleverly plays on the form and content of the Gothic novel, suggests the ubiquity of this concept for the reader in the early nineteenth century.

⁹⁹ Austen, *Northanger Abbey*, 102.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 118.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 124.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 126.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 142.

Through constructing the framework of the pseudo-historic translated text, the Gothic novelist set up a narrative which was strange to the reader, and which may have had literal flaws, breaks or missing sections.¹⁰⁴ Clara Reeve (1729-1807) exemplified this trend in her novel *The Old English Baron* (1778). The book was originally published anonymously as *The Champion of Virtue* (1777) in Colchester by W. Keymer to approximately 500 East Anglian subscribers.¹⁰⁵ In her preface to the novel, Reeve presented the text as an historic found manuscript originally written in Old English, and in this she is clearly following the tradition set by Walpole.¹⁰⁶ Although the novel was published anonymously, the earliest extant advert for this volume still emphasised the provenance of the author: "THE CHAMPION of VIRTUE; a Gothic Story. By the Editor of Phoenix, a Translation from Barclay's Argenis, and Author of a Letter to Courtney Melmoth, Esq."¹⁰⁷ The attribution of these works would have recommended the author as a serious translator of historic texts, as *The Phoenix* was a translation of John Barclay's

¹⁰⁴ In a discussion of this trope, Williams referred to Charles Maturin's (1780-1824) *Melmoth the Wanderer* (1820), in which John Melmoth's reading of an historic text is interrupted where the original manuscript has been damaged by fire (Williams, *Art of Darkness*, 67).

¹⁰⁵ Gary Kelly, "Reeve, Clara (1729-1807), Novelist and Poet," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, May 27, 2010, accessed July 19, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/23292>.

¹⁰⁶ Clara Reeve, *The Champion of Virtue. A Gothic Story* (Colchester: Printed for the Author, by W. Keymer, 1777), vii.

¹⁰⁷ "To be SOLD," editorial, *Ipswich Journal*, Apr 26, 1777, 3. The second text mentioned in this review is *A Letter to Courtney Melmoth, Esq; With some Remarks on two Books, called Liberal Opinions, and the Pupil of Pleasure* (1777), which railed against the perceived lack of morality in the named novels by Courtney Melmoth. Melmoth was a pseudonym used by writer and actor Samuel Pratt Jackson (1749-1814) after he left the clerical profession to elope with a boarding school mistress named Charlotte (1749-1805 or 1823, possibly née Melmoth) (Grant P. Cerny, "Pratt, Samuel Jackson [pseud. Courtney Melmoth] (1749-1814), writer and actor," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Jan 3, 2008, accessed July 22, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/22710>). One review of the *Letter* expressed the view that it "freely censures some of Mr. Melmoth's publications, as unfriendly to virtue; charges the writer with displaying luxurious representations of the scenes of vice; and particularly characterises his *Pupil of Pleasure* as the preceptor of voluptuousness" (Anon. B, "MONTHLY CATALOGUE For MAY, 1777," *The Monthly Review; or, Literary Journal From January to Jun, inclusive* 61 (1777): 391).

(1582-1621) *Argenis* (1621), which was originally written in Latin.¹⁰⁸ This information was also included in the frontispiece of the volume itself.¹⁰⁹ The popularity of *The Champion of Virtue* led to national publication by the London firm of Dilly, at which time Clara Reeve's name was added to the title page and the title of the novel was altered to *The Old English Baron*.¹¹⁰ In the preface of the 1778 version of the novel Reeve was candid about the origins of the text as her attempt to write an improved version of *The Castle of Otranto*. She suggested that the modern Romantic novel needed three aspects to be successful: "a sufficient degree of the marvellous to excite the attention; enough of the manners of real life, to give an air of probability to the work; and enough of the pathetic, to engage the heart in its behalf."¹¹¹ In her opinion, Walpole's use of the "marvellous" was overblown to the point that it would "excite laughter" in the reader.¹¹² Reeve clearly stated that her re-telling of the tale was an attempt to correct this perceived flaw in Walpole's novel.¹¹³

Despite these clear signs that the novel was entirely contemporary in origin, *The Old English Baron* retained references to a decaying historic manuscript which were first

¹⁰⁸ Kelly, "Reeve, Clara."

¹⁰⁹ Reeve, *The Champion of Virtue*, frontispiece.

¹¹⁰ Kelly, "Reeve, Clara."

¹¹¹ Clara Reeve, *The Old English Baron*, ed. James Trainer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), 4.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 5.

¹¹³ In correspondence with William Cole, Walpole scathingly remarked on the criticism included in the preface to *The English Baron*: "It is not at all oblique, but though mixed with high compliments, directly attacks the visionary part, which, says the author, or authoress, makes one laugh. I do assure you I have not had the smallest inclination to return that attack. It would be ungrateful, for the work is professed imitation of mine, only stripped of the marvellous; and so entirely stripped, except in one awkward attempt at a ghost or two, that it is the most insipid dull nothing you ever saw. It certainly does not make one laugh, for what makes one doze, seldom makes one merry." (Horace Walpole to William Cole, Aug 22, 1778, in *Horace Walpole Correspondence, Yale Edition*, vol. 2, ed. The Lewis Walpole Library and Yale (New Haven: Yale University Library, 2011), 88, accessed August 7, 2019, <http://images.library.yale.edu/hwcorrespondence/default.asp>).

seen in *The Champion of Virtue*. In the early portion of the novel the narrative has been broken by five insertions from the supposed editor. Notations explained that certain portions of the original manuscript were written in a different hand, were illegible or had been ruined in the intervening centuries between writing and publication:

From this place the characters in the manuscript are effaced by time and damp. Here and there some sentences are legible, but not sufficient to pursue the thread of the story. [...] The following incidents are clear enough to be transcribed; but the beginning of the next succeeding pages is obliterated: However, we may guess at the beginning by what remains.¹¹⁴

These insertions drew the reader out of the narrative itself to remind them of the supposed historic nature of the document. Although the reader was not reading from this “original” manuscript, these notes were a reminder of the tangible fragility of the imagined historic material. Reeve fragmented her own text with these intrusions in order to give her novel an air of authenticity. By reminding the reader of crumbling pages and mysteriously illegible handwriting the notion of the manuscript as a rare survival of pre-Reformation England was reinforced.

In the literary examples explored above, authors constructed the appearance of “authentic” historic texts. This was achieved by highlighting the fallibility of the physical manuscript and the possibilities of misinterpretation by intervening generations. The less perfect, complete, and comprehensible the novel, the more authentic it was purported to be. Walpole’s technique for the display of stained glass was comparable to this in that the presentation of the historic was not achieved simply through mimicking the techniques of medieval stained-glass in their original form, nor did he use medieval materials to achieve

¹¹⁴ Reeve, *The Old English Baron*, 27.

a Gothic aesthetic. Instead, the glass presented was from different periods, including the contemporary, and depicted varied iconography. The coloured glass was therefore not used to create unified windows in the medieval mosaic style. Instead, it drew the disparate pieces together to form an obviously composite window much as the Gothic author formed a novel from the fragmented historic manuscript. The fragmentation and variation of the windows was intentional. The viewer was intended to see the different hands and styles of the glazing, and these were to be read much like the framing narratives seen in Gothic novels of the same period. Similarly, fragments of glass with uneven edges, as opposed to roundels, can be compared to the broken text techniques used by Clara Reeve. Stained-glass panels were often cut to retain the most saleable elements or to better fit a new location. This damage was often undisguised, as was the case in Walpole's central Library window, where pieces in rows five and six were clearly cut to shape. As with Reeve's interjections, the contemporary hand emphasised or created fragmentation to suggest a specific historic origin tale which was actually fictitious.

The notion of fragmentation over unity in Walpole's windows does not detract from the argument that the coloured surrounds were an attempt to imitate medieval glazing styles. The alteration to light levels in particular was of great significance. This is clearly linked to the "gloom and perspectives infused such sensations of romantic devotion" which Walpole saw as integral to the medieval Gothic Church.¹¹⁵ The injection of colour into Walpole's windows certainly suggested an attempt to create a Gothic

¹¹⁵ Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, 70.

interior with a medieval origin, however there is a greater recognition of Walpole as modern descendent of these ancient forebearers. For Walpole, he has created a fantasy in which he has inherited the supposedly historic family seat, and the house therefore bears traces of this legacy. Walpole's architectural choices and collections displayed at Strawberry Hill further supported this reading of the house. Clive Wainwright argued, in reference to the staircase Armoury which was created using pieces from across the world, that "*effect* was exactly what Walpole was striving for."¹¹⁶ In the gloom of the hallway created by the implementation of composite stained-glass windows and lantern, the reality that the armour was not ancestral would have been difficult for the visitor to discern. This view of the house as a composed ancestral house has been discussed by Kevin Rogers, however it has not previously been considered in relation to the stained glass, nor in light of the concept of the literary Gothic fragment.¹¹⁷ Walpole was able to insert renaissance and contemporary stained-glass panels into schemes without undermining the concept of these windows being medieval in original style. Walpole was aware of how easily fragments could be manipulated to continue this vision. Writing to Mann regarding his stained-glass purchase of 1750, Walpole wrote: "I have got an immense cargo of painted glass from Flanders: indeed several of the pieces are Flemish arms; but I call them the achievements of the old Counts of Strawberry."¹¹⁸ Walpole himself was aware that his design was not an attempt to reproduce medieval architecture and design exactly. He wrote of the rooms of Strawberry Hill that "every true Goth must

¹¹⁶ Clive Wainwright, *The Romantic Interior: The British Collector at Home 1750-1850* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989), 101.

¹¹⁷ Kevin Rogers, "Walpole's Gothic: Creating a Fictive History," 63.

¹¹⁸ Walpole to Mann, Oct 18, 1750, 199-200.

perceive that they are more the works of fancy than of imitation.”¹¹⁹ The role of stained glass in the design of Walpole’s Strawberry Hill was more complex than has been suggested by previous studies, particularly in terms of how the design takes inspiration from the wider appeal of the Gothic fragment. Exploring Walpole’s glazing in this content proves the strong foundations which were laid for the fragment window as an expression of the Gothic into the early nineteenth century.

East Anglian Goths

Norwich: A Cosmopolitan City

Norwich was a significant city in terms of its development of the Gothic, regarding both literary and antiquarian interests. At the turn of the nineteenth century Norwich was a thriving city with a vibrant literary and artistic scene. The active literary culture and number of circulating libraries are particularly noteworthy, as has been explored by Franz J. Potter in his research on Gothic publishing.¹²⁰ In addition, the Norwich Society of Artists (1803-1833) were trailblazers of the arts outside London:¹²¹

When we consider that this is the only institution of the kind in England, out of the metropolis, it speaks loudly in [sic] behalf of its members, and of the state of the arts in the ancient city, which has given birth to several celebrated artists, and encouragement to others; witness the names of Beechey, Catton, Clover, Cotman, Martin, Miles, Opie, Repton, Wilkins, Westhall, &c. &c.

The Exhibition room has been the resort of much genteel and fashionable company, every day this week.¹²²

¹¹⁹ Horace Walpole to Mary Berry, Oct 17, 1794, in *Horace Walpole Correspondence, Yale Edition*, vol. 12, ed. Lewis Walpole Library and Yale, 137, accessed Nov 26, 2019, <http://images.library.yale.edu/hwcorrespondence/default.asp>.

¹²⁰ Franz J. Potter, *The History of Gothic Publishing 1800-1835: Exhuming the Trade* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

¹²¹ Re-named the Norfolk and Suffolk Institution for the Promotion of Fine Arts after 1828.

¹²² “Norwich Society of Artists,” editorial, *NC&NG* August 16, 1806, 2.

The writer of this advertisement was aware of the city's thriving intellectual and artistic scene and was happy to claim his own organisation as a continuation of this.¹²³ The Norwich Society of Artists attracted popular contemporary artists, including John Crome (1768-1821) and John Sell Cotman (1782-1842), who both served as vice-president and president of the organisation on more than one occasion.¹²⁴

Many of the artists, writers and designers working in Norwich maintained connections to London and were aware of how their work interacted with national trends. These individuals were not merely provincial followers of metropolitan trends, and many were innovators in their own right. Nationally recognised voices included Francis Lathom (1777-1832), author of novels such as *The Castle of Ollada* (1795) and *The Midnight Bell* (1798), the latter of which was named as one of the "horrid novels" in Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey*.¹²⁵ Amelia Opie (née Alderson, 1769-1853) was a prolific author of novels and poetry and her work was highly respected across the country in the early decades of the nineteenth century.¹²⁶ These authors wrote in the knowledge of national literary trends and were in correspondence with writers in the metropolis. Cotman exhibited with the Royal Academy from 1800 and was among the early members of the Sketching Society which met in London between 1799 and 1851.¹²⁷ Contemporary

¹²³ Although founded in 1803, the first annual exhibition of the group's work was not held until 1805 (Mikos Rajnai and Mary Stevens, *The Norwich Society of Artists 1805-1833: A Dictionary of Contributor and their Work* (Norwich: Norfolk Museums Service, 1976), 3).

¹²⁴ Crome served as vice-president in 1807 and 1820 and president in 1808 while Cotman served as vice-president in 1810, 1831 and 1832 and president in 1811 and 1833 (Mikos Rajnai, *The Members of the Norwich Society of Artists, 1805-1833* (Norwich: Norfolk Archaeology, 1971), 5).

¹²⁵ Jane Austen, *Northanger Abbey*, 25.

¹²⁶ Gary Kelly, "Opie [née Alderson], Amelia, (1769-1853), novelist and poet," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Sept 23, 2004, accessed August 06, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/20799>.

¹²⁷ Richard Ormond, "'The Sketching Society' at the Victoria and Albert Museum," *The Burlington Magazine* 113, no. 816 (1971): 169.

members of the latter organisation included Thomas Girtin (1775-1802), Louis Francia (1772-1839), Robert Kerr Porter (1777-1842), and Paul Sandby Munn (1773-1845).¹²⁸ The Society was established by a group of landscape artists from the circle of art collector and patron Dr Thomas Monro (1759-1833). The group met in different members' homes and the host was president for the evening, providing materials for drawing and a subject. Each member then sketched according to the subject, with the host retaining the drawings.¹²⁹ Cotman's career, which spanned London and Norwich, is a symbol of the connections which existed between Norwich and more widely recognised metropolitan artistic communities of the period.

Fraternity of United Friars

The Fraternity of United Friars (also known as the College of St Luke or the Society for the Participation of United Friars) was a group which is illustrative of Norwich as a leading city in cultural and antiquarian pursuits. The Fraternity was founded in 1785 and met regularly until 1828. Although this group was based in Norwich, many members had connections to London and a branch was established there in 1818 as the College of St Mark. This offshoot was founded by Arthur Taylor, who was previously initiated into the original Norwich Society. Members of the London Friars were to be automatically appointed members of the Norwich Friars and vice versa.¹³⁰ Little work has been done on the history of this organisation and their contemporary significance. The single dedicated study was written by Mark Knights in the nineteenth century, and only seems to exist in manuscript

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 168-69.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 169.

¹³⁰ Mark Knights, MS history of the Friars Society Compiled by Mark Knights with brief biographies of members and list of records and communications, 131, The Coleman Manuscript Collection, COL 9/193/2, NRO, Norwich, late 19th century.

form.¹³¹ The group had a substantial impact on intellectual life in Norwich and they used their Gothic and antiquarian interests to further their progressive societal aims. The lack of scholarship for this organisation means that the foundation, structure, and activities of the fraternity will be discussed extensively here.

Eight men were present at the inaugural meeting of the Friars in Norwich on 18 October 1795: publisher of maps Mostyn John Armstrong (d. 1791);¹³² artist and latterly royal portraitist William Beechey (1753-1839); John Cook (possibly glassman of Norwich);¹³³ Thomas Holl of unknown profession; miniature painter Edward Miles (1752-1828); Thomas Ransome (c. 1752-1815); architectural designer and historian William Wilkins (d. 1815) who was partner of Humphry Repton (1752-1818) between c. 1785 and 1796;¹³⁴ and Rishton Woodcocke of unknown profession (d. 1788).¹³⁵ The group was formed by Ransome, who worked as a clerk in the Gurney's Banking House until his death in 1815, "where the beauty of his penmanship attracted general admiration."¹³⁶ He was best known for his interest in the fine arts, the science of optics, and mechanics.¹³⁷ A number of the city's prominent business people, particularly those involved in publishing, were members of the Fraternity. This included publisher William Stevenson (1741-1821) and his son Seth William Stevenson, as well as the elder Stevenson's business partners

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² See Betty Chambers, "M. J. Armstrong in Norfolk: The Progress of an Eighteenth Century County Survey," *The Geographical Journal* 130, no. 3 (1964): 427-31.

¹³³ Honor Ridout, *Cambirdge and Stourbridge Fair* (Cambridge: Blue Ocean Publishing, 2011), 45.

¹³⁴ R. Windsor Liscombe, "Wilkins, William (1778-1839), architect and antiquary," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, May 21, 2009, accessed July 26, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/29422>.

¹³⁵ Knights, MS history of the Friars Society, 11.

¹³⁶ Anon. C, "DEATHS," *The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle* 118, no. 2 (1815): 88

¹³⁷ Ibid., 88.

John Matchett and Richard Bacon.¹³⁸ Prosperous bank owner Bartlett Gurney (c. 1766-1803, figure 31) was also a member of the fraternity. Other artists involved in the organisation included Cotman, renowned watercolourist and president of the Norfolk and Suffolk Institution for the Promotion of the Fine Arts for 1833-34 (formerly the Norwich Society of Artists).¹³⁹ The Fraternity was a place for the artistic and literary circles of Norwich to exchange ideas and socialise, as reported in the contemporary press: “Amidst their philosophic studies, that gaiety which wit and wine inspires is enlivened by music; and their evenings are spent in harmony of sentiment, and improvement of the mind.”¹⁴⁰

Despite the monastic connotations of the Fraternity’s name and structure, religion was not a major concern for the group. The Fraternity rules of 1791 state that “Politics and Religion are subjects that shall at no time be agitated in Convent.”¹⁴¹ It seems there were no Catholic members, although a small number of the group did practice outside of the Established Church as members of the Religious Society of Friends. Despite this, the organisation used a monastic framework to structure all aspects of their activity. The reasoning behind this was explained in the following exordium to the rules and orders of the fraternity:

[W]ith a view to the Cultivation of a LIBERAL and RATIONAL System of Good-Fellowship, the Confraternity, under the Title of United Friars,
Was Established at NORWICH, in the Year M,DCC,LXXXV.

¹³⁸ Richard Bacon was for a time in partnership with a Yarrington, who was quite possibly the father or relative of glazier S. C. Yarrington. See appendix I and chapter five for more information on this partnership.

¹³⁹ Andrew W. Moore, “Cotman, John Sell (1782-1842), painter and etcher,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Jan 3, 2008, accessed July 31, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/6390>.

¹⁴⁰ “COUNTRY NEWS,” editorial, *Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette*, Dec 29, 1785, 2.

¹⁴¹ Rules and Orders of the United Friars or Society for the Participation of Useful Knowledge Approved & Confirmed in a Conclave of the Fraternity held in the College of St Luke in Norwich the Twenty-Fifth Day of January 1791, 5, COL9/29, The Coleman Manuscript Collection, NRO, Norwich.

WHATEVER Evils may have arisen from Monastic Institutions, or, however incompatible with refined Policy the sequestered Habits of former Times may be considered,¹⁴² it is allowed on all Authorities, that within the gloomy mansions of the Ancient Religious Fraternities, the FINE ARTS were nurtured; PHILOSOPHY and SCIENCE flourished; all the Profundity of ERUDITION was deposited; and to add Lustre to the Scene, the ELEEMOSYNARY VIRTUES took their Stand before their Gates, and dispensed the Blessings of CHARITY far and wide throughout the World!¹⁴³

The language of the monastery was assumed by the United Friars throughout their organisation as they considered the monastic structure to be the model for a society which combined charitable concern with academic progress. The Fraternity's meeting place was a Convent and meetings were referred to as either Chapters or Conclaves, these being ordinary or special meetings respectively.¹⁴⁴ There were eight key named positions within the Fraternity, with Brothers being appointed on an annual basis: Abbot, Prior, Procurator, Precentor, Bursar, Confessor, Librarian, and Verger.¹⁴⁵ The Abbot and Prior, as first and second in command, were elected by all Brothers and these two then assigned the other roles.¹⁴⁶ The Abbot was styled Paul, and ordinal numerals were used to distinguish between consecutive Abbots. All members of the fraternity were referred to as "Brother." Membership was divided into "residential" or "non-residential," a title which referred to the status of the individual. To become a residential Brother the member was assigned to a different monastic order which was done to symbolise a coming together of different factions of the Church, hence the society's title of the United

¹⁴² This view of monastic establishments referenced the concept of corruption, which was often associated with these wealthy institutions following the Reformation. This view was a key feature of the Gothic novel, as best exemplified by Matthew Gregory Lewis' vastly popular and scandalous publication, *The Monk* (1794), in which the Abbott is labelled a "Monster of hypocrisy" (Matthew Gregory Lewis, *The Monk*, ed. D. L. Macdonald and Kathleen Scherf (Plymouth: Broadview Press), 263).

¹⁴³ Fraternity of United Friars, *Exordium to the Rules and Orders of the Fraternity of the United Friars* (Norwich: Printed by Stevenson, Matchett, and Stevenson, n.d.), 1-2, COL/9/28/22, NRO, Norwich.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁴⁵ In the first decade of the organisation's existence there were several other roles, however this number was reduced later, and the associated responsibilities were assumed by one of the remaining titles (Knights, MS history of the Friars Society, 108.

¹⁴⁶ Rules and Orders of the United Friars, 3.

Friars. The applicant had to write a history of their given Order and upon the reading of this history they were permitted status of residential member.¹⁴⁷ Each Residential Brother was expected to “provide himself with the Habit of his Order which must be made up from the best Authorities.”¹⁴⁸ The Abbot had a specific set of robes as well as a mitre and crozier to demarcate their status.¹⁴⁹ In addition to the robes, each Friar wore a rosary of twenty-four beads with each individual bead representing a character value required of the Brothers (figure 32).¹⁵⁰ The rosary and associated values were integral to the ethos of the United Friars and a framed and glazed version was listed among the pictures owned by the society.¹⁵¹

The choice to use Catholic organisational structures and iconography as the basis for a non-Catholic fraternity may seem counter-intuitive from a modern standpoint, and the decision would have been more controversial at the founding of the Fraternity. The early decades of the Fraternity’s existence were marked by a shifting and nuanced public reaction to the Catholic Church. The Fraternity was founded in a period of increased freedom for those practicing the Catholic religion, being between the Catholic Relief Acts of 1778 and 1791. The first of these Acts granted Catholics permission to purchase land and join the army on the condition that they swore an oath of allegiance to the Crown. After the passage of the Act into law the Protestant Association was formed to lobby for

¹⁴⁷ On his appointment to the Order of St James de Compostela in 1801 Cotman was permitted to present a drawing of the saint in lieu of an orated history (Knights, MS history of the Friars Society, 113).

¹⁴⁸ Rules and Orders of the United Friars, 2.

¹⁴⁹ Elisha De Hague, Thomas Woodcocke and George Warte, Inventory of Property including Scientific Instruments and Models, The Coleman Manuscript Collection, COL 9/40/2, NRO, Norwich, 1790, 2.

¹⁵⁰ The Characters of the Beads which Constitute the Rosary of the United Friars, COL9/32, The Coleman Manuscript Collection, NRO, Norwich.

¹⁵¹ De Hague, Woodcocke and Warte, Inventory of Property, 3.

its repeal. Led by Association President George Gordon (1751-93), a petition calling for the revocation of this law was delivered to the Houses of Parliament on 2 June 1780, followed by a 60 000 strong crowd.¹⁵² Violence was sparked after the crowd became restless, and this led to a week of “No Popery” riots which left hundreds dead and wounded as well as colossal damage to property. The *Whitehall Evening Post* describes the events of the 2 June 1780, which included the attack on the Catholic Chapel in Lincoln’s Inn Fields, where rioters “began to break open the doors of the chapel, and pull down the rails, seats, pews, communion table, &c. and brought them into the street, laid them against the doors, and set them on fire; and in about twenty minutes the chapel caught fire, and the mob would not suffer any body to endeavour to extinguish it.”¹⁵³ Attacks which started at the doors of Catholic homes and chapels soon spilled out to other institutions, including the Bank of England and prisons across London, the latter of which led to the release of prisoners into the city. The chaos was brought under control by 15 000 troops and nearly 300 protestors were shot dead in the process.¹⁵⁴ The intense level of violence perpetrated in the name of anti-Catholicism actually led to an upsurge in sympathy for Catholics in the wider population.¹⁵⁵ The 1791 Act which followed was much broader in scope than that of 1778 and included a measure which gave Catholics freedom to worship.

¹⁵² Colin Haydon, “Gordon, Lord George (1751-1793), political and religious agitator,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Jan 3, 2008, accessed August 18, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/11040>.

¹⁵³ Editorial, “PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION,” *Whitehall Evening Post*, Jun 1, 1780, 1.

¹⁵⁴ “Newspaper Report of the Gordon Riots,” British Library, n.d., accessed August 22, 2019, <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/newspaper-report-of-the-gordon-riots-1780>.

¹⁵⁵ O’Malley, *Catholicism, Sexual Deviance*, 17.

In the polarised world of the Gothic novel Catholicism was associated with wickedness and corrupt power. Matthew Gregory Lewis' (1775-1818) popular novel *The Monk* (1796) was built on this assumption. The plot of the book follows the eponymous monk, Father Ambrosio, as he becomes embroiled in demonic schemes and is revealed to be a "Monster of hypocrisy."¹⁵⁶ Both the Prior and the Prioress of the twin institutions at the centre of the tale are power hungry, and both meet their doom by the novel's end. For Lewis, religious institutions were breeding grounds of corruption through the absolute dictatorial power of key figureheads. The Fraternity of United Friars was clearly aware of the mixed public perception of Catholics and Catholic institutions, both in relation to the political climate and popular tropes. The Fraternity's exordium quoted above is as much a justification of the monastic model as it is a description of the fraternity. The United Friars stressed the role of monks in dispensing charity "wide throughout the World" outside their gates to challenge the association between the secluded monastic life and hidden corruption.

Although the Fraternity members were clearly anxious to distinguish their organisation from the concept of corruption in the Catholic Church, the full extent of the appropriation of Catholic language would not have been familiar to the public at large. This was a closed group, and meetings would have been restricted to Brothers only. Under the guise of the Catholic Monastery, the secretive processes of the Fraternity were secular in all but language, as exemplified by the initiation ceremony for Novices. This complex ceremony was introduced a few years into the existence of the organisation. In it, the

¹⁵⁶ Lewis, *The Monk*, 263.

Novice passed through a pageant-like series of questioning, oath taking, ceremonial declarations, and drinking to become a Brother. This included answering a list of questions presented in private by the Confessor, including, “Do you profess yourself a Friend to learning dispos’d to practice the Moral and Societal duties, and to cultivate a plan of rational good friendship?”¹⁵⁷ Despite the lack of overt religious affiliation within the ceremony itself, the act of taking oaths proved problematic to members who were also affiliated with the Religious Society of Friends, as oath-taking by its members was strictly forbidden. Founder Ransome seceded from the United Friars in 1789 due to this issue, upon which time he wrote to the remaining members that “there are some forms in your institution not only repugnant to the principles of the religious society to which I belong [...which are] also irreconcilable to my present ideas of propriety & consistency of character.”¹⁵⁸ The swearing of vows was later removed from the initiation ceremony in response to the Unlawful Societies Act of 1799.¹⁵⁹ Apart from this temporary clash of principles with the Religious Society of Friends, there was nothing overtly religious in the ceremonies of the fraternity. The appeals to civil duty, brotherhood, and chivalry seen in the initiation of Novices had more in common with the chivalric virtues of Clara Reeves’ *The Old English Baron* than the mysterious darkness of Lewis’ *The Monk*.

The cautious approach to Catholicism and corruption shown by the United Friars, as exemplified by the above exordium, continued in the fraternity’s choice of meeting

¹⁵⁷ Rules and Orders of the United Friars, 18.

¹⁵⁸ Knights, MS history of the Friars Society, 18. This rule did not seem to have such an impact on Bartlett Gurney, who is also known to have been a member of the Religious Society of Friends. He joined the fraternity in 1786, and so like Ransome, would not have taken the oath personally. He continued as a Brother from this time until his death in 1803, and was appointed Abbot in 1793 (Knights, MS history of the Friars Society, 118).

¹⁵⁹ Knights, MS history of the Friars Society, 18-19.

place. The organisation met at three different locations in the city over the years. Originally the fraternity had intended to erect a new building fit for their needs in St Martin at Palace, to plans by architect William Wilkins (1778-1839). These plans were abandoned on 7 March 1786 and rooms were instead hired in the White Horse Yard in the same neighbourhood. These rooms were soon found to be unsuitable, however, and so the Convent moved to a house owned by Henry Dobson near St Andrews Hall in 1791.¹⁶⁰ The fraternity referred to this building as their “New College.”¹⁶¹ The organisation did not remain at this property for long, as it was decided that the rent of thirty pounds per annum was too extravagant considering the needs of the poor in the city, and so in 1799 the Friars moved their meeting place for the final time. The final rooms rented by the society was in Crown Court on Elm Hill with a rent of six pounds per annum.¹⁶² Although many of the sixteenth-century buildings on Elm Hill remain, the majority of courtyards leading off this winding street were demolished during slum clearance, including Crown Court.¹⁶³ The original wooden lintel was carved with the mark of mercer and armiger Augustine Steward (1491-1571) on the right, and those of the Mercer’s Company on the left. This remains to this day and marks where one would have entered the courtyard from the street (figures 33-35).

Despite the loss of the original building, records of the United Friars are useful in reconstructing the interior layout of the Convent. It seems that the frugality with which the Friars approached the cost of rent did not lead to a plain interior space. The Friars

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 15-16.

¹⁶¹ Editorial, “HOME NEWS,” *NC&NG*, Oct 22, 1791, 2.

¹⁶² Knights, MS history of the Friars Society, 15-16.

¹⁶³ Wrights Court is the sole extant example of a residential court leading off Elm Hill.

rented two rooms, and the chamber on the ground floor was used for Conclave or Chapter meetings while the room above was reserved for use as a refectory. This building would only have been visited by Brothers of the organisation and a few select guests. The ground floor room was particularly ornamented, as presented by Knights: "This apartment [...] had broad many-mullioned windows, a lofty handsome ceiling divided by ornamental plastering into lozenge shaped compartments, and a wide deep-set fireplace within a debased moulded arch."¹⁶⁴ Inventories of furniture and furnishings survive, however these tend not to offer much information regarding the style of the objects. The one listing which gives an indication of the probable Gothic character of the Convent interior is for nineteen "Gothic" chairs, which were used in the meeting room.¹⁶⁵

The significance of stained glass as an aspect of the Georgian Gothic interior has been discussed in relation to Walpole earlier in this chapter. Although it seems that the Fraternity did not purchase any glass for the decoration of their interior, this is not due to lack of trying. Knights writes that an "effort was at one time made by the Friars to secure the stained glass from Carrow Abbey for the enrichment of their window."¹⁶⁶ Carrow Abbey was originally founded in 1146 as a Benedictine nunnery. The church was nearly 200 feet in length and was the largest Norman building in the city after the cathedral.¹⁶⁷ Very little remains from the site of the Abbey today, and the most complete building is the sixteenth-century Prioress' lodgings, which were greatly re-modelled by the Colman

¹⁶⁴ Knights, MS history of the Friars Society, 16.

¹⁶⁵ De Hague, Woodcocke and Warte, Inventory of Property, 1.

¹⁶⁶ Knights, MS history of the Friars Society, 17.

¹⁶⁷ Jonathan Finch, "The Churches," in *Medieval Norwich*, ed. Carole Rawcliffe and Richard Wilson (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2004), 61.

family between 1899 and 1909.¹⁶⁸ The church was already in a ruinous state by the time the United Friars established their fraternity and the only stained glass which survived on site by the eighteenth century is described in Walter Rye's 1889 publication on the Abbey. In this book, Rye transcribes an eighteenth-century account of the armorials present in some stained glass.¹⁶⁹ The account was written by one Anthony Norris in "about the year 17.." and was in Rye's library in 1889.¹⁷⁰ The glass is described as being "arms painted on the glass."¹⁷¹ Thirty-four coats of arms are described in the glazing, ten in the hall, twenty-two in a large parlour and two in a room which Norris presumes to be a visitor's refectory.¹⁷² Pictorial representations of the arms accompanied the text (figure 36). It seems that these panels were likely contemporary to the building of the Prioress' lodgings. Like Walpole, the fraternity showed a particular interest in heraldic stained-glass imagery. It is unclear why the Fraternity did not purchase the Carrow Abbey glass, however it is evidence of their interest in the medium as an aspect of their Convent

¹⁶⁸ The Abbey site was excavated prior to the Colman building project, details of which were recorded in the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* (E. P. Loftus Brock, "On the Excavation of the Site of Carrow Abbey, Norwich, by J. J. Colman, Esq., M. P., in 1880-1881," *Journal of the British Archaeological Association: First Series* 38, no. 2 (1882): 165-77).

¹⁶⁹ Walter Rye, *Carrow Abbey, Otherwise Carrow Priory: Near Norwich, in the County of Norfolk: Its Foundation, Buildings, Officers, & Inmates. With Appendices: Charters, Proceedings, Extracts from Wills, Landed Possessions, Founders, Architectural Description of the Remains of the Buildings, and Some Account of the Family of the Present Owners* (Norwich: Printed by Agas H. Goose, Rampant Horse Street, Norwich, 1889), 29-32.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.* It seems likely that Anthony Norris was actually Anthony Aufrere (1756-1833), translator and antiquary. His father, also named Anthony Aufrere (1730-1814), was the owner of Hoveton Hall (Norfolk) and his mother was Anna Carthew, daughter of John Norris (d. 1734), the latter of whom was lord of the manor at Witton (Norfolk). It is highly probable that Anthony Aufrere wrote under the name of his maternal grandfather in the stained-glass account described by Rye, which would suggest that this can be dated to the last few decades of the eighteenth century (T. F. T. Dyer and J. A. March and, "Aufrere, Anthony (1756-1833), Translator and Antiquary in Europe," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Jan 3, 2008, accessed July 29, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/897>; W. Wroth and John D. Pickles, "Norris, John (1733/4-1777), Benefactor," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Sept 23, 2004, accessed July 29, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/20279>).

¹⁷¹ Anthony Norris in Rye, *Carrow Abbey*, 29.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 29-32.

interior.¹⁷³ The Fraternity also owned “a print of the painted window in Exeter Cathedral” according to the 1790 inventory.¹⁷⁴ It seems likely that this refers to an engraving of the West window which was designed and executed by William Peckitt (1731-95) and completed in 1767 (figure 37). The difficulty which the United Friars faced in their attempt to purchase stained glass illustrates how dramatically the influx of continental glass through Norwich in the early nineteenth century changed the market.

Despite the pseudo-medieval ceremony and Gothic aesthetic of the Convent, the United Friars was a modern organisation whose members aimed to further humanist causes and scientific knowledge. The progressive nature of the Fraternity is illustrated by the group’s connection to the Abolitionist movement. Abolitionism as a cause was increasingly in the public consciousness towards the end of the eighteenth century, as evidenced by the fact that William Fox’s *An Address to the People of Great Britain, on the Utility of Refraining from West Indian Sugar and Rum* (1891) was the pamphlet with the widest circulation of the eighteenth century.¹⁷⁵ Fox laid out the stark and brutal realities of slavery as they related to the sugar and rum trades in order to call the public to action. He addressed the reader directly: “we have to make our choice, either to join ourselves

¹⁷³ The engraving was made by Robert Pranker and it was advertised by John Tothill, surveyor to the Chapter at Exeter Cathedral, in the same year (“To the Honourable & Right Revd The Lord Bishop & To the Revd the Dean & Chapter of Exeter, This Engraving of the Great West Window in their Cathedral Church : Executed in Stained & Painted Glass by Mr Wm Peckitt of York, is with due Respect & Gratitude Inscribed by their most Obedient Humble Servant John Tothill. / Wm Peckitt delin ; W: Peckitt Pinxt&tinx ; R. Pranker sculpt,” *King George III’s Personal Coloured Views Collection*, n.d., accessed July 31, 2019, <http://george3.splrarebooks.com/collection/view/To-the-Honourable-Right-Revd-The-Lord-Bishop-To-the-Revd-the-Dean-Chapter-o>).

¹⁷⁴ De Hague, Woodcocke and Warte, *Inventory of Property*, 3.

¹⁷⁵ Timothy Whelan, “William Fox, Martha Gurney, and Racial Discourse of the 1790s,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 42, no. 3 (2009): 397.

with these manufacturers of human woe, or to renounce the horrid association.”¹⁷⁶ It was reported that 25 000 people joined Fox’s boycott of sugar and rum in London alone. Norwich was another major centre of the boycott, and the *Aris’s Birmingham Gazette* reported that at “Norwich, in particular, a large association is entered into, to leave off the use of sugar entirely.”¹⁷⁷ Fox’s work was largely distributed by Baptist bookseller Martha Gurney,¹⁷⁸ who may have been connected to the Gurney’s of Norwich, a family which made the county of Norfolk an “early center [sic] of abolitionist enthusiasm.”¹⁷⁹

The following notice was printed in the *Norfolk Chronicle and Norwich Gazette* (NC&NG) at the direction of the United Friars:

THE Society of UNITED FRIARS, and for the PARTICIPATION OF USEFUL KNOWLEDGE, considering the Abolition of the Slave Trade as an OBJECT of HUMANITY, cannot but express their earnest hope, that the exertions for this purpose may prove successful; and they further feel themselves bound, by the same SACRED Principle of HUMANITY, to support those Gentlemen ONLY, as proper Representatives of the People, who vote for the annihilation of that most INQUITOUS TRAFFIC in human flesh.

Norwich, Feb. 7, 1792.

W. WILKINS, Abbot.¹⁸⁰

The Abolitionist cause was a central issue for several Abbots of the United Friars, including William Stevenson, who held the title in 1795 and 1802.¹⁸¹ Stevenson was

¹⁷⁶ William Fox, *An Address to the People of Great Britain, on the Utility of Refraining from West Indian Sugar and Rum* (London: Sold by M Gurney, No. 128, Holborn-Hill, and W. Darton and Co. No. 55, Gracechurch-Street, 1791), 10.

¹⁷⁷ “BIRMINGHAM, November 7,” *Aris’s Birmingham Gazette*, editorial, Nov 7, 1791, 3.

¹⁷⁸ Whelan, “William Fox, Martha Gurney,” 402.

¹⁷⁹ Christopher Leslie Brown, *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 444.

¹⁸⁰ William Wilkins, “THE Society of UNITED FRIARS,” *NC&NG*, Feb 18, 1792, 3.

¹⁸¹ The Society of United Friars, Contemporary tables of members, subjects etc. in COL 9/14, The Coleman Manuscript Collection, COL 9/5, NRO, Norwich, c. 1788-1822. Bacon and Yarrington were also listed as subscribers, and the two were in business partners as stationers and publishers at this time. This Yarrington is likely the father of glazier Samuel Carter Yarrington, whose business practices will be discussed in chapter four.

deeply involved in the movement in Norwich and at the national level. He was listed as a subscriber of the Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade in a report on the meeting of “a society for the purpose of investigating the horrors of the Slave Trade” held in December 1788.¹⁸²

Stevenson was a close friend of Ignatius Sancho (1729-1780), the black British composer, actor, man-of-letters, abolitionist, grocer, and former enslaved person. Sancho is now best known for his letter writing, but he was also the first known person of African descent to vote in a British general election during the eighteenth century (1774 and 1780). In addition to this, he was the first person of African descent to receive an obituary in the British press.¹⁸³ Sancho and Stevenson corresponded regularly and affectionately about family and friends, and in one missive Sancho referred to Stevenson as “my own dear Stee.”¹⁸⁴ Stevenson’s close relationship with such a central voice in the national abolitionist movement proves his dedication to this humanitarian movement. Stevenson ensured that his publication (*NC&NG*) reported on national anti-slavery activity. Both he and Fraternity founder Thomas Ransome were outspoken supporters of the abolitionist cause and the two contributed to the movement in Norwich.¹⁸⁵ Sancho, who was born on a slave ship and brought to England as an orphan at the age of two, was tokenised by

¹⁸² William Leigh, “SLAVE TRADE,” *NC&NG*, Dec 20, 1788, 1.

¹⁸³ Vincent Carretta, “Sancho, (Charles) Ignatius (1729?-1780), Author,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Sept 1, 2017, accessed Nov 29, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/24609>.

¹⁸⁴ Ignatius Sancho to William Stevenson, Oct 18, 1780, in *The Letters of Ignatius Sancho*, ed. Paul Edwards and Polly Rewt (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994), 253.

¹⁸⁵ Norwich and Norfolk Racial Equality Council, “1787- Norfolk’s Abolition Campaign Begins,” Norfolk’s Hidden Heritage, 2019, accessed Jul 26, 2019, http://www.norfolkshiddenheritage.org.uk/content/norfolks_abolition_campaign.php.

those fighting for the emancipation of slaves. His life story, artistic, and epistolary achievements were extolled to disprove arguments of anti-abolitionists:

Some of the advocates [...] in favour of the present unhuman system, had attempted to support the opinion, that they were an inferior class of human beings; but this was a very weak argument, as the extraordinary talents and writings of Phillis Wheatley,¹⁸⁶ and the no less distinguished abilities of Ignatius Sancho (better known in this part of the country) were an ample refutation of the absurdity of this argument."¹⁸⁷

Sancho was well known in artistic and literary circles in his lifetime. In addition to being written into Laurence Sterne's (1713-68) *Tristram Shandy* (1759-1767) he was also painted by Thomas Gainsborough (1727-1788) at Bath in November 1768 (figure 38). Despite these outward signs of acceptance, Sancho was never fully initiated into the London elite, and he continued to live "as a poor grocer on the fringes of London's literary society."¹⁸⁸ The extent of Sancho's friendship with Stevenson can be seen in the continued relationship between Stevenson and Sancho's family after the death of the latter in 1780, which Stevenson maintained until his own death in 1821. He sent Sancho's daughter Elizabeth an annuity until his death, at which time the same was then paid by his son Seth William Stevenson.¹⁸⁹ Elizabeth Sancho also sent the aforementioned Gainsborough portrait to William Stevenson following the death of her father.

¹⁸⁶ Phillis Wheatley (c. 1753-84) was best known for her poetic brilliance and she was often tokenised by the abolitionists in a similar manner to Sancho, although she was often not referred to by name (see Humanus, "FOR THE KENTISH GAZETTE," *Kentish Gazette*, Apr 29, 1791, 2). Wheatley was born in the Gambia region before being transported as an enslaved person to Boston, Massachusetts. Despite receiving critical acclaim for her poetry during her lifetime, she died in poverty from complications of childbirth (John C. Shields, "Wheatley [married name Peters], Phillis (c.1753-1784), Poet," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, May 24, 2008, accessed July 26, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/53405>).

¹⁸⁷ "Meeting of the County of Suffolk respecting the Slave Trade," editorial, *The Ipswich Journal*, Mar 29, 1788, 4. See also Humanus, "FOR THE KENTISH GAZETTE," 2; Philanthropist, "AM I NOT A MAN, AND A BROTHER!," *Staffordshire Advertiser*, Sept 19, 1795, 4.

¹⁸⁸ Mark Jones, "The Mobilisation of Public Opinion Against the Slave Trade and Slavery: Popular Abolitionism in National and Regional Politics, 1787-1838" (D. Phil thesis, University of York, 1998), 13.

¹⁸⁹ Paul Edwards, "The Portrait by Gainsborough," in *The Letters of Ignatius Sancho*, ed. Paul Edwards and Polly Rewt (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994), 266.

The support for the abolitionist cause shown by the Fraternity of United Friars and key members of the group, as flawed as this movement was, demonstrates one branch of the humanitarian work carried out by the organisation. The United Friars were also well known for their annual winter soup kitchen, first adopted in 1795, which provided relief to the poor of Norwich through the charity of wealthy subscribers.¹⁹⁰ For the United Friars, appropriating the language and structure of the medieval monastery provided the ideal context for the furthering of modern humanist causes. Their vision of the monastery was stripped of the negative associations of corruption, as was most often perpetuated by Gothic novelists like Matthew Lewis. According to their definition, the monastery in its intended form was the natural home for progressive movements of the fine arts, philosophy, science, scholarship, and charity. The United Friars offer an example of how the interest in medieval religious institutions, as an aspect of the Georgian Gothic, was expressed in Norwich. This interest amongst the literary, artistic, and influential classes in the city laid the groundwork for the interest in Gothic architecture into the early nineteenth century.

Foreign Glass and “Liberation”

The antiquarian base in Norwich formed an enthusiastic clientele for sellers of historic imported stained glass like J. C. Hampp. However, the lure of continental glass and the import trade of historic objects should also be considered in relation to international

¹⁹⁰ “FOR THE RELIEF OF THE POOR, By a Distribution of SOUP AND BREAD,” editorial, *NC&NG*, Dec 10, 1796, 3.

political narratives. Much of the stained glass imported from the continent in the early nineteenth century originated in France, and those panels which were from further afield were largely transported to England from the French ports of Dieppe and Calais. Despite the appeal of historic objects made in France, the general reputation of the French in England was coloured by the state of conflict which existed between the two nations throughout much of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. France was often presented to the British public as a “priest-ridden, backward, and autocratic country all too eager to encroach upon British prosperity and territory.”¹⁹¹ For those in power, fears of the real potential for France to invade England were compounded by the notion that the English public would be inspired to revolutionary action. Others argued that the strength of French trade and commerce threatened the notion of British dominance in the international marketplace.¹⁹² For those in authority, it was imperative that Britain retained its supremacy internationally, and France was considered to be a threat to this, as illustrated by reports of Parliamentary activity in 1802:

Mr. *Windham* began a speech of considerable length, but imperfect arrangement [...]. It had been said that France was not vicious unless provoked: in point of fact, her vices had been most marked when there was the smallest possibility of provocation. **The Hon. Gentleman had said, that with France we were in future to have only a rivalry in commerce and manufactures. But what assurance had we of the amity, or of the forbearance of that country? Every day tells us of some new usurpation on her part. Piedmont, Tuscany, and Parma, are swallowed up, one after the other; “The news but one day doth shame the teller.” We had either to be reduced to the abject situation of Spain, or converted into a province, for the purpose of growing timber for the navy of France, and for producing a hardy race of men to recruit for their armies.** He was far from instilling into the public mind unnecessary apprehensions, but he was desirous that the people should be apprised of their danger, and that Ministers, by a future attention to the public good, would expiate their sins for the past, and not

¹⁹¹ James Buzard, “‘Then on the Shore of the Wide World’: The Victorian Nation and its Others,” in *A Companion to Victorian Literature and Culture*, ed. Herbert F. Tucker (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 443.

¹⁹² F. J. McLynn, *France and the Jacobite Uprising* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1981), 5.

allow themselves to be handed down to posterity as the *Augustuli* of the present age [emphasis added by current author].¹⁹³

The Mr Windham speaking here was William Windham III (1750-1810) of Felbrigg.¹⁹⁴

Windham had a long political career, including being appointed Secretary at War during the period of 1794-1801, during which time Britain was at war with France.¹⁹⁵ He was later appointed Secretary for War and the Colonies in 1806 and ultimately his focus on the economic prosperity of Britain drove his political career. He was one of only 16 MPs to vote against the Slavery Abolition Bill in 1807 as he believed that such an Act would ensure financial ruin in the colonies.¹⁹⁶ Windham feared that if the British lost their financial power, then the country could be entirely subsumed by the might of France, thus moving from colonial power to colony.

British exceptionalism was an ethos accepted by many in this period. Jeremy Black wrote that the Grand Tour, which was how many young men of wealth and collecting power came to experience continental Europe, affirmed the concept of British supremacy for most British tourists.¹⁹⁷ This viewpoint can be found in the travel writing of Seth

¹⁹³“HOUSE OF COMMONS,” editorial, *NC&NG*, Dec 01, 1802, 4.

¹⁹⁴ William Windham III died with no issue and passed the estate on to the eldest son of his half-brother George Lukin, Vice-Admiral William Lukin. William Lukin was the father of William Howe Windham, who was responsible for the glazing of the Great Hall (National Trust, “A Brief History of Felbrigg Hall,” National Trust, n.d. Accessed Sept 6, 2021, <https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/felbrigg-hall-gardens-and-estate/features/a-brief-history-of-felbrigg-hall>).

¹⁹⁵ Windham was also Secretary of State for War and Colonies (1806-07). Prior to this, he was appointed Major in the Norfolk militia in 1778 (R. G. Thorne, ed., *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1790-1820* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1986), accessed Sept 13, 2021, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1790-1820/member/windham-william-1750-1810>). In 1801 he resigned from his position of Secretary at War over the King’s veto of Catholic emancipation in Ireland (David Wilkinson, “Windham, William (1750-1810), Politician,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Jan 3, 2008, accessed Aug 19, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/29725>).

¹⁹⁶ National Trust, “A Brief History of Felbrigg Hall.”

¹⁹⁷ Jeremy Black, “The Grand Tour,” in *Journey through the Market: Travel, Travellers and the Book Trade*, ed. Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Folkestone: St Paul’s Bibliographies, 1999), 83.

William Stevenson of Norwich, who was an important figure in antiquarian circles in Norwich and a key member of the United Friars of Norwich. He is particularly significant in the study of English stained-glass imports as he worked with the prolific importer Hampp.¹⁹⁸ In 1802 Stevenson travelled in Europe, including through France. This visit would have been facilitated by the signing of the Treaty of Amiens on 27 March 1802, an agreement which ensured a fourteen-month period of peace in Europe. This Treaty was signed by the respective rulers of the French Republic, Spain, the short-lived Batavian Republic, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Stevenson read the journal of his 1802 expedition across France to the Fraternity of United Friars on 30 November 1813, just four weeks after his membership of the society was proposed by Brother De Hague.¹⁹⁹ Although the current whereabouts of this journal is unknown, Stevenson also wrote a journal of his 1816 travels which was printed in 1817.²⁰⁰ This later journal gives an impression of Stevenson's thoughts on the country and people of France. Stevenson was particularly critical of French architecture and had a dislike of both the historic architecture in Rouen and the impact of more recent city planning. He wrote that the façade of Rouen Cathedral "does not [...] produce on my mind that sensation of harmonious effect, which the western front of our York Minster never fails of impressing

¹⁹⁸ William Stevenson also traded in glass sourced from Norfolk (David King, "Medieval Glass Painting," in *Medieval Norwich*, 121). For example, King has suggested that Stevenson was the likely source of the local glass used in the scheme at the Church of St Mary Magdalen, Warham (David King, "Norfolk: Warham, St Mary, Parish Church of St Mary Magdalen," CVMA, 2010. Accessed Mar 7, 2022, <http://www.cvma.ac.uk/publications/digital/norfolk/sites/felbrigghall/history.html>). For more information regarding the role of traders in the early nineteenth-century resurgence of interest in stained glass see chapter four.

¹⁹⁹ Brother De Hague is likely a reference to Elisha de Hague, Jr (1755-1826), Town Clerk of Norwich.

²⁰⁰ Stevenson published an additional continental tour journal to a wider audience in 1825 (Seth William Stevenson, *A Tour in France, Savoy, Northern Italy, Switzerland, Germany and the Netherlands, in the Summer of 1825: Including some Observations on the Scenery of The Neckar and the Rhine* (London: Published by C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church-Yard, and Waterloo-Place, Pall-Mall; Matchett, Stevenson, and Matchett, Norwich; Deighton and Sons, Cambridge; J. Parker, Oxford; J. Wolstenholme, York; C. Hough, Gloucester; and Bell and Bradfute, Edinburgh, 1825)).

[...]. In thus venturing to adduce what I humbly conceive to be an instance of superiority in the noblest of our own Gothic structures over the Cathedral of Rouen [...].”²⁰¹ The author attributed “the inconveniences of *old Rouen*” to the nature of the “Frenchman [who...] seem neither to participate in, nor to comprehend that bold and restless spirit of improvement, with which an Englishman is actuated.”²⁰² Stevenson’s dislike for the structure of historic continental cities was, according to Black, a trend in eighteenth-century travel writing, in which “[o]ld towns were disliked; the preference was for wide, straight streets, as in Turin or the newer sections of Marseilles.”²⁰³ In his writing Stevenson created a clear opposition for his readers, in which architecture was representative of national character at large. Culture and progress belonged to the English, while the French were labelled as regressive and complacent.

Understanding how Stevenson established France and England in opposition was particularly significant when one considers Stevenson’s role in removing historic stained-glass from France for the English market. In his 1816 journal, Stevenson discussed the purchase of glass in Rouen on his 1802 visit to the city:

Very many of them [the Convents and Churches of Rouen] have been converted to secular purposes; some not the most dignified. The *Diligences* drive into the portals of more than one: and the two churches of St. *Jean* and St. *Nicholas* were magazines for wool, when, on my former visit, we inspected their fine stained glass windows, which, every day, were breaking into shivers, from the pressure of the bales, which these mercantile *Goths* were perpetually pulling up against them, without compunction.*

²⁰¹ Seth William Stevenson, *Journal of a Tour through Part of France, Flanders, and Holland, including a Visit to Paris, and a Walk over the Field of Waterloo: Made in the Summer of 1816* (Norwich: Printed (Not for Sale) at the Norfolk Chronicle Press, by Stevenson, Matchett, and Stevenson, 1817), 21-22.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 26.

²⁰³ Jeremy Black, *The British Abroad: The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1992), 277.

*The act of securing a portion of these admirable paintings from further injury, by their removal to a country where their merits were appreciated, and their subjects revered, was surely one that deserves a less obnoxious appellation than that of *pillage*, with which it has been branded in the work of a certain English Antiquary. For myself, I am not ashamed of avowing a participation in the employment of taking many of these tasteful donations of Catholic bounty from their mouldering frames, and packing them up (in 1802) for a voyage to England, where the chief part now serve to enrich the windows of our Protestant Churches. The Jacobin venders of these brittle reliques [sic], did not part with them for *nothing*. How fruitful a source of expense, and of anxious and laborious occupation, they proved in the purchase and subsequent disposal, I have, on very *near* and *near* considerations, cause but too decidedly to affirm!²⁰⁴

There was a clear polarisation in the way that Stevenson described his own actions in collecting versus those of the French salespeople, echoing the broader prejudice against France seen in his travel writing. According to Stevenson, British collectors were saviours of art, which was at serious threat due to the underappreciation of the “mercantile *Goths*” of France. He criticised the French for their monetary concerns in both the re-use of historic buildings and in the sale of historic objects, yet Stevenson never addressed the capitalist motives behind his purchase of the glass on behalf of merchant Hampp. Indeed, Stevenson defended his purchase of historic stained glass as beneficial to the French both monetarily and in terms of passing on responsibility for the glass to himself. Stevenson established further division between Britain and France along religious lines when he described “taking many of these tasteful donations of **Catholic** bounty” and removing them to England where they now “enrich the windows of our **Protestant** Churches [emphasis added by current author].”²⁰⁵ This contrast was particularly strong for the British when travelling in France, especially prior to the French Revolution when France

²⁰⁴ Stevenson, *Journal of a Tour through Parts of France*, 32.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 32.

was labelled “an autocratic Catholic state,” and thus as the inverse of the Protestant and nominally democratic Britain.²⁰⁶

In his justification of English purchasing methods Stevenson suggested that work such as his was necessary considering the negligence of the French. By 1816 a vocal contingent of Stevenson’s fellow antiquarians was ready to condemn this type of collecting as pillaging, to the extent that Stevenson felt obligated to defend his own role as a buyer of foreign stained glass, suggesting that he was only too aware of this criticism, and yet had no issue with supporting the wholesale purchase of French stained glass on the open market. Stevenson attempted to put the focus on preservation of historic materials, in which he depicts himself as a guardian of otherwise doomed artwork. Although there is some truth to the argument that much stained glass was at risk in France during this period, the xenophobic rhetoric which Stevenson used to justify his own actions should make the reader question his motives. The sale of continental stained glass was a lucrative trade in this period due to the appeal of the Georgian Gothic aesthetic. Stevenson’s choices relating to the purchase of historic stained glass were ultimately made according to business requirements. He used his knowledge of the market in service of buying panels which would ultimately fill the windows of prosperous English antiquarians.

²⁰⁶ Jeremy Black, “The Grand Tour,” 71.

The argument that purchasing this stained glass was a form of preservation, although not free from criticism in the nineteenth century, was part of the discourse in this period. The rise of the antiquarian movement in the late eighteenth century led to a greater interrogation of England's iconoclastic past, as will be discussed further in chapter three. The iconoclasm seen in sixteenth-century England was followed by a period in which historic buildings were neglected or re-purposed, which led to the loss of related artefacts and architectural features. This was seen as comparable to the iconoclastic activities in France at the end of the eighteenth century. Anti-monument revolutionary activity in France, which was extended to Belgium and the Rhineland thanks to the military and naval success of Napoleon, was driven by the desire to destroy objects which symbolised archaic hierarchies of power.²⁰⁷ In the years which followed, more damage was done as historic monuments and buildings were re-purposed and surviving objects were sold. The association between these two periods of iconoclasm and loss was not lost on English antiquarians of the early nineteenth century. Cotman compared the two in a discussion of French monumental brasses, noting that he "ought, perhaps, rather to have spoken in the past tense; the French Revolution having been even more destructive to such memorials abroad, than the times of our own Commonwealth were with us."²⁰⁸ There is something to be said for English collectors and antiquarians believing that importing continental stained glass was an act of preservation. Where they were unable

²⁰⁷ Stanley J. Idzerda, "Iconoclasm during the French Revolution," *The American Historical Review* 60, no. 1 (1954): 15.

²⁰⁸ John Sell Cotman, *Engravings of Sepulchral Brasses in Norfolk, tending to Illustrate the Ecclesiastical, Military, and Civil Costume as well as to Preserve Memorials of Ancient Families in that County. By John Sell Cotman Esq. with an Introductory Essay by Dawson Turner, Esq. F.R.S. F.S.A. &c. Second Edition with Additional Plates, and with Notes by Sir Samuel Rush Meyrick, L.L.D. F.S.A &c. Albert Way, Esq. and Sir Harris Nicolas, K.C.M.G.* (London: Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, 1838), viii.

to save stained glass lost to iconoclasm and subsequent neglect in England, they were able to intervene on the continent.

The Francophobic attitude seen in travel writing in this period remains significant when considering the context of English purchasing of historic stained glass on the Continent. William Howe Windham (1802-1854), who paid for the composite Great Hall glazing scheme at Felbrigg Hall (Norfolk) in c. 1840 (figure 39), seems to have shared Stevenson's opinion of the French, both architecture and people.²⁰⁹ Howe Windham undertook a tour through Europe between 1824 and 1825 during which he penned his observations in a journal.²¹⁰ He wrote that at Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris there was "nothing particular to be seen, except one or two pictures, and one or two pieces of Sculpture — a very moderate church for so large a Capital." He believed that the countryside outside Paris was "pretty good, although they [the French] by no means know the way to make the most of it— It is very dull, and has not the lively appearance, which [...] England gives you." Howe Windham was equally unimpressed by his first view of the Jura Mountain range which formed the border between France and Switzerland, and he observed that they only "appeared about 3 times as high as Cromer Lighthouse Cliffs." Upon reaching Geneva he wrote of the appeal of the city's inhabitants in relation to his dislike of the French: "I like the place of Geneva very much— a civil industrious set of fellows— not at all like the French— in short I like them very much."

²⁰⁹ This case study will be explored in chapter two.

²¹⁰ *Diary of a European Tour*, WKC 6/233. 403X4, Family and Estate Papers of the Ketton-Cremer Family of Felbrigg Hall, NRO, Norwich, 1824-1825.

This notion of English superiority would have been reinforced by the notion of the English collector as saviour of what they deemed to be doomed historic artefacts. Knowing Howe Windham's opinion of English excellence in comparison to France, this adds a further layer of symbolism when one considers his glazing scheme for the Great Hall at Felbrigg. Howe Windham was able to present himself as the English gentleman with antiquarian leanings. In this conception, his new window scheme represented an attempt to preserve fragments of an historic artwork which otherwise would have been lost to French destruction. The very symbols of established power which the French were purposefully destroying at the end of the nineteenth century, those of religious iconography and heraldry, have been transferred to the windows of an English country house. Cited alongside new heraldic stained glass and historic English panels, these continental imports have been used to represent the power of a new patron.

Conclusion

As is well understood, the Georgian Gothic was a diverse movement, which included a wide-spread fascination with medieval architectural styles, social structures, and religious institutions. Key individuals and foundations shaped the development of the Gothic in the eighteenth century, and their influence can be seen into the early nineteenth century. National trends were defined by individuals like Walpole, who popularised the style through the celebrity of Strawberry Hill, known to imitators abroad. It is Walpole's fascination with fragmented windows and the creation of Gothic gloom which has previously been less recognised in scholarship relating to his architectural design for the

house. Walpole's use of continental fragments as part of a larger glazing scheme was intended to suggest centuries of intervention and alteration, thus rendering the windows "historic." This approach to glazing has been shown here to have developed out of a wider cultural interest in the Gothic fragment. The popularisation of the fragmentary glazing style can be seen most clearly in the early nineteenth century, at which time the influx of imported continental stained glass was more easily accessible to English buyers than it had been previously, answering a market demand that had been inadequately served only a few years previously. Norwich was a key centre of artistic and literary development in this period, and the city was the site of considerable interest in the medieval past, as is clear from the development of the Fraternity of United Friars. For the United Friars, progressive philanthropy and liberal social ideas and antiquarian interests were combined in their use of the monastic model for the structure of their organisation. Further interest in medieval art and architecture is represented by The Norwich Society of Artists, which provided space for artists to discuss and document antiquities. Cotman's role in the organisation is particularly notable as he went on to publish numerous volumes relating to both local and international medieval art.²¹¹ The city's intellectual and liberal circles provided the ideal marketplace for fragment windows using continental stained-glass panels. Consequently, the style flourished in Norwich and windows of this style were found in parish churches and country houses across East Anglia. The collection of stained glass from the continent, and particularly from France, was justified by the thought that these panels would be safer in the care of English collectors. Despite the continuation of the style popularised by Walpole, it is important to acknowledge the

²¹¹ Cotman's antiquarian publications included his 1817 volume, *Specimens of Norman and Gothic Architecture, in the County of Norfolk*, which included eighty etchings of historic architectural features in Norfolk (John Sell Cotman, *Specimens of Norman and Gothic Architecture, in the County of Norfolk* (1817)).

passage of time between the construction of Strawberry Hill and the nineteenth-century practice of using continental roundels. Although the style remains similar throughout the early nineteenth century, the rapidly changing social context of Britain as an industrialising country on an international stage would have had an impact on the role of commissions. Associations and developments in style specific to the nineteenth century will be considered in the next two chapters of this thesis.

Chapter Two: Domestic Schemes

The example of Horace Walpole's Strawberry Hill demonstrates the way in which Gothic design in the domestic interior could be used to construct a narrative relating to the patron in question. Using stained glass, Walpole purposefully manipulated the light and imagery of the space to present his visitor with a specific vision of both the architectural space and his own fanciful persona. This approach to glazing, including a reliance on continental stained-glass fragments in the design, continued to influence the approach taken for domestic spaces into the nineteenth century. These schemes were usually more restrained in approach than Walpole's fanciful re-imagining of the Gothic, however patrons continued to use stained glass as a tool for defining architectural space and to express something about their role as landowner in this period. Domestic schemes can be considered more complex than their ecclesiastical counterparts to some extent: these were spaces which were lived in and as such glazing schemes had to be adapted to suit the different rooms in which they were set. This chapter will consider the way in which different schemes of stained glass were altered to suit different types of space within the country home, with specific reference to East Anglian schemes.

Lineage, Heraldry, and Power

The early nineteenth century saw a significant increase in the amount of stained glass imported from the Continent. It was also a period marked by societal change caused by increased industrialisation. The new economic landscape at once created a class of powerful and wealthy industrialists while also leading to unrest amongst impoverished agricultural workers. In Eastern England, collective displays of protest were particularly prevalent following the close of the Napoleonic wars. Riots in 1822 were highly damaging

in the region, as were the Swing Riots of 1830 which led to the wholesale destruction of threshing machines across Eastern and Southern England.²¹² Large-scale actions such as these were a threat to both the long-established land-owning class and the newly affluent industrialists alike. As the role of these wealthy classes was developing in the face of a shifting economic model, architectural trends reflected the lack of stability felt by these groups. The increased popularity of castle architecture as a facet of Gothic design has been particularly explored in relation to these changes. As Brooks wrote, “sublime castles appeared as social insurrection stirred at home.”²¹³ Apart from the obvious associations with defence, why were castellated forms of architecture so popular in this period? Gothic architectural forms, and particularly castles, were associated with an imagined past of chivalric romance, in which class designations were clear and respected by both rich and poor alike. The popularity of this form of Gothic design in both new builds and renovations of the early nineteenth century speaks of a landowning class playing into this narrative. Gothic design was associated “with ancient landed families, patriotism and the continuity of British institutions” and landowners benefitted from the societal model evoked by these connotations.²¹⁴

Despite the appeal to a supposedly historic class structure, many of the new Georgian Gothic mansions were built on the success of the newly established industrialised global economy, and particularly the proceeds of the international slave economy. William Beckford’s (1760-1844) infamous Gothic construction, Fonthill Abbey

²¹² John E. Archer, *Social Unrest and Popular Protest in England 1780-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 15-16.

²¹³ Chris Brooks, *The Gothic Revival* (London: Phaidon Press, 1999), 170.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 166.

(Wiltshire), was built between 1796 and 1813. The final construction of Fonthill far exceeded the early original plans for the site, which consisted of the building of a mock convent on Hinkley Hill. By 1818 Fonthill had been developed into a cruciform country house-cum-mausoleum, crowned by a 276-foot central tower.²¹⁵ Beckford installed stained-glass windows throughout his monastic Gothic construction and he employed contemporary glass painters Pearson, Francis Eginton (1737-1805), and William Raphael Eginton (1778-1834).²¹⁶ Stained glass windows featured religious and heraldic imagery set inside pseudo-religious spaces, like the oratory, which featured glass by W. R. Eginton (figure 40). The financing of this project was entirely dependent on the sugar trade and thus the exploitation of enslaved peoples in Jamaica. William Beckford was in fact the fourth generation of his family to own sugar plantations, the first being Peter Beckford (bap.1643-1710).²¹⁷ Peter Beckford founded the greatest sugar fortune in the West Indies on the backs of enslaved people and the Beckford family owned twenty estates as a direct result of this legacy.²¹⁸ William Beckford used this fortune to establish himself as a writer, collector of art, and connoisseur of the Gothic. He made references to his dependence upon the prosperity of the plantations in his diary, for example on 10 November 1807 where he wrote that the “sugar news is so terrible that Ruin stands nigh unto my door. Already I seem to hear her knock. None too sweet is the sound of such a visitor- worse even than the Commendatore’s statue in the opera *Don Juan*: pale and white and

²¹⁵ James Lees-Milne, *William Beckford* (Tisbury: Compton Russell, 1976), 52.

²¹⁶ Wainwright, *The Romantic Interior*, 116.

²¹⁷ Richard B. Sheridan, “Beckford, Peter (1672/3-1735), Planter and Politician in Jamaica,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Sept 23, 2004, accessed Aug 19, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/50424>.

²¹⁸ Anita McConnell, “Beckford, William Thomas (1760-1844), Writer and Art Collector,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, May 21, 2009, accessed Aug 19, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/1905>.

smelling of Hell.”²¹⁹ The state of business was precarious in this period, and there was an uncertainty associated with any income derived from sugar plantations, which Beckford was clearly aware of. In Norwich and the surrounding county, as we have seen there was a general movement against supporting sugar plantations due to the horrific exploitation of enslaved peoples by the English.²²⁰ Regardless of this, families in the county continued to profit from this industry and built Gothic country residences with the proceeds.

A good example of this link between the human rights violations of the sugar plantations and Gothic building in Norfolk can be found in Earsham Hall. Until the death of Joseph Windham, the Hall itself was owned by the Windham family. At this time the house passed out of the direct family line to William Windham Dalling (1775-1864).²²¹ Windham Dalling was the son and heir of Sir John Dalling (c. 1731-98), who had been acting governor of Jamaica in 1772-1774 and governor in 1777-1781, at which time he purchased the estate at Donnington Castle (Jamaica).²²² Windham Dalling inherited this estate in January 1798 and continued to profit from the forced labour of up to 273 enslaved people (as recorded in 1811), who tended to crops of sugar, manufactured rum, and tended to livestock on the plantation.²²³ Windham’s last known association with the

²¹⁹ Boyd Alexander, trans. and ed., *Life at Fonthill 1807-22: With Interludes in Paris and London from the Correspondence of William Beckford* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1957), 56.

²²⁰ See chapter one for contemporary references to the early nineteenth-century abolitionist movement in Norwich.

²²¹ Jonathan Spain, “Dalling, Sir John, First Baronet (c. 1731-1798), Army Officer and Colonial Governor,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Jan 3, 2008, accessed Aug 19, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/53621>.

²²² Centre for the Study of the Legacies of British Slavery, “Sir William Windham Dalling 2nd Bart.,” University College London, 2019, accessed Aug 19, 2019, <http://www.depts-live.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/person/view/12672>.

²²³ “Donnington Castle Estate and Pen [Jamaica | St Mary],” *Legacies of British Slave-Ownership Database*, University College London, 2021, accessed Feb 17, 2021, <http://www.deptslive.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/estate/view/1587>.

estate was in 1839 and he continued to enjoy an income of between £5000 and £6000 per annum through the sugar estate in the 1820s and 1830s.²²⁴ Alterations were made to Earsham Hall using profits from both the Earsham Estate and from the Donnington Castle Estate, including the addition of a library. Although there is no direct evidence that Earsham House had stained glass installed under the ownership of Windham Dalling, he did give stained glass to the local church in 1863, at which time the East window was installed using some continental stained-glass panels.²²⁵ This house is unlike Fonthill, in that it is not filled with stained glass, but it does exemplify the financial catalyst between rural residences and the globalised economy of the slave trade. Even though it appears that there is no direct line between international slavery and domestic composite windows in East Anglia, it is important to recognise the prevalence of this in this period and the role which this played in building Gothic country estates in general.

It is important to recognise the contemporary practices which allowed the building and decoration of Gothic building in this period. These projects allowed for landowners to construct buildings which referenced an imagined pre-industrial England, in which they would have assumed powerful positions in the social hierarchy. The romanticised constructions were entirely divorced from the industrial processes which laid the financial foundations upon which the majority of these buildings were constructed. The revival of stained glass, with its implicit connection to Gothic buildings of the past, was considered an integral aspect of the idiom, and thus stained-glass windows became increasingly

²²⁴ "Sir William Windham Dalling 2nd Bart."

²²⁵ See appendix II for more information on this scheme.

popular in the Gothic residence. As a medium, regardless of the period or place of origin, stained glass became a visual signifier of the imagined medieval past in the nineteenth century much as it had for Walpole at Strawberry Hill in the previous century. As continental stained-glass imports widened access to stained-glass windows in the home during the early decades of the nineteenth century, distinct styles were developed for different spaces in the residence. The next section of this thesis will consider these different configurations to address what this says about the role of stained glass as a projection of identity for the landowner.

In rooms which would have been used by visitors and family alike, stained glass was usually restricted to the upper portions of windows, as in the case of the Library at Strawberry Hill. As well as allowing more natural light to enter a room, this distribution of glass also allowed better views out of the window across a house's parklands. Fleetwood-Hesketh has shown that the start of the nineteenth century saw an increased interest in uniting "out-of-doors" with "indoors." He argued that this was achieved through enlarging windows, lowering their sills, and installing French windows to allow direct access to gardens or terraces.²²⁶ The installation of stained glass could be considered as a direct contradiction of this concept, however the arrangement of coloured and painted glass in the upper sections of windows framed views. This ensured that the landscape was not obscured but rather became part of the decorative scheme of the room. This technique is well exemplified by the Drawing Room at Luscombe Castle (Devonshire). The

²²⁶ Peter Fleetwood-Hesketh, "Romantic Revival 1790-1840," in *Great Interiors*, ed. Ian Grant (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967), 138.

house was designed for Charles Hoare (d. 1851) and it was built between 1799 and 1804 by architect John Nash (1752-1835). The gardens were originally designed by the pre-eminent landscaper of the period, Humphry Repton (1752-1818).²²⁷ Repton's Red Book²²⁸ for Luscombe Castle was completed in 1799, making this design contemporary to the building of the residence.²²⁹ A watercolour of the Drawing Room (c.1825) depicts small stained-glass panels which appear to be continental in origin. These have been set directly above French doors which allowed direct access to the veranda (figure 41). The stained-glass, set high above the sight line of anyone sitting or standing in the room, frames the view across this modern outside living space.

Using stained glass as a border to focus attention on the window while allowing an unrestricted view beyond was also seen in continental glazing schemes in the first half of the nineteenth century, as described by Claudia Schumacher and Ivo Rauch in their study of Stolzenfels Castle near Koblenz on the Rhine.²³⁰ Conceived at the behest of patron Prince Frederick William of Prussia, these windows were made between 1840 and 1843. Instructions were given that windows which overlooked the Rhine were to have the stained glass restricted to the borders to allow for an unimpeded view of the Rhine

²²⁷ Christian Hussey, *English Country Houses Late Georgian 1800-1840* (London: Country Life, 1958), 55.

²²⁸ Repton's Red Books, named after the red morocco leather which many of these were bound in, were reports which he drew up on the sites where he had been commissioned to design landscapes. These books were popular, and they contained sketches of proposed alterations and additions. Repton often demonstrated his proposals by using flaps, which could be lifted to demonstrate how his concepts would appear in practice.

²²⁹ George Carter, Patrick Goode and Kedrun Laurie, eds., *Humphrey Repton: Landscape Gardener 1752-1818* (Norwich: Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts, 1982), 150.

²³⁰ Claudia Schumacher and Ivo Rauch, "Inszenierte Ausblicke- Präziö Gerahmt: Die im Auftrag Friedrich Wilhelms IV. Von Preussen geschaffenen Fenster von Schloss Stolzenfels am Rhein," in *Le Vitrail dans la Demeure des Origines à nos Jours*, ed. Karine Boulanger (Gand: Snoeck, 2018), 192.

Valley.²³¹ What significance did breaking the division between interior and exterior spaces have in early nineteenth century England and how was stained glass used to achieve this?

Felbrigg Hall (Norfolk) underwent major alterations in c. 1840, which included the insertion of a major glazing scheme in the Great Hall (figure 39). This work was undertaken by Norwich glazier John Dixon (1783-1857) at the behest of William Howe Windham.²³² Howe Windham inherited Felbrigg House and succeeded to the estates of his father Vice-Admiral William Lukin (1768-1833) in 1833. By this time his political career had already begun. In 1832 he was elected to the first reform parliament for East Norfolk by the Liberal party and at his death he was serving as a magistrate and Deputy Lieutenant for Norfolk.²³³ He also served the office of High Sherriff in Norfolk in 1842. Howe Windham married Lady Sophia Elizabeth Caroline Hervey (1811-1863), third daughter of the Marquess of Bristol, in 1835. She later gave birth to their only son William Frederick Windham (1840-1866). Howe Windham was known as an improving landlord who invested heavily in farming,²³⁴ and he expanded the Felbrigg Estate through the purchase of several adjoining properties.²³⁵ Howe Windham left the estate in a robust state for his son to inherit. William Frederick Windham was the subject of an infamous

²³¹ Interesting comparisons can be made between English and continental uses of composite windows in the Georgian period. The glazing of the Gothic House, Wörlitz (Germany) was directly influenced by Walpole's Strawberry Hill. This collection of continental medieval and Renaissance glass was assembled by Prince Leopold III Friedrich Franz (1740-1817) following a visit to Walpole's summer house in 1763 (David King, "Mylène Ruoss and Barbara Giesicke, *Die Glasgemälde im Gotischen Haus zu Wörlitz*, Berlin, 2012. Volume 4 of the series *Wissenschaftliche Bestandskataloge der Kulturstiftung Dessau Wörlitz*, ed. Rüdiger Becksmann, €68," *Vidimus* 86 (2014), accessed Mar 7, 2022, <https://www.vidimus.org/issues/issue-86/books/>).

²³² David King, "Norfolk: Felbrigg Hall, Felbrigg Hall," CVMA, 2010. Accessed May 10, 2019, <http://www.cvma.ac.uk/publications/digital/norfolk/sites/felbrigghall/history.html>.

²³³ Anon. D., "Wm. Howe Windham, Esq.," *Gentleman's Magazine* 43 (1855), 195.

²³⁴ National Trust, "A Brief History of Felbrigg Hall."

²³⁵ "Death of Mr. Windham," editorial, *NC&NG*, Dec 30, 1854, 3.

“lunacy” case between 1861 and 1862, in which it was recorded that at “the age of 21 he would become entitled to Felbrigg Hall and the park and timber, and a rental of £3,000 per annum, subject to a reduction of £1,500 for his mother’s jointure, and about £250 for outgoings, so that he would have a net income of about £1,200.”²³⁶ This impressive income was set to increase to five thousand pounds per year from 1869, which shows the care with which Howe Windham cared for the estate and its finances.

Although Howe Windham clearly prioritised the development of his estate over re-modelling the house, the changes he oversaw came soon after he inherited the house and established his lineage through marriage and the birth of his son. The Hall was modified and elaborate neo-Jacobean ceiling pendants, cornicing, and door-cases were added.²³⁷ The glazing scheme at Felbrigg is complex and originally included three English medieval panels from St Peter Mancroft, Norwich. These sit alongside a mixture of imported continental panels and nineteenth-century heraldic and decorative pieces (figures 42-45).²³⁸ Each of the four windows contains two rows of stained-glass panels and a single lower row of plain glazing. The three south windows feature significantly larger plain glazing sections than the West Bay window. The south windows were on the front of the house and therefore a larger area of clear glazing would have allowed for better views across the driveway and parklands. The scale of the panels used in this scheme varies enormously. Fifteen large-scale figurative panels were in place across three of the

²³⁶ Anon. E., *The Great Lunacy Case of Mr. W. F. Windham. Reported by a Solicitor* (London: H. Vickers, Holywell Street, 1862), 7.

²³⁷ Robert Wyndham Ketton-Cremer, *Felbrigg: The Story of a House* (Ipswich: The Boydell Press, 1976), 245.

²³⁸ Dixon had a strong relationship with St Peter Mancroft and had previously restored the East window. This work included replacing some of the fifteenth-century panels, with both copies of the historic glass and panels of his own design. For further information on Dixon’s work see appendix I.

windows, three of which were in the West Bay window and are thought to have been originally made for the Toppes Window at St Peter Mancroft, Norwich (figure 45).²³⁹ A further three fifteenth-century panels are arranged in the top row of window sII (figure 43). The remaining nine large panels are copies of original panels from St Peter Mancroft. In addition to these, window sI and the South Bay window feature multiple historic continental roundels (figures 42&44). The roundels in window sI all depict religious scenes, in keeping with the three Dixon copies of Peter Mancroft panels in the row below, which illustrate the Visitation, the Annunciation and Adoration of the Shepherds, and finally The Adoration of the Magi. Window sII contains a mixture of smaller continental panels, including a number of Swiss armorial panels and other assorted coats of arms. Some of these armorial panels are of nineteenth-century English provenance and were likely painted by Dixon's workshop. Nineteenth-century heraldry can also be found in the West Bay window, where they feature prominently in row 2. These arms represent the Windham and Hervey families and they have been set in fields of nineteenth-century patterns and inscriptions which make up the panels.

The prominent display of heraldry in the Felbrigg scheme was a typical feature of composite windows in the early nineteenth century. It was not uncommon for unrelated arms to be placed together to form new schemes in both domestic and ecclesiastical settings. An ecclesiastical example of this can be found at St Michael and Our Lady Church, Wragby (West Yorkshire), where many of the windows were filled with Swiss

²³⁹ King, "Norfolk: Felbrigg Hall." The panel depicting the Apostles Assembled (panel 3a) was returned to St Peter Mancroft for exhibition and a replacement panel was made by Dennis King in 1983. This replacement panel is still in place at Felbrigg Hall at the time of writing.

stained-glass, including panels depicting heraldic imagery, in the mid-nineteenth century (figure 46). Dixon's scheme at Felbrigg combined both ancient and modern heraldry, and armorial glass forms the largest component of the nineteenth-century glass in the Great Hall scheme. By 1840 there were several skilled painters of stained glass working in Norwich, which meant that the commissioning of new high-quality stained-glass heraldry was a feasible option for the glazing of domestic spaces.²⁴⁰ The period in which the Felbrigg glass was installed was a significant one in the life of Howe Windham. He had inherited the Hall in 1833, married Lady Hervey in 1835, and his only son was born in 1840. The West Bay window contains the majority of the nineteenth-century heraldic stained glass, and these panels represent different combinations of heraldry belonging to the Windham and Hervey families. The joining of these arms represented the future of the Felbrigg Estate as home of Howe Windham-Hervey lineage, which was assured by the birth of their heir William Frederick Windham during the period in which this glass was installed. The South Bay window also featured various versions of the Windham family arms, the most prominent of which was installed in panel 3d. A small fragment of Windham arms thought to date from the sixteenth century is included in panel 2a. In row 2 additional nineteenth-century arms of the Windham family are located amongst several Swiss heraldic panels: Sir Edmund Wyndham's arms of displayed in panel 2c and the arms of Windham quartering Scrope and Tiptoft, impaling Bacon are shown in panel 2f.

²⁴⁰ The development of glazing practice throughout the early nineteenth century in Norwich, and the connections between this and the continental glass trade, are the subject of chapter five.

In the South Bay window, the choice to use familial heraldry alongside imported and unrelated historic heraldry created the fictitious appearance of a more complex and longer line between Howe Windham and the historic owners of Felbrigg Hall. Howe Windham's inheritance of Felbrigg Hall was not as direct as this arrangement suggests, as is borne out when one considers how his father Vice Admiral William Lukin came to inherit Felbrigg. William Windham III (1750-1810) had settled the inheritance on Vice-Admiral Lukin, the eldest son of his half-brother George Lukin (c. 1739-1812), after some deliberation. Vice-Admiral Lukin assumed the surname Windham as surrogate heir when he came into possession of the Hall in 1824, thereafter becoming William Lukin Windham. In his enthusiastic use of heraldry, Howe Windham was able to reinforce the notion that he was the legitimate owner of the historic Felbrigg Estate and heir to the Windham family, despite his tenuous connection to the Windham family of Felbrigg Hall. The significance placed on heraldic imagery by patrons such as Howe Windham should be understood within the context of the idealised historic past. The use of heraldic iconography alluded to the historic position of the landowner as lord of the manor, and the integration of Howe Windham's own arms into the window suggested that his position in society was a legitimate continuation of this idealised tradition. The Romantic vision of historic England, with a chivalric and benevolent lord of the manor ruling over contented peasants, was of course a fallacy as "nineteenth-century landowners were agrarian capitalists not feudal lords."²⁴¹ Stained glass was strongly associated with the English medieval Gothic even when it was neither English nor medieval. As such, stained-

²⁴¹ Brooks, *The Gothic Revival*, 193.

glass windows proved to be a popular medium for displaying armorial designs to further this narrative of family lineage and land ownership.²⁴²

Howe Windham was particularly concerned with his role as caretaker of the Felbrigg Estate. He was dedicated to improving the estate and did so by investing in farming while purchasing neighbouring land. The distribution of stained glass in the Great Hall windows provided an essential link between the interior of the Hall and the lands around of which Howe Windham was so concerned. In his article for *Garden History* John Phibbs proves that the landscaping at Felbrigg was almost certainly contributed to or wholly undertaken by Humphrey Repton between 1778 and 1784.²⁴³ Towards the end of the eighteenth century, Repton led a movement in English landscape gardening which was centred around irregular planning and the “diffusion” of the house into the park.²⁴⁴ Although alterations would have been made between the period of Repton’s landscaping and Howe Windham’s installation of glazing, this notion of the window as permeable barrier between interior and exterior remained. The house was the central hub of the large estate and this blurring of the interior and exterior spaces which was accommodated by the window design would have reinforced the interdependence of business and domestic space. Installing stained glass exclusively in the upper portions of the Great Hall windows allowed the view out across the estate to become an important

²⁴² Other more extravagant schemes of the early nineteenth century made extreme claims of lineage. At Fonthill, Beckford contrived a heraldic scheme which linked his daughter to all seventy-one of the original Knights of the Garter and he claimed that the family was descended from all six sons of Edward III (Brooks, *The Gothic Revival*, 159).

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, 39.

²⁴⁴ George Carter, “Architecture,” in *Humphrey Repton Landscape Gardener 1752-1818*, ed. George Carter, Patrick Goode and Kendrun Laurie (Norwich: Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts, 1982), 87.

element of the interior. The South Bay window, which slightly projected from the main room would have offered the best view of the estate from the front of the house. The upper panels of this window formed a historicised narrative of the Windham family at Felbrigg, within which Howe Windham was the central figure. The position of this scheme created a narrative framework through which the estate could be viewed. This further aligned Howe Windham with the historic creation, maintenance, and future success of the Felbrigg Estate and by extension those employed by it.

Contemplation and Study

The majority of secular stained-glass windows from this period were located in spaces such as the Great Hall at Felbrigg, however there are some examples of stained glass being installed in domestic settings of a different nature. Stained glass was also used in spaces reserved for private study, which would have had more restricted access than reception rooms. How did these windows differ from those in more public areas of the house? Can a reading of these windows offer a more nuanced view of how stained glass was used in domestic schemes of the early nineteenth century?

The personal study was a space distinct from the library in the Georgian period and the different glazing styles found in these spaces are illustrative of their separate uses. The library was one of the most significant reception rooms of the fashionable house from the latter decades of the eighteenth century.²⁴⁵ It also acted as the main

²⁴⁵ M. H. Port, "Library Architecture and Interiors," in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*, ed. Giles Mandelbrote and K. A. Manley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 472, accessed Dec 28, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521792745.029>.

living room for the family into the mid-nineteenth century, in contrast to the more formal drawing room.²⁴⁶ The library and drawing room were often discussed together in architectural writing of the period, as is exemplified by the architect Isaac Ware (bap. 1704-1766). Ware wrote in his 1756 publication *A Complete Body of Architecture* that the drawing room and library were considered “the two great apartments” of the “town-house of the greatest elegance.”²⁴⁷ The fashionable placement of both rooms as part of a “suite of reception rooms” on the ground floor further reinforced the similar general use of these spaces.²⁴⁸ The drawing-room and library continued to be viewed as connected spaces into the nineteenth century, as can be seen in the writing of landscape gardener and horticulturalist John Claudius Loudon (1783-1843). In his *Encyclopaedia of Cottage, Farm, and Villa Architecture and Furniture* (1832-1833) Loudon describes the library “in form and proportions [...] exactly similar to the drawing-room,” that simultaneously “should present a great contrast to the light and elegance of the drawing-room.”²⁴⁹ The comparative darkness and heaviness of the library did not continue into the design of stained-glass windows. The style of glazing most commonly found in the library is well illustrated by Walpole’s Strawberry Hill, where coloured and painted glass was restricted to the upper portions of the windows much like in the later Great Hall at Felbrigg. At Strawberry Hill this allowed for continued views across to the distant river Thames. In

²⁴⁶ Ibid., 798.

²⁴⁷ Isaac Ware, *A Complete Body of Architecture. Adorned with Plans and Elevations, from Original Designs* (London: Printed for T. Osbourne and J. Shipton, in Gray’s-Inn; J. Hodges, near London-Bridge; L. Davis in Fleetstreet; J. Ward, in Cornhill; and R. Baldwin, in Pater-Noster-Row, 1796), 429 and 432.

²⁴⁸ Port, “Library Architecture and Interiors,” 473.

²⁴⁹ John Claudius Loudon, *An Encyclopedia of Cottage, Farm, and Villa Architecture and Furniture; containing Numerous Designs for Dwellings, from the Villa to the Cottage and the Farm, including Farm Houses, Farmeries, and other Architectural Buildings; Country Inns, Public Houses, and Parochial Schools: with the Requisite Fittings-Up, Fixtures, and Furniture; and Appropriate Offices, Gardens, and Garden Scenery: Each Design Accompanied by Analytical and Critical Remarks* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, Patenoster-Row, 1846), 798.

addition to providing views, the extensive clear glazing produced a bright and evenly lit interior. This lighting would also have enabled a better viewing experience for the visitor admiring the family's collection of books and manuscripts. Bookcases in the fashionable library were built to further facilitate the display of these collections for guests. Loudon recommended that the "lower part of the cases should be enclosed by doors of brass wire, in which should be kept the more curious and valuable books, prints, drawings &c., the shelves above being open."²⁵⁰

In contrast to the library as reception room, the personal study was a space for solitude and contemplation and thus access would usually be restricted. It is in these spaces that one sees a different approach to glazing schemes when compared to reception rooms. Edmund Bartell Junior (1775-1855) of Swannington (Norfolk) was most explicit in his advocacy for the use of stained glass in the study in his *Hints for Picturesque Improvements in Ornamental Cottages* (1804).²⁵¹ Bartell was highly influenced by popular writers of the sublime as well as contemporary architectural and landscaping writers. His in-depth discussion of stained glass in the ornamental cottage was unique, however it reflects the use of stained glass in rooms reserved for study more widely. Most of Bartell's contemporaries writing on villa and ornamented cottages restricted themselves to discussing window shapes and types, for example, William Atkinson (1774/5-1839) wrote:

The windows most in character, are those which consist of casements, with leaded glass. They are generally made of iron, but as metal cannot, without much labour,

²⁵⁰ Ibid., 798.

²⁵¹ Edmund Bartell (Junior), *Hints for Picturesque Improvements in Ornamented Cottages, and their Scenery: Including some Observations on the Labourer and his Cottage* (London: Printed for J. Taylor, Architectural Library, High Holborn, 1804).

be made to fit very close; I have employed wood, which produces the same effect, and keeps out better the cold.²⁵²

Atkinson included figures which depict the windows described here, which consisted of either diamond or rectangular panes of glass in simple rectangular openings, some with rounded heads (figure 47). The practicality of Atkinson's design style was totally at odds with the elaborate styles of stained glass discussed by Bartell. Critics of Bartell were clear in their assertion that the notion of stained glass in an ornamented cottage was contradictory to the simplicity which was seen as the defining characteristic of the cottage. A critic for *The Eclectic Review* (1805) wrote:

[H]e [Bartell] expatiates at length in favour of stained glass for the windows; and departs, we apprehend, in this particular, from most of those principles of simplicity which he has previously recommended. Painted glass, and "in large masses," if it be proper for a *villa*, of which we doubt, since we strongly associate with it the idea of "dim *religious* light," is certainly misplaced in a cottage [...].²⁵³

Bartell himself clearly predicted this type of criticism at the time of writing, as he set out very clear outlines for the use of stained glass in the ornamented cottage. He defended the medium, arguing that it had both a practical application and that it added to "the romantic character" of the architectural design.²⁵⁴

For Bartell, the practical application of stained glass was found in the obscuration of external distractions for the scholar which could be achieved by limiting the light entering the apartment. He argued that this was particularly fitting for the "lover of rural

²⁵² William Atkinson, *Views of Picturesque Cottages with Plans: Selected from a Collection of Drawings taken in Different Parts of England, and Intended as Hints for the Improvement of Village Scenery* (London: Printed for T. Gardiner: Princes Street, Cavendish Square, 1805), 22.

²⁵³ Anon. F, "Hints for Picturesque Improvements in Ornamented Cottages and their Scenery: Including some Observations on the Labourer and his Cottage; in Three Essays. Illustrated by Sketches. By Edmund Bartell, Jun. Royal Svo. pp. 151. Price 10s. 6d. Taylor, 1804," *The Eclectic Review* 1 (1805): 221.

²⁵⁴ Bartell, *Hints for Picturesque Improvements*, 30.

retirement” who “generally speaking, possess a cultivated mind.”²⁵⁵ He wrote that the purpose of including stained glass in the study was:

To enable us to apply with attention, our thoughts should be abstracted from all external objects; for which reason, many persons prefer reading by candle-light to any other time of the day. An apartment, therefore, admitting no more light than is necessary, I should think more proper for the enjoyment as well as the advantages of study.²⁵⁶

Bartell here focussed on the importance of filtering light to create an atmosphere appropriate for study. He suggested that the ideal form would be a bow window “the middle space of which may be entirely filled, while each side may contain merely a sufficient quantity to preserve unity and complete the design.”²⁵⁷ For Bartell, the style of stained glass chosen was less significant than the overall effect of the window which was attained by using masses of glass:

When well managed, coloured glass is capable of producing a most pleasing effect; but it must be in a mass, and that a pretty large one, to give it all its value. We may admire a single piece of glass, for the beauty of its execution, or the splendour of its colours; but seen in mass, the detail is forgotten, and we admire it, not for what it is, but for the effect which it produces; that sweet solemnity, that peculiar and universal tint, which is only to be acquired by a partial exclusion of light through a coloured medium [...].²⁵⁸

According to Bartell, lighting effect was the most important aspect of stained-glass design, a theory which was similar to that purported by eighteenth-century discussions of the historic purpose of ecclesiastical stained-glass windows.²⁵⁹ Bartell rather forces this point by listing a variety of potential alternatives. He suggested using “windows painted in oil colours upon ground glass” as a durable alternative which offered more options in terms of design than “the collection of old stained glass [where] the purchaser must be

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 33.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 35.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 35.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 30-31.

²⁵⁹ This will be discussed extensively in chapter three of this thesis.

content with such gleanings as are left him, and pick up these as he can,” a situation which he had personal experience of, as we shall see.²⁶⁰ This suggestion of applying paint to obscure light can be compared to the contemporary use of paper or textile transparencies, which will be discussed in chapter four. Another barrier which Bartell believed could give the same effect as stained-glass was the growth of plants across the window. He particularly suggested ivy for this:

“ivy certainly gives a nearer idea of the intricate tracery work of a Gothic window, and the effect of coloured glass, than any thing besides; and this the poet seems also to have conceived:

“That casement, arch’d with ivy’s brownest shade,
First to these eyes the light of Heaven convey’d.”

ROGERS.²⁶¹

The final alternative Bartell suggested for stained glass is hypothetical, and he contemplated whether glass could be produced to appear as marbled paper. Bartell suggested that the play between two colours marbled together would be “amusing,” with “no two pieces being exactly like each other.”²⁶²

Bartell’s discussion of alternatives to stained glass seems to have been largely added to assuage the doubts of his hypothetical detractors who considered the medium to be too extravagant for the ornamental cottage. Bartell had a particular interest in stained glass, as can be ascertained from the remnants of the glazing scheme at Swannington Manor, known in Bartell’s time The Swannington Lawn Estate (figure 48-

²⁶⁰Bartell, *Hints for Picturesque Improvements*, 38-39.

²⁶¹*Ibid.*, 42. The poem quoted by Bartell is Samuel Roger’s (1763-1855) popular poem *The Pleasures of Memory*, which was published in two parts (Samuel Roger, *The Pleasures of Memory* (London: Printed by J. Davis. Sold by T. Cadell, in the Strand, 1792)). The poem went through four editions in the original year of publication and had sold approximately 25000 copies by 1820 (J. W. Introduction. *The Pleasures of Memory, a Poem, in Two Parts* (Oxford: Woodstock Books, 1989), 2).

²⁶²Bartell, *Hints for Picturesque Improvements*, 32-33.

52),²⁶³ and St Margaret's Church, Swannington (Norfolk). Bartell was an amateur glass painter and his signature appears on two of the shields at Swannington Manor which are dated 1821 (figures 53&54). The East window of St Margaret's also bears his initials in the centre tracery panels (figure 55).²⁶⁴ The almost total lack of religious imagery seen in this East window is unusual for this period. The heads of two male saints do appear in lights a and d, with the former being a copy of the head which Yarrington added to the figure of St John the Baptist in window sV at the Church of St Michael, Aysham (Norfolk). However, these panels are not centrally positioned within the composition and instead have been used to flank the more unusual floral panels. It seems likely that the unique composition of this window has been designed to showcase panels which were painted or designed by Bartell himself. Tracery glass retained in window sVIII was also part of the same original scheme at the church (figure 56). The style of glass used here is remarkably similar to glass used in schemes attributed to Yarrington, and notably the small diamond-shaped glass pieces with decorative painting, which have been made using red glass here, are found at several of his schemes (figures 57&58). These comparisons suggest that the windows at St Margaret were installed by Yarrington with some involvement from Bartell, and the same can probably be considered for the original design of the Manor glazing.

Bartell's personal interest in the medium may explain why he was so intent on suggesting stained glass as an appropriate decoration for the ornamental cottage. At the time of writing, Swannington Manor has five stained-glass windows. All stained glass is

²⁶³ SWANNINGTON LAWN ESTATE," editorial, *NC&NG*, Feb 18, 1860, 8.

²⁶⁴ For further information on this window see appendix II.

now positioned in windows at the front of the house: three on the ground floor and two on the first floor. The two windows on the first floor contain fragments of glass which date from between the medieval period to the nineteenth century. In their current arrangement these fragments have been placed against a clear diapered background. These pieces have been generally divided into loose categories with heraldic and floral designs separated from the architectural, figurative, and ecclesiastical pieces. The large amount of clear glass in the design suggests that the current configuration of these windows is probably the result of a misguided twentieth-century restoration project. It is likely that the glass was arranged quite differently when Bartell owned the house and the glass was originally distributed across fewer windows, possibly in accordance with Bartell's principles for stained glass as explored in relation to ornamental cottage design. Although Bartell did not stipulate the use of continental glass, he was certainly aware of the popularity and availability of these at the time of writing:

The public has of late been much indebted to two gentlemen of the city of Norwich, for bringing into this country some of the finest specimens of painted glass, perhaps that are extant; and no less so for the liberal manner in which they indulged the general curiosity, by gratuitous exhibition of it.²⁶⁵

These two men are undoubtedly Hampp and Stevenson, whose important role on the trade of stained glass will be addressed in chapter four. It is quite possible that Bartell sourced some of his historic stained-glass for Swannington through Hampp, either directly or through glazier S. C. Yarrington.²⁶⁶ The original installation of the stained glass at Swannington Manor may have occurred in 1821, which is the date given in the signed Bartell armorial panels.

²⁶⁵ Bartell, *Hints for Picturesque Improvements*, 37.

²⁶⁶ The connection between glass used at the Church of St Margaret, Swannington and other schemes known to have been installed by S. C. Yarrington is considered in appendix II.

The importance of the quality of light produced by stained glass was expressed in John Milton's (1608-1674) well-known poem *Il Penseroso* (1645/46). Although written in the seventeenth century, Milton's poetic description of ecclesiastical stained glass was often quoted throughout the nineteenth century and would have been familiar to educated men of the period²⁶⁷

But let my due feet never fail,
To walk the studious Cloysters pale,
And love the high embowered Roof
With antick Pillars massy proof,
And storied Windows richly dight,
Casting a dim religious light.²⁶⁸

Stained glass was a revelatory instrument for the speaker in Milton's poem, for whom the windows transformed light into a religious medium. The coloured glass filtered bright daylight and thus the interior of the church was suitably "dim." Milton's poem further connects the atmosphere of the religious institution to scholarly pursuits, and thus there is a direct correspondence between the "dim religious light" of stained glass and contemplative religious spaces. This vision of monastic institutions as seats of learning was clearly well-known in artistic circles of Norwich in the Georgian period, as has been explored in relation to the Fraternity of United Friars in chapter one. This relationship

²⁶⁷ Milton's poem was quoted by innumerable publications in this period, and the phrase "casting a dim religious light" was repeatedly used in descriptions of churches. This quotation was often unattributed, presumably with the understanding that the reader would be familiar with the phrase. An example of this can be found in the description of Cheadle Church in William Pitt's *A Topographical History of Staffordshire; including its Agriculture, Mines, and Manufactures. Memoirs of Eminent Natives; Statistical Tables; and Every Species of Information Connected with the Local History of the County. With a Succinct Account of the Rise and Progress of the Staffordshire Potteries* (Newcastle-Under-Lyme: Printed by and for J. Smith, and Sold by Him, High-Street, Newcastle; Rogers, Staffod; Lomax, Lichfield; Smart, Wolverhampton; and the Different Booksellers in Staffordshire; also by Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster-Row, London, 1817), 229.

²⁶⁸ John Milton, "Il Penseroso," *The Poems of John Milton*, ed. Ernest Bernbaum (New York: Ronald Press, 1936), 69, lines 155-160.

between monastic studiousness and stained glass was a concept which was later applied to more general studious spaces by writers like Bartell and architect John Soane in his London home and museum at Lincoln's Inn Fields.

Soane purchased number twelve Lincoln Inn's Fields in 1792 and went on to purchase number thirteen in 1808 and finally number fourteen in 1823.²⁶⁹ Among the rooms of artefacts and collections which ranged these three houses Soane constructed a chamber which was referred to as the Monk's Parlour. This room was dedicated to Soane's fanciful *alter ego*, "Padre Giovanni," a mournful figure who emerged following the death of his wife Elizabeth Soane (1760-1815, née Smith).²⁷⁰ Elizabeth died in 1815, at which time Soane began to make mention of a "Monk's Cell" at Lincoln's Inn Fields in his Notebook, which likely refers to the Study.²⁷¹ In his 1835 description of the parlour, Soane listed the religious artefacts and artworks with which he had filled the room, which were designed to "impress the spectator with reverence for the monk."²⁷² The room itself is in the basement level of Lincoln's Inn Fields, close to the crypt. These two architectural spaces featured heavily as settings for mystery and tragedy in the Gothic novel. Directly above the parlour is the oratory, which one can view from inside the parlour itself, and Soane noted that viewing the oratory from this location allowed a good view of a carved

²⁶⁹ Trustees of Sir John Soane's Museum, *A New Description of Sir John Soane's Museum* (London: The Trustees, 2001), 91-95.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 4.

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 35-36.

²⁷² John Soane, *Description of the House and Museum on the North Side of Lincoln's Inn Fields, the Residence of Sir John Soane, Professor of Architecture in the Royal Academy, one of the Architects attached to His Majesty's Office of Works, Architect to the Bank of England and College of Surgeons, F. R. S. R.A. F. S. A. Grand Superintendent of the Works of The United Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons of England, Membre Honoraire de L'Academie Imperiale et Royale des Beaux Arts en Vienne, Consigliere Corrispondente Della Ducale Academia di Belle Arti, Parma, &c. &c. &c. with Graphic Illustrations and Incidental Details* (London: Printed by Levey, Robson, and Franklyn, St. Martin's Lane, 1835), 26.

wooden Crucifixion scene. The parlour contained a small library as well as items which are described to impress upon the visitor the high taste of Padre Giovanni: a Dutch engraving which was “said to be an exact draught of one of the thirty pieces of silver for which Judas betrayed our Saviour, and in the possession of the Grand Master of Malta,” and other works which were “of intellectual and highly gifted talent.”²⁷³ The religious trappings of the room were part of Soane’s construction of the intellectual in his study and this was a room for reading and contemplation more than religious ceremony.

Stained glass was featured throughout Soane’s Museum, and this was particularly the case in the Monk’s Parlour, which had five stained glass windows, all of which contained continental stained-glass panels. Although alterations have been made to the arrangement of stained glass in the house since Soane’s death, the first Curator of the Museum, George Bailey, drew plans of all stained-glass windows at the time of Soane’s death (c. 1837). These records informed the recent restoration project at the museum, as well as giving a full picture of the glazing of the Monk’s Parlour at this time. Of the five windows, only one was inserted in an exterior wall. This window was installed by Soane’s glazier and decorator William Watson in 1823-24, and this was clearly depicted in a sketch by architect Edward Davis (1802-52) which dates to c. 1825 (figure 59).²⁷⁴ Davis’ sketch illustrates the East-West section of the room and details the individual stained-glass panels. The window was made up of twenty small-scale foreign panels, set against blue and yellow glass and red border glass etched with a ball enrichment pattern (figure

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, 26.

²⁷⁴ Helen Dorey, “‘Exquisite Hues and magical effects’: Sir John Soane’s use of Stained Glass at 13 Lincoln’s Inn Fields,” *The Journal of Stained Glass* 27 (2004): 17.

60). Helen Dorey has argued that this window was particularly significant for Soane as although hundreds of views exist which show the house, the sketch by Davis is the only one which he commissioned specifically to depict one of his stained-glass windows.²⁷⁵ Looking at Bailey's plans, it is clear that all five windows in the Monk's Parlour were filled with stained-glass, with foreign panels being surrounded by modern decorative and coloured glass (figure 61-66). From his description, Soane stressed the importance of this stained glass in the construction of the room's atmosphere. He wrote that the "Scriptural subjects, represented on glass, are suited to the destination of the place, and increase its sombre character."²⁷⁶ The choice of religious subject matter for the stained glass of the Monk's Parlour, and the complete lack of popular heraldic imagery which was so important to other schemes of this period, reflect the contemplative and private nature of this space.

The five windows of the Monk's Parlour, as well as the view to the oratory, created a complex overall space, within which Soane played with different levels of transparency and obscurity. Although the external window was fully glazed with stained and coloured glass, Soane stressed the importance of the view out to "the Ruins of a Monastery" which "arrest the attention" of the visitor. He wrote that the "interest created in the mind of the spectator, on visiting the abode of the monk, will not be weakened by wandering among the ruins of his once noble monastery."²⁷⁷ The white glass of the continental roundels used in Soane's window would have allowed some level

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 17.

²⁷⁶ Soane, *Description of the House and Museum on the North Side of Lincoln's Inn Fields*, 26.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 26.

of transparency, through which there would have been a limited view through to the constructed ruins beyond. Soane, like Bartell, acknowledged that an unobscured view would allow the mind to wonder. However, for Soane this is less problematic than it was to Bartell. For Soane, the partially obstructed view offered a mystery which increased the contemplation of the scholar. Soane seemed to sanction this idea on the grounds that the view was of the most beneficial subject to the viewer. It is therefore unlikely that if the window overlooked the street, he would have been so agreeable to the notion. The use of coloured glass to surround the continental panels would have contributed to the obscuration of the view and would also have significantly lowered the amount of natural light entering the chamber. By diffusing daylight through coloured glass, the quality of light in the room would have been more in keeping with that of Milton's poem, while also subscribing to Bartell's suggestions for the scholar at work. The four other stained-glass windows in this room led onto an interior corridor at the basement level, and therefore these largely obscured the view of the corridor. These windows allowed Soane to display more stained glass in the Monk's Parlour, while the style of the windows ensured that the corridor and rooms beyond were hidden. Thus, Soane used stained glass to obscure and filter views to further emphasise the purpose of the Monk's Parlour as a contemplative retreat for the intellectual and melancholy Padre Giovanni.

The Romantic vision of the scholar at work, bathed in coloured light passing through a stained-glass window, is epitomised in Henry Stisted's 1826 painting of author Sir Walter Scott in his Armoury at Abbotsford House (Melrose, figure 67).²⁷⁸ Scott is sat at

²⁷⁸ For a detailed study of Scott's Abbotsford House see Wainwright, *The Romantic Interior*, 147-207.

a desk directly in front of a large stained-glass window which is filled with heraldic and figurative glass bordered with a decorative framework. His original intention for this window was to install continental stained glass, like Walpole had done at Strawberry Hill. Instead, the window was made using entirely new painted glass which was installed in 1817. Using new glass here allowed Scott to specify the imagery which the window depicted, including familial heraldry. Scott's Armoury window was designed by either Daniel Terry (c. 1780-1829) or Elizabeth Terry (1798-1874), the former of whom was a primary aide in the furnishing and design of the house.²⁷⁹ As Rosemary Sweet has suggested, Abbotsford was "an expression of the man and his work all in one."²⁸⁰ The significance of the house's design is made abundantly clear in Stisted's painting. Scott is the figure of scholarly contemplation, as he sits absorbed in his book, bathed in warm light from the window. He is surrounded by the hallmarks of the medievalist, as was fitting for an historian and historicist author of his repute: armour hangs glinting on the wall, wooden gates carved in the mode of Gothic tracery and at the height of a communion rail demarcate the entrance to the room, and a vaulted ceiling with central pennant is just visible. The scene is completed by the large luminous stained-glass window, which forms the focal point of the composition.

Staircases and Concealment of the Unsightly

Continental stained glass in domestic space was used to reveal, exclude or mitigate views, and created a further layer of meaning to the interior according to the audience. The distribution of glass across a scheme, as well as the choice of setting glass, could be

²⁷⁹ Wainwright, *The Romantic Interior*, 174-75.

²⁸⁰ Rosemary Sweet, *Time's Witness: History in the Age of Romanticism* (London: Penguin Books, 2021), 153.

altered to fit imported panels to the desires of the patron. Contemplative spaces were suited to stained-glass windows which could obscure a view; however, this approach was also taken in domestic spaces of quite a different nature, in which one might wish to obscure unsightly or undesirable views. These areas would have been frequented by guests and family alike, and stained glass was installed to maintain the design of the interior without intrusion from the outside world.

Jasmine Allen has discussed the way in which stained glass was used to facilitate privacy and to block out unsightly views in the later nineteenth-century urban environment.²⁸¹ There are some examples of non-ecclesiastical urban installations of stained glass in Norwich during the early nineteenth century which also seem to have been used for this purpose. For example, Norwich guildhall council chamber features three stained-glass windows which were likely installed in the early nineteenth century (figure 68).²⁸² These windows are formed from numerous figurative fragments and armorial panels set against hexagonal-cut historic stained-glass pieces. The glass used in the window, which contains English pieces of different periods and some continental fragments, was possibly arranged by John Dixon of Norwich.²⁸³ If he was involved in the glazing of the council chamber this would date the project to c. 1835-50.²⁸⁴ As well as conveying the status of the council members and the business of the chamber, the full

²⁸¹ Jasmine Allen, "Stained Glass in the Victorian Home," in *Le vitrail dans la demeure des origines à nos jours : actes du XXVIIIe colloque international du Corpus vitrearum, Troyes 4-8 juillet 2016*, ed. Karine Boulanger (Gand : Snoeck 2018), 136.

²⁸² There is some uncertainty regarding the date of installation for this scheme. See appendix II for further information on alternative dating.

²⁸³ David King, "Norfolk: Norwich, Guildhall, Mayoral Council Chamber," CVMA, 2010. Accessed June 30, 2019, <http://www.cvma.ac.uk/publications/digital/norfolk/sites/norwichguildhall/history.html>.

²⁸⁴ For more information on the work of glazier and glass painter John Dixon please see appendix I and chapter 5.

stained-glass windows would have provided privacy and separation from the busy marketplace below.

Stained glass was also employed in smaller scale domestic residences in Norwich at this early period by those who could afford it, although very little evidence remains regarding the design of these. Glazier and glass painter James George Zobel made reference to some stained glass which he installed in Norwich in a notebook entry dated 2 August 1831: “fixt a new painted subject of Raphael’s Transfigⁿ in Mr S. C. Yarrington’s Hall door light.”²⁸⁵ This panel is particularly fascinating when one considers that Zobel painted the same scene for the East window of Norwich Cathedral in 1826.²⁸⁶ It seems likely that both the Cathedral window and the door panel would have passed through Yarrington’s Norwich workshop, where Zobel was employed during this period.²⁸⁷ The transference of a religious scene from large scale ecclesiastical setting to domestic interior may well have been made in order to commemorate the East window project, which would have been a highly significant commission for the workshop. Thus, in addition to providing privacy for the household, this panel would have held special significance for the patron as a reference to the success of his business. Both Yarrington’s home and business premises were located on King Street throughout his career, where he produced many stained-glass windows until his death in 1846.²⁸⁸ His success is clear both from his connection to high status projects like Norwich Cathedral and from the fact that, in the 1841 census,

²⁸⁵ Notebook of James George Zobel, Dec 31, 1844-Dec 18, 1846.

²⁸⁶ “On Sunday last, the Large East Window,” editorial, *NC&NG*, May 6, 1826, 2.

²⁸⁷ For more information regarding Zobel’s role in Yarrington’s workshop please see chapter five.

²⁸⁸ “TO BE LET,” editorial, *NG&NC*, Dec 26, 1846, 1.

Sarah Moore is listed as a female servant in the household of the Yarrington family.²⁸⁹ King Street was a long road which ran from the southern city boundary wall to the Tombland area of the city near the Cathedral. Although the first census in 1841 does not indicate exactly which house belonged to the Yarrington family, they are listed as residing in the Parish of St George, Tombland, which suggests that the house and business premises were located at the Cathedral end of the road.²⁹⁰ The residence itself would have thus been in a busy central area of the city, and inserting stained glass into the front door would have allowed for light to enter the house while also providing privacy for the residents within. This panel would also have acted as a discreet advertisement for Yarrington's workshop, particularly as the business premises and home were located together.

A surviving example of a domestic urban composite glazing scheme can be found in Great Yarmouth, at 4 South Quay. This merchant's house was built in c. 1596 by Benjamin Cowper and is currently managed by the Norfolk Museums Service for the National Trust as the Elizabethan House Museum. David King's recent article gives a full description of the glazing at the property, including the composite staircase window which includes a collection of Netherlandish stained-glass panels (figure 69).²⁹¹ In this article King has dated the installation of some, and probably all, of the stained glass in the

²⁸⁹ James George Zobel was also listed as a resident of the property in the same census return. Interestingly, although Yarrington's profession is given as "Plumber" Zobel is listed as "Artist." A discussion of the different roles of the two men within the business can be found in chapter 4 (1841 Census. Norfolk. Hundred: Norwich (Street Indexed). Parish: St George Tombland, HO- Records Created or Inherited by the Home Office, Ministry of Home Security, and Related Bodies, HO107/788/9, 6, The National Archives, Kew).

²⁹⁰ Ibid.

²⁹¹ David King, "The Stained Glass at the Elizabethan House Museum, 4 South Quay, Great Yarmouth," *Vidimus* 138 (2022), accessed Mar 6, 2022, <https://www.vidimus.org/issues/issue-138/stained-glass-at-south-quay/>.

house to May 1814, according to graffiti on one of the windows in which this date appears alongside the name “J. Palmer.” John Danby Palmer purchased 4 South Quay in 1809 and made several alterations to the property, including rebuilding the staircase and adding a large round-headed window at the top of the first flight of stairs.²⁹² More stained glass can be found in the ground-floor kitchen, and the first-floor gallery, however these windows reflect later rearrangements of the glass.²⁹³ Although some alterations have also been made to the staircase window since the period of installation, specifically the addition of an inscription panel at the base of light b, this window remains an excellent example of domestic composite glazing from the early nineteenth-century.

In the early nineteenth century the area of Great Yarmouth surrounding South Quay was comprised of a thriving mixture of residential and business properties. The crowded buildings were divided into rows, and this 1854 description of this street system illustrates the cramped nature of this arrangement:

A row is a long narrow lane, or alley, quite straight, or as nearly so as may be, with houses on each side, both of which you can sometimes touch at once with the finger-tips of each hand, by stretching out your arms to their full extent. Now and then the houses overhang, and even join above your head, converting the row so far, into a sort of tunnel, or tubular passage.”²⁹⁴

²⁹² Ibid.

²⁹³ For a full description of these windows see King, “The Stained Glass at the Elizabethan House Museum.”

²⁹⁴ Anon. G., *Pictorial Guide to Great Yarmouth; containing its Early History, and a Succinct Account of the Public Buildings and Other Objects of Interest in the Town and Neighbourhood* (Great Yarmouth: Printed and Published by I. A. Meall, Bookseller, Etc., Quay, 1854), 59.

Row 83, also known as Sayers the Attorney's Row, ran along the southern wall of 4 South Quay. The property would have been surrounded by other dwellings and businesses on three sides. The house front overlooks the River Yare, which would have been busy with boats destined for the timber yards and boat building yards which lined the far side of the riverbank in the early nineteenth-century. It seems probable therefore, that like the urban examples in Norwich, stained glass was employed at 4 South Quay to protect the privacy of the house's inhabitants while also obscuring the view across other buildings. In addition to these practical qualities, the position of the staircase window would also have allowed Palmer to conspicuously display his collection of imported stained glass to all visitors entering the house through the front door. Prominent staircase windows were popular for the exhibition of collections of stained glass in the nineteenth century, and other surviving Norfolk examples can be found in the private houses of Ketteringham Hall (figure 70) and Rainthorpe Hall in Tasburgh.

Despite the survival of the South Quay scheme, most significant secular stained-glass schemes in this period were made for country houses. These large-scale domestic residences were designed to allow for the day-to-day operations of the house, performed by the servants, to be hidden from the notice of the owners and their guests. Christopher Hussey explored the clever obscuration of functionality built into the architectural style of country houses in the nineteenth century. For example, at Sheringham Hall in Norfolk (completed 1839) the greenhouse was constructed to conceal the domestic wing running north.²⁹⁵ Stained glass was also employed within this architectural language of

²⁹⁵ Hussey, *English Country Houses*, 108.

obscuration, to act as a barrier between rooms inhabited by the homeowners and the operational spaces used by staff. The popularity of stained glass as a feature on staircases in this period also seems to be influenced by this need to screen off these different spaces of the country home. Historic stained glass of continental origin was used at Langley Hall (Norfolk) and Nowton Court (Suffolk), although in these cases the overall design of the windows is unknown (figure 71). The continental stained-glass scheme above the Great Hall staircase at Blickling Hall (Norfolk), which remains in its original location, is a rare survival of this type of glazing.²⁹⁶ This window is an excellent case study when considering the different styles of domestic glazing in this period.

Blickling Hall was built by London lawyer Sir Henry Hobart (c. 1560-1625), who purchased the estate in 1616 and the new house incorporated much of the Tudor mansion previously on the site (figure 72). Work on the property began in 1619 under the direction of architect Robert Lyminge (d. 1628) who had previously built Hatfield House (Hertfordshire) for Robert Cecil (1563-1612).²⁹⁷ Under the ownership of John Hobart, 2nd Earl of Buckinghamshire (1723-93), Blickling was re-modelled by architect Thomas Ivory of Norwich (1709-1779) and his son William Ivory (b. 1746).²⁹⁸ It was at this time that the Great Hall, a feature of the original Tudor building, was remodelled to accommodate the grand staircase. In the early seventeenth-century design of this space, the main entrance

²⁹⁶ Although the panels are currently in their nineteenth-century position, they were in fact removed for some decades in the twentieth century. The panels were de-installed in 1935 by the eleventh Marquis of Lothian and were placed into the East window of the Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Erpingham (Norfolk) in 1953. Deterioration caused by unsuitable conditions in the church led to the removal of the glass in 1994, at which time it underwent conservation treatment before being re-installed in the Great Hall at Blickling (King, "Norfolk: Blickling Hall").

²⁹⁷ National Trust, *Blickling Hall, Norfolk* (London: The National Trust, 1998), 4.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 4-5.

from the stone courtyard into the main house had been through the north-western courtyard turret. This was altered in the 1690s so that the main entrance was instead positioned in the centre of the Great Hall's south wall.²⁹⁹ The original corner entrance led one through to the screens passage, and from there either to the Great Hall or to the Jacobean staircase, which was constructed c. 1622-27,³⁰⁰ and the Long Gallery above (figure 73). This staircase was re-located to the Great Hall in 1767 and more timbers were added to extend it into a grand branching design within this larger space.³⁰¹ This not only created an impressive sweeping display from the new position of the front entrance, but also freed up space for a new suite of rooms on the ground floor of the east range.³⁰² A plan of the staircase elevation and ceiling design by William Ivory from 1765 shows that a large window was planned for the space above the staircase from the time of it moving to the Great Hall (figure 74). Despite this, it seems that the stained glass was not installed into this opening until the early nineteenth century, at which point twelve large-scale panels of French and German glass were used to fill the four-light window (figure 75). David King has proved that eight of these panels originated from the Steinfeld Abbey cloister. These panels depict the Nativity of Christ, St Paul and St Norbert, Virgin Mary and St Potentinus, Flight into Egypt, St Quirinus, St Quirinus and scene of his martyrdom, Christ appears to the Three Maries and Christ appears to St Thomas.³⁰³ Two of these panels appear in glass dealer Hampp's 1804 sale catalogue and it is likely that Hampp was

²⁹⁹ John Maddison, "Architectural Drawings at Blickling Hall," *Architectural History* 34 (1991): 75.

³⁰⁰ Caroline Stanley-Millson and John Newman, "Blickling Hall: The Building of a Jacobean Mansion," *Architectural History* 29 (1986): 11.

³⁰¹ Maddison, "Architectural Drawings:" 76.

³⁰² National Trust, *Blickling Hall*, 49.

³⁰³ King, "The Steinfeld Cloister Glazing," *Gesta* 37 (1998) 2: 207.

the supplier of all twelve panels.³⁰⁴ The exact date of installation for this window is unknown, however it was in place by 1829, at which time it is depicted in a watercolour illustrating the Great Hall by architect John Chessell Buckler (1793-1894, figure 76). King noted that some of the panels have been extended to fit the window openings, likely the work of Yarrington of Norwich, which further supports the argument that the stained glass was a later addition to the window opening.³⁰⁵

As well as establishing the date by which the stained glass was installed in the Great Hall at Blickling, Buckler's watercolour allows for a view of the original design context for the window in the 1820s. The stained glass itself is depicted in broad terms at the edge of the painting, and the angle of perspective makes it clear that the focus of this work is the overall architectural design of the space and the staircase within this setting. When comparing this painting to the current design, the interior has been significantly darkened since 1828, with the most notable alteration being the colour of the staircase and balcony balusters (figures 76&77). All the wooden accents of the decor, including the cornicing and statuettes, were originally painted white, as were the walls. This created a light and airy open space. The current mixture of darkened wood, yellow painted walls and numerous painted portraits gives a very different expression of space and much of the previous lightness has been lost. Consequently, the role of the stained-glass window has also been much altered. Rather than standing out as an element of colour against a backdrop of white, the window and the figures within it now blend into the setting. The

³⁰⁴ David King, "Norfolk: Blickling Hall, Blickling Hall," CVMA, 2010, accessed May 5, 2019, <http://www.cvma.ac.uk/publications/digital/norfolk/sites/blicklinghall/history.html>.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

space is now largely dedicated to the painted portraits, and thus the individual stained-glass panels have become another aspect of the overall gallery feel of the space. The original unified white surroundings, combined with the central position of the window above the staircase and opposite the entrance, would have enabled the stained glass to act as the focal point of the room.

The Great Hall staircase window overlooks the second internal courtyard of the house; however, the height of the sill means that it would have only been possible to look out of this window from the gallery level. This small inner courtyard was further reduced in size following the re-location of the Jacobean staircase to the Great Hall when a second staircase was installed in the south-west corner of this space. These enclosed stairs allowed the residing family improved private access between the ground and upper levels of the house (figure 73).³⁰⁶ The orientation of windows in the other rooms which surrounded the courtyard give an indication as to the role of this space and therefore the reason why stained glass was installed in the Great Hall, to obscure this view. Two principal rooms run along the north and east sides of the courtyard, the Peter the Great Room and the Long Gallery respectively.³⁰⁷ Both of these rooms feature windows exclusively on their exterior walls rather than overlooking this courtyard. These would have provided views over the estate much like the windows of Felbrigg's Great Hall. In directing the eye towards a particular view, decisions were made regarding what should be obscured from the viewer. It seems that in the case of these two rooms windows were

³⁰⁶ National Trust, *Blickling Hall*, 14. The staircase was extended down to the basement in 1865 to allow for communication with the private entrance from the west garden.

³⁰⁷ The Peter the Great room was built in c. 1779 to display the tapestry of Peter the Great, a gift from Catherine the Great of Russia (1729-96).

not added to overlook the internal courtyard for two reasons. Firstly, the diminutive size of the courtyard meant that these windows would have directly overlooked one another, thus compromising the privacy of those occupying these rooms. Secondly, it is likely that the courtyard space would have been used for the everyday activities associated with running a large house, and therefore obscuring this view would have been considered beneficial. The design of the Peter the Great Room and Long Gallery ensured that limiting windows to the exterior wall still allowed the rooms to be well lit. This option would not have been suitable for the Great Hall. The double height of the space, as well as the gallery which could easily overshadow the lower portion of the room, meant that if windows were only inserted in the south wall the light cast would not sufficiently light the interior. It was therefore necessary to place a window over the staircase to provide this additional lighting. The necessity of this window at the time of installing the staircase and gallery would have presented a new problem: how to obscure the undesirable view over the inner courtyard. It seems likely that the use of full stained-glass panels provided the perfect solution to this issue. Although the glass would have restricted the amount of light entering the space, when combined with the south wall windows and the general white design of the space this room would have been relatively well lit. Continental stained glass thus provided an aesthetic solution to the issue of how to restrict an undesirable view without entirely blocking light entering the Great Hall.

Conclusion

The various case studies explored in this chapter demonstrate the complex way in which continental stained glass was incorporated into composite stained-glass in order to construct narratives of personal and familial identities. The unique possibilities of stained

glass in interior design were exploited in different ways according to the needs and desires of specific spaces and patrons. Stained glass was equally a medium used to promote monastic contemplation and a tool for displaying fictitious familial lineages in reception rooms. In all cases, there was an acknowledgement of stained glass as a tool to moderate the interaction between interior and exterior spaces. The distribution of stained-glass panels allowed for specific imagery to either frame a view or to obscure it entirely. Simultaneously, these differing arrangements modulated the amount of natural light entering the space, to the point where one could imitate Milton's "dim religious light." The varying uses of continental panels in domestic spaces during the early nineteenth century demonstrates the versatility of this material for glaziers and patrons of this period. This is further proved when one considers that this glass was also used in churches during this period. Ecclesiastical schemes called for different, but related, approaches to this type of glazing, as will be explored in the next chapter of this thesis.

Chapter Three: Continental Stained Glass, Patronage, and National Religion

The turn of the nineteenth century saw the culmination of a century of increasing religious freedom for Christian denominations beyond the Church of England. Increased autonomy for religious organisations had begun with the Toleration Act of 1689, which marked the beginning of legal worship for nonconformist Protestant denominations. This Act granted conditional freedom of worship on the proviso that nonconformists rejected transubstantiation and pledged oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy to the Crown.³⁰⁸ This right to worship was extended to Catholic worshippers with the introduction of the Roman Catholic Relief Act in 1791, although certain restrictions still applied to Catholic congregations following the passing of this Act.³⁰⁹ These relaxations of control on religious expression combined with the rapid growth in urban populations at the turn of the century led to a period of church building both within and outside the Established Church. For the Church of England this increasingly diverse religious landscape threatened their position as the dominant religious force of the nation.

The early decades of the nineteenth century were therefore a period in which the language of church building was being developed against a wide range of different Christian liturgical practices. The Gothic Revival was an increasingly influential movement across denominations. Stained glass became an increasingly common expression of

³⁰⁸ This ruling therefore excluded Catholics and Unitarians.

³⁰⁹ Unitarians had been excluded from the Toleration Act of 1689 as this legislation only pertained to Protestant dissidents who accepted the Trinity as a foundational element of Christianity. The Doctrine of the Trinity Act of 1813 (otherwise known as the Unitarian Relief Act) amended the Blasphemy Act of 1697. This ensured that the acceptance of the Trinity was no longer a legal requirement for the freedom of worship.

Gothic form in religious buildings from the 1830s onwards. This was not the case in the period 1800-20, during the early boom of multi-denominational church building. This period of stained-glass history was characterised by the importation of continental stained glass and the subsequent fragment windows within which these foreign materials featured prominently. Although examples of this style of glazing can be found in some private Catholic chapels, most public schemes were installed in historic churches owned by the Established Church.³¹⁰ This chapter will consider how fragmented windows constructed around foreign stained-glass panels of predominantly Catholic origin were built into the visual narrative of the Church of England. The first section of this chapter will consider the wider context of church building in this period. Why was the ecclesiastical form of this glazing style not seen widely outside historic Anglican churches? What does this use of stained glass indicate about the position of the Church of England in this period of religious and societal change?

Church Building in the Early Nineteenth Century: The Impact of Nonconformity

The English religious landscape dramatically altered during the eighteenth- and nineteenth centuries. Clive D. Field has used various primary and secondary sources in order to ascertain quantitative estimates of the religious make up of populations in five “snapshots” between 1680 and 1840.³¹¹ Using this data, it is possible to see trends in religious practice at a national scale over time, from the period just prior to the Toleration Act of 1689. Over the 160-year period covered in Field’s study, there was a rapid and

³¹⁰ Costessey Chapel was a prominent private Catholic chapel scheme which will be briefly discussed in this chapter.

³¹¹ Clive D. Field, “Counting Religion in England and Wales: The Long Eighteenth Century, c. 1680-c. 1840,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 63: 4 (2012): 693-720.

striking increase in the number of practicing nonconformists in England and Wales, with numbers rising from 243 500 to 3 144 000 between 1680 and 1840.³¹² In addition to the numerical increase, it is important to note that over this period there was an increasingly diverse range of nonconformist groups operating openly in these nations. For example, the earliest of Field's "snapshots" to feature Wesleyan Methodists (in 1760) describes a population of approximately 45000 members. By 1840 this group accounted for over a third of the non-conformist population, at approximately 1 150 000 individuals. In terms of percentage of the overall population, nonconformists increased their total share from 4.4 percent in 1680 to 19.9 percent in 1840.³¹³ In the same period, the Catholic population rose from 60 000 to 425 000, which equated to an increase in terms of the overall population from 1.1 percent in 1680 to 2.7 percent in 1840. Although the percentage of the population publicly professing to practice Catholicism doubled over the 160-year period, comparing this shift to those experienced by some nonconformist movements makes this growth in Catholic population appear modest. While both nonconformist and Catholic denominations saw growth over the period considered by Field, the Established Church saw a drop in their share of the overall population. The group which Field labels "Nominal Anglicans" saw a drop from 94.4 percent of the total population in 1680 to 76.9 percent in 1840. The description of this group as nominally Anglican is a useful reminder that subscribing to the Anglian faith did not automatically translate to regular attendance of church services.³¹⁴ The high proportion of the population claimed by the Established Church even as late as 1840 was therefore unlikely

³¹² Field gave estimates both including and excluding Catholics and Jews. The number given here is exclusive of these two religious groups (Field, "Counting Religion in England and Wales," 710).

³¹³ Field, "Counting Religion in England and Wales," 711.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 717.

to represent the proportion of the population who were regular attendees of church services.

Despite the best efforts of the Church of England, by the middle of the nineteenth-century nonconformist denominations were a well-established aspect of the religious landscape of England and Wales' religious landscape. The decrease in the overall population who identified as Anglican described by Fields continued into the latter half of the nineteenth century. The 1851 census, the first to record religious attendance across the country, demonstrated this continued shift of the population away from the Church of England. The Established Church continued to boast the largest share of any denomination, at 48.57 per cent, however this was closely followed by the number of nonconformist attendees, which stood at 47.43 percent of religious attendance. Most of the remaining 4 percent accounted for attendees of Catholic services.³¹⁵ In many areas of the country nonconformist congregations were larger than those of the Church of England, including Norwich which had 16 185 nonconformist attendances and 15 087 attendances at Church of England services.³¹⁶

Another strong indicator of the rapid growth in nonconformist denominations was the number of meeting houses and chapels registered by the Registrars-General between the Act of Toleration and the early nineteenth century. Between 1691 and 1750 fewer

³¹⁵ John Woolde, *God and Greater Britain: Religion and National Life in Britain and Ireland 1843-1945* (London: Routledge, 1994), 64.

³¹⁶ Richard Hale, "Nonconformity in Nineteenth Century Norwich," in *Norwich in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Christopher Barringer (Norwich: Gliddon Books, 1984), 176.

than fifty new registrations for permanent places of worship were made. From the of the eighteenth century there was a rapid increase in these registrations which grew exponentially in the early decades of the nineteenth century:

1751-1760:	55
1761-1770:	85
1771-1780:	158
1781-1790:	251
1791-1800:	832
1801-1810:	1470
1811-1820:	2645 ³¹⁷

Christopher Wakeling has connected the dramatic increase in this number of registrations to the advance of Methodism in particular, which is supported by Field's estimates of the Wesleyan Methodist population in the same period. Proponents of the Established Church was aware of the popularity of the Methodist faith and many saw this as a threat to their previous supremacy across the country. In his influential pamphlet of 1815 Reverend Richard Yates (1769-1834) discussed the rise of Methodism as a consequence of the lack of church room in Establishment places of worship.³¹⁸ He argued that "the increase of Sectarian Methodism is not the Cause, but a Consequence of the present state of the Church."³¹⁹ Despite this focus on Methodism, a number of other nonconformist movements also experienced major growth from the late eighteenth century, and

³¹⁷ Christopher Wakeling, *Chapels of England: Buildings of Protestant Nonconformity* (Swindon: Historic England, 2017), 67.

³¹⁸ Pew renting was a controversial topic for the Church of England throughout this period, and was discussed by numerous contemporary commentators, including Richard Yates. For more information see John Charles Bennett, "The English Anglican Practice of Pew-Renting, 1800-1960," (PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2011).

³¹⁹ Richard Yates, *The Church in Danger: A Statement of the Cause, and of the Probably Means of Averting that Danger Attempted; in a Letter to the Right Honourable Earl of Liverpool, &c. &c. &c.* (London: Printed by Nichols, Son, and Bentley, Red Lion Passage, Fleet Street, for F. C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard; J. Hatchard, Piccadilly; and E. Lloyd, Harley Street, 1815), 18.

subsequently built new chapels and meeting houses to accommodate their enlarging congregations.³²⁰

Nonconformist congregations built chapels and meeting houses at a rate which the Established Church could not match in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. This disparity was most notable in newly established urban centres, where populations were exploding in growth beyond the capacity of the Church of England's parochial system. Although different nonconformist denominations had varying approaches to religious practice, building styles remained similar across these divisions.³²¹ The widespread building of nonconformist chapels and meeting houses ensured that these movements had a considerable impact on the visual language used for places of worship in the early nineteenth century. By 1800, nonconformity had an established tradition of chapel building, which had developed over the period following the Toleration Act of 1689. Specific architectural forms and features were found in chapels across different denominations, and the rectangular plan was most often employed for these places of worship. The long-wall façade was initially a popular model in the period immediately following the Act of Toleration, however by the middle of the eighteenth century the short-wall façade was increasingly common.³²² Internally, the central processional aisle most commonly found in historic Establishment churches was foregone in favour of an unbroken block of seating. This arrangement reflected the importance of seeing and

³²⁰ Wakeling, *Chapels of England*, 67.

³²¹ *Ibid.*, 73.

³²² *Ibid.*, 52.

hearing for the attendees of nonconformist services.³²³ The significance of sight lines and the auditory experience of congregants was reinforced by the presence of galleries.

The importance of acoustics for nonconformist worship led to experimentation in building plans in the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. John Wesley (1703-1791) recommended the octagon as an ideal shape for a chapel interior. He believed that this arrangement offered a space suited to the human voice while also allowing for extensive church room in the form of galleries.³²⁴ The first major octagonal place of worship in England was the Octagon Chapel in Norwich (figure 78), which was built between 1754 and 1756 for Presbyterian worship.³²⁵ The internal character of this chapel is dominated by the galleries which range around the interior. These are supported by eight Corinthian pillars which rise from block entablatures through the double-height interior to semi-circular arches above.³²⁶ The façade of the Octagon Chapel boasts a pedimented portico supported on four unfluted Ionic columns. The use of pediments and the gable-end façade were common features of the Palladianism and early neoclassicism which were popular styles for nonconformist places of worship. Two tiers of arched sashed windows, a popular style in this period, feature prominently against the red brick of the exterior and allowed even natural lighting for worshippers at both the ground floor and gallery levels of the chapel. In addition to these windows, a further row of eight ocular windows in the roof added to the even lighting of the chapel interior. The importance of even and bright natural lighting for nonconformist places of worship is demonstrated in the

³²³ *Ibid.*, 54.

³²⁴ *Ibid.*, 61-62.

³²⁵ The chapel is now home to a Unitarian congregation.

³²⁶ Nikolas Pevsner and Bill Wilson, *Norfolk 1: Norwich and North-East* (London: Penguin Books, 1997), 254.

extensive use of large windows across multiple levels in their buildings. Stained glass, particularly the richly painted and coloured fragment windows incorporating continental stained glass, would have had a detrimental effect on this lighting of chapel interiors. This explains why this medium is rarely seen in nonconformist chapels prior to the advent of the Cambridge Camden Society and Ecclesiology.

Many nonconformist chapels of the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries were characterised by their use of Palladian and neoclassical features within their designs, particularly in the eighteenth century. Although the Classical idiom was consistently influential for nonconformist design into the nineteenth century, there was an increased interest in Gothic style from the late eighteenth century, as exemplified by the Wesleyan Methodist chapel at Oldham Street, Manchester (1779-1780, now demolished, figure 79).³²⁷ The overall design of the façade followed the Classical type often associated with Methodism: a gable-end, short-wall façade with a central plan. Despite this, the architectural details are unmistakably Gothic. The gable-end is crowned with a battlemented parapet with crocketed pinnacles and the central doorway is surmounted by ogee detailing. The windows were also designed in the Gothic idiom. The intersecting glazing bars of the main windows are a clear reference to window tracery associated with Gothic architecture and the gable-end features an oculus window. As the nineteenth century progressed, architects designing for nonconformist chapels were not excluded from the wider interest in archaeologically correct Gothic design of the period. By the 1840s, all major nonconformist movements, excluding the Religious Society of

³²⁷ Wakeling, *Chapels of England*, 64.

Friends, had commissioned places of worship that reflected the trend of early nineteenth-century Gothic.³²⁸ Echoing the new Gothic building projects of the Church of England, new stained-glass windows began to be introduced to nonconformist chapels from the 1840s. Nonconformist parishes were happy to commission craftspeople most often associated with the ecclesiological movement in the Church of England, such as Thomas Willement (1786-1871) at Highbury Congregational Chapel (1842-1843) and William Warrington (1796-1869) at Gee Cross Unitarian Chapel, Hyde (Cheshire) which was built between 1846 and 1848.³²⁹

The growing number of nonconformist places of worship was a key factor in the development of a national church building movement for the Church of England. If the Church wished to win over the rapidly growing and increasingly population, they needed to be able to build churches quickly and at a competitive rate. This need to provide better pastoral care for the growing population was recognised in the early eighteenth century during the reign of Queen Anne. The Queen Anne's Bounty Act 1703 was given royal assent on 3 April 1704. This allocated the First-Fruits and Tenths to augment the income of the poorest clergy in an attempt to provide the poor better access to the Church in less wealthy parishes.³³⁰ Following this legislation, the Commission for Building Fifty New Churches was appointed by an Act of Parliament in 1711. This board was directly responsible for building churches in London to support rapid population growth in the capital. Although it was proposed that fifty new churches should be built in the Cities of

³²⁸ *Ibid.*, 127.

³²⁹ *Ibid.*, 128.

³³⁰ David W. V. Weston, "The Origins, Development and Demise of Perpetual Curacy," *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 5, no. 23 (1998): 97.

London and Westminster using money from this fund, in fact only ten new churches were built while a further two were rebuilt. Despite the progress that was made thanks to the Queen Anne fund, by the early nineteenth century the scheme was perceived to have failed. In Yates' words the Queen Anne law "failed of its intended effect" due to some "deficiency in the Enactments" and due to "the Buildings being conducted on too expensive a scale."³³¹

The nineteenth-century response to the crisis of church room was the Church Building Act of 1818. This Act was passed into law with the explicit aim of extending the reach of the Church of England through the building of new places of worship.³³² This legislation was highly informed by the evidence Yates presented regarding the state of religious practice. His argument rested on the notion that only the Established Church, with ties to the monarchy and political system, could ensure national prosperity. He described the Church of England as the only institution which had the ability to provide "the most stable and solid Basis of a liberal and enlightened Government."³³³ Yates predicted that, without immediate state intervention, the lack of Establishment churches would lead to an "Abyss of Anarchy — of Political Devastation, and Individual Misery."³³⁴ For Yates, religion, national identity, and individual patriotism were inextricably united in the Church of England. In his pamphlet he argued that the success of the Established

³³¹ Yates, *The Church in Danger*, 30.

³³² While it was accepted that the Scottish National religion was suffering from the same issues as those seen in England, this was considered a separate issue beyond the reach of the legislators in 1818 (United Kingdom Parliament. House of Commons. 1818. *Parliamentary Debates*. Mar 6, 1116. Accessed Dec 20, 2020, http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1818/mar/16/building-of-new-churches#s1v0037p0_18180316_hoc_35, 1126).

³³³ Yates, *The Church in Danger*, 5.

³³⁴ *Ibid.*, 89.

Church was vital for national prosperity. This argument also implied that the increase in nonconformity, which drew people away from the Church of England, could be actively harmful to the nation.

While Yates' suggestions for the rebuilding of the Church of England were not followed to the letter, his arguments for the significance of the institution to the stability of the Government was central to the debates surrounding the Church Building Act of 1818. In a debate on 16 March 1818, Speaker Charles Manners-Sutton (1780-1845) read an extract from a Speech of the Lord Commissioners, who called for a resolution in the deficiency of church-seating on behalf of the Prince Regent:

His Royal Highness most earnestly recommends this important subject to your early consideration; deeply impressed, as he has no doubt you are, with a just sense of the many blessings which this country, by the favour of Divine Providence, has enjoyed, and with the conviction that the religious and moral habits of the people are the most sure and firm foundations of national prosperity."³³⁵

The language used here is highly reminiscent of Yates' description of the Church as "the most stable and solid Basis" of Government.³³⁶ The purpose of the Act was to increase Church of England congregations in order to quell dissent.³³⁷ Citing Yates in the March 1818 debate on church building, the Chancellor of the Exchequer Nicholas Vansittart (1766-1851), was recorded as supporting Yates' call for more churches and greater access to pastoral care and rites. He argued that "the reform for which he [Yates] pleaded, was

³³⁵United Kingdom Parliament, 1117.

³³⁶ Yates, *The Church in Danger*, 5.

³³⁷ Michael Harry Port, *600 New Churches: The Church Building Commission 1818-1856* (Reading: Spire Books, 2006), 39.

not less important to the security of property and of the civil order of society, than to the higher considerations of religion and morality.”³³⁸

The Church Building Act established the Church Building Commission with an initial grant of one million pounds Sterling for the building of new churches. A further grant of £500 000 was added to this fund in 1825. The Committee took bids from parishes with the most urgent need for more church-room. Yates presented a list of the places experiencing the highest deficiency in this area in *The Church in Danger*. According to his estimations, approximately 946 000 people were denied seats in an Establishment church in the ninety-three parishes surrounding the City of London alone.³³⁹ To meet the extreme need of parishes across the country, and to provide alternatives to nonconformist chapels in urban areas, economy became a constant driving factor of the Church Commissioners. This had a significant impact on the design of churches, including the use of stained glass.

To achieve the greatest number of well-constructed churches within the budget dictated by Government, the Commission demanded that architects followed strict directives in terms of material, structure and budget. The Commission did not dictate specific styles in which new churches were to be designed, and both the Classical and Gothic churches were built throughout the lifetime of the organisation. Interior plans were often similar across different styles of building due to the needs of liturgical

³³⁸ United Kingdom Parliament, 1121.

³³⁹ Yates, *The Church in Danger*, 49-50.

practices and to accommodate large numbers of parishioners into churches.³⁴⁰ In his 2017 article, Christopher Webster stressed the significance of acoustics to the liturgical practices of the Church of England in this period, and how this translated to the arrangement and design of the Commissioners' building projects. The size and arrangement of the interior space was a key concern for architects. It was fundamentally important that all those congregated in a church would be able to hear the sermons and prayers to actively participate in worship.³⁴¹ Yates advocated for a new form of church interior which was to be suited to the human voice: "Protestant worshippers are to be instructed by the ear, and not by the eye. Those spacious churches that are well adapted to the ritual and processions of the Roman Catholic worship are not at all calculated to convey the instructions of the liturgy of the Church of England."³⁴²

This acoustic focus highlights the overlap which existed between nonconformist liturgical needs and some Church of England practices in this period. Despite these similarities the Church Commissioners, like Yates, believed it was important to distinguish their churches from the chapels and meeting houses of nonconformists. It was thought that decorative elements and architectural form could be used to do this, even though nonconformist places of worship did not conform to a single building style from which the Church of England could deviate. The inclusion of a bell tower, or a bell-turret if monetary funds were more stringently controlled, was a particularly common visual cue used by architects to achieve this distinction. These towers were used even in the case of

³⁴⁰ Port, *600 New Churches*, 181.

³⁴¹ Christopher Webster, "Late Georgian Churches: "Absolutely Wretched" or the Triumph of Rational Pragmatism?" *Architectural History* 60 (2017): 153.

³⁴² Yates, *The Church in Danger*, 207-208.

Classically inspired constructions where such a feature was incongruous to the overall building style, as at architect Francis Bedford's Church of St John, Waterloo Road (London, 1823-1824, figure 80).³⁴³ For the Church Commission stylistic idioms could be exploited and altered in order to fit the needs of modern religion, in this case to assert the position of the Established Church within the community.

This flexible approach to style was also a necessary element of the economic approach of the Church Commission. Architects often struggled to reduce the costs of their projects to the satisfaction of the Commissioners, particularly in the later decades, where financial constraints grew increasingly restrictive. While some parishes were able to raise funds from within congregations, for others the reduced budgets made the planning of new churches an increasingly challenging task. The increased financial struggles of the Commission are illustrated when one looks at how the grants issued to individual church projects altered over the decades. In November 1818 the Commissioners' set the maximum limit for a grant at £20 000 for London churches, with it being understood that provincial projects could expect a maximum grant of £16 000.³⁴⁴ By the late 1820s these earlier grants had been dramatically reduced: the average grant per sitting dropped from £8 10s in 1824-25 to £3 4s in 1834-35.³⁴⁵

³⁴³ Port, *600 New Churches*, 97.

³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 67.

³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 248.

The reduction of decorative elements became increasingly necessary to ensure that the architects had enough capital to ensure the structural integrity of the building. This drive for economy would explain why stained glass was not installed by the Church Commission. In many cases, grants only partially covered the building costs and additional funds had to be raised by subscription. Stained-glass windows would have been considered an extravagance for a Commission which was required to adhere to such stringent budgets. Even in parishes which were able to raise large amounts of money to supplement their Commission grant, stained glass was not installed at the time of construction. The Church of St Luke, Chelsea (London) was built to plans by architect James Savage (1779-1852) between 1820 and 1824 (figure 81). This was the first of the large-scale projects of the Church Commissioners' to attempt to reproduce Gothic construction methods.³⁴⁶ The project received a Church Commission grant of £8333, which was far exceeded by the contract price of £28 109, which in itself was thought to have been surpassed by the total cost of the build.³⁴⁷ The parish therefore paid for the majority of this project and potentially had a greater control over the finished product than churches more substantially funded by the Commissioners. The building design combined Gothic influences from both England and France to create a unique interpretation of the idiom. The slender buttresses, high clerestory and the sanctuary bay's fan-vaulting have been compared to those of Bath Abbey, while the internal dimensions have been compared to those of Notre Dame, Alençon in France.³⁴⁸ The church boasts a number of stained-glass windows, however the earliest of these can be

³⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 186.

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 327.

³⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 186.

dated to the 1880s.³⁴⁹ The original windows of the church were installed following an advertisement posted in 1824 which asked for tenders for the ironwork enclosure and glazing of the church. The notice specified that glaziers were wanted for “Fitting in the Windows of the said Church with Ground-glass.”³⁵⁰ Ground-glass would have allowed natural light to enter the interior, while the opacity of the material would have blocked the view out across the increasingly metropolitan landscape of Chelsea, which being actively built up in this period. The rapid urbanisation of this area is particularly clear when one compares a map of the area from 1822, when the church was still in construction, to a map drawn from surveys of 1865 (figures 82&83). The use of ground-glass would have been a much more affordable option for a church of this size than coloured or stained glass. As most churches built by the Church Commissioners were constructed with far smaller budgets than that of St Luke’s, it seems unlikely that stained glass was considered a legitimate option for the glazing of churches built by the Commission in this period.

Despite the criticisms levelled at the Commissioners from the nineteenth century onwards, their building campaign had an impact on the religious landscape of the country.³⁵¹ Including grants, subscriptions and parish rates, a total of over three million

³⁴⁹ Three windows under the organ screen were installed by Ward and Hughes in c. 1880 (Historic England, “Church of St Luke,” Historic England, 2021, accessed Sept 18, 2021, <https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1390756>).

³⁵⁰ “TO SMITHS and GLAZIERS,” editorial, *Morning Advertiser*, May 3, 1824, 1.

³⁵¹ Pugin was particularly disparaging of the economical approach of the Church Commissioners, an opinion which he voiced forcibly in his 1836 polemical work, *Contrasts*: “I hesitate not to say, that a more meagre, miserable display of architectural skill never was made, nor more improprieties and absurdities committed, than in the mass of paltry churches erected under the auspices of the commissioners, and which are to be found scattered over every modern portion of the metropolis and its neighbourhood — a disgrace to the age, both on the score of their composition, and the miserable sums that have been allotted for their construction” (Pugin, *Contrasts*, 27-28).

pounds had provided 612 churches before the dissolution of the Commission in 1856.³⁵²

Even with the impressive number of churches built by the Church Commissioners, the Church of England was not able to revert the societal changes which lay beneath the shifting religious landscape of England in the nineteenth century. Ultimately, nonconformist movements were increasingly popular, and the Established Church was unable to remain the dominant national religion in terms of public adherence.

The influence of the Commission was most felt in rapidly developing urban areas which had previously been significantly underserved by the Church of England. While in the March 1818 debate, Nicholas Vansittart listed cities where the church-room continued to be adequate for the population. He argued that in “Norwich, Lincoln, and other cities which existed under the Roman empire, the parishes are small and the churches very numerous, and originally of small dimensions, as appears from the few original structures which are still remaining.”³⁵³ Yates recorded that parish population sizes across East Anglia were considerably lower than the national average of 640 people per parish.³⁵⁴ Of the eighteen counties listed, Norfolk and Suffolk were listed as having the second and fourth lowest average populations per parish respectively, which was equivalent to 405 people per parish in Norfolk and 456 in Suffolk. This average for Norfolk included both Norwich and the newer and rapidly expanding town of Yarmouth,³⁵⁵ the latter of which constituted a single parish despite boasting a population of 17 977

³⁵² Port, *600 New Churches*, 276.

³⁵³ United Kingdom Parliament, 1120.

³⁵⁴ Yates, *The Church in Danger*, 43-44.

³⁵⁵ Now Great Yarmouth.

people.³⁵⁶ Therefore, it is highly likely that the majority of rural parishes had populations below the already relatively low average of 405. Two churches were built in Norfolk using funding from the half million grant given to the Church Commissioners' by the Government in 1825. The first was in the aforementioned town of Yarmouth where the Church of St Peter was built to plans by Gothic Revival architect Joseph John Scoles (1798-1863) between 1831 and 1833.³⁵⁷ This large-scale Gothic church boasted accommodation for 704 in pews and 1096 free seats.³⁵⁸ The second church of St John the Evangelist, King's Lynn was also built in the Gothic idiom, but at the later date of 1845 to 1846.³⁵⁹

Proponents of the Established Church considered the institution to be the legitimate seat of national identity, patriotism, and governance. The building of new churches was not considered a necessary use of funds in rural areas like East Anglia and therefore the message of the Church Commission would have been felt to a lesser extent by these populations than those in recently established urban centres. Norfolk and Suffolk retained a high proportion of their medieval churches and in these counties the building of new places of worship was more commonly associated with nonconformist movements. The restoration of historic Anglican churches was largely undertaken through the donations of fittings, fixtures, extensions and renovations at the expense of private donors, rather than through partial governmental grants. Private donation ensured that economy was not the driving force of these projects. This fundamental

³⁵⁶ Yates, *The Church in Danger*, 39-40.

³⁵⁷ Port, *600 New Churches*, 339.

³⁵⁸ The building was formally dedicated to the Greek Orthodox Church in April 1983 and is now the Church of St Spyridon (St Spyridon, "About the Church," St Spyridon, 2020, accessed May 26, 2020, <https://www.saintspyridonschurch.org/pages/about-the-church.html>).

³⁵⁹ Port, *600 New Churches*, 339.

difference explains why continental glass was so popular in historic churches in places like Norfolk, but not Commissioners' churches. Without the same financial restrictions, private donors were free to enrich historic places of worship, which included the use of composite windows created around imported continental fragments and panels. The next section of this chapter will explore the installation of these windows in this period of uncertainty for the Church of England on the national religious stage.

Beyond the Church Commissioners: East Anglian Patronage

East Anglia provides a fascinating case study of early nineteenth century church building and patronage beyond the Church Commission. Although most areas of Norfolk and Suffolk had enough church room in historic churches of the Established Church, these counties also saw a growth in nonconformity from the eighteenth century. This effectively disproves Yates' theory that church room was the most significant factor determining the rise of Methodism in this period. In Norwich the oldest surviving nonconformist place of worship is the Congregationalist Old Meeting House which was built in 1693, just five years after the passing of the Act of Toleration. Numerous dissenting churches and meeting houses were built in the city in the following decades, including the Friends Meeting House (Gildencroft) in 1699 (destroyed by fire in 1942 and rebuilt following the old plan in 1958), St Mary's Baptist Chapel (St Mary's Plain) in 1744 (destroyed by fires in 1939 and 1942) and the Octagon Chapel (Colegate) in 1754-56.

Although Norwich, like much of Norfolk and Suffolk, retained many of its pre-Reformation churches, a significant number of these had suffered from iconoclasm and

neglect, which included the loss of many stained-glass schemes. East Anglia was particularly a target for iconoclasts like William Dowsing (1596-1668) in the seventeenth century. Dowsing was appointed provost marshal of the eastern association in August 1643.³⁶⁰ His commission was created according to orders passed by the House of Commons in 1641 and 1643. The earlier order included moving communion tables and removing their candles, candlesticks and basins, removing communion rails, levelling chancels, stripping away imagery relating to the Trinity, the Virgin Mary and crucifixes.³⁶¹ Two further ordinances in 1643 and 1644 added to and strengthened these initial orders. All altars, images and pictures of saints, superstitious inscriptions, roodlofts, fonts and organs were prohibited in this period.³⁶² With his deputies Dowsing visited and “cleansed” most of the churches in Cambridgeshire and Suffolk as well as churches in north Essex and south Norfolk. As Morrill wrote, “Dowsing had no parallel elsewhere in the country.”³⁶³

Dowsing’s role in East Anglia was widely recognized in the eighteenth century. His journal, which documented most of the image destruction he carried out, was purchased by a London bookseller in 1704. From this time the document was copied and distributed in increments by various antiquarians.³⁶⁴ Using this resource it was possible to attribute

³⁶⁰ Trevor Cooper, ed. *The Journal of William Dowsing: Iconoclasm in East Anglia during the English Civil War* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press in association with The Ecclesiological Society, 2001); John Morrill, “Dowsing, William (bap. 1596, d. 1668), Iconoclast,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Sept 23, 2004, accessed Aug 19, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/7990>.

³⁶¹ Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c. 1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 276.

³⁶² *Ibid.*, 277.

³⁶³ Morrill, “Dowsing, William.”

³⁶⁴ Thomas Cocke, “Forward,” *The Journal of William Dowsing: Iconoclasm in East Anglia during the English Civil War*, Trevor Cooper, ed. (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press in association with The Ecclesiological Society, 2001), xvii.

specific damage to Dowsing and his deputies, as William White did in relation to

Lowestoft, St Margaret over two centuries after the events:

The font is very ancient, and round it are two rows of saints, which were much injured in 1644 by Dowsing, the parliamentary church spoliator, who tore up all the brasses from the grave stones [sic], except for a few which escaped his notice."³⁶⁵

The Suffolk portion of Dowsing's account was first printed in full by publisher Robert Loder (d. 1811) of Woodbridge (Suffolk) in 1786, which allowed for a wider non-specialist audience to access this information in full.³⁶⁶ This publication was met with equal measures of interest in the antiquarian quality of the volume and dismay at the reported destruction, as is clear from this contemporaneous review: "It gives us pleasure to announce this little publication of an ingenious provincial printer. However deeply we lament the detestable fanaticism which occasioned the original Journal, it is a melancholy satisfaction to peruse these records of devastation."³⁶⁷

³⁶⁵ William White, *History, Gazetteer, and Directory of Suffolk; comprising, under a Lucid Arrangement of Subjects, a General Survey of the County, and Separate Histories, & Statistical & Topographical Descriptions of all the Hundreds, Liberties, Unions, Boroughs, Towns, Ports, Parishes, Townships, Villages, and Hamlets; shewing their Extent and Population; their Agriculture, Manufacture, Markets, Fairs, Trade and Commerce; their Charities and Public Institutions; their Churches and Chapels; the Annual Value, and Patrons and Incumbents of the Benefices; the Lords of the Manors and Owners of the Soil and Tithes; the Unions and County Court Districts; the Addresses of the Inhabitants; the Railway Trains, Steam Packets, Coaches and Carriers; the Seats of Nobility and Gentry, Magistrates and Public Officers; and a Variety of other Agricultural, Statistical, and Biographical Information. In One Volume, with a Map of the County, 2nd ed* (Printed for the Author, Robert Leader, Independent Office, Sheffield; And Sold by W. White, Collegiate Crescent, Sheffield; by his Agents, and Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., London, 1845), 561.

³⁶⁶ William Dowsing, *The Journal of William Dowsing, of Stratford, Parliamentary Visitor, Appointed under a Warrant from the Earl of Manchester, for Demolishing the Superstitious Pictures and Ornaments of Churches, &c. within the County of Suffolk, in the Years 1643,-1644* (Woodbridge: Printed by and for R. Loder. Sold by J. Nichols, London, 1786). In an 1839 *Dictionary of Printers and Printing* Loder is recognised as the publisher of a number of antiquarian works: "*Ordinances, &c. for Seckford's Almshouses in Woodbridge, 4to. Woodbridge Terrier, exhibiting an Account of all the Charters, with notes. Orders of the Free School in Woodbridge. Dowsing's Journal for demolishing Church Ornaments in Suffolk. History of Framlingham, 1798*" (C. H. Timperley, *A Dictionary of Printers and Printing, with the Progress of Literature, Ancient and Modern; Bibliographical Illustrations, etc. etc.* (London: H. Johnson, 49, Paternoster-Row; Fraser & Co. Edinburgh; Symington & Co. Glasgow; Curry & Co. Dublin and Bancks & Co. Manchester, 1839), 843).

³⁶⁷ Gentleman's Magazine. "Dowsing's Journal." *The British Register, or A Choice of the most Interesting Articles selected from all the English Periodical Works, relative to the Literature, Arts, Sciences, History, Agriculture, Commerce, Chymistry, Physic, Medecine, Law, Manners and Customs of Great Britain* 3 (1787): 186-190.

Dowsing removed or defaced many stained-glass schemes in churches across East Anglia, as at the Church of St Gregory, Sudbury (Suffolk), of which Dowsing wrote “We brake about 10 mighty great Angels in Glass.”³⁶⁸ This type of destruction, accompanied by centuries of neglect and limited access to competent stained-glass craftspeople, ensured that the medieval remains of stained glass in the region were greatly diminished.³⁶⁹ The poor state of Norfolk’s churches was recognised by artist and antiquarian John Sell Cotman:

The hand of rapine or of fanaticism has robbed her of by far the greater part of what she once possessed: every effigy in her Cathedral church at Norwich, every morsel of brass at Yarmouth, is gone; nor is there a village church but bears the mark of the despoiler’s violence. A portion of the mischief is to be traced as high as the Reformation; still more is ascribable to the mad fury of the Commonwealth; and what remained from these has in our days gradually been disappearing: here, from the ignorant stupidity of parish officers; there, from the thievishness of workmen; but in too many instances, I am sorry to say, from the inconceivable folly and villainy of antiquaries themselves; who have been the cause of an immense number of sepulchral brasses, and of a still greater quantity of painted glass, being stolen from the churches which they illustrated and adorned.³⁷⁰

As noted by Cotman, stained glass was particularly vulnerable to both iconoclasm and neglect, as was reflected in the loss and poor repair of windows across the region in this period. The disrepair of churches was increasingly recognised as an issue to be rectified in the early decades of the nineteenth century. In areas like Norfolk, where the population density ensured that the Church Commissioners were rarely involved in the building of new churches, traditional patronage by wealthy local families was the solution to the

³⁶⁸ Dowsing, *The Journal of William Dowsing*, 1.

³⁶⁹ Substantial amounts of medieval stained glass do survive in some churches in East Anglia, including Holy Trinity Church, Long Melford and the Church of St Peter Mancroft, Norwich.

³⁷⁰ John S. Cotman, *Engravings of Sepulchral Brasses in Norfolk and Suffolk* (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1939), 10.

issue of dilapidated churches. These restoration efforts, like the building of new churches in urban areas, can be seen as part of a larger campaign to strengthen the Church of England in reaction to nonconformist growth.

The increased interest in church restoration in the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was aided by the rise of antiquarianism, as discussed in chapter one. Stained glass was discussed as a vital component of pre-Reformation worship by writers in this period and earlier. One particularly famous, and often quoted, examples of this can be found in John Milton's (1608-1674) poem *Il Penseroso* (1645/46):

But let my due feet never fail
To walk the studious cloister's pale,
And love the high embowed roof,
With antique pillars massy proof,
And storied windows richly dight,
Casting a dim religious light.
There let the pealing organ blow,
To the full-voic'd quire below,
In service high, and anthems clear,
As may with sweetness, through mine ear,
Dissolve me into ecstasies,
And bring all Heav'n before mine eyes.³⁷¹

Milton expressed the overwhelming nature of a religious experience through a description of key visual and auditory stimuli. In this section of the poem Milton explored these sensual cues to give an impression of the soaring heights of the church interior. The sights and sounds of religious experience rain down on the narrator and cause his dissolution into "ecstasies." Much as the "high embowed roof" lead to "antique pillars," so the "storied windows richly dight" cast "a dim religious light." The description of

³⁷¹ John Milton, "Il Penseroso," 69, lines 155-166.

church music also follow the same trajectory and Milton exploited the homonymous nature of the “quire” to suggest that the very building is “full voic’d” and echoed the sounds of the high mounted organ pipes. The subject of the poem, standing the path of the sights and sounds of religion, cannot help but be overtaken by Heavenly inspiration. The description of stained glass given by Milton focusses on the light produced by this material. It is this effect which most contributed to the interior within which the speaker was able to experience religious “ecstasies,” not the subject matter depicted in the windows. This focus on interior lighting over narrative depiction in relation to stained glass continued to evolve in the eighteenth century. Walpole listed the architectural features of the Gothic cathedral which created an atmosphere of inspiration for the worshipper: “edifices whose pomp, mechanism, vaults, tombs, painted windows, gloom and perspectives infused such sensations of romantic devotion.”³⁷²

From the second half of the eighteenth century an increasing number of books on the historic development of Gothic church architecture were published. Several of these considered the historic importance of stained glass in line with concepts of gloom, light, and devotion. Writings of this period remained influential into the nineteenth century, as illustrated by the publication of *Essays on Gothic Architecture* (1800). This relatively affordable octavo volume was in its third edition by 1808 and remained a popular and influential source of architectural history into the nineteenth century.³⁷³ Included in this collection was an essay by antiquary and Church of England clergyman James Bentham

³⁷² Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, 70.

³⁷³ Simon Bradley, “The Englishness of Gothic: Theories and Interpretations from William Gilpin to J. H. Parker,” *Architectural History* 45 (2002): 328, accessed Mar 7, 2020, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1568787>.

(1709-1794), who described the use of stained-glass windows within ecclesiastical architectural schemes:

This kind of ornament, as it diminished the light, induced the necessity of making an alteration in the windows, either by increasing the number or enlarging their proportions; for though a gloominess rather than over-much light seems more proper for such sacred edifices, and “better calculated for recollecting the thoughts, and fixing pious affections,” [...] yet without that alteration, our churches had been too dark and gloomy; as some of them now, being divested of that ornament, for the same reason appear over-light.³⁷⁴

Bentham, like Milton, referred to the benefits of stained glass as it provided appropriate gloom for the sacred atmosphere of a church. Indeed, he goes further in his criticism of some modern churches which have been “divested of that ornament” and therefore seem “over-light.” With this comment, Bentham moves beyond pure architectural history and offers the pre-restoration Church as a model for those building and restoring churches in the modern period.

Looking more closely at Bentham’s sources allows for a greater understanding of the theoretical basis for these arguments for the use of stained glass in ecclesiastical spaces in this period. Bentham quotes William Hole (1710-1791), who was Archdeacon of Barnstaple between 1745 and 1791. Hole reasoned that the “dark and gloomy” interior of a church was appropriate according to the principles of the sublime, which he himself supported, using an extract from Edmund Burke’s (1729-1797) *A Philosophical Enquiry*

³⁷⁴ James Bentham, “Historical Remarks on the Saxon Churches,” in *Essays on Gothic Architecture, by the Rev. T. Warton, Rev. J. Bentham, Captain Grose, and the Rev. J. Milner. (With a Letter to the Publisher.) Illustrated with Ten Plates of Ornaments, &c. Selected from Ancient Buildings; Calculated to Exhibit the Various Styles of Different Periods.* (London: Printed by S. Gosnell, Little Queen Street, Holborn, for J. Taylor, at the Architectural Library, Holborn, 1800), 82. Accessed Mar 7, 2020, <http://find.gale.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=uniyork&tabID=T001&docId=CW107943602&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>.

into the *Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1757).³⁷⁵ In this treatise Burke specifically addresses the importance of light in buildings:

I think then, that all edifices calculated to produce an idea of the sublime, ought rather to be dark and gloomy, and this for two reasons; the first is, that darkness itself on other occasions is known by experience to have a greater effect on the passions than light. The second is, that to make an object very striking, we should make it as different as possible from the objects with which we have been immediately conversant; when therefore you enter a building, you cannot pass into a greater light than you had in the open air; to go into one some few degrees less, can make only a trifling change; but to make the transition thoroughly striking, you ought to pass from the greatest light, to as much darkness as is consistent with the uses of architecture.³⁷⁶

The language used here by Burke is that of contrasts, in which extremes of light and dark created the change in environment needed for an interior of the sublime. Burke's writings were highly influential in the second half of the eighteenth century. This is particularly clear when one examines the language used by later writers like Bentham, Hole, and Walpole, whose discussions of gloom in relation to the passions are directly linked to Burke's writing. Where these writers differ from Burke is in the way they ascribe this idea of the interior directly to ecclesiastical buildings. The use of the sublime as an attribute of places of worship has been ascribed to Catholic bishop John Milner (1752-1826), whose also wrote the introductory essay for *Essays on Gothic Architecture*.³⁷⁷ In his critical

³⁷⁵ William Hole, *The Ornaments of Churches Considered, with a Particular View to the Late Decoration of the Parish Church of St. Margaret Westminster. To which is Subjoined, an Appendix, Containing, the History of the said Church; a Account of the Altar-Piece, and Stained Glass Window Erected over it; a State of the Prosecution it has Occasioned; and Other Papers* (Oxford: Printed by W. Jackson: and sold by R. and J. Dodsley, in Pall-Mall; J. Walter, Charing-Cross; J. Fox, in Westminster-Hall, London; and by the booksellers in Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, 1761), 94-95. Accessed Mar 7, 2020, <http://find.gale.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=uniyork&tabID=T001&docId=CW107137263&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>.

³⁷⁶ Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful*, ed. Adam Phillips (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 63.

³⁷⁷ John Milner, "Observations on the Means necessary for further Illustrating the Ecclesiastical Architecture of the Middle Ages, in a Letter from the Rev. John Milner, M.A.F.S.A. to Mr. Taylor," in *Essays on Gothic Architecture, by the Rev. T. Warton, Rev. J. Bentham, Captain Grose, and the Rev. J. Milner. (With a Letter to the Publisher.) Illustrated with Ten Plates of Ornaments, &c. Selected from Ancient Buildings; Calculated to Exhibit the Various Styles of Different Periods.* (London: Printed by S. Gosnell, Little Queen Street, Holborn, for J. Taylor, at the Architectural Library, Holborn, 1800), xi-xxiii. Accessed Mar 7, 2020,

publication on the sublime, Samuel Monk argued that Milner's tenets of medieval cathedral architecture were based on Burke's sublime.³⁷⁸ Milner touches upon the importance of gloom in the church, which he thought was at least in part due to "that glowing effect produced by appropriate painting and carving in the windows."³⁷⁹ Milner did not go as far as Bentham to question the lack of stained glass in contemporary churches, however both theorists directly co-opted Burke's vision of the sublime to support their remarkable similar concepts of effective church architecture.

Burke's discussion of the sublime as a general concept did not stop Milner, Bentham, and their contemporaries from enthusiastically building this into their theories of religious architecture. Burke's language would have seemed appealing, particularly in his discussion of passion caused by the sublime. Burke's discussion of the sublime centred on the passion felt by the human mind:

In this case the mind is so entirely filled with its object, that it cannot entertain any other, nor by consequence reason on the object which employs it. Hence arises the great power of the sublime, that far from being produced by them, it anticipates our reasonings, and hurries us on by an irresistible force. Astonishment [...] is the effect of the sublime in its highest degree; the inferior effects are admiration, reverence and respect.³⁸⁰

For Burke the passion caused by the sublime, which he also described as "[a]stonishment" when it is "in its highest degree," was triggered before reason could measure a response to the stimuli. As we have seen, it was Walpole who most clearly takes this concept of

<http://find.gale.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=uniyork&tabID=T001&docId=CW107943602&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>.

³⁷⁸ Samuel Monk, *The Sublime: A Study of Critical Theories in XVIII-Century England* (New York: Modern Language Association of America), 141.

³⁷⁹ Milner, "Observations on the Means necessary for further Illustrating the Ecclesiastical Architecture of the Middle Ages," xix.

³⁸⁰ Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry*, 41-42.

passion versus rational mind and associates it specifically with the Gothic architectural style in *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, where he writes that one “must have taste to be sensible of the beauties of Grecian architecture; one only want passions to feel Gothic.”³⁸¹ For Walpole and his contemporary architectural commentators, the sublime and the Gothic were inextricably linked in medieval church architecture. Stained glass became the ideal material for producing a gloomy interior which contrasted drastically with the brightness of the outside world. According to architectural writers, windows entirely filled with stained glass were necessary to cast less intense light into church interiors. In this way, stained glass was employed to create the stark contrast between the interior of the church and the bright outside world. Stained-glass windows therefore became a fundamental tool for the translation of Burke’s sublime from text to architectural practice.

In the early nineteenth century, continental stained-glass fragments allowed this theoretical analysis of pre-Reformation stained glass to be implemented in historic churches. Even though these windows were created from materials foreign to these churches, their installation was considered an act of restoration in this period. Continental fragments, although mostly dating to the renaissance period and taken from historic Catholic contexts, were used within Anglican schemes to recreate the sublime atmosphere of the pre-Reformation Church. Physically restoring these places of worship, which had seen centuries of religious practice and change, can be read as an attempt to

³⁸¹ Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, 70.

reinforce the concept that the Established Church as the only legitimate home of National Religion.

Although the purpose of stained glass in the early nineteenth century was to create an appropriately darkened and sublime interior, stylistic coherence can be found across and within schemes of this period. Geometry, symmetry, and pattern were guiding principles for the creation of these windows as continental fragments were combined with modern and historic English glass in complex arrangements. The scheme at Herringfleet, which remains largely unchanged since its inception, allows a unique opportunity to analyse the stylistic approach used for ecclesiastical fragment windows in the early nineteenth century (figure 84). David E. Davy visited Herringfleet in 1832 and briefly described the stained glass of the church:

We soon arrived at Herringfleet Church, which detained us some time, Mr Leathes having lately filled the windows of the Chancel with painted glass which he obtained from abroad, chiefly from Cologne; among which are many coats of arms, some of them English, but chiefly foreign.³⁸²

The Mr Leathes identified here as the donor is John Francis Leathes (d. 1848) who was lord of the manor at Herringfleet Hall from 1817 (figure 85).³⁸³ Birkin Haward suggests that the stained-glass scheme was likely installed by Yarrington in c. 1825-1832, which accords with Davy's account in terms of the dating.³⁸⁴ Panels painted in the style of Robert Allen of Lowestoft are present across three of the four windows in this glazing

³⁸² David Elisha Davy, *A Journal of Excursions through the County of Suffolk 1823-1844*, ed. Michael Stone (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1982), 198.

³⁸³ *Ibid.*, 198.

³⁸⁴ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, 215.

scheme, which is made up of the East window, windows nII, sII and sIII.³⁸⁵ As will become clear in chapter five, the connection to Allen strengthens the argument that Yarrington was likely to have been the glazier responsible for this series of windows.³⁸⁶ In addition to this, the presence of the Gawdy family arms in panel A4 of the East window also supports this identification as it suggests a possible connection to window nII at the Church of St Mary, Redenhall (Norfolk, figure 86). Antiquarian and topographer John Chambers recorded that Yarrington installed a window at “Redenhall church, armorial bearings of the Gaudy family, and of the Rev. John Holmes, of Gaudy Hall” in 1825.³⁸⁷ Window nII is dominated by Gawdy family armorials, some of which were removed from an earlier glazing scheme at Gawdy Hall. It seems likely that Yarrington was either able to purchase some of this glass for re-use in other schemes or that he used this historic glass as a model for the creation of new armorials for later schemes. This would account for the presence of the Gawdy armorial at Herringfleet. White’s 1855 Suffolk directory also makes a reference to the stained glass at Herringfleet:

The windows are all new, the materials for the Gothic stone-work [sic] of which were supplied from the ruined arches of the priory. The altar window is a fine piece of architecture, and exhibits a rich display of stained glass, mostly ancient fragments, rescued from a monastery in France,³⁸⁸ at the commencement of the Revolution. There are also some fine specimens of ancient and modern stained glass in several of the other windows.³⁸⁹

This identification of the stonework as re-used ancient material, whether true or not, is unusual in that it adds a further layer of fragmentation to the scheme. The stone, like the

³⁸⁵ Further information regarding the work of Robert Allen, and his pivotal role in the nineteenth-century resurgence in East Anglian glass painting, will be presented in chapter five. Also see appendix I for biographical details.

³⁸⁶ Stained glass painted by Robert Allen can be found in Yarrington schemes across East Anglia. The relationship between these two craftspeople is explored in chapter five.

³⁸⁷ Chambers, *A General History of the County of Norfolk*, vol. 3, 1039.

³⁸⁸ This notion of the English as rescuers of historic art from the Revolutionary French was a common view in this period. This has been explored in relation to the work of Seth William Stevenson in chapter one.

³⁸⁹ White, *History, Gazetteer, and Directory of Suffolk*, 543.

glass, is a historic survival re-purposed in the present architecture. This image of “the ruined arches of the priory” is not only drenched in the rhetoric of the Gothic novel, but also plants the idea of the current church building as a continuation of the much older site.³⁹⁰

The chancel at Herringfleet has four window openings which make up the Yarrington scheme (figures 15, 87-89). Window nII contains historic fragments used to represent a disjointed figure (figure 87). The diminutive scale of this window makes it difficult to be certain of the period of installation, however a small piece of purple glass above the head of the figure is comparable to some of the glass in windows sII and sIII (figures 88&89). This suggests that this window was arranged or altered at the same time as the other chancel windows. The East window is particularly crowded with figurative and decorative glass fragments, including imported continental glass (figure 15). In addition to this, both historic and nineteenth-century English glass has also been used in this window. Despite the wide variety of different types and styles of stained glass used, the design remains highly symmetrical. The line of symmetry runs vertically through the centre light of this window and the strips of vertical diamond border at the outer edges of lights a and c are the most dominant examples of close symmetry across the scheme. The varied nature of this collection means that there are few cases where this level of exact symmetry is possible. In order to create the illusion of symmetry the glazier has used fragments of similar shape. In some cases, it seems that panels were cut in half in order to

³⁹⁰ Ibid., 543.

fulfil this design feature, or additional fragments were added to mimic the corresponding shaped panel on the other side of the window.

This symmetrical style continued in windows sII and sIII, although the approach to the display of stained glass was different here than in the East window. The unpainted surround glass, which has been arranged to form a geometric pattern, is a dominant aspect of the design. It seems likely that the spacing between the panels can be attributed to the fact that the donor wished for the imported glass to be concentrated in the East window as this dominates one's view of the chancel from the nave. The vivid background glass therefore ensures that the light entering the chancel is dim, in accordance with Burke's principles of the sublime. These windows also feature more complete nineteenth-century panels than in the East window, particularly in window sIII, which is again likely due to the prioritisation of the East window within the overall design. The style of many of these panels suggests that these were painted by Allen, including six square decorative pieces in sII and seven similar decorative panels in sIII. The two figurative panels in sIII, including St Luke, are also likely to have been painted by Allen.³⁹¹ The origin of the medieval stained-glass figures of St Catherine and another female saint is unknown. In his 1855 gazetteer White writes that the stonework of the windows was new at the time the windows were inserted and it is possible that this glass originates from this earlier scheme.³⁹²

³⁹¹ For more information on the St Luke panel and Allen's use of pictorial sources, see chapter five.

³⁹² White, *History, Gazetteer, and Directory of Suffolk*, 543.

The vertical line of symmetry within Herringfleet windows was a common feature across ecclesiastical fragments windows of this period. Herringfleet is an extreme example of a fragmentary window in regard to the number of unique historic glass pieces of different shapes and sizes. This use of symmetry is more apparent in schemes such as the East window at Nowton (figures 8&9) due to the use of roundels as the defining form. The glass used to frame these roundels was all nineteenth century in date, which ensured that the workshop was able to use identical designs across the window. The level of exact symmetry was therefore contingent on the historic material which was to be incorporated into the scheme, but the essential aim for symmetry remains the same regardless.³⁹³ Windows sV and sVI at All Saint's Church, Earsham (Norfolk) were installed c. 1802-1810 and both show the levels of exacting symmetry which was attainable when small amounts of continental glass were set within large amounts of decorative nineteenth-century surround glass (figures 2&5). In schemes where the continental collection was made up of roundels, the symmetrical arrangement of the glass was particularly effective, as was the case in the East window at Nowton. The roundel continued to be used as a form to arrange stained glass symmetrically across a window even where continental stained-glass panels were not employed, as in window nXIX at St Mary Redcliffe Church, Bristol (figure 90). This window was installed as part of a larger scheme of building restoration (1840-1872) and consists of a collection of roundels and heads, set against a background of other stained-glass fragments. The original location and configuration of the glass here is unknown, although Kerry Ayre has suggested that much of the glass dates from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.³⁹⁴ Many of the

³⁹³ See diagrams in Spirit, "St Peter, Nowton: Deciphering an Early Nineteenth-Century Glazing Scheme," 138-139.

³⁹⁴ Kerry Ayre, *Medieval English Figurative Roundels* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 116.

roundels have been encircled with a narrow band of coloured glass, which ensures that they stand out visually against the numerous fragments which make up the window panels. This technique is common to the treatment of continental roundels in the early nineteenth century and can be found in many of Yarrington's East Anglian schemes, including Nowton. It is not unreasonable to say that the use of roundels to form cohesion in the scheme at St Mary Redcliffe was influenced by the fragmentary style of glazing so commonly used for continental roundels in the first half of the nineteenth century.

The densely packed symmetrical style of fragment windows of the early nineteenth century would have filtered the natural light entering churches, thus creating the darkened atmosphere of the sublime. This was particularly true of churches where the donor was able to fill a significant number of windows across the building. Chambers recorded that Yarrington installed thirteen windows at St Ethelbert's Church, Thurton (Norfolk) in 1826 at the patronage of Sir Thomas Beauchamp-Proctor (1756-1827) and Lady Mary Beauchamp-Proctor (née Palmer, 1760-1848) of Langley Hall. This would account for all of the windows in the chancel and nave of the building. Although the original settings have been lost, some glass remains in the church, including figurative and decorative panels by Robert Allen (figure 91). Chambers briefly described the windows of the church: "one eastern window, St. Ethelbert, cherubim, armorial bearings, &c. Twelve other windows with small subjects from the New Testament, saints, and ornaments."³⁹⁵

³⁹⁵ Chambers, *A General History of the County of Norfolk*, vol. 3, 1039.

These “small subjects” were a combination of historic English pieces, enamel-painted pieces largely by Allen, and continental roundels.³⁹⁶

From the description of these windows given by Chambers, and the fragmentary remains of this scheme which remain in the church, it is likely that these windows were densely packed with historic continental and contemporary English stained and coloured glass. The impact of thirteen windows in this style would have been dramatic in terms of the lighting of the interior. The sublime nature of the interior as created by these impressive and complicated fragmentary stained-glass schemes was the reason why these windows were installed. It was unfortunately also the reason why so many have since been altered beyond all recognition. At Thurton the East window was replaced in the late nineteenth century, according to an inscription which reads “Reglazed & restored December 1898 by W R Weyer & Co, Norwich” (window detail, figure 92). The tracery of this window appears to be original when compared to other similar tracery lights by Yarrington in the East window of St Nicholas’ Church, Buckenham (Norfolk, figures 93&94).³⁹⁷ The arrangement of glass in the main lights of this window and across the rest of the church has been drastically altered since they were originally installed, and much of the original decorative glass is no longer in the windows. A similar approach can be found at St Michael’s Church, Langley (Norfolk), which was patronised by the Beauchamp Proctor’s who also paid for the stained glass at Thurton. Chambers wrote that this

³⁹⁶ See chapter five for an examination of Allen’s techniques for painting stained glass and the business relationship between Allen and Yarrington.

³⁹⁷ The East window at Buckenham was a gift of rector John Holmes and this window was also briefly described by Chambers. The scheme was installed in 1823 and depicted “the four Evangelists, with rich Gothic canopies, cherubim, & Co.” (Chambers, *A General History of the County of Norfolk*, vol. 3, 1039).

scheme was installed in 1823, and he described this scheme in greater detail than that at

Thurton:

Eight windows in Langley church: eastern window four subjects: Simeon and the Shepherds, Offering of the Wise Men, Christ before Caiaphas, Christ before Pilate. Two windows in the chancel, armorial. Four windows in the church: the four Evangelists, with small subjects from the New Testament, coats of arms, &c. One west window, armorial bearings, &c.³⁹⁸

This account proves that all but one of the windows in the church were filled with stained glass at this time. Like Thurton, Langley was also subject to drastic rearrangement since the original installation of the windows in the 1820s. At this site much of the nineteenth-century surround glass has been removed and major rearrangement of the remaining glass included transferring the figures of three Evangelists to the West window (figure 95).³⁹⁹

To create such densely packed and rich stained-glass schemes, private donors gave collections of continental glass to churches. These were combined with historic English glass as well as contemporary coloured and painted glass. The trade in historic English glass during this period meant that local glass found in composite schemes was not always native to the church in question. This was the case at the Church of St Mary Magdalen, Mulbarton (Norfolk), where the incumbent Reverend R Spurgeon brought most of the medieval glass used in the East window from the Church of St Mary, Martham (Norfolk) in c. 1815 (figure 96).⁴⁰⁰ The very act of donation can be read as reinforcing the relationship between patron and parish which was considered inherent to the parochial

³⁹⁸ Chambers, *A General History of the County of Norfolk*, vol. 3, 1039

³⁹⁹ The current location of the figure of St Luke is unknown.

⁴⁰⁰ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, Mulbarton S Mary Magd gazetteer entry.

system of the historic Church. An early example of an ecclesiastical glazing scheme can be found at All Saints Church, Earsham. Composite stained-glass arrangements were created for windows sV and sVI at the behest of Joseph Windham of Earsham House in c. 1802-1810.⁴⁰¹ These window frames underwent substantial alterations to accommodate both large-scale panels and roundels imported from the continent (figures 2-7). These windows were dramatically altered again in 1952 in an attempt to reverse these early nineteenth-century modifications, however twentieth-century photographs demonstrate the level of intervention made in c. 1802-1810. The stonework of window sV was particularly unusual. The height of the window was reduced, and the window was composed of a single wide light surmounted with curvilinear tracery. Window sVI was more conventional, being made up of three round-headed lights with simple traceries above. Particularly in the case of window sV, it seems that the window shape was determined by a central large-scale continental stained-glass panel. The panel which window sV was formulated to hold was likely originally imported into the country by Hampp, which suggests that he was also responsible for importing the other continental panels in these windows. In an entry dated 28 April 1802, a Joseph panel is listed alongside five other panels as lot “no. 2,” purchased together for £23 17s —:

Pilate
 Joseph with the Sacks
 Annunciation
 Moses before the Jews
 Death of Abel
 St Louis⁴⁰²

⁴⁰¹ Continental stained glass was installed at All Saints, Earsham in two campaigns during the nineteenth century. Windows sV and sVI were installed in c. 1802-1810 while the East window was set in 1863. All of these windows were drastically altered in 1953. For full information regarding these schemes please see appendix II.

⁴⁰² J. C. Hampp Account Book.

The specific description of the panel as “Joseph with the Sacks,” as well as the fact that this panel was imported in the first decade of the nineteenth century, means that the description of this panel aligns with what we know about the panel originally in window sV at Earsham.

The original location of the Earsham Joseph panel was not listed in Hampp’s account book, however a probable attribution can be ascertained when one compares this work to another similar piece. A panel depicting “Joseph’s Brethren Discover Money in their Grain Sacks” is held in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York, accession no. 27.108, figure 97). Similarities in the scale and costume design of the figures, particularly in terms of Joseph’s hat and split-sleeve garment, suggest that these panels are related. It is possible that these works were originally part of the same scheme on the Continent, or that they were made from the same set of cartoons. The Metropolitan Museum gives the dimensions of their panel as 36x26.25 inches (91.4x66.7cm),⁴⁰³ while the dimensions for the Earsham panel were recorded by architect J. Fletcher Watson in the 1950s as 40x27 inches (101.6x68.6cm).⁴⁰⁴ This last measurement was recorded on a schematic for the panel when reset in window sVI and the forty-inch measurement seems to extend from the bar below the panel to the bar above. This would include the added decorative silver stain border pieces at the top and bottom of the Joseph panel, and therefore the actual measurement of this panel is remarkably close to that of the Metropolitan Museum’s panel. In terms of provenance, the museum believes

⁴⁰³ “Joseph’s Brethren Discover Money in their Grain Sacks,” *Collection*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000-2018, accessed Aug 20, 2018, <https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/195778>.

⁴⁰⁴ J. Fletcher Watson, Earsham Church Drawing No. 2,” May 27, 1952, RK&S, Folder 2/2/13/34 Earsham, NRO, Norwich.

that their panel may be originally from Rouen, c. 1530.⁴⁰⁵ This attribution would also be quite fitting for the panel at Earsham considering that with the assistance of Stevenson, Hampp certainly purchased stained glass in this city.

The unusual structure of window sV seems to have been designed around the dimensions of the Joseph panel. If one considers the main light of the window with the lower register of tracery panels, the Joseph panel is positioned directly in the centre of the window. The small-scale continental roundels and nineteenth-century surround glass in the main light and lower tracery create a complex border for the large-scale Joseph panel. The curvilinear design of the upper light and the tracery stonework is reminiscent of eighteenth-century Gothic style. This framing mechanism, which included the lower tracery panels, suggests a visual hierarchy within the window, in which the Joseph panel is the central and thus most significant component. The important status of this panel is further confirmed when one considers the detrimental effect which the removal of stone mullions would have had upon the overall structural integrity of the window. Fletcher Watson suggested that the windowsill level had been raised nine inches when the window was installed to accommodate the new stained-glass scheme.⁴⁰⁶ The width of the window was given as 5 foot 2 inches (157.5cm) by Fletcher Watson, a width of unusual proportion, and one in which stone mullions would have been de rigueur.⁴⁰⁷ It seems that prior to the scheme of c. 1802-10, the window would have been divided into three lights

⁴⁰⁵ "Joseph's Brethren Discover Money in their Grain Sacks."

⁴⁰⁶ J. Fletcher Watson, "Specification of Works to be Executed in the Repairs to the War -Damaged Windows, etc., etc., at All Saints' Church, Earsham, for the Rector and Churchwardens," June 1952, RK&S, Folder 2/2/13/34 Earsham, NRO, Norwich.

⁴⁰⁷ J. Fletcher Watson, "Earsham Church Drawing No. 1," May 27, 1952, RK&S, Folder 2/2/13/34 Earsham, NRO, Norwich.

by stone mullions, as can be seen in other windows across the church. This theory was advanced by architect Fletcher Watson in 1953, who proposed that his firm should “fix two new stone mullions, thus restoring [the] window to its original state.”⁴⁰⁸ It is possible that raising the sill was done to counteract the effects of this structural change when the new composite window was composed.

Why was this panel so important that the architectural structure of the window was so dramatically and unusually altered? This question can be addressed when one considers the scheme’s patron. Although he only had one publication attributed solely to him, William Windham was known as an eminent antiquary.⁴⁰⁹ He was elected as a fellow of the Society of Antiquities in 1775, and of the Royal Society in 1781.⁴¹⁰ Further to these fellowships, Windham was also elected to membership of the Society of Dilettanti in 1783. The Joseph panel in window sV was clearly a direct allusion to Joseph Windham himself and was likely included as a more subtle form of reference than a heraldic panel, the latter of which was often included in composite stained-glass schemes. The reason why a figurative allusion was used in preference to a heraldic panel may be as much a practical consideration as an attempt at subtlety or a nod to Windham’s antiquarian

⁴⁰⁸ J. Fletcher Watson, “Earsham Church,” June 10, 1953, RK&S, Folder 2/2/13/34 Earsham, NRO, Norwich.

⁴⁰⁹ Joseph Windham, “Observations upon a Passage in Pliny’s Natural History, Relative to the Temple of Diana at Ephesus,” *Archaeologia* 6 (1782): 67-75. In addition to this, Windham contributed drawings from his Italian tour to Charles Cameron (c.1743-1812), who used them in his publication alongside an English text, which Windham also contributed to (Charles Cameron, *The Baths of the Romans Explained and Illustrated. With the Restorations of Palladio Corrected and Improved. To which is Prefixed, an Introductory Preface, Pointing out the Nature of the Work. And a Dissertation upon the State of the Arts during the Different Periods of the Roman Empire* (London: Printed by George Scott: and to be had of the Author, next door to Egremont-House, Piccadilly, 1772)). In addition to these works, Windham also contributed to the Society of Dilettanti’s *Antiquities of Ionia* (London: Printed by T. Spilsbury and W. Haskell, 1769) and James Stuart’s (1713 -88) *The Antiquities of Athens*, volume 2 (London: Printed by John Haberkorn, 1787) (E. I. Carlyle and Philip Carter, “Windham, Joseph (1739-1810), Antiquary,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Sept 23, 2004, accessed Nov 30, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/29723>).

⁴¹⁰ Carlyle and Carter, “Windham, Joseph.”

interests. The early date of this scheme would have made it difficult to commission a skilfully executed heraldic panel. The reason why this panel was chosen to be the central component of window sV and not another window in the church may be indicative of the original position of the Windham family pew.

The Joseph panel at Earsham, removed from its original context, was built into a narrative of Joseph Windham as the landowner and patron of the church. Windham's role as benefactor of the parish was praised in his obituary as much as his scholarly pursuits:

In every relation of his life he was exemplary. A kind husband, a firm friend, a generous landlord, an indulgent master. The constant and anxious enquiries of his poorest neighbours at his gate during his illness, bore the most affecting testimony to his worth; and his memory is honoured by the long and deep regrets of his equals—by the prayers and tears of the poor.⁴¹¹

Contemporaneous gothic writers often described ancient landed families as defenders of the poor.⁴¹² The paternalism ascribed to Windham and the deference of the ordinary people of the parish is a clear reference to this trope. The view of Windham as chivalric lord of the manor was further espoused in a poem of mourning published in the *NC&NG*:

[...]
 Each drooping Tenant hangs his pensive head,
 Laments his friend, his benefactor dead:
 Each parent, anxious to extend his fame,
 Teaches e'en babes to lisp that much-lov'd name.
 So great, so truly great, the loss we find,
 It throws a gloom o'er every thinking mind:
 The Son of Worth lies low, on his last bed;
 The Son of Charity and Peace is dead
 [...]
 With these his mind was fraught; whilst here below
 Mercy and pity he to all did show:
 He clothed the naked, and the hungry fed;
 When he appeared, all want and misery fled.

⁴¹¹ Anon. H., "Memoirs of the Late Joseph Windham, Esq.," *The Gentleman's Magazine: and Historical Chronicle* 80: 2 (1810): 489.

⁴¹² Brooks, *The Gothic Revival*, 166.

A brighter Crown, than earthly Monarchs wear,
 Surrounds his brow, released from every care:
 Then weep no more, and if you would be blest,
 Follow his steps, and seek eternal rest.
 Sept. 1810⁴¹³

The unnamed poet “B” is hyperbolic in his praise of Windham as a man who fulfilled his duty as an ideal patron of the parish. To this writer Windham was as charitable as he was wise. Windham, like many of his contemporaries, donated stained glass to his parish church as part of his role as benevolent lord of the manor.

The three-window scheme at the Church of St Mary, Ditchingham (1822) provides a more obvious example of donors who used imagery of an imagined Romantic past to portray themselves as patrons, although continental glass was not used here (figures 98-100). In this example, an engraving of Sir William de Berdewell (1367-1434) which was made by antiquary William Fowler (1761-1832) in 1805 (figure 101) was used as a model to represent the patrons of incumbent Reverend J. Newling: Sir Rowland Hill of St John’s College, Cambridge (light a, window sIII), Howard Duke of Norfolk (light a, window nII) and Bedingfield (light b, nII).⁴¹⁴ A copy of this engraving was also used in the East window of St Deiniol Church, Worthenbury (Wrexham, figure 102). This fragment window was installed by Betton and Evans in 1823 and is therefore contemporary to the Ditchingham scheme. In the Worthenbury version, the armorial bearing has been adapted so that the figure represents Sir Roger de Pulesdon (d. 1294), the thirteenth-century High Sheriff of Anglesey who was born just over thirty miles south-east of Wrexham. Fowler’s engraving was modelled on a medieval stained-glass panel from St Paul’s Church,

⁴¹³ B., “Lines written on the Death of Joseph Windham, Esq. of Earsham-House, Norfolk,” *NC&NG*, Oct 20, 1810, 4.

⁴¹⁴ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, 276.

Bardwell (Suffolk) which depicts Sir William de Berdewell kneeling in armour (figure 103). In each iteration at Ditchingham, Berdewell's coat of arms has been exchanged for those of one of these three patrons. Rosemary Sweet discussed the important role of antiquarianism in the late eighteenth century: "It was antiquarianism that provided the raw material from which the narratives of history could be fashioned."⁴¹⁵ In the case of Ditchingham that "raw material" was the original medieval stained-glass panel, which was made available to a wider audience via antiquarian etchings. This image was re-created in the nineteenth century to develop a narrative of the devout knight and beneficent donor, which began with the historic object but was also to be applied to the contemporary donors at Ditchingham. An additional etching was used as a source for these windows. In window sIII light b, a panel has been made after a painting of Lady Margaret Beaufort held by St John's College, Cambridge (figures 104&105).⁴¹⁶ This painting has recently been attributed to Dutch artist Meynnart Wewyck (fl. In England c. 1502-1525) and is known to have been painted in c. 1510, before arriving at St John's College in 1534.⁴¹⁷ This painting was reproduced in many etchings in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, including in Randolph Ackerman's *History of the University of Cambridge* (1815), which Haward suggests could be the source used by the glass painter at Ditchingham.⁴¹⁸ To give some uniformity across the four panels used in the Ditchingham windows a kneeler has been added to the Beaufort panel which mimics those of the Berdewell panels. It is no coincidence that this panel, with its connection to St John's College, should be placed in

⁴¹⁵ Rosemary Sweet, "Antiquaries and Antiquities in Eighteenth-Century England," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 34, no. 2 (2001): 181.

⁴¹⁶ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, 276.

⁴¹⁷ Andrew Chen and Charlotte Bolland, "Meynnart Wewyck and the Portrait of Lady Margaret Beaufort in the Master's Lodge at St John's College, Cambridge," *The Burlington Magazine* 161 (2019): 314-319.

⁴¹⁸ (Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, 276.

the same window as the panel which depicts Sir Roland Hill, considering his connections to the institution in question.

The approach at Earsham is more subtle than that at Ditchingham, however this still plays into the Romantic trope of the landowner as an altruistic and Godly defender of the populous. Whereas at Ditchingham the stained-glass panels were newly made and based on a historic image, at Earsham the gift of historic continental stained-glass imports formed the basis for this depiction of the donor. This concept is further supported when one considers the scene depicted in the Joseph panel. The moment represented in this window shows Joseph as a wealthy man in Egypt, unrecognised by his brothers who have come from famine-stricken Canaan to buy grain. Joseph has ordered that the sacks be filled with grain and additionally instructed that the money used to buy the grain be returned to the unsuspecting men: "Then Joseph commanded to fill their sacks with corn, and to restore every man's money into his sack, and to give them provision for the way: and thus did he unto them."⁴¹⁹ By using this image as the centrepiece of his own donation to the parish, Joseph Windham seems to be comparing his own work as benevolent patron within the parish to the compassion and charity of the biblical Joseph.

For Joseph Windham, the composite window allowed him to reinforce a longstanding connection between a landed family as patron and the parish church. Alternatively, the rich scheme of glazing at Nowton demonstrates how, through acts of donation, a newly established landowner was able to take on the role of patron in a

⁴¹⁹ Genesis 42: 25 King James Version.

historic parish. This is comparable to the use of stained glass in the country home, as considered in chapter two. Stained-glass windows were installed here at the behest of two generations of the Oakes family, Orbell Ray Oakes (1768-1837) and his son Henry James Oakes (1796-1875). These windows form an important collection of continental stained-glass roundels which dominated the church interior and created a rich interior quite unlike those created by the Church Commission in the same period.⁴²⁰

The Oakes' family were prosperous businesspeople who were involved in the yarn trade and banking in Bury St Edmunds (Suffolk). The Oakes' association with Nowton began in 1795, when James Oakes jnr. (1741-1829) gifted his son Orbell Ray Oakes a parcel of land in the parish worth 4500 pounds. This was then followed six years later by a further purchase of 130 acres for 7000 pounds.⁴²¹ The village of Nowton was less than three miles from the Suffolk and County Bank in Bury St Edmunds.⁴²² According to Jane Fiske it was the "force of [James] Oakes personality" which prevented Orbell Ray Oakes from relocating to Nowton permanently at this time. Until James Oakes jnr.'s death in 1829 his son split his time between his house in Bury St Edmunds and his country retreat at Nowton.⁴²³ Orbell Ray Oakes continued to accrue property and land in and around Nowton throughout his life. One of his most significant purchases made following the death of James Oakes jnr. was the Manor of Nowton, more recently known as Nowton Court, which he purchased from the Marquess of Bristol in 1832. The significance of this

⁴²⁰ For a full history of these schemes please see Spirit, "St Peter, Nowton."

⁴²¹ Jane Fiske, ed., *The Oakes Diaries: Business, Politics and the Family in Bury St Edmunds, 1778-1827*, vol. 1 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1990), 181-182.

⁴²² The Suffolk and County building is home to the Lloyds Bank, 9 Butter Market at the time of writing.

⁴²³ Fiske, *The Oakes Diaries*, vol. 1: 199.

particular investment is made clear by a surviving portrait from 1835 (figure 106). Edwin Dalton Smith's (1800-1883) miniature watercolour on ivory depicts Orbell Ray Oakes as an older man with his right arm leaning on a table or pedestal. This composition leads the viewer's eye to the window in the background, which is framed by a red silk curtain, and gives a view to Nowton church. The angle of this view and the position of the church building make it clear that this portrait depicts Orbell Ray Oakes in his new home of Nowton Court. The following information, added to the reverse of the frame after Orbell Ray Oakes' death, supports this assessment:

Orbell Ray Oakes
 Baptised at S^t Mary's Bury S^t Edmunds
 1768. Died 29 July 1837
 Purchased NOWTON 1832.⁴²⁴

This reference to the purchase of "NOWTON" must refer to Nowton Court, which as the manor house of the village would have been the most prominent holding in the area. In the portrait Orbell Ray Oakes' pose is proprietary, and indeed he owned much, if not all, of the land between the manor house and the church. This miniature portrait can be viewed as a statement about the position of Orbell Ray Oakes as landowner and patron of the parish.

Orbell Ray Oakes became actively involved in Nowton parish affairs in the early nineteenth century and first appears in the Churchwarden's Accounts as a churchwarden

⁴²⁴ "E D Smith (British, fl. 19th Century) A Portrait Miniature of Orbell Ray Oakes (1768-1837) in Blue," *The Fine Arts Sale*, The Saleroom, 2020, accessed Mar 24, 2020, <https://www.the-saleroom.com/en-gb/auction-catalogues/cheffinsfineart/catalogue-id-srche10138/lot-b9fda8da-8003-41c2-810c-a88f011ecb35>.

in the period of Easter 1811- Easter 1812.⁴²⁵ The Accounts also show that Orbell Ray Oakes acted as intercessor between the churchwardens and the steeple repair company in 1814, the price of which was recorded in the Accounts for Easter 1815- Easter 1816:

The expense [...of] £136.16.1 will be found to exceed any former years, which was occasioned by [...] the Archdeacon and his petition to put the Belfry Steeple in complete repair which has been suffered to fall into decay no repairs having been done for more than a century.⁴²⁶

It seems likely that this serious financial investment, made shortly after Orbell Ray Oakes became a church warden, ushered in a period of change and regeneration for the church fabric.⁴²⁷ Orbell Ray Oakes made alterations to the ornament of the church, and these were recorded by John Gage in his 1838 publication *The History and Antiquities of Suffolk: Thingoe Hundred*:

This church has been repaired throughout, and highly adorned, by the munificence of Orbell Ray Oakes, the lord of the manor. All the windows are filled with painted glass, imported from Flanders, chiefly representing scriptural subjects in circular patterns. In the south window of the body of the church, overlooking the Oakes family pew, are painted the arms of Orbell Ray Oakes and Elizabeth his wife [...].⁴²⁸

The family pew, carved with five armorials, continued the heraldic theme of the window described in the above quotation (figures 107&108).⁴²⁹ The first armorial was Oakes impaling Plampin to represent his marriage to Elizabeth Plampin (1768-1811). The four remaining armorials each represented the union of one of his children and their spouse. The contemporary octagonal font also bore the painted arms of Oakes impaling Plampin

⁴²⁵ Churchwardens' Accounts, 1763-1888, Nowton Parish Records, FL512/5/1, Suffolk Records Office, Bury St Edmunds.

⁴²⁶ Ibid.

⁴²⁷ This argument was first considered in Spirit, "St Peter, Nowton," 27.

⁴²⁸ John Gage, *The History and Antiquities of Suffolk: Thingoe Hundred* (Bury St Edmunds: Published by John Deck, Bury St Edmunds, and Samuel Bentley, Dorset Street, 1838), 498.

⁴²⁹ Ibid., 498.

alongside the arms of other significant families and those of the See of Norwich.⁴³⁰ In addition to this, “Arms claimed by Farmers occupying Lands on the parish” were also included.⁴³¹ Gage also described two memorial tablets, the first for Elizabeth and the second to their daughter Elizabeth Frances Hustler (1799-1831).⁴³² In addition to these familial adornments, Orbell Ray Oakes also donated an organ to the church as well as the bells for the repaired church tower.⁴³³

At the time of Orbell Ray Oakes’ donation of stained glass to St Peter, the body of the church had six windows: an East window, two flanking windows in the north and south choir walls, two windows in the south wall of the nave and one West window in the tower.⁴³⁴ In terms of stonework configuration, the East window, nII, sII, and the West window remain as they were at the start of the nineteenth century. Windows sIII and sIV are described by Gage as “two modern windows [...] each of three lights, with square label heads.”⁴³⁵ As quoted above, Gage wrote that all of these windows are filled with stained glass imported from the Continent. The stained glass in the East window, nII and sII replaced decorative glazing of unclear date, as recorded by David E. Davy, probably from the notes of one T. Martin (figures 8, 9, 109&110). Davy wrote that the “chancel

⁴³⁰ Ibid., 499. Gage reported that the first of these monuments was executed by Bacon, who is likely to be sculptor John Bacon (1777-1859). John Bacon exhibited work at the Royal Academy and the British Institution (Jason Edwards, “Bacon, John (1777-1859), Sculptor,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Sept 23, 2004, accessed Mar 26, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/996>).

⁴³¹ Davy, *A Journal of Excursions*, 146.

⁴³² The arms of Hustler impaling Oakes are included in the carving of the family pew.

⁴³³ This organ given by Orbell Ray Oakes was removed to the west end of the north aisle during a period of major renovation at the church in 1876 (“Renovation of the Chancel of Nowton Church,” editorial, *B&NP*, May 2, 1876, 8). The current organ in the east end of the north aisle was given to the church in 1890, and it seems likely that the Oakes organ was removed from the church at this time.

⁴³⁴ Gage, *The History and Antiquities of Suffolk*, 497-498.

⁴³⁵ Ibid., 497.

windows were previously embellished with these figures of cups, fleur de lis's, cinqfoils, &c. chiefly yellow [sic]."⁴³⁶ A plaque in the church reinforces the role of Orbell Ray Oakes as donor of the new imported glazing and assists with the dating of these windows (figure 111):

This Church
was embellished & decorated with Painted Glass.
collected from the Monasteries at Brussels.
an Organ erected with a Peal of Six Bells.
at the Expense & Gift of
Orbell Ray Oakes. Esq^r.
The inhabitants inscribe this tablet as a memorial of his liberality.
1820.

The date on this tablet likely relates to the date that the windows were installed as the bells were not fitted until 1829.⁴³⁷ The earliest possible date for the installation of the windows can be ascertained from the dates of Cotman's brass engravings, the most recent of which used here was dated to 1816. The glass was certainly in place by 1821, at which time two sketches by John Buckler (1770-1851) or John Chessell Buckler (1793-1894) indicate that the glass was present.⁴³⁸ Therefore, the first phase of glazing by Yarington at Nowton must date to c.1816-21.

The original scheme of the chancel windows at Nowton, including the West window, was not documented in detail. From the description given by Gage it would seem that windows sIII and sIV were originally much larger than in the current scheme as

⁴³⁶ COLLECTIONS by David Elisha Davy, Vol. 31, 176.

⁴³⁷ William Cole, *A Description of the Glass in St Peter's Church, Nowton* (Published by the Author, 1982), 3.

⁴³⁸ "(XXXIII. ff. 278). Cos. Staff. (Tat-Y). f. 3;-Suff. f. 144;-Surr. (B-R). f. 210.includes:ff. 3, 4 Tatenhill, Staffordshire: Views of church: 1839. ff. 3-143 County of Stafford: Views, etc.: 1806-1849. f. 5 Tean Hall, Staffordshire: View: 19th cent," ff. 184&185, 1787-1897, Add MS 36388, British Library, London.

they were each formed of three lights. The windows on the south aisle were altered when the north aisle was added to the church, in order to create conformity in form across the windows in the nave.⁴³⁹ These later alterations were made thanks to the patronage of Orbell Ray Oakes' eldest son Henry James Oakes in 1843. It seems likely that the glass previously arranged in windows sIII, sIV, and possibly the West window were re-set in new surrounds in the smaller windows of the nave at this time. The one glass panel described in detail by Gage from the first iteration of the glazing scheme was the armorial shield:

In the south window of the body of the church, overlooking the Oakes family pew, are painted the arms of Orbell Ray Oakes and Elizabeth his wife, Sable, on a fess engrailed, between six slips of oak fructed Or, three oak-leaves Vert, a bordure engrailed Ermine, *Oakes*; impaling, Paly of six Argent and Azure, in a canton Gules, a role of the first, *Plampin*: crest, on a mount Vert, an oak-tree proper, fructed Or, encircled by iron palisades; motto, *Quercus robur salus Patriæ*.⁴⁴⁰

This description, which gives not only gives details of the armorial, also gives the position of the panel within the scheme. Davy gives enough detail to be able to place the panel in window sV in the original nineteenth century scheme (figure 112). The location of this panel above the family pew ensured that a close relationship between the Oakes family and the act of donation through stained glass is clear. The significance of this was clearly great for the Oakes family, as despite the re-arrangement of much of the nave glass in the 1840s, this panel was re-placed in the same location above the family pew. Heraldic symbols were particularly popular in stained glass and other mediums from the eighteenth century, as has been shown in the case of Walpole's Strawberry Hill in chapter one.

⁴³⁹ Davy attributed this information to J. W. Darby (1845) in his notes. *COLLECTIONS* by David Elisha Davy, vol. 31, 179.

⁴⁴⁰ Gage, *The History and Antiquaries of Suffolk*, 498.

Orbell Ray Oakes prominently displayed the armorials of his own family in the stained-glass window and family pew, which were placed close together to compound this effect. The font also bore the arms of Oakes' family and in this object these bearings have been combined with those of other prominent members of the local community and the Church. The use of imagery designed to evoke the medieval past intentionally forms a comparison between the leaders of the community in the nineteenth century and the ruling classes of the medieval past. This was an intentional choice designed to boost the status of landowners like Oakes through the suggestion that these individuals had an established aristocratic genealogy. Being able to trace ancestry to aristocratic and royal historic figures was an admirable trait for patrons in this period. For example, the obituary for Leathes, the patron at Herringfleet, speaks at length of the "ancient house" of Musenden from which Leathes was lineally descended, including a description of Sir William de Mussenden who came over from Normandy at the time of William the Conqueror.⁴⁴¹ This prestigious lineage was provided to suggest Leathe's descent from antiquity, and thus this was given as a sign of his status more than his own achievements, the latter of which were given very little room in his obituary.

The Oakes family could not claim any historic connections of the magnitude that Leathes could, and arms were only granted to James Oakes jnr., and therefore to the family line, in 1806.⁴⁴² This means that these arms were at most fifteen years old when

⁴⁴¹ "John Francis Leathes, Esq., of Herringfleet Hall, Suffolk," editorial, *The Sun*, Sept 21, 1848, 1.

⁴⁴² Fiske, *The Oakes Diaries*, vol. 1, 199.

they were combined with those of Elizabeth Plampin in the stained glass of Nowton church. Elizabeth Plampin was the third daughter of John Plampin (1726/27-1805).⁴⁴³ John Plampin inherited Chadacre Hall and the manor of Shimping (Suffolk) in 1757.⁴⁴⁴ About 5 years prior to this, Thomas Gainsborough (1727-88) painted his portrait with the spire of All Saints Church, Lawshall (Suffolk) in the distance (figure 113). Plampin's proprietorial stance, which reflects his authority and position in society, is comparable to the later portrait of Oakes with Nowton church in the distance. An association with the Plampin name, and the joining of these arms to his own, would have presented Oakes with an opportunity to associate his own lineage with that of the established landed gentry. Using these arms to decorate a historic church interior created an association between the age of the building and the legitimacy of the Oakes family as donors to the parish. This method of combining familial heraldry, which has been a typical method for a proof of nobility since the medieval period, is comparable to the approach taken by Howe Windham at Felbrigg Hall, as discussed in chapter two. In addition to the heraldry employed to reference the Oakes family, the East vestry window contains what appears to be two stained-glass oak trees (figure 114). It is likely that this allusion to the family name in glass was previously installed in the main body of the church, possibly in the West window. Restoration projects like those at Nowton continued to reinforce historic parochial structures of the Church of England by attributing the historic role of patron to new landowners. In turn, this further contributed to the argument that the Church of England, as a historic institution, had to be maintained as the legitimate National Religion.

⁴⁴³ Gage, *The History and Antiquities of Suffolk*, 494.

⁴⁴⁴ In his 1735 publication, John Kirby refers to the Hall and family using the archaic spellings. He wrote that "Cheracre (or Shadacre) Hall" was as being the "Inheritance of the Plampyns" (David Dymond, ed., *John Kirby's Suffolk: His Maps and Roadbook* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004), 116.

Individual private restoration projects like those at Nowton thus contributed to the attempt to conserve the power of the Church of England, which was matched by the national governmental church building project managed by the Church Commission from 1818 onwards.

Schemes including continental stained-glass fragments were also found in some private Catholic chapels of this period. The public architecture of Catholic churches in the decades immediately following the Catholic Relief Act of 1791 has been compared to nonconformist architecture.⁴⁴⁵ Although Catholics were not free to worship in public until the passing of this law, general attitudes towards practicing Catholics had become more lenient in the decades leading to legal emancipation. The violence of the Gordon riots against Catholics in 1780 and the immigration of French Catholics escaping the Revolution in the 1790s had evoked sympathy from much of the English population.⁴⁴⁶ In the context of these events, Black has suggested that the relaxation of laws relating to Catholic worship in England from the 1770s likely demonstrates the law catching up with a more tolerant society.⁴⁴⁷ Despite a growing acceptance, or at least indifference, towards Catholics across the country, there was a reticence to build outside of this accepted architectural language until the 1840s.⁴⁴⁸

⁴⁴⁵ Bryan Little, *Catholic Churches since 1623: A Study of Roman Catholic Churches in England and Wales from Penal Times to the Present Day* (London: Robert Hale, 1966), 38.

⁴⁴⁶ O'Malley, *Catholicism, Sexual Deviance*, 17.

⁴⁴⁷ Jeremy Black, "Confession State or Elect Nation? Religion and Identity in Eighteenth-Century England," in *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650-c. 1850*, Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 62.

⁴⁴⁸ The Metropolitan Cathedral Church and Basilica of Saint Chad in Birmingham was designed by Pugin and this building was substantially completed in the Gothic idiom by 1841.

In East Anglia, Bury St Edmunds was a relatively large centre for Catholic worship in the eighteenth century. As historian Joy Rowe wrote: “The Relief Act of 1791 legitimized [sic] the freedom to meet for worship that Suffolk Catholics had already enjoyed for some years.”⁴⁴⁹ In 1767 all Anglican incumbents were required to make a return of all Catholics residing in their parish to the diocese. In Suffolk 512 Catholics were reported, 150 of whom resided in the two parishes of Bury St Edmunds.⁴⁵⁰ At that time Bury St Edmunds Catholics worshipped surreptitiously on Westgate Street in a private chapel built at the rear of what was then known as number 21 St Edmund’s House. The house was built in 1760-1761 and the chapel was functional shortly after, although it was not formally licensed for public Roman Catholic worship until 1791.⁴⁵¹ In 1837, the new and enlarged Catholic church was built directly next to this earlier building, which has acted as the presbytery for the church since this time. The new Catholic church of St Edmund in Bury St Edmunds was built to designs by architect Charles Day in 1837 in the Classical architectural mode.⁴⁵² The interior was remodelled in 1877, however the exterior remains true to the original design. The doorway is flanked by two fluted Ionic columns which support a pedimented portico, much like the non-conformist places of worship discussed earlier in this chapter. The use of Ionic columns and a central portico reflects specific trends in non-conformist architectural projects of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and was common in Catholic architecture in the early nineteenth

⁴⁴⁹ Joy Rowe, “The Lopped Tree”: The Re-formation of the Suffolk Catholic Community,” in *England’s Long Reformation 1500-1800*, Nicholas Tyacke, ed. (London: UCL Press, 1998), 189.

⁴⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 187-188.

⁴⁵¹ Room first registered 18 July 1791 and first chapel registered July 1795 (T. C. B. Timmins, ed. *Suffolk Returns from the Census of Religious Worship of 1851* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997), 176).

⁴⁵² Nikolaus Pevsner and Enid Radcliffe, *Suffolk*, 2nd ed. (London: Penguin Books, 1985), 145.

century. The Jesuit Chapel on Willow Lane in Norwich was constructed in 1827-28 and also used these same design features. Like the non-conformist places of worship considered in Norwich, these two buildings also featured large and simple window designs. In Bury St Edmunds, the windows were of a rectangular form, while those in Norwich were round headed. Interestingly, an impression of the Catholic Chapel in Norwich made in 1828 by James Sillett (1764-1840) of the Norwich School of Painters demonstrates that the street facing façade of the church seems to have had three blind windows in the upper register.⁴⁵³ The central window space remains filled, however the two flanking window spaces have since been opened. Stained glass was not added to the building until 1847.

In the nineteenth century, it took several decades to see more lavish Gothic Catholic chapels which included stained-glass windows, especially in towns and cities. In the early decades of the nineteenth century, which was the peak period for the importation and re-setting of continental stained glass, it was in private chapels that one found the Catholic interpretation of this glazing style. Costessey Hall's St Augustine Chapel was built in 1809 under the patronage of Sir William Jerningham (1736-1809, figure 115).⁴⁵⁴ Mary Shepard discusses the unique nature of this ambitious Gothic chapel in the context of the social and legal position of Catholic worship and building in England during this period.⁴⁵⁵ At the time of construction the chapel was often compared to

⁴⁵³ Hale, "Nonconformity in Nineteenth Century Norwich," 190.

⁴⁵⁴ The stained-glass windows were removed when Costessey Hall and chapel were sold in 1913 and sold to dealer Grosvenor Thomas for sixteen thousand pounds. Both buildings were demolished soon after (Mary B. Shepard, "'Our Fine Gothic Magnificence': The Nineteenth-Century Chapel at Costessey Hall (Norfolk) and Its Medieval Glazing," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 54, no. 2 (1995): 187).

⁴⁵⁵ Shepard, "Our Fine Gothic Magnificence."

Cambridge's early sixteenth-century King's College Chapel, a precedent which Shepard argued was a way in which Jerningham sought to "establish the legitimacy of his own aristocratic pedigree."⁴⁵⁶ This appeal to historic models bears similarities to those employed by landowners who patronised historic parish churches belonging to the Church of England. Like the Oakes' at Nowton parish church, Jerningham used familial arms as a prominent aspect of the chapel's internal design.

Shepard highlighted the impressive nature of the glazing scheme in this chapel, which included twenty-two large windows filled with continental glass purchased from Norwich trader John Christopher Hampp. In addition to these imported panels, this scheme included some English medieval stained glass which was probably supplied by William Stevenson.⁴⁵⁷ Shepard identified that the arrangement of stained glass across the windows had been purposeful, with the grouping of some iconographic types as well as the careful placement of panels in pairs across the two-light windows.⁴⁵⁸ Sweet argued that the layout of these panels reflects the medieval system of types and anti-types, with the windows on the north wall depicting Old Testament scenes which were matched up with scenes from the infancy of Christ on the south.⁴⁵⁹ Both continental and historic English glass has been used across the scheme. In surviving photographs one can see that the arrangement of panels within windows bears a remarkable similarity to those in Church of England schemes of a similar date. The use of symmetry is particularly striking in the two-light window illustrated in figure 116. In the lowest register of panels, a full-

⁴⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 190.

⁴⁵⁷ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, 281.

⁴⁵⁸ Shepard, "Our Fine Gothic Magnificence," 196-199.

⁴⁵⁹ Sweet, *Time's Witness*, 176.

length female saint has been positioned in the centre of each light. These figures have been surrounded by other smaller fragments of glass, the shapes and designs of which closely mirror one another. A line of symmetry exists along the centre of the window and the glazier has used the glass pieces sympathetically to maintain this as closely as possible throughout the window. Shepard tied the glazing of the chapel to the overall role of the building for the local Catholic community: "This installation emphasized [sic] the Jerninghams' role as patrons, as builders of the chapel, but also as public benefactors providing a place of worship for the village parishioners."⁴⁶⁰

Many similarities can be found between this scheme at Costessey and those of private donors within the Church of England. Both were using historic models of patronage to reinforce their position in the local community. The stained glass was purchased from the same dealers following the same stylistic principles. Jerningham, like Anglican donors, was evoking pre-Reformation forms of architecture and church design with the aim of restoring an earlier English Church. The window directly above the family pew was filled with armorial stained glass, "trumpeting the family's noble pretensions" much like their Protestant counterparts.⁴⁶¹ Shepard argued that the use of Gothic architectural form at Costessey chapel was due to the influence of John Milner (1776-1752), who believed as a point of nationalistic pride that the Gothic pointed arch was an architectural wonder developed by the historic Catholic Church.⁴⁶² Milner's influence extended to the design of the chapel's windows, and he was responsible for the

⁴⁶⁰ Shepard, "Our Fine Gothic Magnificence," 199.

⁴⁶¹ Sweet, *Time's Witness*, 176.

⁴⁶² Shepard, "Our Fine Gothic Magnificence," 193-94.

arrangement of glass.⁴⁶³ Shepard has suggested that the arrangement of the glass was done with reference to the iconography of the panels, for example the grouping of Old Testament scenes on the north side of the chapel.⁴⁶⁴ Oakes and Jerningham were each trying to revive their branch of the historic Church. By using imagery and architectural forms designed to evoke the pre-Reformation Church both were attempting to prove the legitimacy of their cause. One could argue that Jerningham was the more successful of the two. Whereas the Church of England was continuing to lose members the Catholic Church in England was growing in support in this period, albeit at a modest rate when one compares this to the growth of nonconformist movements.

Other Catholic collectors across England also employed historic continental glass in their chapel schemes in the early nineteenth century. Stained glass at Burton Constable Hall (East Yorkshire) has recently been the subject of studies by Lauren Healy and Iona Hart.⁴⁶⁵ Hart's recent publication details the stained-glass window from the private chapel of St John the Baptist, which was located inside the Hall (figure 117). The room which housed the Catholic chapel from 1844 had previously been a billiards room and then a coffee room.⁴⁶⁶ It was converted to a chapel when the Clifford Constables of Tixall (Staffordshire) took possession of Burton Constable Hall. This window did not contain any continental stained glass, although it does incorporate English glass from the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. Continental stained glass did have a major role in the glazing of

⁴⁶³ Sweet, *Time's Witness*, 176.

⁴⁶⁴ Shepard, "Our Fine Gothic Magnificence," 196.

⁴⁶⁵ Lauren Healy, "Catholic Collecting in Nineteenth-Century England: The Impact of History on the Stained Glass of the Long Gallery, Burton Constable Hall (MA dissertation, University of York, 2014); Iona Hart, "A Very Recusant Window: The Chapel Window at Burton Constable Hall," *Vidimus* 136 (2021), accessed Sept 19, 2021, <https://www.vidimus.org/issues/issue-136/features/chapel-window-burton-constable-hall/>.

⁴⁶⁶ Hart, "A Very Recusant Window."

the family's previous chapel at Tixall, as explored by Healy.⁴⁶⁷ Although it is difficult to trace the composition of the glass in the 1820s chapel at Tixall, Healy has demonstrated that stained glass from the chapel was removed to the Long Galley at Burton Constable prior to c.1845, at which point the original chapel was resituated in the village of Great Haywood (figure 118).⁴⁶⁸ The stained glass used in the Burton Constable chapel was also brought to the Hall from the chapel at Tixall.⁴⁶⁹ The initial purchase of this glass, and the removal of it to the new family seat of Burton Constable, demonstrates the desirability of historic stained glass for Catholic collectors in the early nineteenth century. Hart has suggested that the re-use of the stained glass in the Burton Constable chapel, which depicts Catholic imagery, was representative of the new freedom of the Clifford Constables to worship without restriction.⁴⁷⁰ Further to this, through re-constituting and re-installing deposed Catholic images in stained glass at Tixall, both the fifteenth-century English glass and the imported continental panels, the family were able to signal the role of modern Catholics as the legitimate heirs of the historic Catholic Church. Sweet has argued that for "Catholics of an antiquarian cast of mind [...] it was important to build churches which in style and substance were the equal of those from which they felt they had been evicted at the Reformation."⁴⁷¹ The use of stained glass featuring Catholic iconography was a significant aspect of this, and the trade in continental glass provided the opportunity to purchase these images in glass.

⁴⁶⁷ Healy, "Catholic Collecting in Nineteenth-Century England," 37-56.

⁴⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 55.

⁴⁶⁹ Hart, "A Very Recusant Window."

⁴⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷¹ Sweet, *Time's Witness*, 175.

When considering the foreign Catholic origin of imported glass, it may seem strange that this material was also used by the Church of England to inspire adherence to a Protestant denomination. The importance of the sublime effect of stained glass over the scenes depicted in the glass goes some way to explain this, as does the fact that this material was more readily available and affordable than newly painted and stained English glass in this period. The advent of the Cambridge Camden Society and the Ecclesiological movement from the 1830s ushered in a new period of archaeological correctness in the Gothic movement for places of worship. By this period fewer schemes centred on continental stained-glass fragments were being installed. In practical terms, the reason for this was that less material was being imported from the Continent. As the majority of continental glass in East Anglia was imported early in the nineteenth century, by this period new composite windows were made using the glass which had not been sold in earlier decades. Additionally, a larger number of glass painters were able to make new stained-glass windows at an affordable price by this period. The cost of glass fell substantially following the 1845 repeal of excise duty on glass.⁴⁷² Just as important was the shift of focus within groups interested in how best to translate Gothic style for the building and restoration of places of worship. For pioneers of the Gothic Revival, this shift of focus was a reaction against the various ways in which the Gothic idiom was used by various denominations in earlier decades. A. W. N. Pugin introduced his influential *Contrasts* (1836) by reflecting on the poor state of architectural practice in the nineteenth century, which he felt was particularly apparent when compared to the brilliance of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century work: “that science [architecture] is at a very low ebb:

⁴⁷² Cheshire, *Stained Glass and the Victorian Gothic Revival*, 163.

in which state, I fear, it will remain, unless the same feelings which influenced the old designers in the composition of their Works, can be restored."⁴⁷³ This interest in a return to archaeologically correct Gothic churches was an expression of the return to pre-Reformation religious practice which was also an aspiration of many Ecclesiologists. Although lighting effect remained an important aspect of stained glass, being able to commission new stained-glass windows which depicted specific imagery became increasingly important in this period. The East window at the Church of St Mark, Lakenham (Norfolk) was built in the early 1840s and new stained glass was installed in the East window by Yarrington in c.1845. These windows were a departure from his earlier composite style, and instead comprised of large-scale figures in new glass. These windows were an integral aspect of the church's interior design, which was built to service and improve the growing community of poor residents in the parish. An advertisement called for donors to come forward to pay for the scheme:

Painted glass for the greater portion of it has been either given, or promised to be given, by several liberal persons.— Mr. Culyer, of St. Giles's, has received orders to glaze all the upper parts of its tracery, according to a pictorial design, with which he has been furnished. With respect to the ten lower and larger compartments, besides the well-executed figure representing St. Mark, given by Mr. Yarrington, and which occupies a central position— five figures have already been promised, viz. those of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John, and also of St. Peter and St. Andrew; and Mr. Yarrington is employed to prepare them.— Thus, only four figures more are wanted to complete the filling of this finely proportioned window, with stained glass, of which the combined effect, "casting a dim religious light," cannot then fail of being particularly handsome and appropriate. The cost of each figure is computed at 12 guineas. The arrangement contemplated is—St. Mark (as now), in the centre of the upper row of lights; on the right, St. Peter and St. Andrew, and on the left, St. Paul and St. Barnabas. In the lower row of compartments, the other three Evangelists, with St. James the

⁴⁷³ Pugin, *Contrasts*, iii.

greater, and St. James the less, on either side. It is hoped that, through the generous spirit of affluent individuals, the plan will be realised."⁴⁷⁴

The church was damaged by bombing in 1942, at which time the East window was lost. A photograph of the church from before the Second World War is not clear enough to discern for certain how far this scheme was completed, however it is possible to distinguish the window openings (figure 119). Rather than being installed as a single five-light window as described in the article quoted above, five two-light windows were arranged around the chancel. It seems that each of the ten figures was placed in a single light within an architectural canopy, as was common for Yarrington's large-scale figures. As the nineteenth century progressed, new stained-glass windows were increasingly installed in churches of all denominations and ages.

Although the use of continental glass in new stained-glass window schemes had dramatically reduced as the interest in Ecclesiology rose, a number of examples from the 1840s onwards can be found. The East window of the Church of St Mary, Depden (Suffolk, figure 120) was installed in 1842 as part of a wider programme of restoration:

Our recollection carries us back to an edifice raised for public worship to the divine Creator, but, we grieve to say, most lamentedly neglected, save by a few of the best inhabitants, whose weekly visits to the damp walls of the church but too plainly spoke of its generally neglected state. *The neglect, however, we are happy to say, no longer exists:* the present most worthy rector, with unbounded liberality, has so metamorphosed the building that it has now become the most *inspiring* temple the soul of man can now desire for communion with his God. The munificent rector has himself borne the whole of these several expenses; and one of his most recent additions and improvements has been the erection in the chancel of a very beautiful window of stained glass, the most exquisite portions of

⁴⁷⁴ "Lakenham New Church," editorial, *NC&NG*, Oct 5, 1844, 2.

which we understand were purchased at the sale of Strawberry Hill. Great praise is due to Mr. Whittaker [sic], of Bury, by whom the window was designed and adapted; and we sincerely hope that the worthy rector will for many years continue to enjoy that high gratification, which he cannot fail to derive from the reflection of what his church was, and what it has become!⁴⁷⁵

This article was written just six years after the publication of Pugin's *Contrasts* and three years after the Cambridge Camden Society was founded. The way in which the author praises the generosity of the rector in patronising the restoration work is reminiscent of the ecclesiologist view that church building was an act of religion in itself. The stained-glass windows were particularly praised in the article above, with the clear suggestion that the installation of these was a significant final act in the overall restoration of the church to its former, possibly pre-Reformation, state. The use of stained glass at Depden illustrates the way that the influence of the ecclesiologists did not mean a complete break from earlier approaches to restoration.

The East window of Depden Church combined glass of various periods and places of origin. This window retains substantial remains of fourteenth-century canopies across three windows, which may have been part of an earlier scheme original to the church. The lower panels of the window have been filled with continental glass panels set in nineteenth-century surrounds. The tracery glass includes the arms of King Henry VII (1457-1509) in panel B1 those of Queen Victoria (1819-1901) in panel B2. Two large continental panels from the Life of Christ have been placed centrally in the scheme to form a simple narrative. Christ Falls on the Road to Calvary in panel 2a contains many infill pieces and may have originally been two panels combined to make the one scene. This

⁴⁷⁵ "We have been much gratified (observes a respectable informant)," editorial, *B&NP*, Oct 19, 1842, 2.

has been positioned directly below the Lamentation of Christ in panel 2b. This two-panel narrative is framed by a further two lights composed of smaller historic glass pieces. These fragments have been arranged in distinctive shapes, mirrored across lights a and c, with blue-glass borders used to emphasise this symmetrical arrangement. This framing technique draws the eye to the narrative panels in the window's central light.

This window is a relatively late example of this use of continental fragments, however the way in which the lineage of the material is discussed in the above article is an interesting example of how foreign material was incorporated into a nationalist narrative. The article quoted above informs the reader that some of the glass was purchased with the help of Mr Whittaker [sic] of Bury St Edmunds from the sale at Strawberry Hill. A Mr T. Whitaker, house and ornamental painter of Whiting Street,⁴⁷⁶ advertised himself as a prospective agent for those wishing to buy stained glass from the sale.⁴⁷⁷ Whitaker had acquired a catalogue for the auction from which prospective buyers could peruse and which Whitaker could then bid on at the sale itself. Little is known about Whitaker's interest in stained glass and there is no evidence that he had ever worked as a

⁴⁷⁶ William Robson, *Robson's Commercial Directory of the Six Counties Forming the Norfolk Circuit: viz. Beds, Bucks, Cambridgeshire, Hunts, Norfolk, and Suffolk, with Oxfordshire; an Alphabetical List of the Names, Residences and Professions of the Commercial Establishments in the Above Counties: A Classification of Trades to all Market Towns therein, with every Information connected with the Arrival and Departure of Mails and other Coaches, Posting Houses, Commercial Inns, &c. &c. Accompanied by an Historical and Statistical Display of the Area in Statute Acres; the Annual Value thereof, as assessed to the Property Tax in 1815; the Annual Income of the Beneficed Clergy, as Returned to Parliament in 1834; with a Beautifully Engraved Map of each of the Seven Counties, on which is Delineated the New Divisions or Parochial Unions, formed under the Poor Law Amendment Act of 3 & 4 William IV. 1834. Also, the Names of Unions, Number of Parishes and Guardians to each Union, the Date and Place of Meeting, with the Names of Clerks to each Board of Guardians throughout the Seven Counties above Names; Superintendent Registrars, Registrars of Marriages, and of Births and Deaths; Coaches, Carriers, Coasting Vessels, Steam Packets, Inland Navigation & Railroads* (London: William Robson & Co. London Directory and Court Guide Office, 4, Cloak Lane, Cheapside, 1839), Suffolk 26.

⁴⁷⁷ "STRAWBERRY HILL SALE. GREAT SALE OF ANCIENT STAINED GLASS!!," editorial, *B&NP*, Apr 6, 1842, 2.

glazier or glass painter. It is likely that Whitaker acted as an agent for M. J. Lloyd (the rector of Depden) and that an unnamed glazier fitted the window, despite the 1842 article listing Whitaker as being the person “by whom the window was designed and adapted.”⁴⁷⁸ This glazier may also have supplied additional historic glass to supplement the panels purchased at the Strawberry Hill sale. Whitaker is very clear in his advert that he is willing to act as an agent for the purchase of stained glass and not for any of the other objects or materials which were being sold across the first twenty-three days of sale. The sale at Strawberry Hill occurred over twenty-four days, with objects categorised by material and type into separate auctions across this period. From Whitaker’s advertisement in the *Bury and Norwich Post; Or, Suffolk, Norfolk, Essex, and Cambridge Advertiser (B&NP)* it is clear that he only intended to act as an agent for those interested in the stained-glass sale. This suggests that he may have had connections to craftspeople who could manage the deinstallation and transport of the stained-glass panels from Strawberry Hill, which was a condition of the sale. Given Yarrington’s notoriety in this period as a maker of stained glass, particularly in connection with the continental trade, it seems that he would have been a likely candidate for collaboration with Whitaker. Numerous panels in the East window at Depden were originally installed in Steinfeld Abbey’s cloister.⁴⁷⁹ This further supports the argument that this scheme was installed by

⁴⁷⁸ Little is known about M. J. Lloyd. He was appointed to the position of vicar at Depden in 1836, and was still in post for the clergy list of 1866 (*The Ecclesiastical Gazette, The Clergy List for 1866, containing Alphabetical List of the Clergy in England and Wales; Houses of Convocation; Alphabetical List of Clergy in Ireland; List of the Clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church; Lists of the Clergy of Colonial Dioceses; Foreign Chaplaincies, Public Schools; Alphabetical List of Benefices, with Post Towns, &c. Cathedral Establishments, and Collegiate Chapters; Ecclesiastical Preferments in the Patronage of the Crown, the Bishops, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, Universities, Colleges, and Private Individuals. Benefices arranged under their Ecclesiastical Divisions* (London: Published by George Cox, at the Ecclesiastical Gazette Office, 20, King William Street Strand; and sold by all booksellers, 1866), 68).

⁴⁷⁹ King, “The Steinfeld Cloister Glazing,” 208. See Appendix II for further details of these panels.

Yarlington due to his established involvement in other local schemes containing Steinfeld glass, such as All Saints Church, Chedgrave (Norfolk).

Entry to the Strawberry Hill sale was relatively exclusive. Each catalogue cost seven shillings and would “admit Four Persons to the Public View” on 4 April 1842.⁴⁸⁰ It was also required for use as “a passport to the Purchaser through the Sale.”⁴⁸¹ Catalogues were for sale at five locations: Paris, Leipsic (Leipzig), Strawberry Hill, the Auction Mart and Robins’ offices in Covent Garden. Despite these restrictions, more than a thousand visitors toured the house on each viewing day.⁴⁸² For Norwich residents looking to buy from the sale this would have meant at least two trips to the capital, firstly to buy a catalogue and view the collection and secondly to take part in the bidding. With the additional work of securing deinstallation and transportation of purchases one can see the appeal of employing an agent in this process. Whitaker is listed as having purchased two lots of glass at Strawberry Hill on 21 May 1842.⁴⁸³ Firstly lot twenty-eight, from the hall, was described as a “pair of very fine old stained glass windows at the sides of the hall door, representing full length figures of Saints, with Coats of Arms and sundry small

⁴⁸⁰ A private viewing of the collection commenced on 28 March 1842. Whitaker’s advert suggests that this is the day which he attended Strawberry Hill to view the glass, which would make chronological sense if he posted his advertisement in Norwich after having viewed the glass in London (George Henry Robins, *Strawberry Hill, the Renowned Seat of Horace Walpole. Mr. George Robins is Honoured by having been Selected by the Earl of Waldegrave, to Sell by Public Competition, the Valuable Contents of Strawberry Hill, and it may Fearlessly be Proclaimed as the most Distinguished Gem that has ever Adorned the Annals of Auctions. It is definitely fixed for Monday, the 25th day of April, 1842, and Twenty-Three following days (Sundays Excepted), and within will be found a Repast for the Lovers of Literature and the Fine Arts, of which Bygone Days Furnish no Previous Example, and it would be in Vain to Contemplate it in Times to Come* (London: George Robins, 1842), iii).

⁴⁸¹ Robins, *Strawberry Hill, the Renowned Seat of Horace Walpole*, iii.

⁴⁸² Sweet, *Time’s Witness*, 166.

⁴⁸³ Robins, *Strawberry Hill, the Renowned Seat of Horace Walpole*, 56.

pieces, 3 feet 6 high by 11 inches wide."⁴⁸⁴ The second window bought was lot eighty-four, which was taken from the chapel in the grounds and is described as:

A very fine ancient stained **glass window**, in seventeen compartments, in which are represented the original Portraits of Henry III and his Queen, with Saints at whole length, Coats of Arms and other devices; *it was a present from the Earl of Ashburnham, and was brought from the church of Bexhill, Sussex.* The Portraits of Henry and his Queen, are the only ones known; they have been engraved and are more fully described in Horace Walpole's *Anecdotes of Painting*.⁴⁸⁵

Whitaker purchased these lots for £5 4s 6d and £30 9s – respectively. These descriptions do not exactly translate to glass used in the East window at Depden, however the arms of Henry VII in the window's tracery and some fragments in lights a and c may have originated from this sale. If Whitaker worked with Yarrington to install the windows at Depden, it is likely that the two panels from the life of Christ were taken from the stores of glass at Yarrington's workshop. In the auction catalogue for the sale of materials from Yarrington's workshop in 1847, lots fifty-seven to 160 were made up of historic glass, much of which has been imported by Hampp and Stevenson from the Continent.⁴⁸⁶ In addition to these, numerous boxes were for sale and were listed as "containing fragments of old glass, chiefly vestiges of a collection, which was, soon after the French Revolution, purchased on the Continent, at considerable risk and expence [sic], by the late Messrs Hampp and Stevenson of Norwich."⁴⁸⁷ Yarrington had access to a large collection of

⁴⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 240.

⁴⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 247.

⁴⁸⁶ Ives, "Stained Glass. To be Sold by Auction, by Mr. Ives, On Wednesday, March the 17th, 1847, and Following Days, all the Extensive and Valuable Collection of Ancient & Modern Stained Glass, Books, Pictures, Fixtures, Luggage Cart, Harness, Implements of Business, Stock of Lead, Paints, Glass, Oil, Turpentine, Dry Colours, Brass Works, Pumps, Water Closet Apparatus, &c. &c. of the Late Mr. S. C. Yarrington, Plumber, Glazier, and Painter, Upper King Street, Norwich, by Order of the Executors," 5-7. In *Memorials of the Restoration of the Parish Church of St Nicholas and of the Establishment of National Schools at Great Yarmouth*, compiled by Charles John Palmer, volume 2, *Parish Records of Great Yarmouth St Nicholas with St Peter, St John, St Andrew, St James, St Paul and St Luke*, PD 28/355, NRO, Norwich, 219.

⁴⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 7

continental stained glass which could have provided the additional material Whitaker required in addition to the glass purchased at Strawberry Hill.

The East window at Depden was installed after the initial period of interest in fragment windows formulated around historic imports. The association to Strawberry Hill in this case adds a further point of interest to the scheme, regardless of how much of the material had previously belonged to Walpole. The significance of this connection was such that it was named in the article describing the restoration of the church, despite the fact that the majority of the stained glass was likely from a different collection altogether. Whitaker discusses the prestigious nature of Walpole's collection at length in his advertisement, the body of which is quoted at length below:

To the Lovers of the Rare and Beautiful of this most interesting species of Antiquity, the perfectly unique collection at Strawberry Hill, in which the matchless designs of those celebrated Masters *Diepenback* and *Lucas van Leyden*,⁴⁸⁸ together with the only *known* Glass specimens of Henry the Third and his Queen, will be found; must indeed be highly gratifying, though by no means the *less* to be regretted that the concentrated labours of a long life, of steady, careful, and profound antiquarian research should be destined, from *any* cause, to be *scattered* again over the face of the earth. To possess the merest fragment from a casket so rich with the jewels of nature and of art, as that which once belonged to the renowned HORACE WALPOLE, it is no matter of astonishment that the *virtuosi* of *other* nations as well as our own, should be at this moment on the alert; for the honour of our nation it is devoutly hoped that a struggle will be made by the wealthy to wrest from the grasp of Foreigners those matchless treasures culled by the hand of their noble minded and talented countryman.⁴⁸⁹

Whitaker's reference to the panels of Queen Eleanor and King Henry III is of particular interest as he went on to purchase this glass at auction for an unknown patron. These

⁴⁸⁸ Both of these artists are named as sources for stained glass panels in the auction catalogue (Robins, *Strawberry Hill, the Renowned Seat of Horace Walpole*, 239).

⁴⁸⁹ "STRAWBERRY HILL SALE," 2.

panels had added prestige beyond the supposed unique nature of the imagery. These panels would have been widely recognised from the engraving of these panels which was used as the frontispiece for volume one of Walpole's *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (figure 121).⁴⁹⁰ Whitaker framed the preservation of Walpole's collection as a battle between wealthy nationalists and "grasp[ing] Foreigners" in which "the honour of our nation" is on the line. This rhetoric renders the actual origin of much of this collection invisible: propagating the legend of Walpole and his "casket so rich with the jewels of nature and of art" erased the fact that much of this collection originated from the countries of those maligned "foreigners." This praise of Walpole is quite different from the disparaging comments made by some contemporary commentators whose views on Strawberry Hill were discussed in the introduction. In the case of Depden, the link between object and place of origin through association with a prominent English collector demonstrates how successfully foreign stained-glass was incorporated into a larger nationalist narrative. At Depden, naming Strawberry Hill as the source of some of the stained glass in the East window connected the restoration of this church to the Walpole's prestigious collection, regardless of how little of the material actually had been previously installed at Strawberry Hill.

Conclusion

The use of continental stained glass in the early decades of the nineteenth century was part of a larger programme of Restoration for the Church of England. Firstly, continental

⁴⁹⁰ Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England: with some Account of the Principle Artists, and Incidental Notes on Other Arts: Collected by the Late Mr. George Vertue, and now Digested and Published from his Original MSS*, vol. 1 (Strawberry Hill: Thomas Kirgate, 1765).

glass was a material which was manipulated to create new schemes alongside contemporary coloured and painted glass. These new windows were made to recreate the sublime atmosphere which was considered to have been an integral aspect of pre-Reformation religion by antiquarians at the turn of the nineteenth century. In addition to these individual restorative schemes, the renewal of church interiors fed into a large Restoration of the structural role of the Church of England at the national level. The combination of increased religious freedoms for other Christian denominations and population shifts towards urban centres was already driving down the percentage of the population which adhered to the Established Church by the turn of the nineteenth century. The Church began a programme of government subsidised church building in 1818 to reinforce their position as the religion of the country and to encourage attendance across the country. Private donation of materials like stained glass in historic churches, which had begun before the advent of the Church Commission, contributed to this larger mission of Restoration for the Church of England.

Chapter Four: Stained-Glass Import Networks: The Influence of Traders, Agents, and Auction Houses on Composite Scheme Designs

The work of traders and agents purchasing continental stained glass for English markets has been a subject of interest for stained-glass historians for decades.⁴⁹¹ Tracing the import routes has often been used as a tool to establish the origins of specific panels or to identify the current locations of different components of large schemes dispersed by early nineteenth-century sales.⁴⁹² In this chapter, the role of traders, agents, and auction houses will be reconsidered in relation to the distribution of continental stained-glass panels in England. How were networks established by those employed in this trade and what impact did these groups have on the material imported? Auction houses played an important role in the distribution of imported stained glass in England. How far can it be said that auction houses were curating stained-glass collections by categorising disparate panels into lots and categories for sale? Did the organisation of stained glass in these catalogues have an impact on the choices made by collectors selecting glass to form new composite schemes?

The popularisation of the composite stained-glass window was inextricably linked to the changing political situation in continental Europe. Historic stained glass became available for purchase in high quantities after the French Revolution of 1793, which led to the secularisation and destruction of many religious buildings in France, Germany, and

⁴⁹¹ Several articles were published in the early to mid-twentieth century which looked at what glass was imported by traders like Hampp, including Kent, "John Christopher Hampp of Norwich" and Lafond, "The Traffic in Old Stained Glass."

⁴⁹² See Cole, *A Catalogue of Netherlandish and Northern European Roundels* and King "The Steinfeld Cloister Glazing."

Chapter Four: Stained-Glass Import Networks: The Influence of Traders, Agents, and Auction Houses on Composite Scheme Designs

the Netherlands.⁴⁹³ Despite the establishment of the Monuments Commission for saving artefacts of historic note, many objects were lost during this period of revolutionary unrest. For many radical revolutionaries the power dynamics represented by art relating to the monarchy and the Church were considered antithetical to their cause, and thus these objects were defaced or destroyed.⁴⁹⁴ The tension between the conservation of historic artefacts and the destruction of harmful symbols continued throughout the early 1790s and nowhere was more representative of this struggle than the Louvre.⁴⁹⁵ From August 1793 the museum displayed objects, fittings, and architectural fragments which were of historic significance. Simultaneously, pieces of a similar provenance outside the museum were being destroyed as oppressive symbols of monarchic power. The stripping and burning of churches became particularly widespread in Paris and beyond following the uprising of the Paris Commune in 1792, and this was further exacerbated by the passing of laws in October 1793. Much stained glass was stripped from ecclesiastical buildings in this period and this material became available for sale on the open market as a result, although some stained glass was retained for use in museum and display settings. Alexandre Lenoir (1769-1839) acquired a “suite” of panels from the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés for his Musée de Français,⁴⁹⁶ despite the chapel being destroyed in 1802.⁴⁹⁷

⁴⁹³ Richard Marks, *Stained Glass in England during the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 1993), 243.

⁴⁹⁴ Idzerda, “Iconoclasm during the French Revolution,” 14-15.

⁴⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁴⁹⁶ The Musée des monuments français was opened by Lenoir in 1795. For full information on the founding of this museum in revolutionary Paris see Alexandra Stara, *The Museum of French Monuments, 1795-1816: “Killing Art to Make History”* (London: Routledge, 2016).

⁴⁹⁷ Roger Rosewell and Mary B. Sheperd, “The Stained Glass of Saint-Germain-des-Prés,” *Vidimus* 21, no. 8 (2008), para 2-3, accessed Sept 12, 2021, <https://www.vidimus.org/issues/issue-21/feature/>.

As Tracy has shown, stained glass was the earliest form of continental artwork to be imported into England in large quantities during the early nineteenth century.⁴⁹⁸ This not only points to the high demand for stained glass in England at this time, but also for the relative ease with which such material could be transported. Roundels and small pieces of glass would have been particularly easy to ship in bulk for use in new fragmentary windows. The rapacious appetites of English traders and collectors for the stained-glass collections of the great religious institutions was increasingly poorly received by many in France as these men worked their way across the Continent. This mode of collecting was so thorough that it was labelled “Elginism,” a term coined after Thomas Bruce, 7th Earl of Elgin (1766-1841) and his transportation of the Parthenon Marbles to London between 1801 and 1805.⁴⁹⁹ It was the combination of increased availability of stained glass on the Continent and the demand for such material in England that created such a lucrative market for the stained-glass import market in the early nineteenth century.

In addition to the changing political context on the Continent, developing international relations between the United Kingdom and France re-established safe passage for traders and collectors bringing glass across the English Channel. The Treaty of Amiens went into effect on 25 March 1802 following a preliminary agreement which was made in October 1801, heralding a period of peace between the United Kingdom and France which was in effect until May 1803.⁵⁰⁰ This particularly worked in the favour of

⁴⁹⁸ Tracy, *Continental Church Furniture in England*, 39.

⁴⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 41.

⁵⁰⁰ John D. Grainger, *The Amiens Truce: Britain and Bonaparte 1801-1803* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004), 210.

large-scale importers and it was during this fourteen-month armistice that J. C. Hampp of Norwich began importing stained glass into England.⁵⁰¹ He conducted trade with Flanders, which gave him opportunities to develop his business to include the importation of wine and stained glass into England. Hampp only brought glass into the country between 1802 and 1804, however he was responsible for the importation of the most significant quantity of the continental stained glass in English collections in the early nineteenth century, particularly in East Anglia. Smaller scale importers continued to bring stained glass into the country for themselves and select clients throughout the early decades of the nineteenth century, many of whom used their antiquarian connections to secure sales. Sir Brooke Boothby (1744-1824) purchased the sixteenth-century windows from the Cistercian abbey at Herkenrode (Liège, Belgium) for £200 in 1802.⁵⁰² The imported panels were arranged and inserted into the windows of the Lady Chapel at Lichfield Cathedral (Staffordshire) in 1804-05 by John Betton junior (1765-1849).⁵⁰³ Betton was able to accommodate almost all of the original glass in the new arrangement at Lichfield (figure 122).⁵⁰⁴ In East Anglia, Colonel Robert Rushbrooke (1779-1845) worked as an agent in a similar mode to Boothby, as he worked for individual clients sourcing glass for specific schemes. His work on behalf of Reverend Henry Cockayne Cust for the Church of St John the Baptist, Cockayne Hatley (Bedfordshire) will be considered in this chapter.⁵⁰⁵ This

⁵⁰¹ Prior to importing stained glass Hampp also purchased wine on the Continent to sell in England. His account book begins with a list of wine imports dating from 1791 to 1804 (J. C. Hampp Account Book, The Fitzwilliam Museum Manuscript Collection, The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge).

⁵⁰² Marks, *Stained Glass in England during the Middle Ages*, 243.

⁵⁰³ Sarah Brown, "Medieval Stained Glass and the Victorian Restorer," *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century* 30 (2020), accessed Sept 20, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.16995/ntn.2901>.

⁵⁰⁴ A volume detailing the history of the glass at Herkenrode Abbey and Lichfield Cathedral is forthcoming (Yvette Vanden Bemden and Isabelle Lecocq, *The Stained Glass of Herkenrode Abbey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).

⁵⁰⁵ Rushbrooke purchased glass which was later installed at the Church of St Peter, Nowton (Suffolk). It is also possible that he bought glass for his own parish church of St Nicholas (Rushbrook).

approach, in which glass is purchased for a specific setting, is quite different to the speculative approach to stained-glass acquisition taken by Hampp. Whereas Boothby's purchase was made during a period of continental travel unrelated to business, Hampp's approach to buying stained glass was established within a pre-existing mercenary framework.⁵⁰⁶ For Hampp, stained glass was a commodity, and he entrusted agents to buy glass which would be popular on the English market without having identified specific clients.

Trade Routes and Dealers: Established Routes of Importation

Rushbrooke: Agent Importer

Although large-scale importers like Hampp imported large quantities of stained glass on behalf of English collectors, there were many smaller traders who imported lesser quantities either for their own building projects or for fellow antiquary and wealthy patrons. What influence did these individuals have over glazing imports and designs, and how does this differ from large-scale importers like Hampp? Colonel Robert Rushbrooke, the owner of Rushbrooke Hall (Suffolk, demolished 1962) was a small-scale trader who had a great interest in antiquarianism and historic interiors. Tracy described Rushbrooke as an "M.P, J.P [...] grand tourist, connoisseur, collector, amateur architect and wood carver."⁵⁰⁷ Rushbrooke was known to have a good knowledge of antiquities among his

⁵⁰⁶ Boothby spent much of his life travelling Europe, including the years surrounding his purchase of the Herkenrode stained glass (Rebecca Mills, "Boothby, Sir Brooke, Seventh Baronet (1744-1824)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Sept 23, 2004, accessed Sept 20, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/2898>).

⁵⁰⁷ Charles Tracy, "Colonel Robert Rushbrook, M.P, J.P. (1779 -1845): Grand Tourist, Connoisseur, Collector, Amateur Architect and Wood Carver," *Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History Proceedings* 40, no. 3 (2003): 306.

peers, as is evidenced by this entry in the journal of prolific antiquarian writer David E.

Davy, dated 16 October 1834:

Col. Rushbrooke, who [...] accompanied us to the church,⁵⁰⁸ promised to send me an account of the first Duke of Exeter in 1778, drawn up by his grandfather, who was present at the examination of the body; this promise he was kind enough to perform the next morning.⁵⁰⁹ I mentioned to him the circumstance of the Roman brick which I had received from Dr. Colville, from Colchester Green; he had not heard of it, but knew that there were some earth works there, & promised he would take an early opportunity of examining the spot.⁵¹⁰

He was able to build on the reputation he had made among his fellow antiquaries in order to occasionally work as an agent sourcing and importing historic continental stained glass and woodwork for select English patrons.⁵¹¹ The scale of this operation was small in comparison to Hampp's business, however Rushbrooke arguably had more influence over the finished schemes for which he sourced glass. Whereas Hampp was sourcing stained glass for a varied marketplace, Rushbrooke was travelling the Continent looking for material to fit the exact specifications laid out by his patrons. Tracy has explored Rushbrooke's business model in relation to his work at the Church of St John the Baptist,

⁵⁰⁸ The Abbey Church at Bury St Edmunds (Suffolk).

⁵⁰⁹ The Duke of Exeter referred to here is Thomas Beaufort (c. 1377 -1426). An extract of a letter sent from Bury St Edmunds (dated 24 February 1772), originally published in the London Gazette, gave an account of this discovery. Although the above letter was published anonymously, it is possible that this is the account referred to by Davy. The body was exhumed by men working in the abbey ruins on 20 February 1772: "The workmen opened the lead, and to their great surprize [sic], found the flesh, hair, and toe and hand nails, as perfect and sound as though he had not been dead six hours. A Surgeon in the neighbourhood was sent for, who made on [sic] incision on the breast, and declares the flesh cut as firm as a living subject, and there was an appearance of blood [...]. The workmen coming early on Friday morning, resolved to make a prize of the lead, and therefore cut him out, tumbling him into a hole near at hand, and threw dirt on him. The lead was conveyed directly to a plumbers [sic] and there sold for twenty-two shillings. Thus, in Shakespeare's phrase, was a great man knocked about the sconce with a dirty shovel ("Extract of a letter from Bury St. Edmunds, dated February 24," editorial, *Kentish Gazette*, Feb 25, 1772, 3)."

⁵¹⁰ Davy, *A Journal of Excursions*, 219-20.

⁵¹¹ Some stained-glass fragments can also be found in windows at the Church of St Nicholas, Rushbrooke (Suffolk). It has been suggested that the pre-nineteenth-century fragments and panels, particularly the heraldic glass, were likely to have been previously installed at Little Saxham Hall which was demolished in 1773 by Richard Crofts (Tracy, "Colonel Robert Rushbrooke," 323). The presence of brightly coloured blue, amber, and green glass fragments suggests that the present state of the windows might represent a later restoration of an early nineteenth-century scheme. It is possible that Rushbrooke was involved in the sourcing of glass at his local parish church as he was responsible for some of the distinctive carved wooden choir stalls.

Cockayne Hatley (Bedfordshire) on behalf of Reverend Henry Cockayne Cust. In this instance Rushbrooke acted as an agent for Cust, exploiting his connections with dealers and traders on the Continent to find and import stained glass and Belgian woodwork for the church's interior.⁵¹²

Rushbrooke's work as an agent was built into his extensive travels on the Continent and as such his business dealings were an extension of his own antiquarian explorations. Rushbrooke embarked on collecting trips to Belgium in c. 1815-1820 and 1826-1828 and it was during this latter trip that he was tasked with sourcing glass for Cockayne Hatley. As he wrote to Cust on 16 January 1827:

"I have resolved to extend my stay herein one twelvemonth more than at first intended. So if you have more *Abbeys* to endow & to decorate, you may be assured of my *Agency* until September 1828. Unless unforeseen accidents or good fortune accelerate my return."⁵¹³

Despite his relaxed approach to business relationships displayed in the above quotation, Rushbrooke was serious about his work as an agent. He was dedicated to sourcing glass to exactly fit the proportions of the window at Cockayne Hatley, and asked Cust for specific measurements to ensure he purchased the right combination of stained-glass panels for the scheme:

You have sent me more than once the width (viz 13ft) but the height I have been obliged 'to put x' up to this time. – Let that be given in xxx next & most speedily, that I may be able to calculate the Q[uantit]y required [gives diagram of a window with letters relating to different parts] – Let me have the dimensions of the lancet abcdefgh [gives diagram of a window with letters relating to different parts on

⁵¹² Tracy, *Continental Church Furniture in England*, 66.

⁵¹³ Robert Rushbrooke, Letter to Henry Cockayne Cust, June 9, 1829, in Tracy, *Continental Church Furniture in England*, 280.

the window head] – so as to have the curvature correctly in case we can fit it, bearing in mind the application of an organ case when occasion serve.⁵¹⁴

Rushbrooke was not successful in sourcing stained glass for this scheme and Cust instead commissioned Thomas Willement (1786-1871), with whom he was working closely in the reglazing of St George's chapel, Windsor, to make windows for the church instead. The East window was installed in 1829 (figure 123) and two armorial windows followed in 1839.⁵¹⁵ Pevsner remarks that the inspiration for the pictorial style of the East window was inspired by seventeenth-century Netherlandish stained-glass designs.⁵¹⁶ By this point in the nineteenth century, fewer panels were available for sale on the Continent and commissioning new stained-glass windows was an increasingly practical alternative. While Rushbrooke's glazing scheme was never realised here, he was still responsible for importing much of the carved woodwork in the church.⁵¹⁷ Pevsner listed these pieces of woodwork in his description of the church: a large screen from Louvain under the tower, communion rails from Malines displaying trophies and musical instruments, stalls and stall backs from Aulne Abbey near Charleroi (dated 1689), reading desks constructed to

⁵¹⁴ Ibid., 279-80. Additions and observations given in square brackets are taken from Tracy's transcription of the original letter, including "paints," which should read "points."

⁵¹⁵ Nikolaus Pevsner, *Bedfordshire and the County of Huntingdon and Peterborough* (London: Penguin Books, 1968), 72.

⁵¹⁶ Ibid., 72. The imitation of historic glazing goes beyond simulating the pictorial style of historic stained glass. Areas of the window have been designed to appear as if the glass has undergone historic repairs which have been completed with mending leads (a feature not uncommon to glazing of the mid-nineteenth century, as practiced by firms such as Clayton and Bell). These imitation repair leads are particularly visible in the upper panels of the window, where the expanse of vivid blue sky in all three scenes has been fragmented by numerous dark lead lines. These deliberate design choices give these windows the appearance of age without the limitations inherent to installing glass which was not originally designed for the window opening in question. Willement completed other work at the church in this period, including the painting and gilding of organ pipes. The installation of the East window as well as this additional decorative work was undertaken as part of a single period of work, during the week commencing 26 May 1830 (Brownlow Papers, Personal journals/account books of the Honourable and Revd Henry Cockayne Cust, 1812-1859, 35 vols, Lincolnshire Archives, in Tracy, *Continental Church Furniture in England*, 278).

⁵¹⁷ Tracy, *Continental Church Furniture in England*, 66.

include “all sorts of collected bits,” and the North aisle screen which was originally from St Bavo in Ghent and includes pieces dating from c. 1540 into the seventeenth century.⁵¹⁸

Although Rushbrooke did not go on to import stained glass on behalf of Cust for Cockayne Hatley, the communications between the two men illustrate the role which Rushbrooke took as an agent. It seems that Rushbrooke had significant control over the style and symbolism of the glass which he was looking to source. It is possible that his definition of what the client was looking for limited his ability to find glass to fit the window in this case. He was particularly concerned with finding panels which would fit the curvature of the light heads of the East window, which would have minimised the need for additional surround glass once the panels were imported. Whether this was to be achieved using large-scale panels or smaller fragments and roundels is unclear. Regardless of this stylistic choice, the desire to entirely fill the East window with stained glass accords with the purpose of historic composite windows in churches during the early nineteenth century. As discussed in chapter three, the subject matter of historic glazing was often of secondary importance to the lighting effect which could be created by limiting the amount of clear glass in a window scheme.⁵¹⁹

Documents related to Cockayne Hatley are useful in understanding the role which Rushbrooke undertook as an agent, despite the fact that the scheme was never realised. This can assist in the interpretation of the earlier scheme at St Peter, Nowton, which was

⁵¹⁸ Pevsner, *Bedfordshire*, 71.

⁵¹⁹ See chapter three for details of the Sublime and stained glass at the turn of the nineteenth century.

created using continental roundels which were purchased by Rushbrooke.⁵²⁰ The role which Rushbrooke fulfilled as agent at Nowton was recorded by Davy on 27 August 1829:

The E[ast] window is large, & filled with painted glass; consisting of numerous small circles, representing portions of scriptural history, & legends, set in modern glass by a man at Norwich: the other windows throughout the church are filled in like manner: the circles were all collected abroad by Col. Rushbrooke, & purchased by the present Mr. Oakes, who placed them in their present situation at his own expense, as well as presented them to the Parish.⁵²¹

The first iteration of the Nowton glazing scheme was installed c. 1816-1821 which suggests that Rushbrooke must have purchased the roundels for the scheme on his earlier collecting trip to the Continent between 1815 and 1820 (figure 8, 9, 109&110). Unlike at Cockayne Hatley, there is no surviving correspondence to prove exactly how much glass Rushbrooke imported for Oakes, and it is possible that he imported more glass than was required for the initial scheme. This may explain why continental stained glass was available for use at Nowton Court, which was acquired in 1832 by O. R. Oakes.⁵²² Some glass may have remained unused until the church was altered in 1843. At this time a north aisle was added, and it is possible that any remaining glass imported by Rushbrooke was incorporated into the glazing scheme at this time.⁵²³ The sheer quantity of roundels imported by Rushbrooke for the church at Nowton suggests that these panels were purchased in bulk. It is therefore likely that the scale and shape of these roundels were of greater value to the purchaser than the iconography depicted in the individual panels. The overall scheme was constructed around the similarity in size and scale of the continental roundels. The surrounds were carefully constructed to create an overall

⁵²⁰ More details of this scheme, including the patron Orbell Ray Oakes, can be found in chapter three.

⁵²¹ COLLECTIONS by David Elisha Davy, Vol. 31, facing 177.

⁵²² See appendix II for details of the glazing at Nowton Court.

⁵²³ An alternative theory is that these panels may have been previously arranged in the West window of this church in the initial glazing scheme of c. 1816-1821. It is possible that H. J. Oakes removed this glass in 1843 in order to fill the windows of the newly constructed north aisle.

symmetry and balance of colour and design across each window of the scheme. The significance of the East window as a focal point of the scheme was enhanced by the fact that any roundels with coloured enamel paintwork were placed in this window.

It seems that Oakes used Rushbrooke as an agent due to an existing social connection between the two men. As discussed in chapter three, the Oakes' family members were prosperous businesspeople who were prominent members of Bury St Edmund's society. Rushbrooke had worked as a barrister in the town and would have moved in the same social circles as the Oakes family.⁵²⁴ Bury St Edmunds was the second largest town in the county of Suffolk, and the population expanded from almost 8000 in 1801 to 11436 in 1831.⁵²⁵ The town was a prosperous centre of yarn manufacture and had undergone major gentrification by the eighteenth century. The Oakes family was central in this process and James Oakes was one of the wealthiest merchants in the town.⁵²⁶ As such, he formed close connections to the local landowning classes, including Sir Charles Davers, 6th Baronet (1737-1806), who owned Rushbrooke Hall until his death in 1806.⁵²⁷ Orbell Ray Oakes' father, James Oakes, had been a close friend of Davers since the two met at Bury Grammar School and this relationship continued into adulthood. Davers had acted as one of Oakes' sureties when he became Receiver General and he also provided advice when Oakes founded his bank in Bury St Edmunds. In addition to this, Davers also provided summer grazing for Oakes' horses at Rushbrooke Park. On Davers' death, ownership of Rushbrooke Hall passed to Frederick Hervey (1769-1859), who then

⁵²⁴ Fiske, *The Oakes Diaries*, vol. 1, 195.

⁵²⁵ *Ibid.*, 2-3.

⁵²⁶ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁵²⁷ *Ibid.*, 126.

sold the house to Rushbrooke in the same year. Rushbrooke and the Oakes' family would have been acquainted prior to the former purchasing Rushbrooke Hall, however it is likely that this move would have further added to the relationship between Orbell Ray Oakes and Rushbrooke. As a well-known antiquary living who was travelling the Continent on account of his interest in historic architecture, Rushbrooke would have been an ideal candidate when Orbell Ray Oakes was looking for an agent to supply historic stained glass for the church at Nowton. In the examples of both Cockayne Hatley and Nowton, Rushbrooke personally facilitated the provision of stained glass. The relationship of agent to patron was built on previously existing business and personal networks. The acquisition of stained glass and woodwork from the Continent was entrusted to Rushbrooke both because of these pre-existing connexions and because he had established himself as an expert antiquary. This level of personal concern was not possible for large-scale importers like Hampp, who instead entrusted the purchase of stained glass to agents.

Hampp: The Large-Scale Importer

John Christopher Hampp (1750-1825) is the most well-known large-scale importer of foreign stained glass from the start of the nineteenth century, in part due to the preservation of notebooks which record many of his imports from the continent and sales in England.⁵²⁸ He sold stained glass both from his Norwich warehouse and from Christie's auction house in London. How was it that Hampp, who was neither an antiquary nor a glazier, became such an important figure in the trade of continental stained glass in the early nineteenth century? To answer this, it is first necessary to consider how Hampp had the financial means to become such a major player on the stained-glass market. Hampp, a

⁵²⁸ J. C. Hampp Account Book.

Chapter Four: Stained-Glass Import Networks: The Influence of Traders, Agents, and Auction Houses on Composite Scheme Designs

native of the Duchy of Württemberg,⁵²⁹ settled in Norwich and was granted the Freedom of the City as a worsted-weaver in 1793.⁵³⁰ Norwich was the centre of the established East Anglian worsted-weaving trade in this period, and the production and export opportunities available in the city would have been highly attractive to traders like Hampp. Norwich was the only producer of worsted fabric in the British Isles, which was a later development from the historic role of this region as a producer of raw wool, fibre, and textiles.⁵³¹ The finished textiles were distributed by merchants domestically as well as being sold throughout the world, thus this trade provided an opportunity for cultural and business links between Norfolk and the Continent. Fifteen ships were dedicated to the trade between Yarmouth and Western Europe in the early nineteenth century, exporting worsted cloth and importing timber, rope, dyes, linen and iron.⁵³² The town of Yarmouth experienced major population growth and urban development in this period. From this town, goods could be trans-shipped to smaller vessels to continue along the river Yare to Norwich. It seems highly likely that Hampp would have used this transport route in reverse to ship his worsted to the Continent, although no records remain to unequivocally prove this. It is also possible that stained glass was imported into Norwich via this route, although if this was the case it was not the only route used by Hampp. What is certain is that Hampp imported stained glass into England via Dover, as can be ascertained from his account book. An entry dated 17 April 1803 noted an expense of £12 10s to cover both “Charges attending duties and freight at Dover” and “Carriage from Dover to Norwich.”⁵³³

⁵²⁹ The Duchy of Württemberg presently forms the Federal State of Baden-Württemberg in Germany.

⁵³⁰ Kent, “John Christopher Hampp of Norwich,” 193.

⁵³¹ J. K. Edwards, “Industrial Development- 1800-1900,” in *Norwich in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Christopher Barringer (Norwich: Gliddon Books, 1984), 138.

⁵³² *Ibid.*, 139.

⁵³³ J. C. Hampp Account Book.

The choice of over-land transportation methods between Dover and Norwich was common in this period. Strong winds and offshore shoaling would have posed risks to those shipping goods up the coast from Dover to Norfolk. The crossing from Dover to Calais would have been the most opportune route for importing stained glass from France in this period. In addition to ensuring the safe delivery of the cargo to Norwich, overland routes also meant that additional tonnage dues would be avoided at Yarmouth.⁵³⁴ The earliest date given in Hampp's notebook for the importation of stained glass is 12 February 1802. He was able to build on his business contacts on the Continent as well as his familial ties to create a profitable business venture, which he is now remembered for above his work in the worsted trade. The fact that Norwich became such a significant centre for the importation of historic continental stained glass, and therefore the manufacture of composite windows, is not coincidental. The worsted trade brought Hampp to Norwich from Germany and the prosperity which he found in the city ensured that he was able to take advantage of the lucrative trade in stained glass happening on the Continent.

Hampp's role in the city of Norwich answers how he had the capital and the appropriate experience in international trade required to embark on a new international business venture. It does not explain why he chose stained glass as a commodity for import. The existence of a strong market for historic stained glass in England at the turn

⁵³⁴ The Norwich and Yarmouth Navigation was formed in 1682, an organization by which tonnage dues were levied on all goods entering Yarmouth. The money raised was invested in the maintenance and enhancement of the rivers Yare, Bure and Waveney, as well as Yarmouth Haven (J. K. Edwards, "Transport and Communications in the 19th Century," in *Norwich in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Christopher Barringer (Norwich: Gliddon Books, 1984), 120-121).

of the nineteenth century has been proved in earlier chapters of this thesis. It seems likely that it was through contact with antiquaries in Norwich and business associates on the Continent that Hampp became aware that he was in the position to profit from this demand. One connection of particular significance was made with Seth William Stevenson, who acted on Hampp's behalf on the continent. It seems that Stevenson was able to use his antiquarian knowledge and love of stained glass to make aesthetic choices on behalf of the businessman Hampp. The symbiotic relationship which existed between Hampp and the Stevensons, the businessman and the antiquarians, has not been adequately understood in previous research. The role of Hampp has previously overshadowed the contributions made by the Stevensons. Seth William Stevenson was a prominent member of the Fraternity of United Friars in Norwich from 1813 and he was elected to the eminent position of Abbot of this secular organisation in 1818.⁵³⁵ Furthermore, S. W. Stevenson was also a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London for many years.⁵³⁶ In his journal describing a European tour undertaken in 1817 which was discussed in chapter one, S. W. Stevenson describes his work of buying continental stained glass which he then packed for shipment to England.⁵³⁷ It seems likely that the connection between Seth William Stevenson and Hampp was forged by the former's father, William Stevenson.⁵³⁸ In the auction catalogue for the sale following glazier Yarrington's death in 1827, a reference is made to glass which was "purchased on the Continent, at considerable risk, by the late Messrs Hampp and Stevenson of Norwich."⁵³⁹

⁵³⁵ The Society of United Friars, Contemporary tables of members, subjects etc.

⁵³⁶ For more information on Seth William Stevenson please see chapter one appendix I.

⁵³⁷ Stevenson, *Journal of a Tour through Parts of France*, 32. This passage is quoted in full in chapter one.

⁵³⁸ More information on the role of William Stevenson as an antiquary and his impact on Norwich society can be found in chapter one.

⁵³⁹ Ives, "Stained Glass. To be Sold by Auction," 7.

This statement seems to attribute the role of importation to the senior Stevenson, who died in 1821, rather than to his son Seth William, who lived until 1853. However, Seth William Stevenson followed in his father's footsteps in terms of business and antiquarian interests and was clearly involved in the purchase of glass on the continent. While it is clear that William Stevenson assisted in the sale of stained glass in England, it is equally apparent that Seth William Stevenson had a major role in the actual purchase of stained glass on the Continent in 1802.

Seth William Stevenson's strong interest in and knowledge of historic stained glass can be ascertained from his travel writing. He passed comment on numerous stained-glass schemes in the account of his 1817 European tour. Stevenson found the stained glass of St-Ouen Abbey in Rouen should be "prized for its antiquity, and for the appropriate effect of its sombre tones of blue and ruby, 'shedding a dim religious light,' than for pictorial execution, consisting, as they do, of scraps of scriptural and legendary history, jumbled together without regard to subject or connection."⁵⁴⁰ He praised the quality of the transept rose windows at the Abbey of St Denis, Paris, but found that "the effect is glaring; it is not in harmony with the tranquil solemnity of the edifice."⁵⁴¹ The windows of the Cathedral of St Michael and Saint Gudula in Brussels which met with Stevenson's unequivocal praise: "The windows contain some of the best painted glass I have seen on our journey. The white or rather the *pink* washer's brush has been used

⁵⁴⁰ Stevenson, *Journal of a Tour through Parts of France*, 24

⁵⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 151-152.

here with enough of zeal, and of knowledge and improvement little enough.”⁵⁴² In these descriptions, Stevenson shows an interest in the antiquity, iconography, and execution of historic stained glass as well as an understanding of the impact of stained-glass schemes on the atmosphere and lighting of a space. Further writing supports the notion that Stevenson had already developed a keen eye for the art of stained glass by the time he embarked on his 1802 trip to France as an agent of Hampp. In the appendix of his 1817 journal Stevenson included an account of his visit to the Museum of French Monuments in Paris which was written during his 1802 European trip:

There is a considerable quantity of stained glass in the windows of the different apartments. The sepulchral Chapel of Francis the First is ornamented with three lights, in chaste and simple *grisaille*, finely executed, representing Christ preaching in the Wilderness, Abraham delivering his Son to Agar, and the Victory gained by Moses over the Amalekites. In the windows of the cloisters are twenty-two fine paintings on glass, representing the history of Cupid and Psyche, after the cartoons of Raphael: but the greater portion of this collection, I was surprised to find, very inferior both in design and execution, and put together in a clumsy and unworkmanlike manner.”⁵⁴³

Even at this early date Stevenson shows that he had developed strong opinions on the execution and arrangement of stained glass, which would have been useful when purchasing stained-glass panels in Rouen. Hampp was able to use the discerning taste of Stevenson to his advantage and as a result he was able to import stained-glass panels which were attuned to the tastes of the English antiquarian marketplace.

⁵⁴² Ibid., 263. Writing in 1864, Charles Winston was in agreement that the windows of this Cathedral were the “most powerful and striking of glass-paintings (Charles Winston, “Remarks on the Painted Glass at Lichfield Cathedral,” *The Archaeological Journal* 21 (1864), 193-194).”

⁵⁴³ Stevenson, *Journal of a Tour through Parts of France*, Appendix 8.

In addition to contacts in Norwich, Hampp built on previous business relationships in his work as an importer of stained glass. Chief among these was Peter Bemberg of Cologne (1742-1814), who was referenced four times in Hampp's account book as selling glass to Hampp between February 1803 and February 1804. Various members of the Bemberg family were involved in cloth manufacture and trade in Cologne, and it is likely that Hampp formed a connection with this family through his own worsted export business.⁵⁴⁴ In addition to the references in Hampp's notebook, a further document remains which suggests that Peter Bemberg was a major figure from whom Hampp purchased glass in this period. An account for seventeen boxes of glass imported from the Continent in May 1804, which was originally tucked into Hampp's account book, records a total cost of £1752 18s –.⁵⁴⁵ This total cost included the purchase of glass on the Continent as well as the duty and charges associated with transporting the glass to Norwich. Bemberg's fee for providing stained glass accounted for just over a third of this total cost, at £482 16s –. This considerable sum supports Peter Martin's claim that Bemberg was Hampp's principal supplier of stained glass in the early nineteenth century.⁵⁴⁶ This certainly seems to have been the case by 1804, however the records are less clear as to the involvement of Bemberg in Hampp's operation prior to February 1803. Both Peter Bemberg and his brother Caper Heinrich Bemberg (1744-1824) were involved in the family cloth production firm Friedrich Wilhelm Bemberg & Co.⁵⁴⁷ Unlike Hampp, the Bemberg brothers had a sustained antiquarian interest in the collection of stained glass in addition to being commercially involved in the sale of historic glass to other collectors. It

⁵⁴⁴ Martin, "The European Trade in Stained Glass," 121.

⁵⁴⁵ Account of 17 Cases of Glass Imported in May 1804, John C. Hampp Account Book Letters Folder, The Fitzwilliam Museum Manuscript Collection, The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.

⁵⁴⁶ Martin, "The European Trade in Stained Glass," 121.

⁵⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 60.

is even possible that the way that the Bemberg family combined their interest in the textile and wool trades with the sale of stained glass inspired Hampp to do the same. Where Rushbrooke built his own diminutive role in the importation of continental stained glass on existing business and personal relationships, Hampp arguably did the same, albeit on a larger scale through the employment of Bemberg.

In addition to Bemberg, Hampp also worked with another continental agent with connections to the cloth and wool trade. The name “Hauserman” first appears in Hampp’s notebook under a bill recorded on 12 February 1802.⁵⁴⁸ Martin has explored the relationship between Hampp and “Hauserman” and identified the latter as Christoph Friedrich Häussermann (1772-1842).⁵⁴⁹ Häussermann was Hampp’s nephew, the son of his sister Euphrosina Dorothea (1741-1808) and Georg Adam Häussermann (d. 1822).⁵⁵⁰ During the early years of trade recorded in Hampp’s account book C. F. Häussermann was living in Paris, and Martin records that like Hampp he was involved in the wool and cloth trades in Europe.⁵⁵¹ Unlike Bemberg, there is no indication that Häussermann had independent knowledge of stained glass beyond his work with Hampp. The familial relationship between the two men may go further to explain why Häussermann worked as an agent for Hampp in this field. In addition to this, the fact that Häussermann was based in Paris would have placed him in an ideal location for purchasing stained glass from major French cities, including Rouen. It is possible that Häussermann was working with knowledge supplied by Stevenson, given that both men sourced stained glass for

⁵⁴⁸ J. C. Hampp Account Book.

⁵⁴⁹ Martin, “The European Trade in Stained Glass,” 317.

⁵⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 317.

⁵⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 317.

Hampp in a similar geographical area. Between Bemberg and Häussermann, Hampp was able to import glass from two of the major centres for the continental stained-glass trade in this period, as exemplified by an account book entry for April 1803.⁵⁵² Paris, Rouen, and Cologne were all centres with plentiful glass of the early sixteenth-century date and pictorial renaissance style which was attractive to English collectors. This single entry clearly lists three separate lots of stained glass which were shipped together to Dover before being carried overland to Norwich.⁵⁵³ Firstly, Häussermann sent four cases of stained glass from Paris consisting of a collection of twenty-five subjects purchased for £104. Secondly, Bemberg supplied 106 tablets, for which he required a payment of £72, £40 of which was the cost of the glass and the remaining £32 accounted for Bemberg's expenses. Given the location of his business, this glass was likely sourced from Cologne or nearby cities. The final lot of glass was four boxes of glass from Rouen which had been paid for on a previous trip and may well have been purchased by Stevenson when he visited the city on behalf of Hampp the previous year. In addition to the assistance of Stevenson therefore, Hampp was able to use familial and business connections to employ agents who were native to the Continent. The combined influence and knowledge of these individuals ensured that Hampp was able to make a name for himself as a significant importer of stained glass in England.

The use of existing business and personal networks shown to have been used by Hampp echoed those seen in Rushbrooke's work for Orbell Ray Oakes. However, where

⁵⁵² J. C. Hampp Account Book.

⁵⁵³ The total cost for charges attending duties and freight at Dover combined with the price of the carriage from Dover to Norwich amounted to £70 13s 6d (J. C. Hampp Account Book).

Hampp's connections found him agents, Rushbrooke's found him clients. Although both men were importers, Rushbrooke's more amateur operation means that he acted as both agent and importer. The two vastly different scales of business exemplified by Hampp and Rushbrooke by necessity called for different approaches in the sourcing of material on the Continent. From the correspondence with Cust it is clear that Rushbrooke's choices would have had a major impact on the final appearance of this scheme. The greatest restriction which he faced was the size and shape of the existing East window's lights. Hampp's interest was mercantile, and as such he needed to employ various agents to source vast quantities of stained glass. This material was purchased for a general audience with the aim of finding a large pool of interested buyers once the material was in England. The choices of Hampp's individual agents had an impact on what material was made available to collectors in England, and they were likely influenced by their acumen in understanding the demands of the English marketplace. They did not have influence over how this glass would be manipulated to fit new schemes once it was purchased. While Rushbrooke's imports would have been dispatched directly to the seller, Hampp's importation style required that historic stained glass was sold at auction. The next section of this chapter will explore what influence this mode of selling had on the final appearance of new schemes once the continental stained-glass panels and fragments arrived in England.

Stained-Glass Auctions and their Influence on Collecting

illuminating and Spectacle: Advertising Stained Glass

For large-scale importers of stained glass like Hampp, the sales process for the collection of imported glass necessitated the use of auction houses to sell large swathes of stock

efficiently. Advertisement of this stock ahead of time was an important aspect for those tasked with selling such large collections of disparate stained-glass panels, and in this work Hampp's business relationship with the Stevensons continued. In order to advertise their wares, stained glass was exhibited both in Norwich and at 97 Pall Mall, London. William Stevenson was involved in the sale of stained glass in London, as was recorded in an 1803 entry in Hampp's account book.⁵⁵⁴ Norwich was an important centre for Hampp's sale of stained glass and this contributed to the large number of composite schemes which were installed in Norfolk and Suffolk in the early nineteenth century. It is likely that Hampp used his textile warehouse in Fishers Lane for the storage and sale of stained glass.⁵⁵⁵ Bartell of Swannington, whose own enthusiasm for the art of stained glass has been discussed in chapter two, referred to the Norwich display in his book *Hints for Picturesque Improvements in Ornamental Cottages*:

The public has of late been much indebted to two gentleman of the city of Norwich,⁵⁵⁶ for bringing into this country some of the finest specimens of painted glass, perhaps, that are extant; and no less so for the liberal manner in which they indulged general curiosity, by a gratuitous exhibition of it. Having myself seen this splendid exhibition two or three times, which I understood has since been removed for sale in London, containing pieces of all size and subjects, from the designs of the first masters, I feel myself better enabled to speak in the application of it.⁵⁵⁷

The exhibition of stained glass in Norwich acted as a precursor to the sale of stained glass in both London and Norwich.

⁵⁵⁴ J. C. Hampp Account Book.

⁵⁵⁵ Kent, "John Christopher Hampp of Norwich," 195.

⁵⁵⁶ Undoubtedly Hampp and Stevenson.

⁵⁵⁷ Bartell, *Hints for Picturesque Improvements in Ornamented Cottages*, 37.

Jasmine Allen has written extensively on the exhibition of stained glass in the nineteenth century.⁵⁵⁸ In London, stained glass was displayed for a short time before being auctioned, as in 1808, where the collection was made available for view two days prior to the sale itself.⁵⁵⁹ Martin recorded that William Stevenson was involved in establishing a system for displaying the stained glass and that from 1806 he backlit the panels using gaslight, thanks to the new leaseholder and pioneer of gas lighting technologies F. A. Winsor (1763-1830).⁵⁶⁰ Winsor had a high opinion of his own work in the field of gas lighting, and publicly demonstrated his experiments at 97 Pall Mall, despite having to defend his practices against detractors in his own advertisements: “Several hundred of my Public Lectures, attended by many thousands of persons, including the most learned of Chemistry and Medicine, have already established public conviction, far above the most malicious efforts of a few ignorant and obscure individuals.”⁵⁶¹ The method of illumination used by Stevenson in London would have been familiar to contemporary audiences, particularly due to the popularity of transparencies in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Transparencies could be made on roller blinds which could be drawn across a window or could be pasted directly onto windows, made of paper painted with oils and varnished to transparency.⁵⁶² Larger transparencies would be painted onto fabric which was then stretched across wooden frames for support. Once lit from behind, these images would have been presented as

⁵⁵⁸ See Jasmine Allen, “Stained Glass and the Culture of Spectacle, 1780-1862,” *Visual Culture in Britain* 13, no. 1 (2012), 1-23 and Jasmine Allen, “Stained Glassworlds.”

⁵⁵⁹ H. T. Kirby, ed., “An Early Nineteenth Century Sale Catalogue,” *JBSMGP* 10, no 4 (1951): 181.

⁵⁶⁰ Martin, “The European Trade in Stained Glass,” 78.

⁵⁶¹ F. A. Winsor, “EXPERIMENTS with pure GAS LIGHTS,” *Morning Advertiser*, Jan 22, 1808, 2.

⁵⁶² Peter Thornton, *Authentic Décor: The Domestic Interior 1620-1920* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1984), 154-55. For information regarding paper transparencies on glass in the later nineteenth century, including related conservation issues, see Monika Adamczak, “Glacier Transparencies Research and Conservation Challenges,” in *Recent Advances in Glass and Ceramics Conservation 2016*, ed. Hannelore Roemich and Lauren Fair (Paris: ICOM-CC, 2016), 63-72.

glowing illuminations. In addition to the use of paper or fabric as a foundation for a transparency, glass could also be used, blurring the line between what was considered stained glass or transparency.⁵⁶³ This would have been further complicated by the fact that glass transparencies also appeared alongside historic stained-glass panels in exhibitions. Comyns' 1815 exhibition at Pall Mall included a large-scale transparency by Pearson after a painting by Reynolds (8ft by 5ft) alongside historic stained glass previously in store at Norwich.⁵⁶⁴ Comyns was involved in the sale of stained glass at 98 Pall Mall from the period in which Hampp's collections were advertised to the public in 1803, when "A VALUABLE COLLECTION of ANCIENT STAINED GLASS, for Churches, Public Buildings, and Cabinets" brought from the Continent was presented for the notice of "The Nobility, Clergy, and Collectors of these rare Specimens of the Arts."⁵⁶⁵ Letters of interest were to be sent to Mr. Comyns at 98 Pall Mall.⁵⁶⁶

It was not uncommon to find that those producing stained glass and transparencies were one and the same. In Norwich, James George Zobel recorded the method by which he made a transparency for Yarrington on 8 September 1831.⁵⁶⁷ Although Zobel does not describe the finished image produced, he does suggest elements of the design in his instructions. The finished subject was approximately 3 ½ feet wide by 2 1/3 feet tall (107cmx71cm) and Zobel also lists the colours which he used: orange

⁵⁶³ Allen, "Stained Glass and the Culture of Spectacle," 6-7.

⁵⁶⁴ Allen, "Stained Glassworlds," 138.

⁵⁶⁵ "ANCIENT STAINED GLASS. TO BE SOLD BY PRIVATE CONTRACT," editorial, *Star (London)*, Mar 14, 1803, 1.

⁵⁶⁶ Martin has suggested that this Comyns was William Comyns (c. 1746-1815?) and that he was the salesman for Stevenson in London and possibly Hampp in Norwich (Martin, "The European Trade in Stained Glass, 82).

⁵⁶⁷ Notebook of James George Zobel.

chrome, raw sienna, burnt sienna, and crimson lake. In addition to these hints, he also wrote that he should have used some distilled Verdigris, a green pigment, “to glaze over thistle & shamrock leaves.” This description of the symbols of Scotland and Ireland suggests that the design painted by Zobel for Yarrington likely included heraldic imagery related to the Crown. This interest in heraldic imagery is comparable to that seen in stained glass in this period. Although Zobel’s writing is scant in relation to the transparency’s design, he is extremely thorough in his description of the construction process. Zobel used Irish linen attached to, and drawn taut across, a wooden frame with tin tacks.⁵⁶⁸ The design was first applied in transparent and semi-transparent colours finely ground and mixed with turpentine and a varnish. In order to make this image transparent, Zobel then applied a mixture of melted wax, turpentine and Spanish white to both sides of the design with a hog’s hair brush. Zobel was also particular when describing the use of oil lamps to “equally & sufficiently” illuminate the design. First, he bored six holes of ½ inch diameter in the top of the case to allow smoke to escape the case. Six oil lamps were then arranged both on a shelf near the centre of the box and on the bottom of the box itself. Zobel specifies at the end of his description that “lamps should be placed on shelves 13 or 14 inches above each other.”

Transparencies were often displayed in shop fronts, and it seems likely that the transparency produced by Zobel was designed to this purpose, possibly even to advertise the types of imagery which Yarrington’s workshop could reproduce in stained glass. More

⁵⁶⁸ The usual fabric of choice for transparencies in the eighteenth century was silk, but by the nineteenth century Scotch cambric was preferred (James Ayres, *Domestic Interiors: The British Tradition 1500-1850* (London: Yale University Press, 2003), 81)).

temporary forms of transparency were made as advertisements and even to show support for a particular political cause. In Norwich, a night of illuminations was seen in the city to celebrate the recovery of King George III in 1789. Several transparencies were listed among the illuminations on show, including:

In the centre of the second story [of the Mayor's house on Surrey Street] a very beautiful transparency, executed by Mr. Montague, of Hygea holding a medallion of the King, with this motto, "Rejoice and sing, behold your King." [...] MARKET-PLACE [...] Mr. James Barker, various transparencies, with festoons of coloured lamps. [...] Angel,⁵⁶⁹ large transparency, well executed by Mr. Bacon, two large female figures, exhibiting a medallion of the King, with the george [sic], under a festoon drapery, the crown in the centre, motto- Rejoice. [...] Mr. Rump, transparent motto, the length of the front 'A long and Prosperous Reign, with the blessing of Uninterrupted Health.' [...] Crouse and Stevenson, large transparency, executed by Messrs. Goose and Weston, a crown on the top of a marble altar, in the front of which a medallion of the King in a wreath of roses, the lion and unicorn couchant, with the arms on an inclined shield at the foot. This was only begun the preceding day at eleven o'clock, the merit of the artists was, however, sufficiently conspicuous.⁵⁷⁰

Cheaper forms of transparencies, painted on linen or paper and not glass, as with the example made by Zobel, would have offered an accessible form of illumination for business owners. This was increasingly the case as instructional manuals became more readily available, many of which offered patterns for the novice transparency maker, such as Edward Orme's 1807 volume *An Essay on Transparent Prints: and on Transparencies in General*.⁵⁷¹ There was an established relationship between transparent illuminated imagery and notions of spectacle and advertisement, which would have been as well understood by audiences in Norwich as it was in London. By using oil lamps to back light

⁵⁶⁹ Presumably a public house.

⁵⁷⁰ "Home News," editorial, *NC&NG*, Mar 21, 1789, 2.

⁵⁷¹ Edward Orme, *An Essay on Transparent Prints: and on Transparencies in General* (London: Printed for, and Sold by, the Author, Bond Street, the Corner of Brook Street; Longman and Co. Paternoster Row; Vernor and Hood, Poultry; White, Fleet Street: Champante and Whitrow, Aldgate: Ostel, Paternoster Row: Rowe and Waller, Fleet Street, and all the Booksellers and Printsellers, 1807).

historic stained-glass panels, salespeople like Comyns and Stevenson were using these recognised tropes to their advantage in the lead up to auction.

Auction Catalogues: The Importance of Scale

In addition to the exhibition of stained glass, the arrangement of panels into lots and categories was a way in which the auction house could have an impact on the purchasing habits of their clientele. The auction catalogues for four of these sales (1804, 1808, 1816 and 1820) have since been published, recording a total of 556 lots of glass offered for sale, many of them supplied by J. C. Hampp.⁵⁷² These auctions formed a significant marketplace for stained glass collectors of this period. Thus, the types of glass available and the separation of panels and windows into different lots deserves closer examination than has been attempted hitherto. Did the way in which stained glass was sold to the public impact collecting habits and thus the layout of new window schemes? This will be addressed through a close analysis of the four sales catalogues referred to above.

All four catalogues relate to sales at Christie's Auction Rooms in London, although the 1804 sales catalogue covered both 97 Pall-Mall and the Norwich warehouse, which one can presume was owned by Hampp. Contemporary evidence points to the direct connection between Hampp and Christie's. A loose sheet of paper which was possibly one part of Hampp's account book lists twenty lots of glass left with Mr Christie on 22 June 1808, less than a week after the 1808 auction discussed here. It is therefore likely that

⁵⁷² H. T. Kirby, ed., "Catalogue of a Sale of Stained Glass in 1804," *JBSMGP* 12, no. 1 (1955-56): 22-29; Kirby, ed., "An Early Nineteenth Century Sale Catalogue," 181-188; John A. Knowles, ed., "Catalogue of a Sale of Stained Glass at Christie's in 1816," *JBSMGP* 8, no. 1 (1939): 15-17; John A. Knowles, ed., "Catalogue of a Sale by Auction of Ancient Stained Glass in 1820," *JBSMGP* 6, no. 3 (1936): 129-131.

glass collected by Hampp was frequently sold at Christie's auction house in the early decades of the nineteenth century, including the four sales discussed here. The sales of 1804 and 1808 were significantly larger in scale than those of 1816 and 1820 in terms of the number of lots available for sale, as illustrated in the following table:

Table 1: Stained-glass auctions and the number of lots available

Sale Year	Number of lots
1804	287
1808	187
1816	47
1820	35

The significant drop in the number of lots available after the first decade of the nineteenth century is reflective of the diminished scale of the stained-glass market on the Continent as well as Hampp's significant impact on the trade. He only imported glass between 1802 and 1804 and although he sold glass at auctions in the following years, this material was imported only during this two-year period. This drop in sales also reflects the shifting fashions of stained glass by 1820, as new stained-glass windows became an increasingly feasible solution for patrons. Due to the substantial amount of glass available at the two earlier sales, the stained-glass lots were divided into sub-categories. These groupings were largely determined by the sizes of the windows or panels and the general subject matter or style of glass used, for example "Short Historical Lights" (1804) or "Graisaille [sic] Lights" (1808).⁵⁷³ This separation into size can be seen as a pragmatic solution for buyers who were looking to find glass of a particular size for pre-existing

⁵⁷³ Kirby, ed., "Catalogue of a Sale of Stained Glass in 1804," 25-26 and Kirby, ed., "An Early Nineteenth Century Sale Catalogue," 187.

windows, or to combine with other historic panels to create new windows without the additional cost of major alteration to the stonework or the glass. Of the 474 lots in the 1804 and 1808 catalogues all but six have measurements given in feet and inches to further assist the purchaser.⁵⁷⁴ Dimensions were given less frequently in the catalogues produced for the smaller auctions in 1816 and 1820. This seems to be largely because most of the lots in these later sales were comprised of diminutive panels and roundels. It seems likely that these were panels imported in the early years of the nineteenth century which had not been sold at previous auctions. As late as 1847, at the auction following the closure of Yarrington's workshop, a significant number of panels which had been imported by Hampp between 1802 and 1804 were available for sale, as discussed in chapter three.⁵⁷⁵ With such considerable amounts of Hampp's "collection" being available at this late date, it seems likely that the panels listed in the 1816 and 1820 auctions could also have been imported as early as 1802.

The division of lots into sub-categories in the 1804 and 1808 sales had an effect beyond allowing the purchaser to easily find glass of a specific size, whether this was the intention of the auction house or not. Through the arrangement of lots the auction house acted as curator for the bidders. By placing disparate panels and lights together to form groups according to the scale of the panels, the auction house united glass which was

⁵⁷⁴ Of these six lots (one from the 1804 sale, four from the 1808 auction), five consist of a mixture of small panels, with one of these lots being unpainted coloured glass pieces: "Blue, Purple, Lilac, Green, Yellow, Orange, &c. At Very Reduced Prices." (Kirby, ed., "Catalogue of a Sale of Stained Glass in 1804," 29). The only lot with a subject given which does not have the dimensions listed is lot 22 from the second day of the 1808 sale, which is listed in the "Small Lights" section as "Scourging Christ, and Companion" (Kirby, ed., "An Early Nineteenth Century Sale Catalogue," 186).

⁵⁷⁵ Ives, "Stained Glass. To be Sold by Auction."

otherwise quite different in terms of execution and subject matter. An excellent example of this is the sub-category “Long Historical Lights” in the 1804 catalogue.⁵⁷⁶ Short descriptions of these panels were given in the catalogue, which make it clear that these panels were broadly biblical in theme (with the possible exception of lot 15) but are otherwise seemingly unconnected. No information was provided as to where these panels were purchased, what date they may have been executed, or how many panels each light consists of:

Table 2: "Long Historical Lights" category, 1804 sales catalogue

Cat.	Cat. No.	Cat. Category	Description	Height (-f/-i)	Width (-f/-i)
1804	12	Long Historical Lights	Assumption of the Virgin	08 05	02 02
1804	13	Long Historical Lights	Receiving the Sacrament	08 02	02 02
1804	14	Long Historical Lights	Our Saviour coming to St. John	08 05	02 10
1804	15	Long Historical Lights	A fine rich light, subject unknown	07 10	02 08
1804	16	Long Historical Lights	The Vision of the Golden Candlesticks	07 00	02 02
1804	17	Long Historical Lights	Pilate washing his Hands	06 04	01 10
1804	18	Long Historical Lights	Our Saviour betrayed	06 04	01 10
1804	19	Long Historical Lights	The seven deadly Sins	06 01	02 04
1804	20	Long Historical Lights	Companion to ditto [connected to prev. lot]	06 01	02 04
1804	21	Long Historical Lights	Genealogy of our Saviour	05 10	02 02
1804	22	Long Historical Lights	The Salutation	03 05	01 11
1804	23	Long Historical Lights	Angel appearing to Joseph	03 05	01 11
1804	24	Long Historical Lights	Pilate washing his Hands	05 01	02 06
1804	25	Long Historical Lights	Daniel interpreting the King's Dream	05 01	02 06

Through looking at the different sizes of panels, one could propose that certain lots are likely to have come from the same original location, for example lots 17 and 18, which have the same dimensions, and could both originate from a Life of Christ narrative cycle. Other panels from this section of the catalogue can be matched up in a similar way,

⁵⁷⁶ Kirby, ed., “Catalogue of a Sale of Stained Glass in 1804,” 26-27.

however it is only lots 19 and 20 which are distinguished as companions in the description given in the catalogue. Using the information provided in these catalogue listings, those purchasing stained glass had the answers needed to ensure that these panels would be of an appropriate size. They would be able to establish how much additional glass would be needed to create new windows. The composite nature of windows created from continental imports in this period has been recognised by earlier scholars, however this curatorial influence of auction catalogues has not been considered previously.

This curatorial influence is seen to a greater degree in the sale of smaller panels, such as roundels, which are often described as “Cabinet Pieces” or “Tablets” in the sales catalogues of the early nineteenth century. As with the “Long Historical Lights” these panels are listed with short descriptions, and the panels have been grouped into lots by the auction house. By creating lots which contain multiple panels, it was the auction house and not the buyer who created groups of panels which would likely be set together in new composite windows. All four of the catalogues discussed here contain glass of this type, and all offer mixed lots of small panels. The table below lays out the category of “Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops” from the 1808 sale catalogue:⁵⁷⁷

Table 3: "Tablets, Ovals, Squares and Roundels [...] and Circles" category, 1808 sales catalogue

Cat.	Cat. No.	Cat. Category	Description
1808/1	1	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inchesd)	St. Dennis, Sampson and the Lion, Tobias's Departure and his Return

⁵⁷⁷ Kirby, ed., “An Early Nineteenth Century Sale Catalogue,” 181-82.

Chapter Four: Stained-Glass Import Networks: The Influence of Traders, Agents, and Auction Houses on Composite Scheme Designs

1808/1	2	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	Rising from the Tomb, St. John Baptist, St. Margaret, St. George
1808/1	3	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	Crowning with Thorns, St. John, Woman taken in Adultery, St. Dennis
1808/1	4	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	St. Christopher, Mary Magdalen, St. Agnes, Europe
1808/1	5	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	St. Margaret, Arms, St. Agnes, St. Peter, etc.
1808/1	6	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	Arms of the Goldsmiths Company, a Head
1808/1	7	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	Story of Suzanna, within a blue and ruby border, inscribed "in omni opere memento finis"
1808/1	8	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	Death of the Virgin, a Funeral Procession
1808/1	9	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	St Michael, August, the Baptism, etc.
1808/1	10	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	The Flight into Egypt, two Arms
1808/1	11	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	The Annunciation, Arms, St. Ursula
1808/1	12	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	Joseph interpreting Pharoah's dream, St. Peter, etc.
1808/1	13	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	Death of the Virgin, Descent from the Cross, "Ecce Homo"
1808/1	14	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	Pallas with the French Arms, 3 Arms
1808/1	15	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	Virgin and Child, one of a different Design
1808/1	16	Tablets. Ovals, Squares and Round Tops (8x6 to 10x8 inches) and Circles (from 7 to 10 inches d)	Finding the Cup, Angel's Departure, Martyrdom

The descriptions of these panels give some indication as to the dominance of religious scenes depicted in the glass. The presence of armorials is also noted, as this type of

imagery was popular for the decoration of houses and churches from the mid-eighteenth century. Much like the list of lights discussed above, there is no indication as to the provenance, style, or age of individual panels. These smaller panels of stained glass have been grouped roughly by size, with the knowledge that they will be re-set into larger windows. It would be expected that the purchaser would be paying for these pieces to be set in coloured glass which could be adjusted according to the precise dimensions of the historic stained-glass roundels. In addition, panels could be cut down to size if necessary. The similarities of size and shape which existed across these roundels provided a basis for which the auction house could create groups of panels, and this translated to the final glazing schemes in which they were set.

Although the majority of panels were presented without provenance in the auction catalogues, a small number of listings refer to the cities of Cologne and Rouen, both cities in which Hampp employed agents:

Table 4: Lots assigned to specific places of origin across sales catalogues

Building or City Description	No. of Lots	Lot Nos.
Cologne	05	1804: 317 1808: 354, 424-25, 469
The Great Church at Cologne	21	1808: 420-21, 436-42 inclusive, 457-68 inclusive
Rouen	10	1808: 320, 327-29 inclusive, 349-53 inclusive, 422
Rouen, Carthusian Monastery ⁵⁷⁸	13	1804: 243 1808: 331-342 inclusive
Rouen, The Great Church	01	1808: 330
Rouen, St. John's Church	03	1808: 322, 355, 423

⁵⁷⁸ For more information on glass from the Carthusian Monastery in Norfolk see David King, "Carthusian Stained Glass in Norfolk," *Vidimus* 47 (2011), accessed Mar 20, 2022, <https://www.vidimus.org/issues/issue-47/feature/>.

Rouen, St. Nicholas' Church	03	1808: 324-25, 443
-----------------------------	----	-------------------

The fact that the cities of Cologne and Rouen were named in the catalogues can be attributed to the audience for whom these descriptions were written. For Grand Tourists of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, these cities would have been potential destinations on their travels. The route from Rouen to Paris was well-trodden with good roads, and Rouen formed a natural calling point for tourists travelling from Dieppe or Calais to Paris.⁵⁷⁹ Paris was a popular destination for English tourists, although a number of travellers took a different route, via the popular watering place of Spa in the Ardennes. From there one could travel through Aix-le-Chapelle (Aachen) and on to Cologne.⁵⁸⁰ The social status and relative wealth of Christie's customer base ensured that they would be very familiar with the great cities of the Grand Tour, even if they had not personally travelled to these destinations. As Seth William Stevenson noted in his 1817 travel journal, "*Notre Dame* of Rouen was formerly famous for its painted glass: it is nearly all gone."⁵⁸¹ Attributing lots of stained glass to these cities distinguished these specific panels from the rest of the auction catalogue and the intention was to make these panels more desirable to the bidders. Much as Grand Tourists could boast of their collections from their travels to cities like Rouen and Cologne, listing these cities in sales catalogues allowed the purchaser to do likewise with their acquisitions. This accreditation also suggested the quality and style of glass which the potential buyer should expect.

⁵⁷⁹ Jeremy Black, *The British and the Grand Tour* (London; Dover, N. H.: Croom Helm, 1985), 29-30.

⁵⁸⁰ Jeremy Black, *The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1992), 56.

⁵⁸¹ Stevenson, *Journal of a Tour through Parts of France*, 23.

Referring to specific buildings or cities in lot descriptions is rare across the catalogues, yet even more unusual is attribution to specific artists. Three lots give the names of fine artists, the designs of whom have been executed on glass, although the names of the glass painters are not given. Looking at descriptions of the glass it is clear that a number of the panels sold were of English origin. The final entry in the 1804 catalogue describes a “Whole-Length Portrait of His Majesty, In the Coronation Robes, size of Life, from the celebrated picture in the Royal Academy, by the late Sir. J. Reynolds; the lead and iron being concealed, and the whole appearing as one plate of glass, 8 feet by 5 feet.”⁵⁸² A panel of this description is now in the collection of the Stained Glass Museum at Ely (object number ELYGM:L1992.6, figure 124). The panel at the museum depicts King George III and was designed and manufactured by James Pearson (1740-1838) in 1793 after the Reynolds portrait of 1780.⁵⁸³ This Pearson panel was first installed at the King’s dining room at Windsor Castle (Berkshire) and was acquired by the Museum directly from the Royal Collection, and therefore must be different to that listed in the 1804 catalogue. The panel listed for sale at Christie’s could possibly be another copy of the same painting by Pearson. Two further references are made to artists, both in the 1816 catalogue, one “a Sea Fight, from Old V. de Velde” and the other “One [panel] from Wouvermans [sic].”⁵⁸⁴ Further to these named artists, there are a number of lots attributed to the French glass painter Nicholas Pinagrier, who worked in Paris from 1566.⁵⁸⁵ Firstly, lot 285 of the 1804 sale, which advertises tablets “Oval, Square, and

⁵⁸² Kirby, ed., “Catalogue of a Sale of Stained Glass in 1804,” 29.

⁵⁸³ “Portrait of George III,” Stained Glass Museum, n.d., accessed Oct 10, 2018, <https://stainedglassmuseum.com/collections/92L6.htm>.

⁵⁸⁴ “Catalogue of a Sale in 1816,” 15-16.

⁵⁸⁵ Guy-Michel Leproux, “Une Famille de Peintres-Verriers Parisiens: les Pinaigrier,” *Monuments et Mémoires de la Fondation Eugène Piot* 67 (1985): 78.

Circular, a great variety, [...] Among which are some inimitable Specimens by Nicholas Pinagrier” and lots 444 to 456 inclusive, as listed in the 1808 sale under the following heading: “Cabinet Pieces. Of inconceivable Brilliancy and Beauty, and of inestimable value. Many of them by the inimitable pencil of Nicholas Pinagrier.”⁵⁸⁶ One further individual is named in the descriptions of the lots across the catalogues, lot 89 from the second day of the 1808 sale (overall lot number 470), which is described as “St Paul at Malta. This exquisite Picture was formerly the Property of the Duke of Orleans.”⁵⁸⁷ The decision to highlight the relationship to specific buildings and artists gives these panels was likely made to give these lots prestige by association, thus making them more appealing for potential buyers.

Only 13 percent of the lots across all four catalogues considered here were assigned a specific provenance, either through identifying the city or building of origin or through connection to a specific individual.⁵⁸⁸ The breaking up of large schemes began with the indiscriminate sale of glass on the Continent and was further exacerbated by the route to English auction houses via various agents. The division of large-scale schemes into smaller lots of glass by auction houses was necessary as few buyers would have the space or the means to install a large historic ecclesiastical glazing scheme in their home, parish church or chapel.⁵⁸⁹ Where panels and windows were identified as coming from

⁵⁸⁶ Kirby, ed., “Catalogue of a Sale of Stained Glass in 1804,” 29 and Kirby, ed., “An Early Nineteenth Century Sale Catalogue,” 187.

⁵⁸⁷ Kirby, ed., “An Early Nineteenth Century Sale Catalogue,” 188.

⁵⁸⁸ This percentage equates to 73 lots out of a total of 556.

⁵⁸⁹ Exceptions to this rule existed, and some patrons were able to create large-scale schemes from continental imports, such as the twenty-two-window scheme at St Augustine Chapel, Costessey Hall (Norfolk) which is referred to in chapter three. Another major scheme was installed at Ashridge Park Chapel (Hertfordshire). Thirty-eight stained-glass panels from the Premonstratensian abbey of Steinfeld (Germany)

the same original schemes, these were usually broken down into multiple separate lots in auction catalogues. One could argue that this was a mechanism whereby glass from the same scheme could be bought by a single purchaser, thus ensuring that the glass could remain in a single setting. This was not borne out in practice, as is clear when one examines the actual sales recorded in the catalogues. For example, in the 1816 catalogue lots 41 to 45 inclusive are described thus: "The following five Lights form a very rich and beautiful set of Windows for a Small Chapel."⁵⁹⁰ Of these five lights, four were sold to a purchaser called Claughton, while a single light (lot 44) was sold to one Rudge. Although breaking down large-scale schemes into lots was a pragmatic solution for auction houses, this mode of selling ensured that large-scale glazing schemes were usually broken up and distributed across various new stained-glass programmes. Collectors buying stained glass from prestigious auction houses would most frequently not have access to information regarding the provenance of the stained glass they were purchasing. Stripped of their original context and categorised according to size, it was easy for the buyers to repurpose their purchases into new composite schemes. The auction houses, through the division of stained glass into multiple lots and the cataloguing of those lots according to scale and type, had an impact on the buying decisions of their customers. In this way, modes of selling had a direct bearing on the development of composite windows during the early nineteenth century.

were acquired by Lord Brownlow for his chapel and the resulting windows were installed between 1811 and 1831 (King, "The Steinfeld Cloister Glazing," 203).

⁵⁹⁰ Knowles, ed., "Catalogue of a Sale of Stained Glass at Christie's in 1816," 17.

Stonework and the Importance of Panel Size in Practice

The size and scale of stained-glass panels were significant factors for those purchasing continental imports, as evidenced by the priority given to the categorisation of panels by size in the auction catalogues. One of the most obvious reasons for this concern can be found when one considers the places into which these composite windows were installed in the early nineteenth century. It has been established in both chapters two and three that the vast majority of these windows were installed in historic buildings with pre-existing window openings. Given that many new composite glazing schemes were created from fragments of continental glass with added nineteenth-century surrounds, new schemes could theoretically have been tailor made without the necessity of altering the stonework of the original window. Despite this, changes were often made to the original window frames to accommodate the continental stained-glass acquisitions. This section will consider how and why stonework configurations were altered to accommodate new window schemes. How restrictive were existing stonework configurations for glaziers in this period?

Stained glass panels were often trimmed, altered or extended to in order to fit existing window openings, as was the case for the Great Hall window at Blickling Hall where the original panels were extended to fit the new openings (figure 75).⁵⁹¹ Other examples offer a less sympathetic approach to the alteration of historic panels, as was the case with the East window of All Saints Church, Chedgrave (figure 125). This window was installed by Yarington in 1819 and was described by Chambers (1829) as depicting “St.

⁵⁹¹ See chapter two for more information regarding this scheme.

James, St. Thomas, St. John, and other saints in rich colours.”⁵⁹² Like much of the historic continental stained glass installed in this period, the panels used in this window were imported by Hampp in 1802.⁵⁹³ Although some alterations were made to this scheme in c. 1960, the changes made to these panels at the time of installation in 1819 are still apparent.⁵⁹⁴ The addition of glass fragments to extend panels, trimming panels so that figures appear to disappear behind mullions, and cutting panels to centre figurative details are quite striking when one views this window. Arguably, the distribution of stained glass across the window and the resizing of panels in this scheme was dictated by the wish to preserve the original stonework. The practice of cutting glass to create new schemes was not restricted to historic panels. Yarrington also seems to have altered his own newly produced glass to create surrounds to fit pre-existing stonework. For example, the East window at St Peter, Nowton, incorporates a significant number of decorative border pieces painted in Yarrington’s studio, some of which appear to have been cut to fit to fill in spaces between continental roundels (figure 126).

Although there are many examples of glass being cut to fit existing window openings, there are also many other schemes in which stonework was dramatically altered to accommodate new composite stained-glass windows. As discussed in chapter three, one of the most dramatic examples of this can be found at Earsham church (figures 2-7), where the stonework of windows sV and sVI was drastically altered to incorporate composite windows centred around large continental stained-glass panels. Windham’s

⁵⁹² Chambers, *A General History of the County of Norfolk*, vol. 3, 1039.

⁵⁹³ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, Chedgrave All Saints gazetteer entry.

⁵⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, Chedgrave All Saints gazetteer entry.

stained-glass scheme remained in place until 1952, at which time it was thought that “some of the rather vivid Victorian glass clashes badly with the old Flemish glass,” and thus the glass of the East window, window sV, and window sVI was rearranged.⁵⁹⁵ This included the wholesale replacement of stonework in the two south aisle windows. It is important to recognise that composite glazing schemes and their associated stonework were not static compositions even in the nineteenth century. Many schemes were altered within decades of their original installation. At the Church of St Andrew, Great Saxham (Suffolk) windows set in the 1810s were altered in the 1840s, which included altering the stonework to fit these new designs (figure 127). The original design of the East window at Great Saxham included French and Swiss glass collected by William Mills of Great Saxham Hall (c.1778-1859). This scheme was recorded in a watercolour by Ann Mills (1795-1827), and this invaluable work allows one to see the drastic changes which were made to this window in c. 1847 (figure 128). In terms of the stonework, mullions were added to divide the single-light window into three lights. Trefoil-shaped and quatrefoil-shaped tracery lights were also added where previously the window terminated in a simple pointed head. The addition of tracery lights indicates that the architect had an interest in the development of Gothic architectural style during the early nineteenth century. The East window at the Church of St Andrew, Hingham (Norfolk) is another significant example of the alteration of stonework (figure 129). This large window was filled with German sixteenth-century stained glass at the behest of Lord Wodehouse of Kimberley, who gifted the glass to the church in 1813.⁵⁹⁶ The stonework was altered in order to

⁵⁹⁵ G. King & Son (Lead Glaziers) Ltd, All Saint’s Church, Earsham. Report on War Damage. 14th September 1952. Sent to The Rector and Churchwardens, 3, RK&S, Folder Earsham KNG 2/2/13/34, NRO, Norwich.

⁵⁹⁶ Chambers, *A General History of the County of Norfolk*, vol. 3, 1039.

accommodate this glass in addition to some minor nineteenth-century additions from Yarrington's workshop.

These three examples show the extremes to which stonework could be altered to suit early nineteenth-century tastes. Both glass and stone were malleable and could be transformed according to the wealth and influence of the patron. For many, the additional cost of changing stonework would have proved an expense beyond the means of the patron, particularly if they had already purchased glass to fill several windows. Where this was the case, stonework was preserved, and the historic glass was manipulated and fitted with surrounds to fill the pre-existing window lights. For patrons of these schemes, knowing the sizes of stained-glass panels would have been instrumental in their choices when purchasing from importers. The closer the original panels were in size to the existing window openings, the less work would be needed to create the new scheme. Further to this, scale and size of historic stained-glass panels remained an important aspect of design choice even where patrons were willing to transform window openings for new stained-glass schemes. The symmetrical designs of composite windows in this period included the imported continental stained glass. To ensure that the finished windows would be balanced, it was necessary to consider the size and scale of all panels which might be used in a design. In dividing their stock into lots according to size, auction houses provided a curatorial service for patrons. Using these measurements, it would be easy to identify which panels would enable the buyer to create windows in the symmetrical and decorative style typical of this period.

Conclusion

Decisions made across trading networks had a major impact on the continental stained glass which was available for English collectors in the early nineteenth century.

Antiquarian agents, either working directly for clients or on behalf of traders, were charged with purchasing glass to appeal either to specific clients or for the general marketplace. The size and scale of panels seems to have been a particularly significant concern for agent importers like Rushbrooke in his work as agent for Cust at Cockayne Hatley. This same point of interest was reflected in auction catalogues of the period, which divided imported material into lots and categories in which size and scale were major determining factors. The buyers, who were likely sourcing glass for a specific setting, were in a similar position to Rushbrooke. They required measurements to ensure that they brought appropriately sized panels for the overall dimensions of their glazing scheme. It seems that there were two main reasons for this focus on dimensions for buyers and patrons. Firstly, if one could preserve existing stonework and limit alterations to the imported material, the financial cost of this work would be less. Secondly, the visual impact of the composite style of windows of this period came from their overall symmetry of design, as discussed in chapter three. This aesthetic concern ensured that those buying glass would have chosen glass based on the size, scale, and shape of the panels to ensure a balance across the overall scheme. The next chapter will look more closely at the role of glazing workshops on the development of this style, including the burgeoning mass production techniques employed for the manufacture of surround glass at Yarrington's prolific Norwich workshop.

Chapter Five: Workshop Networks and the Development of Glass Painting in Early Nineteenth-Century Norwich

Following the Reformation there was a reduced demand for stained-glass windows in England, which led to fewer glazing studios and a loss of skills, particularly relating to the firing of glass. The hierarchical structures which were previously inherent to stained-glass workshops were also lost at this time. This chapter will examine the developments seen in the glazing practices of the early nineteenth century, which were prompted by the influx of continental stained-glass panels and fragments in this period. Historically, Norwich was a centre of stained-glass practice, and the city was home to large workshops throughout the later medieval period.⁵⁹⁷ Despite this, and in contrast to the city of York, the city had no practicing glass stainers by the end of the eighteenth century. The work of importer Hampp ensured that Norwich once again became a centre for stained-glass practice, with a focus on the creation of composite windows which featured imported continental glass. This chapter will consider the growth of the glass painting industry in the early nineteenth century with a particular focus on the productive glazing workshop of Samuel Carter Yarrington. How did glazing practices evolve in this period in terms of the production of windows and the associated workshop structures?

Terminology: Glaziers, Glass Painters, and Glass Stainers

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, professionals of the glazing trade were labelled with various different professional titles, including “glazier,” “glass painter,” and “glass stainer.” What tasks were performed by these different professionals, and can an

⁵⁹⁷ David King, “Medieval Glaziers’ Workshops in Norwich,” in *Investigations in Medieval Stained Glass*, ed. Brigitte Kurmann-Schwarz and Elizabeth Pastan (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2019), 362-73.

examination of this terminology offer insight into the changing landscape of stained-glass production in this period?

Trade directories of the early nineteenth century demonstrate how the term “glazier” was used in combination with other descriptors, such as “painter” and “plumber.”⁵⁹⁸ The majority of glaziers offered multiple craft and building services, and advertisements of the period give an idea of the diverse range of trades practiced by glaziers in this period. For example, in 1805 the Norwich firm Willsea and Dixon advertised their business under the heading of “Plumbing, Glazing, and House Painting.” The advertisement lists the full range of services which Willsea and Dixon could provide: “Patent water closets, Engine Pump and Beer Engines, Ornamental and Sign Painting, Writing, Transparencies &c., executed in city or county, with neatness and despatch, and on the most reasonable terms.”⁵⁹⁹ A direct connection between plumbing and glazing was established by the eighteenth century, as demonstrated by John Rowell (1689-1756) of Wycombe’s trade card (figure 130). Rowell was trained as a plumber and glazier and was over forty when he first produced stained glass.⁶⁰⁰ This card, after informing the reader of Rowell’s ability to stain glass, stated that “He also by Approv’d Engines Raises Water from great Depths, or Distances, in an Easy and Cheap manner, and (if requir’d)

⁵⁹⁸ Sarah Brown and David O’Connor discussed the development of terminology and stained-glass production in their publication, noting that from the sixteenth century onwards “the word glazier became more specialised and was reserved for those making leaded lights, with its pejorative association of being allied to plumbing (that is working in lead), while terms like *glass-painter* and *peintre-verrier* were coined for those of more artistic bent who worked on stained glass windows (Sarah Brown and David O’Connor, *Glass-Painters* (London: British Museum Press, 1991), 14).”

⁵⁹⁹ Peter Willsea, “Plumbing, Glazing, and House Painting,” *NC&NG*, May 18, 1805, 3.

⁶⁰⁰ Sidney M. Gold, *A Short Account of the Life and Work of John Rowell* (London: Ranelagh Press, 1965), 7.

maintains them yearly for a small Consideration.”⁶⁰¹ Illustrations on this card display examples of his work and the text is framed by two spouting fountains operated by putti. Both the window glazing and plumbing trades required knowledge of lead-working, which explains why the two trades were often practiced together. Glaziers made new windows using clear glass and would have been able to repair historic stained glass, however the vast majority would not have been involved in the painting of new stained-glass panels.

The term “glass painter” is more difficult to clearly define in this period. Some individuals were described as glass painters despite the fact that their work was not fired and thus the glass was likely to suffer from paint loss from the time of installation. This is evidenced in Norwich itself by the work of Mrs Lloyd (1722/23-1801), whose husband was the Dean of Norwich from c. 1765-90, during which time she painted an East window for Norwich Cathedral. The window is described in the *NC&NG* at the time of its renewal in 1826:

The large EW of Norwich Cathedral was exposed into view after restoration. The central light formerly comprised the Transfiguration, after Raphael, painted by the Lady of the late Dean Lloyd, with varnished colours, but these not having been burnt in were after a time entirely dissipated. The same subject has now been re-executed in vitrified colours from a picture by Julio Romano, in the possession of Mr W Wilkins,⁶⁰² by that ingenious artist, Mr Zobel (in the employment of Mr Yarington of Norwich), we offer our congratulations on the success.⁶⁰³

It seems that Mrs Lloyd could be defined as an amateur painter of glass as it seems unlikely that she would have been financially reimbursed for her labour. As a woman of

⁶⁰¹ John Davis, “John Rowell: Plumber and Stained Glass Dial Maker,” *The British Sundial Society* 19, no. 4 (2007): 179.

⁶⁰² William Wilkins, architectural designer and historian who is mentioned in chapter one as a co-founder of the Fraternity of United Friars.

⁶⁰³ “On Sunday last, the Large East Window,” 2.

high social status, Mrs Lloyd would not have had the opportunity to enter a paid profession in the late eighteenth century. However, this measure of professionalism is restrictive and as H. Tom Küpper has discussed, there are social as well as economic factors which have historically determined the concept of the “amateur.”⁶⁰⁴ Mrs Lloyd’s contribution to Norwich Cathedral was well respected by her contemporaries, and was seen in relation to her skills in needlework, as is clear from this short obituary:

Her performances in needlework were so exquisitely wrought that they may be compared with the paintings of the most celebrated artists. The Transfiguration and other figures represented in the eastern windows of Norwich Cathedral have displayed the superior skill of her personal attainments.⁶⁰⁵

The impressive scale of her work, and the admiration shown towards her as an artist, suggests that Mrs Lloyd’s lost work should be re-evaluated within a framework which highlights the positive and progressive contributions made by non-professional artists and craftspeople.⁶⁰⁶

In addition to the Norwich Cathedral glass, there is one further example of the glass painting of Mrs Lloyd. The 1789 illuminations for the recovery of George III have been mentioned in chapter four. Coloured lamps, lights, and transparencies were lit throughout the city, including the Cathedral Close: “Mrs Lloyd’s taste, at the Deanry [sic], was strongly marked by many curious devices on painted glass, exhibiting baskets of fruit, wreaths of laurel, &c. &c.”⁶⁰⁷ It is likely that these panels were painted in the same way as

⁶⁰⁴ H. Tom Küpper, “Amateur Stained Glass in English Churches, 1830-80,” *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century* 2020 (30), accessed Sept 13, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.16995/ntn.2895>.

⁶⁰⁵ Charles Mackie, *Norfolk Annals: A Chronological Record of the Remarkable Events in the Nineteenth Century*, vol. 1 (Printed at the Office of the “Norfolk Chronicle” Market Place Norwich, 1901), 4.

⁶⁰⁶ Küpper, “Amateur Stained Glass in English Churches,” 3-4.

⁶⁰⁷ “Home News,” Mar 21, 1789, 2.

the Cathedral's East window. No examples of Mrs Lloyd's work remain and therefore one must look at the descriptions of her work to ascertain what types of materials she used as well as how her work was viewed by her contemporaries. Mrs Lloyd's glass was referred to as "painted" in the periodicals quoted here, as "curious devices on painted glass" in 1789 and "painted [...] with varnished colours" in 1826. From the latter description it seems likely that Mrs Lloyd was applying paint to the surface of glass which was then displayed or fitted into the window without firing the glass. This would leave the painted surface vulnerable to cracking and peeling with thermal changes, which was the likely cause of the "dissipation" described in the case of the Cathedral window. This application of paint and varnish to glass surfaces could align Mrs Lloyd's work more closely to glass transparency than stained-glass window.⁶⁰⁸ The scale of the Norwich Cathedral East window project, as well as the use of such techniques to fill a historic window opening, places the work of Mrs Lloyd in a grey area between these two crafts. This example underlines the difficulty of categorising craft practices, particularly where the finished effect of the work are so similar as in glass transparencies and stained-glass windows. The generic descriptor of "glass painter" could be a good solution when one considers how to consider Mrs Lloyd as a craftsperson.

In the early nineteenth century, the term "glass stainer" was preferred for those who were able to produce glass panels with fired glass images. Glass stainers could also be glass painters, but the technical skill of glass firing distinguished these craftspeople from the more common trade of the plumber-glazier. This is clearly demonstrated when

⁶⁰⁸ For more information on the art of transparencies see chapter four.

one considers how businesses described their practices in trade directories of the period.

The earliest trade directories listed businesspeople alphabetically, with their profession following. As populations increased and more tradespeople were available, these directories began to separate business owners according to the service they were offering, with trades listed in alphabetical order under subheadings. These subheadings clearly separated those in the glazing trade according to whether they could fire glass or not, with “glass stainer” being used to distinguish those who were able to offer newly fired glass. In Norwich, directories from the 1830s and 1840s used the following subheadings to demarcate different groups within the glazing profession:

Table 5: Glazing and glass painting professional titles in trade directories of the 1830s and 1840s

Year	Titles of professions relating to glazing and glass painting/staining
1830 ⁶⁰⁹	“GLASS STAINER” and “PAINTERS, PLUMBERS AND GLAZIERS”
1836 ⁶¹⁰	“GLASS STAINERS” and “PLUMBERS, GLAZIERS, AND PAINTERS”
1839 ⁶¹¹	“GLASS STAINERS” and “PAINTERS, PLUMBERS AND GLAZIERS”
1845 ⁶¹²	“GLASS STAINERS” and “PLUMBERS, GLAZIERS, AND PAINTERS”

In the case of the examples above it seems that the term “PAINTERS” does not refer to painting on glass, but to ornamental painting of signs and houses, trades which often overlapped as with the example of Willsea and Dixon discussed above. This alignment of trades was made particularly clear in Pigot’s 1839 directory where the subheading

⁶⁰⁹ Pigot and Co., *National Commercial Directory; Comprising a Directory and Classification of the Merchants, Bankers, Professional Gentlemen, Manufacturers and Traders, in all the Cities, Towns, Sea-Ports, and Principle Villages in the following Counties, viz. Norfolk & Suffolk* (London: Pigot & Co., 1830), 49 and 52.

⁶¹⁰ White, *History, Gazetteer, and Directory, of Norfolk* (1836), 190 and 205-06.

⁶¹¹ Pigot and Co., *Pigot’s Directory of Norfolk* (Pigot and Co., 1839), 495 and 497, accessed Aug 25, 2017, <http://cdm16445.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/ref/collection/p16445coll4/id/112408>.

⁶¹² White, *History, Gazetteer, and Directory, of Norfolk* (1845), 186 and 202.

“PAINTERS, PLUMBERS AND GLAZIERS” was followed by “(See also the preceding List.)” that list being “PAINTERS- HOUSE, SIGN, &c.”⁶¹³

As the nineteenth century progressed an increasing number of glaziers were able to develop their practices to include the firing of glass. The table below shows the increase in businesses listed in Norwich directories related to glazing and glass staining between 1783 and 1845. All businesses were listed twice in directories, both under “glass stainer” and “glazier.” In the table supplied below these businesses have been counted only in the column for “glass stainer” to avoid replication:

Table 6: Number of glazing and stained-glass businesses in Norwich listed in trade directories, 1783-1845

Year:	Businesses listed including glazing:	Glass stainers:
1783 ⁶¹⁴	19	0
1811 ⁶¹⁵	26	0
1830 ⁶¹⁶	51	1
1836 ⁶¹⁷	48	3
1839 ⁶¹⁸	50	2
1845 ⁶¹⁹	33	4

For artisans, being able to describe themselves as a “glass stainer” was to increase the range of trades offered by your business, rather than to refine your work to focus on a

⁶¹³ Pigot, *Pigot’s Directory of Norfolk* (1839), 497.

⁶¹⁴ Anon. J., *The Norwich Directory; or Gentlemen and Tradesmen’s Assistant containing an Alphabetical List of the Principal Inhabitants, their Address, Occupation and Residence: The Houses Numbered* (Norwich: Printed and Sold by W. Chase and Co., 1783), 5-45.

⁶¹⁵ C. Berry, *A Concise History and Directory of the City of Norwich; For 1811: Containing besides the LISTS a Variety of LOCAL INFORMATION, USEFUL and INTERESTING to RESIDENTS and STRANGERS* (Norwich: Printed by and for C. Berry, jun., Dove Lane, 1810), 70-135.

⁶¹⁶ Pigot, *Directory* (1830), 49 and 52.

⁶¹⁷ White, *History, Gazetteer, and Directory, of Norfolk* (1836), 190 and 205-06.

⁶¹⁸ Pigot, *Pigot’s Directory of Norfolk* (1839), 495 and 497-98.

⁶¹⁹ White, *History, Gazetteer, and Directory, of Norfolk* (1845), 186 and 202.

single skilled aspect of the glazing trade. In the following table the different tasks related directly to the creation of windows have been listed, which demonstrates the breadth of skills practiced by stainers:

Table 7: Skills according to profession in glazing and glass painting during the early nineteenth century

	Glass stainer	Glass painter	Glazier
Firing glass	✓		
Painting glass	✓	✓	
Glazing and plumbing	✓		✓

The role of glass stainer thus combined that of the glass painter and the glazier, with the added ability to manage a kiln for the firing of glass.

Although it is clear that there was a marked increase in the number of businesses offering the firing of glass in Norwich over the first half of the nineteenth century, this number remains small in comparison to the number of glaziers. The cost of building and running a kiln, both in terms of materials and the employment of a skilled operator, would have been prohibitively expensive for many smaller businesses. Eighteenth-century examples illustrate the difficulty of operating kilns to produce consistently well-fired glass even if one had access to a kiln and some understanding of how to operate it. In his study of John Rowell, Sidney M. Gold writes that “[m]uch of his glass does not appear to have been fired, merely painted. Thus this has suffered during the centuries and much of his glass has either peeled or cracked.”⁶²⁰

⁶²⁰ Gold, *Life and Work of John Rowell*, 21.

Gold does not offer a suggestion of how many of Rowell's windows he believes were fired, instead he works with the idea that glass paint peeling and cracking means that kiln firing was generally not undertaken by Rowell's studio. However, closer analysis of surviving Rowell schemes and a comparison to works by other contemporaneous glass painters suggests a different reason for the poor condition of the paint work. The East window of St Leonard's Church, Apethorpe (Northamptonshire, figure 131), for example, depicts "The Last Supper" and is signed "I; Rowell Wycomb Bucks Fecit, 1732." Although a significant amount of paint loss has occurred, evidence suggests that the glass for this window was fired before installation. The yellow in the window has been created using silver stain, an effect which can only be achieved by firing the glass. In this example, and other windows attributed to Rowell, the stain has been successfully applied and fired. Knowing this the loss of paint, both vitreous and enamel, points instead to an underdeveloped knowledge of kiln management, which has led to the under-firing of the glass in this example. This under-firing was not consistent across Rowell's windows and some schemes suffer far less paint loss than that exhibited by the Apethorpe window. For example, "The Adoration of the Shepherds" in The Tomb Chapel at The Vyne (Sherborne St John, Hampshire), has retained more of the original paint (figure 132). According to Gold, this window was installed c. 1831, which makes it slightly older than "The Last Supper."⁶²¹ This lack of consistency across different schemes of a similar date supports the concept that there was a lack of competent knowledge of kiln technology in Rowell's

⁶²¹ Ibid., 35.

workshop, with an inability to control and maintain temperatures leading to the under-firing of some windows.

Inconsistent firing was not uncommon in the eighteenth century.⁶²² William Peckitt (1731-95) made a large-scale figure of St Peter for window sXXIV of York Minster in 1754, however the paintwork was so deteriorated that he provided a replacement for this just twelve years later, in 1768 (figure 133).⁶²³ The need to control temperatures in order to fire different glass paints, enamels and stains correctly was as difficult to facilitate in practice for Peckitt early in his career as it had been for Rowell twenty years previously. Later examples of Peckitt's stained glass do not suffer from significant paint loss to anywhere like the same extent as some of Rowell's glass, as can be seen when comparing Rowell's "The Last Supper" to the four monumental figures of St Peter (1768), Abraham (1780), Solomon (1780) and Moses (1793) in windows sXVII, sXIX, sXXIII and sXXIV of York Minster. When one understands the complexity of maintaining control over kiln firing, and the extent to which this could have an impact on the longevity and quality of stained-glass windows, it is clear why mastery of this aspect of the glazing trade distinguished a small group of "glass stainers" from general glaziers.

⁶²² Severe paint loss is also seen in surviving nineteenth-century stained-glass windows, due to flaws in the process of making and later environmental reasons. See Alison Gilchrist, "The Tears Wept by our Windows: Severe Paint Loss from Stained Glass Windows of the Mid-Nineteenth Century" (PhD thesis, University of York, 2010).

⁶²³ Trevor Brighton and Brian Sprakes, "Medieval and Georgian Stained Glass in Oxford and Yorkshire. The Work of Thomas of Oxford (1385-1427) and William Peckitt of York (1731-95) in New Melton College Chapel, York Minster and St James, High Melton," *The Antiquaries Journal* 70, no. 2 (1990): 383.

The State of Glass Painting and Staining in the Early Nineteenth Century: The Question of Networks

The need to develop technical skills relating to kiln firing was therefore a significant factor in the development of glass staining businesses. The question of how glaziers developed the technical knowledge to paint glass has been argued by other scholars in the context of other case studies of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. York has been discussed as a centre of glass painting in the centuries preceding the Gothic Revival. John Knowles' claimed that a school of glass painters existed in post-Reformation York, with a focus on Bernard Dinnickhoff (fl. C. 1585-c. 1618), Henry Gyles (1645-1709), and William Peckitt.⁶²⁴ He argued that not only did Gyles' skill in painting come from a Dutch school of glass painting which was established in York, but that Peckitt may have been taught to paint by William Price the Younger. Brighton challenged the claims of Knowles by stating that in fact there was no Dutch school in York at this time.⁶²⁵ Furthermore, he wrote that although the principal glass painters of this period, like Gyles and Peckitt, were aware of the work of their predecessors, they discovered and practiced the art of glass painting independently of one another.

There also seems to have been no studio culture in Norwich in the eighteenth century as there is no evidence for any practicing glass painters in the city during this century. The question remains, then, as to how a revival of glass painting was able to occur in this city in the early nineteenth century, at which time a number of glazing workshops also offered glass painting. Was there a similar pattern of apparently isolated

⁶²⁴ John A. Knowles, *Essays in the History of the York School of Glass Painting* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1936).

⁶²⁵ John Trevor Brighton, "The Enamel Glass-painters of York," (PhD thesis, University of York, 1978), 3-5.

glass painters, as seen earlier in York, or is there a more integrated network of practitioners sharing skills relating particularly to firing techniques and kiln management? This chapter will consider the role of possible networks of glass painters and glaziers in transferring and developing skills in early nineteenth-century East Anglia.

It was during the 1830s and 1840s that a greater number of glass stainers became established in Norwich, with four businesses being listed for the city in White's 1845 trade directory. This followed a general increase in those who listed glazing businesses at this time, which must in part be due to the population increase of the city in the same period. According to census records listed by Armstrong the population of Norwich increased from 38 502 in 1801 to 62 552 in 1831, which gives a total population increase of 62.46 percent.⁶²⁶ The growth in glazing and stained-glass production in terms of the number of workshops can be seen clearly in table 6, which shows businesses listed in trade directories for Norwich from 1783 to 1845. All four of the glass stainers listed in the 1845 directory were also listed as glaziers in earlier directories and their businesses are listed both under the heading of glass stainer and glazier in 1845: John Dixon, James King and Sons (established by James King senior (1778-1851)), John Middleton (1791-1848) and Samuel Carter Yarrington.⁶²⁷ In addition to these Norwich listings, three further practitioners are known to have been staining and firing glass in East Anglia during the early nineteenth century: Robert Allen of Lowestoft, the Winter family of glaziers

⁶²⁶ Alan Armstrong, "Population, 1700-1950," in *Norwich since 1550*, ed. Carole Rawcliffe and Richard Wilson (London: Hambledon and London, 2004), 245.

⁶²⁷ John Middleton of St Stephens Street, Norwich. One surviving scheme has been attributed to Middleton at All Saints Church, Beighton (Norfolk). Eight two-light windows were installed by Middleton at this church in c. 1847-1848. These windows featured a complex geometric lead-line and contain coloured geometric glass painted with floral motifs (Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, 196).

(specifically John Winter (1791-1867) and Cornelius Jansen Winter (1820-1891)) and James George Zobel. These businesses and individuals form the basis of this East Anglian case study. Through examining their business structures and interactions with each other, this chapter will explore how these studios developed and whether they should be considered a network.

How did workshops develop skills in glass painting, and did they continue to produce stained glass after the death or retirement of their establishing artisans? Robert Allen of Lowestoft is the earliest documented glass painter in the region, and he was able to build his skills in the painting and firing of stained glass following a career at the Lowestoft Porcelain Factory. During his employment at the factory, Allen worked extensively with enamel paint in the decoration of soft-paste porcelain ware. Allen worked independently as a glass painter and therefore did not directly pass on any skills or practices to younger generations. For other glass painters of the period, it is more difficult to trace how they developed the ability to fire glass. John Dixon is an example of this, although what is clear is that he only developed this additional skill after decades of work as a glazier. His first business venture was with Peter Willsea in 1805 according to the advertisement in the *NC&NG* quoted above.⁶²⁸ Dixon continued as a plumber and decorative painter throughout his life and the period during which he practiced the painting and staining of glass was relatively short. His first known project was the East window of St Peter Mancroft (Norwich), panels of which were painted by his studio and

⁶²⁸ Willsea, "Plumbing, Glazing, and House Painting," 3.

installed in 1838,⁶²⁹ and he retired approximately twelve years later in c. 1850.⁶³⁰ As with Allen it seems that Dixon did not pass his business on to further generations of craftspeople, which echoes the pattern observed by Brighton in York during the previous century.

Although these examples suggest that it was unusual to find businesses which continued with changes of proprietor, the example of the Winter family demonstrates how it was possible for families to establish a dynasty of glaziers and glass painters.⁶³¹ The Winter family included at least four glaziers: William Winter (c. 1755-1806), R. M. Winter (m. 1833, ill health 1840), John Winter of Bungay (1791-1867), and Cornelius Jansen Walter Winter of Yarmouth (1820-1891). Of these four individuals John Winter and his son Cornelius Winter are the only two who are known to have produced fired stained-glass panels. Glass known to have been painted by John Winter survives in three Norfolk schemes at the Church of St Peter and St Paul at Brockdish, All Saints Church at Earsham, and the Church of St Peter at Hedenham.⁶³² The firing and painting of stained-glass windows was clearly an established aspect of John Winter's business, although it is unclear where he learned the skills necessary for this. John Winter was able to pass on some knowledge of glass painting to his son Cornelius, as seven panels painted by him are extant in Suffolk: a roundel at St Peter's Hall, South Elmham,⁶³³ and six panels depicting the Apostles at the Church of St Andrew, Winston (figures 134-139). These panels were all

⁶²⁹ "Mr. DIXON, of Bethel-street," editorial, *NC&NG*, Aug 25, 1838, 2.

⁶³⁰ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, 227.

⁶³¹ For more information regarding the relationships between the Winter family glaziers see appendix I.

⁶³² See appendix II for details of these schemes.

⁶³³ According to Haward this is based on a print source of a "MATER SALVATORI" figure (Haward, *Nineteenth Century Suffolk Stained Glass*, 271).

made in c. 1840, when Cornelius was about twenty years old and prior to establishing himself as a painter of miniatures at King Street in Yarmouth (Norfolk).⁶³⁴ This suggests that Cornelius Winter spent some time working in his father's business before establishing himself in a separate trade. This is the point at which the line of Winter glaziers finished, and the skill of glass painting was not carried forward by younger generations of the family.

It is with the Kings of Norwich that one finds a truly successful lineage of glass painters founded in the early nineteenth century. The family business was first registered in a trade directory under the name of James King in 1822,⁶³⁵ and members of the family continued to practice into the twentieth century, first as J. King and Sons and later as J & J King. In 1832 the firm began to advertise themselves as glass stainers, as was recorded in Zobel's Notebook, where he wrote that: "Between the months Jan^y & May of 1832 King & Sons erect two [...] Descriptions of their business to the Public, that they are Glass-Stainers &c &c."⁶³⁶ From this period onwards, while under the management of the first King glazier, James King senior (1778-1851) and his son James King junior (1804-65), the firm produced fired stained glass. The longevity of this firm's operation as producers of fired glass shows a break from the more common pattern of individual glass painters whose businesses stopped operating once the original owner was no longer producing stained glass. King & Sons went on to install over seventy-five windows at forty-seven churches. Haward recorded that this level of productivity marks this firm out as the third

⁶³⁴ Harold A. E. Day, *East Anglian Painters*, vol 3 (Eastbourne: Eastbourne Fine Art, 1969), 242.

⁶³⁵ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, 198.

⁶³⁶ Notebook of James George Zobel.

largest supplier of stained glass nationwide in the nineteenth century, following Ward & Hughes of London and equal to William Wailes of Newcastle.⁶³⁷ With this firm, the skills of glass painting were retained and passed down to other family members, although the ability to fire glass was not offered by the King workshop until 1832. By offering glass staining the King family offered the first major competition in Norwich to Yarrington, who owned the first business to produce fired glass in Norwich in the nineteenth century. There was a fourteen-year period in which both firms were both producing large quantities of stained glass in the city, however in this period there was less call for the re-setting of imported stained glass into composite windows, which had been a major aspect of Yarrington's business in the preceding decades. By the period in which practitioners like King and Dixon were established as makers of painted stained glass, the ability to fire glass was less rare across the country and the emphasis had shifted inexorably towards the creation of entirely new windows. The next section will consider how Yarrington developed his business to incorporate the firing of stained glass at such an early point in the century.

Glass Painting and Firing at Yarrington's Workshop

Establishing a Glass Staining Business

Like many other firms offering glass painting in the first half of the nineteenth century, Yarrington first established his business as a glazier in Norwich. He did not pass on the trade to another family member and the business ceased to trade after his death at the end of 1846. Despite this, he was able to build business relationships with other contemporaneous glass painters, which allowed him to advertise his ability to produce

⁶³⁷ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, 235.

fired glass before any other firm in the city. Yarrington's approach to business created a network of artisans which is quite different from other local examples of lone glass painters or family businesses. In addition to owning the first glass staining business in nineteenth-century Norwich, Yarrington was a prolific producer of stained-glass windows throughout the first half of the century. He often worked with material imported by Hampp and he was a leader in the development of composite schemes in this period. His workshop was instrumental in the re-introduction of glass painting in East Anglia on a commercial scale. The following section will first address the genesis of this workshop before exploring the connections between Yarrington and other glass painters of the region, to establish the significance of these relationships to the growth of practice and business in the early nineteenth century. By examining how the studio's structure and practices advanced, this section will establish how small glazing studios were able to transform into large scale operations, and what part the importation of stained glass from the continent had to play in that development.

The progress of Yarrington's business seems to have been influenced by and connected to the importation of continental stained glass from an early period. Although Yarrington's workshop increasingly produced large-scale figurative panels, a substantial number of his schemes included the integration of continental roundels and panels. The popularity of imported panels led to Yarrington developing a particular style of composite windows, in which colourful surround glass was used to create complex symmetrical schemes. The association between Yarrington and Hampp was well known at the time, as demonstrated by William Warrington (1796-1869) in his 1848 publication on the history

of stained glass. Describing the way in which Hampp and Stevenson sold stained glass from Pall Mall, he wrote that “[s]o far as re-leading them was concerned, there was no difficulty, and this was accomplished by the late Mr. Yarrington [sic] of Norwich.”⁶³⁸

Why was Yarrington chosen to perform the task of re-leading for Hampp and Stevenson at this time? He was certainly not the only glazier to be working in Norwich in the first decade of the nineteenth century, and it is likely that the relationship between Hampp and Yarrington pre-dates the latter’s ability to fire glass. It is possible that Yarrington was known to William Stevenson due to an earlier business relationship which he had with one of Yarrington’s older relatives. Between 1788 and 1796 several references can be found in local papers, particularly the *NC&NG*, to the business of Yarrington and Bacon.⁶³⁹ Due to the years in which this business flourished this would place this Yarrington at the right age to be the father of S. C. Yarrington.⁶⁴⁰ The premises owned by Yarrington and Bacon was located on Cockey Lane,⁶⁴¹ now London Street, which runs through the centre of Norwich. The business was first described as a “Printers” in 1789 by the *NC&NG*, and they were listed as a location which was selling tickets for a lottery

⁶³⁸ William Warrington, *The History of Stained Glass, from the Earliest Period of the Art to the Present Time: Illustrated by Coloured Examples of Entire Windows in the Various Styles* (London: published by the author, 1848), 69.

⁶³⁹ This Bacon is likely to be the father of Richard Mackenzie Bacon (1775-1844), liberal editor and proprietor of the *Norwich Mercury*, writer, and musician (Marjorie Allthorpe-Guyton, “Artistic and Literary Life of Nineteenth Century Norwich,” in *Norwich in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Christopher Barringer (Norwich: Gliddon Books, 1984), 13).

⁶⁴⁰ There are multiple references to a Mr William Yarrington who was an attorney in Swaffham, a market town located thirty-one miles West of Norwich. An examination of periodicals and trade directories of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries suggests that the surname Yarrington was not common at this time in Norfolk and thus it is possible that the attorney Yarrington is also related to glazier S. C. Yarrington.

⁶⁴¹ “NOT ACTED THESE LAST TWO YEARS, For the BENEFIT of Mr. HARLEY,” editorial, *NC&NG*, Apr 26, 1788, 3.

arranged by Messrs. Shergold and Co. of Lombard Street.⁶⁴² Yarrington and Bacon are listed as sellers of numerous other items, including Oriental Vegetable Cordial (“One of the most valuable Medicinal Discoveries which Time and Philosophy could ever boast of”) and tickets to local theatrical performances.⁶⁴³ In the case of these advertisements, and many others of a similar nature, the business of Crouse and Stevenson in the Market Place is listed alongside Yarrington and Bacon as a place where one can purchase the tickets and objects advertised. Like Yarrington and Bacon, William Stevenson was a publisher, and was a particularly prominent representative of this trade due to his role at the *NC&NG*.⁶⁴⁴ Stevenson was editor of this paper from 1785 and continued to act as a proprietor until his death in 1821.⁶⁴⁵ It is likely that William Stevenson would have been aware of the elder Yarrington, considering their shared profession in the city of Norwich. If the two men were acquainted, it is possible that when the Stevensons and Hampp were looking for a glazier, the recommendation of the son of a fellow businessman would have been an obvious choice.

In the period where S. C. Yarrington was first working with Hampp and Stevenson, it seems likely that he was still considered to be a glazier rather than a glass stainer. Documentary evidence of the period suggests that Yarrington had gained the ability to fire glass at his workshop sometime between 1811 and 1813. In 1811 he is still described as a “Plumber and Glazier” and not as a “glass stainer.”⁶⁴⁶ A later advertisement for his

⁶⁴² “SEVENTY PER CENT. SAVED,” editorial, *NC&NG*, Mar 07, 1789, 1.

⁶⁴³ “BILIUS and other COMPLAINTS of the STOMACH, &c. Oriental Vegetable Cordial,” editorial, *NC&NG*, Jan 31, 1789, 4; “For the BENEFIT of Mr. and Mrs. FISHER,” editorial, *NC&NG*, May 15, 1790, 3.

⁶⁴⁴ For more information on William Stevenson’s role in Norwich society see chapter one.

⁶⁴⁵ Marjorie Allthorpe-Guyton, “Artistic and Literary Life of Nineteenth Century Norwich,” 41-42.

⁶⁴⁶ Berry, *A Concise History and Directory of the City of Norwich*, 135.

workshop was published in the *NC&NG* in January 1813, which is the first reference to

Yarington as a glass stainer:

STAINED GLASS.
SAMUEL YARINGTON,
PLUMBER, GLAZIER, HOUSE PAINTER,
And GLASS STAINER,
KING STREET (near Tombland), NORWICH,

EXECUTES FIGURES ARMS, ORNAMENTS, and every kind of Device, from ancient
and modern designs, upon reasonable terms. Specimens of which may be seen as
above.

Ancient Stained Windows re-glazed and the defective parts restored, with the
nicest attention to the original.⁶⁴⁷

There seem to be two possible reasons to explain how Yarington was able to develop this new service as an aspect of his business in the period leading up to this 1813 advertisement. The first is that Yarington had learned by experimentation how to paint and fire glass himself. Peckitt had done just so in York during the previous century, so this was not an impossible task for glaziers with no previous firing experience. Peckitt's diary was purchased by the University of York, with support by the Terry Trust, the York Glazier' Trust, and Friends of the Library and Archive, in 2019. Sarah Brown has noted that evidence from this document supports the notion that he was an auto-didact, and this illustrates the success that one could achieve through trial and error in this early period.⁶⁴⁸ The second possibility is that Yarington, having established himself as a glazier with ties to major stained-glass importers Hampp and Stevenson, was able to employ glass painters and kiln technicians. This second explanation seems the most likely when one considers surviving documentary evidence as well as the remaining stained-glass

⁶⁴⁷ Samuel Carter Yarington, "Stained Glass," *NC&NG*, Jan 9, 1813, 1.

⁶⁴⁸ University of York, "His Colourful Materials: University Acquires 18th-Century Stained Glass Painter's Notebook," University of York, 2019, accessed Sept 13, 2021, <https://www.york.ac.uk/news-and-events/news/2019/research/university-acquires-stained-glass-painter-notebook/>.

schemes linked to Yarrington's workshop. Glass painters Allen and Zobel, who both had a firm understanding of kiln technology and stained-glass firing processes, can both be connected to windows produced by Yarrington's workshop. Little is known about the structure of Yarrington's enterprise prior to his employment of James George Zobel, at which point the latter kept records relating to the business, some of which are preserved in the NRO. An examination of key business relationships will be useful in determining the delegation of roles within Yarrington's glazing workshop and in establishing how connections between glass painters functioned at this time.

Robert Allen: Stained-Glass Supplier

Robert Allen was known for his work in the Lowestoft Porcelain Factory, which produced wares between c. 1757 and production ceased c. 1801-03.⁶⁴⁹ This factory became associated with its chinoiserie-style soft-paste porcelain vessels and pieces, recognisable by the blue underglaze decorative patterning used. The significance of Allen's role in the factory to his later career in stained-glass manufacture has been mentioned above, an influence which must have been great when one considers the longevity of Allen's career in porcelain painting. Allen entered the factory at the age of twelve as a painter in blue in 1757.⁶⁵⁰ This role would have involved the application of decorative motifs of the chinoiserie and Delftware styles in blue pigment (likely cobalt oxide) onto soft-paste porcelain.⁶⁵¹ Many of the details of Allen's work at the Lowestoft Porcelain Factory have

⁶⁴⁹ Sheenah Smith, *Lowestoft Porcelain in Norwich Castle Museum*, vol. 1 (Norwich: Norfolk Museums Service, 1975), 1.

⁶⁵⁰ William Chaffers, *Marks and Monograms on European and Oriental Pottery and Porcelain* (London: Reeves and Turner, 1886), 774, accessed Jul 14, 2017, <http://library.si.edu/digital-library/book/marksmonograms00chaf>.

⁶⁵¹ For more information regarding chinoiserie and porcelain in the eighteenth century see Mimi Hellman, "The Nature of Artifice: French Porcelain Flowers and the Rhetoric of the Garnish," in *The Cultural*

been recorded by William Chaffers following consultation with Allen's grandson, Robert Allen Johnson. Allen Johnson suggests that Robert Allen became manager of the factory in 1780, although this cannot be confirmed by any other source.⁶⁵² Regardless of his final role in the business, it seems that Allen remained with the Lowestoft Porcelain Factory until its closure between 1801 and 1803. After spending over forty years working for the company, it seems likely that Allen would have had a good understanding of various stages of the production line, including different stages of painting, glazing, and firing wares.

Although the exact year which Allen began to produce stained glass is unknown, it is likely that he transferred skills learned in the porcelain factory to glass around the time of the factory's closure. It was at this time that Allen continued to produce painted ceramic goods independently and therefore he would have had access to a kiln which would also have been suitable for the firing of glass. When observing surviving stained-glass panels painted by Allen, one can identify techniques which he would have first learned in the painting of soft-paste porcelain. In both crafts, Allen's skills remained in the decoration of goods rather than on the making of wares or the cutting of glass. Allen purchased undecorated wares from larger manufacturers which he painted, glazed, and fired.⁶⁵³ It seems that Allen also purchased pre-cut glass, onto which he then applied paint and stain. All surviving examples of Robert Allen's glass painting have been made using small clear rectangular or square pieces of glass. For large-scale windows like the

Aesthetics of Eighteenth-Century Porcelain, ed. Alden Cavanaugh and Michael E. Yonan (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2010), 56-57.

⁶⁵² Chaffers, *Marks and Monograms*, 774.

⁶⁵³ W. W. Hallam, *Lowestoft China* (Lowestoft: Flood & Son, 1914), 13.

East window of St Margaret, Lowestoft (1819), the painted scenes were created by leading small rectangular panels together into a grid-like configuration. There is no evidence of Allen cutting glass or leading his own windows for installation. The window at Lowestoft is the only documented large-scale project completed by Allen alone, and evidence in the window itself informs the viewer that a separate glazier was employed to complete the leading and installation of the glass. Remains of the East window are now installed in window s11 at the church, including an inscription which tells the viewer that the glass was originally glazed by Samuel Johnson but that “Robert Allen Pinxt.”⁶⁵⁴ This separation of worker according to skill is comparable to that which would have been made in the Lowestoft Porcelain Factory, where there would have been a distinction made between those forming and painting wares.

There is also a significant overlap in painting styles when one compares objects produced by the Lowestoft Porcelain Factory to stained-glass panels painted by Allen. The style of painting which Allen employed when creating stained glass is clearly derived from his work as a porcelain painter, making his work clearly identifiable from that of other contemporary glass painters who did not have this training. As Allen never seems to have painted on pot metal or flashed glasses, all colour in his work was added using enamel paint and silver stain. This preference for enamels would certainly have come from using these in porcelain painting and it is possible that Allen was using the same paint for both his porcelain and glass painting. Allen’s decorative pieces are also distinguishable from others of this period as they have a greater delicacy in detail and the enamel has been

⁶⁵⁴ See appendix II for a full transcription of this inscription.

applied in a painterly manner which means that the brushstrokes remained visible following the firing process. This is particularly clear when one looks at the glass at the Church of St Ethelbert, Thurton (Norfolk), which was previously discussed in chapter three. Yarrington installed a large-scale scheme at the church in 1826 at the behest of Sir Thomas Beauchamp-Proctor (1756-1827) and Lady Mary Beauchamp-Proctor (née Palmer, 1760-1848) of Langley Hall.⁶⁵⁵ This scheme included numerous panels painted by Allen alongside continental panels and other nineteenth-century pieces painted in Yarrington's workshop. When one compares an Allen floral piece from panel 1b, window sVI at Thurton with a Yarrington floral motif from the same window (figures 140&141) the unique nature of Allen's style becomes clear. The colours of the Allen panel are far less vivid than those in the Yarrington piece, while more detail has been added with dark brown paint to the flowers themselves and as a line-and-dot border. The painted enamel has also been applied with a more variegated brush stroke than one sees in the Allen panel. In addition, the use of delicate borders to surround a larger motif, scene or text, as seen in the Allen panel, was a particularly common design feature used by the Lowestoft Porcelain Factory (figures 142-144).

One particularly distinctive feature which demonstrates the influence of the Lowestoft Porcelain Factory on Allen's glass painting is the use of purple enamel paint. This colour appears in numerous stained-glass panels painted by Allen, including the heraldic armorial panels of George III coat of arms now in the East screen at St Margaret Church in Thorpe Market (Norfolk) and the George IV coat of arms in panel 1a, window

⁶⁵⁵ Chambers, *A General History of the County of Norfolk*, vol. 3, 1039.

nIV at Thurton (figures 145&146).⁶⁵⁶ This unique use of colour is present in both decorative and figurative pieces of glass painted by Allen, for example in a floral piece in panel 3a window sII and the robe of the female saint in panel 2a window sVI, both at Thurton church (figures 91&147). The same shade of purple enamel was frequently used in the painting of pieces produced at the Lowestoft Porcelain Factory, such as in a decorative floral motif used to decorate a mug which reads “A Trifle from Lowestoft” (figure 148). One particularly striking example of this colour of enamel can be found in the design of another mug which is now in the collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum. This has been decorated with a view to the sea across Lowestoft, including the town’s first lighthouse, with Trinity House’s coat of arms depicted prominently above this design (figure 149). It has been suggested that Robert Allen is probably responsible for the painting of this piece in c. 1790.⁶⁵⁷ The way in which purple enamel has been used around this coat of arms on this object bears a particular resemblance to that used in Robert Allen’s glass coats of arms at Thurton. This example strongly illustrates the way in which Allen was able to apply techniques learned for the painting of porcelain directly to the painting of stained-glass panels.

In addition to similarities in application of paint, Allen also learned how to control a kiln at the factory and he was able to produce a professional and long-lasting firing of enamel paint for both paste porcelain and glass. It was the ability to transfer both the technical skills of kiln management and the design skills associated with painting

⁶⁵⁶ The coat of arms now at Thorpe Market was originally part of the East window at St Margaret, Lowestoft (Haward, *Nineteenth Century Suffolk Stained Glass*. Lowestoft St Margaret gazetteer entry)).

⁶⁵⁷ “Mug,” *Collections*, Victoria and Albert Museum, n.d., accessed Aug 22, 2017, <https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O337038/mug-allen-robert/>.

technique that single Allen out as a significant artisan in the early nineteenth century. Allen mastered the art of stained glass far earlier than other craftspeople who first practiced as glaziers, including Yarrington. The exceptional skills which Allen exhibited would have been appealing for those glaziers who wished to offer unique services for collectors of stained glass in this period. This would have been particularly key following the influx of continental glass into England in the first decade of the nineteenth century, when glaziers like Yarrington would have been looking for new fired glass pieces to showcase the continental panels in their composite window schemes. Panels in Allen's unique style appear in many of Yarrington's schemes, and it seems likely that the latter was buying Allen's stained-glass figurative and decorative panels to include in new composite windows. The real scale of this transactional relationship is difficult to measure due to the loss and adaptation of Yarrington schemes in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Despite this, enough evidence remains to show that this was an established business relationship which likely took place over a number of years. The table below lays out the number of panels by Allen which survive in altered or partial Yarrington schemes in Norfolk and Suffolk:

Table 8: Robert Allen panels in schemes attributed to the workshop of S. C. Yarrington

Church	Number of figurative panels	Number of decorative panels	Panel shapes
Herringfleet, St Margaret (Suffolk)	6	13	Rectangular/square
Langley, St Michael (Norfolk)	4	0	Rectangular/square
Little Plumstead, St Protase and St Gervase (Norfolk)	4	0	Rectangular/square
Thurton, St Ethelbert (Norfolk)	11	14 (including George IV arms)	Rectangular/square

As decorative panels have been removed from schemes in far larger number than figurative, it is possible that more of these panels could have been lost during various periods of restoration at these churches. This is a particularly strong possibility at Langley, where much of the decorative surround glass which was likely installed by Yarrington has been lost. Pre-restoration photographs of the window at the Church of St Protase and St Gervase, Little Plumstead (Norfolk) show that no decorative panels in the style of Allen were included in the 1851 iteration of the scheme (figures 150&151).⁶⁵⁸ In all of these cases Allen's glass has been integrated into a wider scheme of glazing which also includes continental glass. Arguably, Yarrington was treating Allen's panels in a similar manner to the imported historic stained-glass panels, particularly in the case of the figurative panels. The scale of these panels, figurative style, and use of stain to add colour means that the Allen panels could be considered visually similar to some of the continental panels imported in the early nineteenth century.⁶⁵⁹ As the figurative continental panels came from disparate sources and were painted by different hands, Allen's panels could be easily integrated into larger composite schemes created by Yarrington.

James George Zobel: Glass Painter and Kiln Technician

There is no evidence to indicate that Allen was a regular employee of Yarrington but rather that he purchased panels from Allen as a client which were then worked into composite

⁶⁵⁸ Yarrington installed the East window at Little Plumstead in 1834, however the glass was removed to window sll in 1851. See appendix II for details of the scheme history.

⁶⁵⁹ There are cases where English nineteenth-century panels have been misattributed to continental sources by earlier scholars. For example, the six apostle panels at the Church of St Andrew in Winston have previously been described as "C 17 or 18 ? Foreign" by Birkin Haward (Haward, *Nineteenth Century Suffolk Stained Glass*, Winston St Andrew gazetteer entry). These panels were made in c. 1840 and have been signed by C. J. W. Winter (see appendix II for further details of this scheme).

schemes. Allen was able to produce panels in a scale and of a size to complement collections of continental roundels, which featured popular decorative and figurative imagery. In terms of the figurative panels, depictions of the Apostles and Evangelists were popular and several of these remain in Yarrington schemes across East Anglia.⁶⁶⁰ Although it is unknown when Yarrington purchased panels from Allen, it seems highly likely that these transactions continued even after Yarrington had hired glass painter Zobel to fire glass for his workshop. According to J. K. Edwards, Zobel served an apprenticeship to a glass stainer in London prior to settling in Norwich.⁶⁶¹ Although it is unclear what source he is using for this statement, Zobel was certainly born and raised in London. His father, Benjamin Zobel (1762-1831), was originally from Memmingen in Bavaria and trained as an oil and miniature painter in Amsterdam before arriving in London c. 1783.⁶⁶² Benjamin Zobel was engaged by the Ecchardt Brothers in Chelsea, who manufactured patterned fabrics and wallpapers,⁶⁶³ before being employed as a “table decorator” in the court of George III (figure 152).⁶⁶⁴ Thus it is probable that James George Zobel and his younger brother George Zobel (1810-81) were both born in London. Both of the brothers followed in their father’s footsteps by entering upon careers in the decorative arts, and George established a business as an engraver in London, where he exhibited work from 1854 to 1879.⁶⁶⁵ The date at which J. G. Zobel relocated to Norwich is unclear. In the obituary

⁶⁶⁰ Depictions of Apostles and Evangelists remained a popular choice for those commissioning new stained-glass windows, as seen in the surviving large-scale figures made by Yarrington’s workshop into the 1840s (for examples, see appendix II entries for the Church of St Michael in Aylsham (Norfolk), the Church of St Mark in Lakenham (Norfolk) and the Church of St Michael in Langley (Norfolk)).

⁶⁶¹ J. K. Edwards, “Communications and Trade,” in *Norwich in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Christopher Barringer (Norwich: Gliddon Books, 1984), 150.

⁶⁶² George Zobel, “The Late Mr. Zobel,” *Eastern Daily Press*, Apr 17, 1879, 2.

⁶⁶³ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁶⁶⁴ G. Bernard Hughes, “Decorating the Georgian Dessert Table,” *Country Life*, May 21, 1959, 1145.

⁶⁶⁵ “ZOBEL, George J. (1810-1881), Engraver (Mezzotint),” Oxford University Press, n.d., accessed 21 Aug 2017, <http://oxfordindex.oup.com/view/10.1093/benz/9780199773787.article.B00202227>.

written by George Zobel it is stated that J. G. Zobel had been living in the city for more than fifty years, meaning that he moved there before 1829. Indeed, it seems that he actually resided in the city for more than sixty years. Zobel, a keen watercolourist, exhibited twice with The Norwich Society of Artists (1805-33). In 1819 he exhibited two works listed as exhibit number 129 "St Andrew" and exhibit number 133 "St Peter." He showed two further works in 1833, exhibit numbers sixty-seven and sixty-seven a, both of which were titled "Landscape and Cattle."⁶⁶⁶ A similar motif of cattle in a rural scene can be found as a sketch in Zobel's notebook (figure 153). This suggests that Zobel must have been living in Norwich by at least 1819, the year he turned twenty-eight, although it is quite possible that he was present in the city earlier than this, particularly if he chose to move to Norwich for employment following the completion of his apprenticeship.

Zobel was working for Yarrington by 1826, as is clear from an article describing the new East window at Norwich Cathedral quoted earlier in this chapter. This article describes the "restoration" of a Transfiguration scene, which in actual fact was an entirely new window of the same subject "in vitrified colours from a picture by Julio Romano, in the possession of Mr W Wilkins, by that ingenious artist, Mr Zobel (in the employment of Mr Yarrington of Norwich)."⁶⁶⁷ However, if Zobel's apprenticeship ran for up to seven years, starting at the age of fourteen, he could have been employed as a glass painter and stainer from c. 1812.⁶⁶⁸ This date seems to fit into the period in which Yarrington first describes himself as a "GLASS STAINER" in the earlier quoted advertisement which was

⁶⁶⁶ Rajnai and Stevens, *The Norwich Society of Artists 1805-33*, 95.

⁶⁶⁷ "On Sunday last, the Large East Window," 2.

⁶⁶⁸ Looking at the London registers of apprenticeships of the first decade of the nineteenth century suggests that this is the maximum period of contract drawn for apprentices across all types of business.

published in the *NC&NG* on 9 January 1813.⁶⁶⁹ This correlation suggests that it may have been through the employment of Zobel that Yarrington was able to expand his business beyond glazing to offer glass staining and firing. Considering the rarity of the skill in East Anglia during this period, it seems reasonable to consider that Yarrington would have looked to London when he wished to employ a glass painter with knowledge of glass firing. Zobel was a long-term employee of Yarrington and continued in his employ until the workshop closed following Yarrington's death at the end of 1846. At this time he continued to practice independently, although he did not purchase Yarrington's business and the contents were subsequently sold at auction in March 1847.⁶⁷⁰ As an employee in the workshop it seems unlikely that Zobel would have been able to afford to buy the business outright at this time. He continued to produce glass independently after this date, much to the exasperation of his wife, as recorded by Zobel in his diary in December 1848: "Margaret said, glass painting she thought a fool of a business, to obtain a maintenance by."⁶⁷¹ This suggests that, despite the senior role which Zobel had in Yarrington's workshop, he was not a wealthy man. The records kept by Zobel provide information on the structure of Yarrington's studio from January 1828 until the closure of the studio in 1846.⁶⁷² His diary and notebook offer an insight into the development of a larger scale glazing studio in the second quarter of the nineteenth century.⁶⁷³

⁶⁶⁹ Yarrington, "Stained Glass," 1.

⁶⁷⁰ Ives, "Stained Glass. To be Sold by Auction."

⁶⁷¹ Diary of James George Zobel.

⁶⁷² One earlier entry, dated 14 December 1827, refers to a German grammar book (Diary of James George Zobel).

⁶⁷³ Diary of James George Zobel and Notebook of James George Zobel.

By the 1830s Yarrington's workshop was producing enough stained-glass windows to enable him to employ up to ten men including Zobel.⁶⁷⁴ The names of the other nine individuals appear in entries in Zobel's diary and notebook, including Dury, Fenn, Harford, Lucas, Moore, Mimms, Parish, Parston and Rulludge.⁶⁷⁵ It seems that Zobel held a position in the business above these other employees and was left to delegate day to day tasks on behalf of Yarrington. He noted periods when Yarrington travelled away from Norwich for business, and it is likely that Zobel would have been left in charge of the workshop during these times. One of the earliest entries in Zobel's diary refers to one of these trips: "Monday Jan^y 21st, 1828. Yarrington off to London by the Times Day Coach from Angel-Inn, Market Place. retⁿ [sic] to Norwich Sund^y night 27th."⁶⁷⁶ It seems that the responsible position which Zobel held in the workshop was not only restricted to times when Yarrington was travelling. In his writing Zobel recorded the illnesses of other employees and the impact which this would have on the ability of the men to work. For example, between February and June 1831 he recorded a spate of illnesses experienced by J. Parish, for example, including the fact that he was "attacked with gout on Wednesday March 28th/ 32. & could not come to work until after the lapse of 5 wks 4ds[,] attacked again June 5th/32. Returned to wk June 12."⁶⁷⁷ From reading this section of Zobel's diary it is clear that he was above Parish in the workshop hierarchy. Zobel wrote that "Parish, returns to his work on Mon: June 6. he [sic] could have come on Mon: May 30. but [sic] I **had not anything ready for him**, & on Tues: I was severely attacked with Colic: & did not begin to work until June 6 1831 [emphasis in bold added by current author]."⁶⁷⁸ Zobel was

⁶⁷⁴ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, 193.

⁶⁷⁵ Diary of James George Zobel and Notebook of James George Zobel.

⁶⁷⁶ Diary of James George Zobel.

⁶⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁷⁸ Ibid.

clearly delegating tasks to other employees like Parish in the mode of a supervisor. This further supports the notion that Zobel had a senior role within the workshop structure.

The reason for Zobel's early employment and advanced position within Yarrington's business can be explained by the knowledge of painting and kiln management which Zobel brought to the workshop. The evidence of his skilled approach to these two branches of stained-glass production can be found in fragments and remains of his painted glass and pencil sketches which he drew in his notebook. Unfortunately, very little remains of the Transfiguration window which Zobel painted for Norwich Cathedral. This window had been removed to the East end of the South transept by 1847, before being destroyed by a bomb blast in 1942.⁶⁷⁹ A single fragment of the Cathedral window has been installed into a window in the Church of St Helen on the Great Hospital site in Norwich (figure 154). This rectangular piece depicts the face of a male, possibly one of Christ's Apostles, looking upwards. The face has been painted sensitively in enamels and silver stain, and a variety of different layers of paint have been applied to give depth to the skin-tone. The use of heavy shadow and highlights to sculpt the long thin nose and to define the cheek are techniques which can also be found in pencil sketches by Zobel. One page, which can be dated to c. 1813-14,⁶⁸⁰ illustrates eight male heads, several of which feature the same accentuated and elongated facial features as in the stained-glass fragment. This is particularly evident in the faces to the top right and bottom right of the page (figure 155). In undertaking the ambitious Cathedral window project, Zobel was

⁶⁷⁹ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, 223.

⁶⁸⁰ Zobel's sketches are undated, however the preceding and following entries are dated 10 Sept 1813 and 7 Sept 1814, suggesting this page was completed between these dates.

clearly a skilled artisan who would have been capable of controlling large-scale projects in Yarrington's workshop.

There is evidence in Zobel's notebook that he was able to experiment with painting techniques while working in Yarrington's workshop. On the 9 October 1832 Zobel recorded an experiment in his notebook, where he used "Calcined Magnesia" purchased from the druggist Woolner "for an experiment to serve as a stencil for a white Vitreous ground", the results of which were "Most excellent."⁶⁸¹ Thomas Henry (1734-1816) was the apothecary who first undertook the preparation of calcinated magnesium, which he considered to have several medicinal properties. He published two volumes in the 1770s which discussed the preparation of this medicine and espousing the health benefits of calcined magnesium when taken appropriately.⁶⁸² According to an advertisement published in 1804, it was most commonly used to treat "all diseases of the stomach and bowels, attended with acidity [...and] Most of the complaints of children, in early infancy, and even more advanced periods". "Calcined Magnesia has a great advantage over other absorbents; viz. that it both neutralizes the acid in the alimentary canal, and carries it off, by acting as an efficacious yet gentle purgative."⁶⁸³ The drug was sold in the form of a white powder and would have been readily available throughout the nineteenth century.

⁶⁸¹ Notebook of James George Zobel.

⁶⁸² Thomas Henry, *Experiments and Observations on the following Subjects; 1. On the Preparation, Calcination, and Medicinal Uses of Magnesia Alba. 2. On the Solvent Qualities of Calcined Magnesia. 3. On the variety in the Solvent Powers of Quick-Lime, when used in Different Quantities. 4. On Various Absorbents, as Promoting or Retarding Putrefaction. 5. On the Comparative Antiseptic Powers of Vegetable Infusions Prepared with Lime, &c. 6. On the Sweetening Properties of Fixed Air* (London: Printed for Joseph Johnson, No. 72 St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1773) and Thomas Henry, *An Account of the Medicinal Virtues of Magnesia Alba, more particularly of Calcined Magnesia; with Plain Directions for the Use of them, to which is Prefixed, a Concise Detail of the Invention and Gradual Improvement of these Medicines* (London: Printed for J. Johnson, St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1775).

⁶⁸³ "GENUINE CALCINED MAGNESIA," *Sun (London)*, editorial, Aug 10, 1804, 1.

In order to use this as a stencil Zobel might have created a fluid solution using the powder which would act as a resist for the glass against the white vitreous paint. This would have been a highly experimental use for this compound, which both points to Zobel's knowledge of the firing process and to the level of freedom which he had to experiment while in Yarrington's employ.

The above incident suggests that Zobel had a level of control over the kiln firing processes of Yarrington's studio. This is further reinforced when one considers the records which survive from Zobel's glass firings between December 1844 and December 1846.⁶⁸⁴ The table below outlines the firings, with details given by Zobel which relate to the technical details of the firing. Even from Zobel's sparse notes, it is clear that controlling a coal-fired kiln was a task requiring considerable skill, and the operator would have had to adjust firing times according to the weather conditions and the type of glass paint used. Zobel has provided annotations which point to the relative success or failure of some of the firings, such as "a little too much heat" on 31 December 1844 and "for yell[ow] a trifle too much" on 29 April 1846. The vast majority of firings are described as being all brown, all yellow or a mixture of the two. It seems likely that brown here refers to brown vitreous paint, whereas the yellow is likely to refer to silver stain. Zobel seems to fire different types of paint, stain and enamel in a single firing. For example, on the 24 May 1845, the glass fired is described as "yell: brown, & Blue," suggesting that silver stain, vitreous paint and blue enamel were all fired together for the same amount of time. It is possible that glass in distinct areas of the kiln could have received different amounts of

⁶⁸⁴ Notebook of James George Zobel.

heat and that Zobel's years of kiln operation allowed him to position the glass accordingly. The firing number which Zobel notes next to each entry allows one to establish the number of firings completed in a given year: forty-seven in 1844 (unfortunately the notebook does not give a description of the previous forty-six firings), twenty-seven in 1845, and thirteen in 1846. These are the final years of Yarrington's studio practice and the final firing was completed on 18 December 1846, less than three weeks after Yarrington's death on 1 December. Zobel's firing log is transcribed in the following table:⁶⁸⁵

Table 9: Zobel's firing log for S. C. Yarrington's workshop, December 1844-December 1846

Date	Firing length (hours.minutes)	Description of glass	Firing number	Further notes
31 Dec 1844	3.50	"all Brown"	47	"a little too much heat"
7 Jan 1845	3.40	"all bro + purple enamel"	1	
7 Jan 1845	3.40	"all for yellow"	2	"(good)"
18 Jan 1845	3.40	"all brown colour"		
7 Feb 1845	3.45	"all brown"	4	"(5 min too much)"
17 Feb 1845	3.45	"a little yellow scattered about on 18 or 20 pieces. the [sic] remainder all brown which had been burnt before but re-shaded"	5	
2 Apr 1845	3.35	"all brown"	6	"Easterly"
12 Apr 1845	4.45	"Brown & yell."	7	"very slow & no stirring wind"

⁶⁸⁵ Ibid.

Chapter Five: Workshop Networks and the Development of Glass Painting in Early Nineteenth-Century
Norwich

13 May 1845	4.15	"pot metals and sheet glass, with liquid, & vitreous flesh colours"	8	"Bligth Copeland Main" "Wind fresh Northerly"
21 May 1845	4.17	"All, shade colour"	9	"Wind Northerly"
24 May 1845	4.24	"yell: brown, & Blue"	10	"but little wind & that from S. W."
7 Jul 1845	4.15	"all brown"	11	"N"
29 July 1845	4.20	"all brown"	12	"S.W."
6 Aug 1845	4.15	"all brown"	13	"N.W."
12 Aug 1845	4.20	"all brown"	14	"N"
19 Aug 1845	4.0	"all yellow"	15	"Easterly"
23 Aug 1845	3.50	"all yellow"	16	"N" "dull & rainy"
29 Aug 1845	4.10	"all quarries white ground in size, flashed in this"	17	"Wind N"
2 Sept 1845	4.5	"all brown with a few warm tinted quarries"	18	
9 Sept 1845	4.0	"all brown with a few warm tinted quarries"	19	
13 Sept 1845	4.0	"all brown with a few warm tinted pieces & some white ground"	20	"(a little too much heat)"
16 Sept 1845	3.42	"all yellow"	21	
2 Oct 1845	3.45	"chiefly pot- metals"	21	"no wind"
13 Oct 1845	3.30	"all brown, chiefly pot- metals"	22	"3.20 would have been sufficient"

Chapter Five: Workshop Networks and the Development of Glass Painting in Early Nineteenth-Century
Norwich

18 Nov 1845	3.42	"all Brown, a few pieces of pot metal"	23	
26 Nov 1845	3.42	"chiefly for fell: white grnd & a little enamel blue on 2 nd plate from the bottom. Siz J Boton's crest"	24	
19 Dec 1845	3.45	"St: Nicholas &c."	25	
30 Dec 1845	3.50	"St: Nicholas &c."	26	
19 Jan 1846	3.35	"Brn & yell"	1	
3 Feb 1846	3.35	"brown & yell"	2	"3.25 would have been sufficient"
14 Feb 1846	3.30	"Mr Barker's two sqrs & frames with yell: & enamelled Blue & Purple &c"	3	"The mixture of vitreous white for Mr Barker's two squares 4 times a thimble full of vit: white and one of wtr closet basin pounded finely & ground with it in size, (no pr [?] brown-paper parcels) viz to ½ a pint of water N.B. the lines, for the tree painted Ermine tufts formed first, throughout each entire square, after which, the tufts formed & cleared out & finished as I proceeded: prior to all as stated, when the sized grnd lay was dry, the whole square covered with turfs & a very small portion of Cafairia [?] added thereto"
6 Apr 1846	4.05	"Brown"	4	"Rev Collison's first time"
23 Apr 1846	3.42	"brown & a few yell"	5	
29 Apr 1846	3.30	"yell"	6	"for yell a trifle too much"
4 May 1846	3.30	"yell"	7	
2 Sept 1846	3.40	"Brn"	8	

Chapter Five: Workshop Networks and the Development of Glass Painting in Early Nineteenth-Century
Norwich

7 Sept 1846	3.35	“yell”	9	
20 Oct 1846	4.10	“Deves ‘eux’ 57 pieces of crown glass”	10	“no wind & coals not capital”
10 Nov 1846	3.50	“Collison’s, & Davy’s Canopy for first time.” “O. S. Onley Esqr”	11	
28 Nov 1846	3.55	“all Collison’s white grnd at back and [...?] painting in front”	12	
18 December 1846	3.42	“chiefly for yell. (Collison)”	13	

Zobel’s firing log provides a unique opportunity to glean information regarding firing techniques of the mid-nineteenth century. This data captures the end of Yarrington’s workshop practice, and it is possible that the declining number of firings over these three years reflects a slower production rate associated with this. The record also emphasises the important role which Zobel seems to have held in Yarrington’s workshop as the kiln technician, a position which he seems to have held throughout his employment. There are earlier references to the maintenance of and experimentation with the kiln in Zobel’s notebook and diary which attest to his experience as a kiln operator. On 29 May 1828 Zobel records “Exper^t of an additional piece of cast-iron to Kiln. and [sic] leaded flue- in the yard.”⁶⁸⁶ In December 1831 he records another change to the kiln: “Dec: 17th I altered the kiln flue, & burnt on Frid: 23rd: with an improved draught & strong heat, in 5 hrs & a ½.”⁶⁸⁷ Zobel’s experimental approach to kiln improvement is similar to the approach he

⁶⁸⁶ Diary of James George Zobel.

⁶⁸⁷ Notebook of James George Zobel.

took with painting techniques, as exemplified by his experiments with calcined magnesium. He had both the ability and the authority to make alterations to the processes of making stained glass used by workers at Yarrington's workshop.

The notes which Zobel made for the firings of 1844 to 1846 demonstrate how he was constantly working to perfect the quality of stained glass produced by the workshop and he recorded issues which had occurred during the process. For example, on 31 December 1844 there was "a little too much heat," on 7 February 1845 the firing was "5 min too much," and on 29 April 1846 the firing proved to be "for yell[ow] a trifle too much."⁶⁸⁸ There is evidence that Zobel's alterations to the kiln were successful in terms of the overall efficiency of the firing process, as the firing times required dropped significantly between December 1831 and December 1844-December 1846: from five and a half hours to between three hours thirty minutes and four hours forty-five minutes long.⁶⁸⁹ Although this comparison is not exact as there is no indication of what was fired in 1831, it suggests that Zobel was able to significantly reduce the firing time required for painted glass in this period.

The Hierarchy of Yarrington's Workshop

This analysis of the operation processes of Yarrington's workshop suggests a hierarchy of workers with at least three levels of responsibility. The lowest tier is comprised of up to nine ordinary workers, most of whom seem to be employed for short periods of time. It is likely that these men were involved in the everyday processes of the workshop, including

⁶⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

the cutting and leading of glass and the painting of simple decorative elements. These workers were supervised by Zobel, whose role comprised the second tier of the business hierarchy. He was in charge of the delegation of work within the workshop while also having the technical knowledge required to instigate new processes in the painting process. Most significantly, he worked as the kiln technician and thus facilitated the firing of the painted glass produced by the workshop. Yarrington, who owned the business, would have been at the top of this chain of command and it seems that he liaised with clients and took control of the overall appearance of finished schemes.

Analysis of the glazing scheme installed at the Church of St Mary, Coddendam offers an insight into Yarrington's approach to project management. The East window of this church was glazed by Yarrington in 1832 and the design of this scheme was briefly described by Davy on 3 July 1843:⁶⁹⁰

We baited our horse at Coddendam & I had therefore an opportunity of revisiting the church there, where I made some additions to my former notes; & found the E. window had been filled with stained glass, of arms, &c. of the families connected with the property in the Parish, placed there, apparently [at the cost of the] late Revd. John Longe, his arms being conspicuously placed in the upper tracery.⁶⁹¹

The arms described in the window included some seventeenth-century armorial panels of the Shrubland family.⁶⁹² The process of window installation was documented by both

⁶⁹⁰ The window in question was removed in c. 1892-94, at which time new glass was installed. John Blatchly, editor of *Davy's Journal*, writes that this removal was undertaken by a faculty of December 1892 (Blatchly, ed. *A Journal of Excursions through the County of Suffolk 1823-1844* (Woodbridge Boydell Press, 1982), 229). Michael Stone, editor of *Longe's Diary* claims the date of 1894 (Michael Stone, ed., *The Diary of John Longe: Vicar of Coddendam, 1765-1834* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), xxvii). It seems likely that the Yarrington scheme was removed in 1892 and that the new memorial window was installed in 1894 (figure 12).

⁶⁹¹ Davy, *Journal of Excursions*, 229.

⁶⁹² Michael Stone, ed., *The Diary of John Longe*, xxvii.

Zobel and Reverend John Longe (1765-1834), the patron of the scheme. The following three extracts from Longe's diary illustrate the way in which Yarrington interacted with his clients. On the 23 September 1831 Longe wrote that:

"I expect Mr Yarrington [sic.] about [the] painted glass for the chancel window. Mr Smith left us after breakfast. Mr Yarrington came & examined my old painted glass, & took measures of the east window of the chancel in which I shall place it. I am to arrange the glass as far as may be, & Mr Yarrington will then come over, & take it home with him, so as to complete the window next spring."⁶⁹³

Longe also references the progress of the East window in two later diary entries. On 12 October 1831 he wrote: "A great deal of rain today. All home. Arranged the painted glass for the chancel window."⁶⁹⁴ The final reference to the glazing scheme was written on 31 December 1831: "I spoke to Mr Hare today about a wire screen for the east window of the church, to be filled with painted glass. He will come on Tuesday & bring Mr Lake the plasterer with him."⁶⁹⁵ Using these diary entries one can begin to build a timeline for the process of planning, making, and installing a window as well as the important role which Yarrington himself took in the planning and coordination of this project. This is further supported by references to this project made by Zobel, who recorded Yarrington returning from visiting Longe in Coddendam on 17 February 1832 and 6 July 1832.⁶⁹⁶ Zobel also makes a reference to correspondence between Yarrington and Longe, as he detailed that on 18 August 1832 that he "sent the Rev.^d Jn Longe a letter and paid the postage of it."⁶⁹⁷ From these records, it is therefore possible to infer that Yarrington visited Coddendam on at least three different occasions in order to design, make, and install the East window. The first visit was made on 23 September 1831 to assess the historic stained-glass

⁶⁹³ Longe, *The Diary of John Longe*, 134.

⁶⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 135.

⁶⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 142-43.

⁶⁹⁶ Notebook of James George Zobel.

⁶⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

collection and to measure the openings of the East window. The second visit of 17 February 1832 may have been to pick up the historic glazing for setting into contemporary surround glass at Yarrington's workshop. The window was installed in July 1832,⁶⁹⁸ which would account for the final visit made on 6 July in that same year. Yarrington was thus present for all stages of interacting with the client and was also able to have some control over the design process. Yarrington advised Longe "to arrange the glass as far as may be" before it would be taken away by Yarrington to be made up into a window. It seems therefore that Longe's arrangement of the glass was a starting point from which the workshop could develop a final arrangement of historic panels and nineteenth-century surround glass. Yarrington's role in the workshop would have involved travel across East Anglia and into London to meet with suppliers and clients, to transport glass, and to install windows. Zobel's managerial role allowed work to continue at the workshop as Yarrington worked directly with clients.

The success of Yarrington's studio relied on a network of glaziers and glass stainers, most of whom he employed directly. It was the relationship with glass painter Zobel that enabled Yarrington to establish a reputation for his business as an experienced producer of stained glass. Despite Zobel's significant role in Yarrington's workshop it is important to remember that this was not a relationship of equals. Following Yarrington's death in 1846, the contents of the workshop were sold at this time. Although Zobel continued to make stained glass, this production was at a far smaller scale and ultimately the network established by Yarrington did not continue to thrive after his death.

⁶⁹⁸ Blatchly, ed., *Journal of Excursions*, 229.

Yarington's Workshop: Production Methods and Techniques

Mass Production of Border Glass

This three-tier structure suggests that Yarington's studio was moving closer to an industrialised model, with separate departments within a single overall operation, in contrast to the "cottage industry" model represented by the purchase of glass from local producer Allen. Yarington was producing a large number of stained-glass windows for patrons across East Anglia. Zobel's work to improve efficiency in the workshop in terms of experimenting with stencil-based designs and improvements to the kiln has been recognised in this chapter. These techniques would have improved efficiency of production, ensuring that stained-glass windows could be rapidly produced. Is there further evidence that Yarington's workshop was moving towards a model of mass-production?

The style of surround-glass used in Yarington's composite windows offers an insight into the methods of production employed by the workshop. The reliance on simple repeated floral and geometric designs has been considered in earlier chapters of this thesis. It seems likely that Zobel's experimentation with calcified magnesium as a medium for producing stencils was intended to further develop stencilling processes already practiced at the workshop. The regularity of the repeated shapes featured in the complex borders of composite windows would have been perfectly suited to the use of stencils. This would have ensured that these designs were created uniformly and rapidly without the need for much glass painting experience. For more complex shapes it is

possible that stencils were used to create the basic shape of the floral motif before details were added as a later stage of the painting process. The repetition of specific designs throughout multiple schemes from Yarrington's workshop suggests that these pieces were painted in bulk. When comparing glass at Nowton and Little Plumstead one can find panels bearing the same two floral motifs in each scheme (figures 156&157). The same rose-painted roundel is the centre of the Little Plumstead panel and in the upper portion of the panel at Nowton. A further floral motif is represented twice in the panel at Little Plumstead, five examples of which can be seen painted to a different colour scheme on square panels in the Nowton panel.

This suggests that at least decorative elements of schemes were made in large quantities before being integrated into different schemes. The large amounts of small decorative panels used in Yarrington's workshop points to the fact that Zobel was not solely responsible for painting these pieces. Therefore, it is likely that he taught other workers how to mix and apply paint and enamel while working at Yarrington's studio. This mass production of decorative pieces was possible largely due to the fact that these pieces were used to create new settings alongside small-scale continental roundels. The effect was one of mosaic in which painted glass, both historic and modern, was reconciled using unpainted pot-metal glass cut to create decorative patterns. The suggestion that Yarrington's workshop produced large quantities of decorative pieces is supported by an analysis of the catalogue produced for the sale of goods from the workshop in 1847. The sale was divided over three days (17-19 March 1847 inclusive) and a copy of the

catalogue for the first day of sale is held by the NRO.⁶⁹⁹ All of the stained glass remaining in the studio was to be auctioned on this day, including a total of thirty lots listed under the title of “MODERN PAINTED AND STAINED GLASS, &c.”⁷⁰⁰ Of these lots eight consist of “patteries,”⁷⁰¹ six of “border,” and one is described as being made up of “ornamental edging.”⁷⁰² Each of these lots are comprised of between six and nineteen individual glass pieces. These small panels and edging pieces were sold without attachment to a specific scheme, which suggests they were made speculatively rather than for a specific commission.

Considering the fact that Yarrington’s workshop specialised in composite windows pieced together from continental imports, the piecemeal approach to window planning necessitated by pre-made decorative border pieces would not have been beyond the realm of possibility. Indeed, the complex composition of windows produced by this firm supports this theory. The distribution of nineteenth-century surrounds in the window scheme which is used in both windows nII and sII at the Church of St Peter, Nowton, demonstrates how this approach could have been applied in practice (figures 109&110).⁷⁰³ Each of these windows is composed of two lights surmounted by a single diamond-shaped tracery panel. All four lights across these two windows follow the same

⁶⁹⁹ Ives, “Stained Glass. To be Sold by Auction.”

⁷⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 4-5.

⁷⁰¹ “Patterie” is an anglicised version of architectural term “patera”, “a small round ornament placed in bas-relief upon a flat surface, as seen in almost all styles of architecture” (Architectural Publication Society, *The Dictionary of Architecture*, vol. 3 (London: T. Richards, 1853-92), 61).

⁷⁰² Ives, “Stained Glass. To be Sold by Auction,” 4-5.

⁷⁰³ Both windows follow the same composition, however the surround glass for window sII is an exact replica of the original glass created by conservators Johnathon and Ruth Cooke. The original glass was damaged beyond repair when the church was vandalised in 2004 (The Rector and Churchwardens of St Peter, Nowton, *The Church of St Peter, Nowton: Restoration of the Rare Flemish Stained Glass Windows* (Nowton: Lodge Print, n.d.), 9).

distribution of glass and therefore although this discussion will consider light a, window nll, it also applies to the other lights in these windows. The composition of light a, window nll is divided across two panels and the distribution of nineteenth-century glass has been made around four continental roundels. Each of the two panels used in this light has been bordered with nineteenth-century painted glass with floral designs. In order to create a consistent width of border, some smaller floral pieces have been given borders of green unpainted glass. It is likely that the longer strip-pieces of border have been cut to fit the size of the window opening. The space between this border glass and the roundels has been filled with a mixture of painted nineteenth-century decorative glass and unpainted coloured glass which also dates to the nineteenth century. In this section of the window additional pieces of painted glass have been cut to fit the requirements of the scheme. In the corners of panel 1 and the lower corners of panel 2, quarters of what were originally the same design of floral roundel have been used to define the corners of the panels. Unpainted coloured and clear glass has been cut in shapes which complement the arrangement of the painted glass to fill gaps in the composition between painted glass pieces. The adaptability of both painted and unpainted nineteenth-century glass, would have given the glaziers of Yarrington's workshop a great deal of flexibility when composing a window scheme. Surround glass mass produced in Yarrington's workshop could be slotted into a window scheme to frame and compliment historic glass. It could be cut or given a border of coloured glass to alter the shape and size of the piece for the needs of a specific scheme. Any spaces remaining in the composition would be filled with unpainted coloured glass. This level of malleability ensured that Yarrington's workshop was able to produce complex schemes in which the symmetry of the window could be exacting, down to the smallest piece of surround glass.

Reproduction: Engravings and Glass Painting

In making large quantities of surround glass, which featured simplified floral motifs which were possibly created with the help of stencils, Yarrington's workshop was moving towards a model of mass production. In addition to the use of decorative surround glass, Yarrington's windows also included numerous small-scale figurative panels which have been repeated across different schemes. Several of these designs can be linked to antiquarian and historic engravings. This section will explore how engravings were used by glass painters in this period. How and why were these reproductions used in composite schemes made at Yarrington's workshop?

Robert Allen used etchings as a source for his glass painting, both in the panels sold to Yarrington and in his only large-scale window design for the East window of St Margaret, Lowestoft (figures 13&14). In this window two distinct figurative styles are present, which suggest two different modes of working, one with a strict visual source and the other without. The first set is made up of eight small Apostle demi-figures which are painted entirely on a single rectangular piece of glass, surrounded by a decorative border. The second group is made up of larger biblical scenes, each of which is painted across a number of rectangular glass panels leaded together. There are significant differences between these groups of panels in terms of sophistication of painted detail and overall proportion of the figures in the scenes, as is clear if one compares the small panel of St James in 1b with the Healing the Blind scene in panel 1c (figures 158&159). The faces in the Healing scene are rendered in a more naïve style and the eyes are particularly simple, with the pupil and iris being represented by a single oval shape. The

proportions of the larger figures are peculiar and there is a general lack of detail in the painting of hands and feet. The scale of these large figures would have posed a challenge for an artisan used to working with the restricted surfaces of soft-paste porcelain vessels at the Lowestoft Porcelain Factory. The St James panel has far more detail in the sculpting of the facial features and hands and it is more accurate proportionally. In addition, the clothing of the St James figure is far more intricate, particularly around the collar and the scallop shells on the shoulders.

Similar figures painted on small rectangular panels of glass in the same hand are found in other churches throughout East Anglia and can also be attributed to Allen. Six of the eight demi-figures used in the window at Lowestoft, also feature in other church schemes, as illustrated by the following table:

Table 10: Allen's demi-figures at Lowestoft and their use in other Norfolk schemes

	St Margaret, Lowestoft (Suffolk)	St Michael, Langley (Norfolk)	St Ethelbert, Thurton (Norfolk)
St Peter	1b	-	W 1b
St Mattias	1b	W A4	-
St Andrew	1b	W A1	E 3b
St James	1b	nV 2a	-
St Matthew	sII 2a	W A2	-
St Bartholomew	sII 2c	nV 2c	-
St Paul	sII 4b	-	W 3a
Unidentified Apostle	sII 4b	-	-

In addition to the churches referenced in this table, the Church of St Margaret, Herringfleet and the Church of St Protase and Gervase, Little Plumstead feature similar panels of Evangelists or Apostles painted by Allen (figures 160&161).

A significant number of Allen's demi-figure panels are likely based on the work of Flemish engraver and print publisher Pieter de Jode I (c. 1570-1634). Pieter de Jode I's engravings were also copied by engraver Egbert van Panderen (c. 1581-1637) who often produced works after Dutch and Flemish masters. Van Panderen was later followed by François van den Hoeye (1590-1636) and therefore it is uncertain which of these three versions of the engravings Allen would have used as the definitive source for his glass painting.⁷⁰⁴ Eleven of Allen's panels have been derived from these engravings, seven of which are clear copies of the original works. In the remaining four panels Allen has altered the original etching to change the saint which the engraving represents. Adaptations have been made to depictions of the Apostles Thomas and Matthew to represent both Apostle Bartholomew and St Gregory respectively (figures 162-167).⁷⁰⁵ In both cases these changes are minimal and have been restricted to the object held by the saint in question. It seems that Allen may not have had access to a full set of engravings and thus used those available to represent a larger number of saints. The following table lists the panels which have been derived from these images using the Egbert van Panderen engravings as the key reference point:

Table 11: Allen panels across East Anglian schemes and their visual sources.

Engraving	All Saints, Earsham (Norfolk)	St Margaret, Lowestoft (Suffolk)	St Michael, Langley (Norfolk)	St Protase and St Gervase, Little	St Margaret, Herringfleet (Suffolk)	St Ethelbert, Thurton (Norfolk)

⁷⁰⁴ The Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam holds copies of the four evangelist engravings by Egbert van Panderen after Pieter de Jode I (objects numbers RP-P-2005-438; RP-P-2005-439; RP-P-2005-440; RP-P-2005-441). This collection also houses four evangelist engravings by François van den Hoeye after these earlier van Panderen works (RP-P-1900-A-22189; RP-P-1900-A-22190; RP-P-A-22191; RP-P-A-22192).

⁷⁰⁵ St Gregory identified by Haward (*Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, Langley gazetteer entry).

Chapter Five: Workshop Networks and the Development of Glass Painting in Early Nineteenth-Century
Norwich

				Plumstead (Norfolk)		
Evangelist Matteüs by Egbert van Panderen, after Pieter de Jode I, c. 1590-1637	3a	-	-	sII 2a	-	W 2a
Evangelist Marcus by Egbert van Panderen, after Pieter de Jode I, c. 1590-1637	-	-	-	-	-	W 2b
Evangelist Lucas by Egbert van Panderen, after Pieter de Jode I, c. 1590-1637	3e	-	-	sII, 1a	sIII, 2a	-
Evangelist Johannes by Egbert van Panderen, after Pieter de Jode I, c. 1590-1637	2e	-	-	sII, 1c	-	-
Apostle Simon by Egbert van Panderen, c. 1590- 1637	-	-	-	-	-	W, 1a
Apostle Thomas, by Egbert van Panderen, c. 1590- 1637	-	sII, 2c Spear replaced with flaying knife to represent Bartholomew the Apostle	nV, 2c Spear replaced with flaying knife to represent Bartholomew the Apostle	-	-	-
Apostle Matteüs,		-	W, A3 Set square	-	-	W, 3b Set

by Egbert van Panderen, c. 1590-1637			replaced to represent St Gregory			square replaced to represent St Gregory
--------------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------------	--	--	---

Intriguingly, three of the four evangelist panels at Earsham, which have been discussed earlier in this chapter, are also derived from the same Pieter van Jode I engravings, although these have been painted far more naively than those in other schemes. A different source has been used for the painting of St Mark, following exactly the same pattern which is also seen at Little Plumstead. These Earsham versions were likely painted by John Winter for the 1863 East window scheme, and it is possible that he modelled his own versions of the glass after Allen's panels. A number of other panels in the five churches named above were also painted by Allen and bear the stylistic traits of being derived from an earlier visual source. It is likely that these were also copied from other engravings by Pieter van Jode I, Egbert van Panderen, François van den Hoeye or one of their contemporaries yet to be identified. The use of historic engravings first produced in the lowlands may well indicate an attempt to replicate the imagery seen in imported continental panels. It is also possible that these etchings were more widely available than others in this period, which might explain why they were also used by Winter.

Zobel also had a fascination with historic etchings, as is evidenced in his notebook, where he makes entries relating to items acquired between the 14 September 1831 and 19 September 1832. In this period, he bought eight books and sixty-four

engravings/prints.⁷⁰⁶ This interest is clear in his stained-glass work at Holy Trinity Church, Loddon (Norfolk). The 1842 East window scheme is described in the *NC&NG*:

The Parish Church, at Loddon, has recently been put into a thorough state of reparation, and a handsome stained glass window is inserted in the eastern end of it, consisting of five compartments; in the centre of which is represented our Saviour, the Alpha and Omega, with the influence of the Holy Spirit, by the Dove descending upon him. In the tracery compartments, are represented the Twelve Apostles, with Angels and other devices; there are twenty-eight coats of arms in the window, conspicuous among which are the armorial bearings of the illustrious Knight, at whose sole expense this elegant church was erected, viz. Sir James Hobart, Attorney-General to King Henry the Seventh, and those of his Lady, of the ancient family of Naunton, with others who were formerly benefactors of the church, and of several who are entombed therein; among the ten new shields, will be found those of the present Bishop of Ely (the patron), the Bishop of Norwich, the Earl of Buckinghamshire, the Dowager Lady Suffield, of Blickling; and Lady Beauchamp Proctor, of London; Sir Edmund Bacon, the Premier Baronet; Archdeacon Oldershaw, George Danby Palmer, Esq. with those of several Ladies and Gentlemen subscribers. The whole completed by subscriptions, through the indefatigable exertions of the Churchwardens; and executed in vitreous colours, at S. C. Yarrington's establishment, King-street, Norwich.⁷⁰⁷

It seems that the glass has been rearranged to some extent. The tracery figures are still in place, although only twenty-seven of the supposed twenty-eight coats of arms remain (figure 168). In addition, the central figure of Christ described above is now in nill, although the upper section which must have contained the dove is now missing (figure 169). It is unclear whether any further framing glass has been lost since the original installation. The contemporary account of this window does not describe the small figurative panels which were installed in the tracery lights. Their diminutive size and location high above the ground were likely the reason for this as stylistically they are contemporary to the large-scale Christ figure.

⁷⁰⁶ Notebook of James George Zobel.

⁷⁰⁷ "The Parish Church, at Loddon," editorial. *NC&NG*, Feb 26, 1842, 2.

It seems highly likely that the figurative painting of the original Loddon scheme was completed by Zobel. The evidence for this in relation to the tracery figures is particularly compelling. Within a sketchbook bound into his notebook Zobel has drawn thirteen saints, which he has labelled “Drawn Sept^r 10. 1813. from Cave d.d”.⁷⁰⁸ These figures were taken from William Cave’s (1637-1713) *Apostolici; or, The History of the Lives, Acts, Death and Martyrdoms of those who were Contemporary with, or Immediately Succeeded the Apostles*, originally printed in 1677.⁷⁰⁹ Comparing the tracery figures at Loddon to these sketches, it is clear that they are from the same source, with all but Saint Paul being represented in glass from these sketches (figures 170-176). The glass paintings of these saints are not exact copies of Zobel’s sketches. Like Allen, he took some liberties when it came to reinterpreting etchings for stained glass. Particularly noticeable is the loss of St James’ extravagant headwear between notebook sketch and glass painting, the latter of which was placed in panel A10 (figures 173-174). In this case, the figures stance, folds of the drapery and the jar attached to the waist make it clear that the both the sketch and the glass painting are derived from the same source. It seems a number of changes were made to the figures, possibly in an effort to simplify and clarify them for translation to glass, particularly as the figure is immediately bordered by lead rather than being part of a scene on a larger panel of glass.⁷¹⁰ If Zobel had included St James’ hat this

⁷⁰⁸ Notebook of James George Zobel.

⁷⁰⁹ William Cave, *Apostolici; or, The History of the Lives, Acts, Death and Martyrdoms of those who were Contemporary with, or Immediately Succeeded the Apostles* (London: Printed by Andrew Clark for R. Chiswell, 1677).

⁷¹⁰ Although the original surround glass for these figure panels is unknown, it is clear from the contemporary description that these figures were originally in the tracery compartments. It is possible that the backgrounds may have originally been made up of different glass, however this would not alter the lead lines directly around the figure panels themselves.

detail would have made it difficult to see the saint's nimbus, while also making the cutting of the glass more complex. In other panels, the cut line of the glass has been simplified and more clear glass has been left between the saint and the lead line in order to allow for identifying features to be more easily translated to glass, for example St Matthias's axe (figures 175&176). In addition to these panels at Loddon, four of the tracery panels in window nV at Aylsham Church have also been painted after these Cave engravings which were installed shortly after the East window at Loddon (1844).

Both the panels which Zobel painted after Cave and those of Allen taken from etchings featured iconography which was both popular and recognisable. These panels could therefore be used in a wide variety of different schemes as they would have met with broad approval. This approach is at odds with the imagery seen in the historic continental roundels, which was sometimes unique to the original location and was often unusual enough as to impede identification. It is likely that the increased availability of etchings depicting the Apostles and Evangelists would have contributed to these being used by glass painters of this period as much as the popularity of such biblical figures. Zobel continued producing panels featuring the Apostles after the closure of Yarrington's workshop, and he felt confident enough in the universality of their design that he advertised these in the *NC&NG* in June 1851:

J. G. ZOBEL, GLASS STAINER (with the improvements of 20 years experience in the Art), has the pleasure to announce to Rev. Gentlemen, that he has now completed the TWELVE APOSTLES, with Bordering to the same, from excellent Designs of Artists on Glass of the 16th Century, warranted thoroughly vitrified, which would with a few small additions make a magnificent Chancel Window. It may be doubted whether such an assemblage can be met with in the Diocese. The height of each, including border, 2 feet 10 inches, width 1 foot 6 in. The price for the

Twelve £42.

J.G.Z. invites inspection of them at his STAINED GLASS WORKS, LADY'S LANE,
BETHEL STREET.⁷¹¹

From the size and scale of these panels it is clear that these panels are much larger than either his own painting after Cave or Allen's demi-figures. Despite the difference in scale, these figures were also reproductions of earlier works which Zobel had likely taken from prints of the original. This suggests that not only were these historic images a convenient source of imagery for glass painters, but they also had prestige in their own right which transferred to their stained-glass copies.

Other schemes completed by Yarrington's studio also include glass paintings taken from engravings. A series of panels originally installed at Nowton and the Church of St Mary, Yelverton (Suffolk) are copies of engravings by John Sell Cotman.⁷¹² Cotman produced many etchings in the early nineteenth century in which he demonstrated his interest in antiquarian imagery and architecture. These were sold as collections, each of which was made up of several volumes. These could be purchased individually or by subscription. For example, in November 1810, an advertisement in the *NC&NG* read:

A COLLECTION of ETCHINGS, in Six Numbers, consisting of Picturesque Specimens of Saxon, Norman and Gothic Architecture, Landscape, Shipping, &c. The present Work is submitted by its Author, as n [sic] faithful representation of the different species of Architecture, and the care with which the accompaniments will be adapted to the principal object in each place is a ground, upon which he hopes it may be recommended as a Work of useful reference, both to the professional and to the amateur artist.⁷¹³

⁷¹¹ James George Zobel, "Stained Glass," *NC&NG*, Jun 4, 1851, 1.

⁷¹² Cotman's significant role in the arts in the early nineteenth century, both in London and Norwich, has been discussed in chapter one.

⁷¹³ "Publishing by Subscription," editorial, *NC&NG* Nov 24, 1810, 2.

This advertisement recognises the way in which antiquarian prints were used by artists in this period, much in the mode of the popular design books of the period, for example Nathaniel Whittock's *The Decorative Painters' and Glaziers Guide*, which was first available in 1827.⁷¹⁴ The catalogue produced for the sale of the contents of Yarrington's studio included a number of different antiquarian volumes and instructive decorative books, including Whittock's volume.⁷¹⁵ Cotman's collections of etchings and volumes are not listed in the catalogue, however it is clear that they are the source used for panels at the above named churches, as first identified by Jane Houghton and Janet Whitham.⁷¹⁶ At Nowton, it seems there were originally seven panels, while at Yelverton two panels were previously in the porch windows. It is unclear whether the porch was the original location of the latter panels and these are no longer in situ after they were badly fragmented during vandalism in 2001.⁷¹⁷ These nine panels are all sourced from a series of etchings of Norfolk and Suffolk brasses by Cotman.⁷¹⁸

⁷¹⁴ Nathaniel Whittock, *The Decorative Painters' and Glaziers' Guide; Containing the Most Approved Methods of Imitating Oak, Mahogany, Maple, Rose, Cedar, Coral, and Every Other Kind of Fancy Wood; Verd Antique, Dove, Sienna, Porphyry, White Veined, and Other Marbles; in Oil or Distemper Colour: Designs for Decorating Apartments, in Accordance with the Various Styles of Architecture; with Directions for Stencilling, and Process for Destroying Damp in Walls; also a Complete Body of Information on the Art of Staining and Painting on Glass; Plans for the Erection of Apparatus for Annealing it, and the Method of Joining Figures Together by Leading, with Examples from Ancient Windows* (London: Isaac Taylor Hinton, 1828).

⁷¹⁵ Ives, "Stained Glass. To be Sold by Auction," 3.

⁷¹⁶ Jane Houghton and Janet Whitham, "Brass on Glass," *Monumental Brass Society Bulletin* 115 (2010): 294-95, accessed Feb 21, 2014, [http://www.mbsbrasses.co.uk/Bulletin%20115%20\(September%202010\).pdf](http://www.mbsbrasses.co.uk/Bulletin%20115%20(September%202010).pdf).

⁷¹⁷ A. Morris, Letter to Mr D. King, Mar 21, 2001, RK&S, Folder H330 Yelverton KNG 2/2/6/321, NRO, Norwich.

⁷¹⁸ Sam Smiles has shown that many of these engravings originate from rubbings taken by Thomas Talbot in 1793-1794. Cotman purchased these engravings in 1813. Sam Smiles, "The Art of Recording," *Making History: Antiquaries in Britain 1707-2007*, eds. David Gaimster, Sarah McCarthy and Bernard Nurse (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2007), 138.

At Nowton there are currently two figures in situ: the male effigy from the brass to Sir Symon Felbrygge and his wife Margaret, daughter of Primislaus, Duke of Teschen (1413) in panel 1a of window nV and the male effigy from the brass to Ralph Shelton and his wife Alice Uvedale at Great Snoring (1423) in panel 1a of window nVI (figures 177-180). Windows sIII and sIV, both of which featured copies of Cotman brasses, have recently been removed from the church ahead of restoration. Panel 1a, window sIII represented the brass at Frenze to Sir Thomas Blenerhasset (1531), while panel 1a of window sIII and panel 1a, window sIV contained a panel which depicted the effigy of Alice Uvedale from the brass referenced above.⁷¹⁹ In addition to these four figures, the original East window also featured three copies of Cotman's brass figures along the bottom row of stained-glass panels: an unidentified male figure in panel 1a, the female figure from the Felbrygge brass in panel 1b, and the male figure from the Great Snoring brass in panel 1c (figure 9). This bottom row of panels was removed in 1965 due to structural damage. Continental glass with some nineteenth-century surround glass was substituted for these brass figures, however the original colour scheme of the window has been broken by this substitution. In a letter sent by architects working for the church in 1985, the replacement glass is attributed to the Neave Collection.⁷²⁰ This letter also claims that the glazing workshop retained the three brass panels for installation in the vestry glazing scheme in the future, a project which was never realised. Haward suggests that the recumbent figure panels may have originally been part of a larger window in the church,

⁷¹⁹ The panel from window sIV has been removed from the window since the 1980s, and has been stored by a churchwarden since that time (Adrian Potter (churchwarden at St Peter, Nowton), email to the author, July 28, 2014).

⁷²⁰ Whitworth, Hall and Thomas Architects, Letter to King and Son (Lead Glaziers) Ltd, June 24, 1985, RK&S, Folder 117D Nowton + Hawstead, KNG 2/2/5/115, NRO, Norwich.

or at a church elsewhere, before being removed to these windows at an unknown date.⁷²¹

The West window seems like a likely candidate for this larger window. Haward identified three brasses from Cotman's *Engravings* within the two panels at Yelverton.⁷²² The male figure from the Shelton brass, as found twice in the Nowton scheme, is again represented here (figure 181). The other figure is that of Robert Attelath, the merchant, taken from a brass at King's Lynn (figure 182). Accompanying these figures were two armorial shields which belonged to the Blenerhasset brass, which again relates this scheme back to the source used at Nowton.

The choice of Cotman engravings can be compared to the Allen and Zobel panels discussed above. The size and scale of these original images would have translated well to stained-glass panels. These images could also be achieved in stained glass with the use of a relatively simple colour palette. Some of the engravings featured two recumbent figures within a single brass and thus one purchased image could be used to produce two distinct stained-glass panels, as was the case with the Felbrygge and Great Snoring panels. The choice of the Cotman engravings does differ from other antiquarian sources used by the Yarrington workshop in this period in one significant way. These engravings would have been newly executed at the time that the scheme was installed in c. 1816-1821. The oldest etching to be used as a source for stained glass across the nine panels was made in 1816, and the first bound volume dates to 1819. By using these particular etchings, Yarrington's workshop would have been able to show their ability to reflect contemporary

⁷²¹ Haward, *Nineteenth Century Norfolk Stained Glass*, 278.

⁷²² *Ibid.*, 278.

trends in antiquarian imagery. By reproducing the Cotman etchings, and using them alongside continental roundels, Yarrington reconciled historic collections of international origin with panels which depicted local historic objects of national importance.

Conclusion

Yarrington's workshop was a major centre for the production of composite windows in the early nineteenth century. This chapter has considered the network of glass painters and glaziers which was required to expand the business to offer the firing of stained glass on the premises. An examination of the workshop structure and development of painting and firing techniques highlights the important role that Zobel took in the expansion of the business for the first time. Ultimately, Yarrington was able to capitalise on the craze for continental stained glass in the early nineteenth century, which was particularly relevant to the city of Norwich due to Hampp's import business. His purchase and commission of contemporary panels based on etchings further demonstrates that Yarrington was able to tailor his window production to suit the changing tastes of his client base. This ability to innovate continued throughout the years of Yarrington's practice, as was later shown in his move to produce more large-scale windows depicting Apostles and Evangelists once fewer composite windows were being commissioned.⁷²³

⁷²³ Large-scale figures produced by Yarrington's workshop during the 1840s can be found at the Church of St Michael in Aylsham (Norfolk), the Church of St Mark, Lakenham and Norwich Cathedral (re-worked by William Warrington following Yarrington's death).

Conclusion

Conclusion

The sheer quantity of continental stained glass imported into England in the early nineteenth century provided the materials necessary to allow this style of glazing, first manifest in the second half of the eighteenth century, to be widely implemented. This supply of finely painted historic panels allowed glaziers to create complex new schemes out of fragments derived from different sources and of diverse dates, without necessarily having to learn how to paint glass or how to operate a kiln. In practice, glass painters in this period created complex painted surrounds and pieces which were arranged with exacting precision alongside imported panels. These decorative windows remained popular throughout the early decades of the nineteenth century. Despite their earlier popularity, the composite style of glazing had largely fallen out of favour by the mid-nineteenth century. This shift was caused by changing trends in ecclesiastical architecture as well as by changes in stained-glass production. By the 1840s, the ecclesiological movement was defining what should be considered appropriate in the subject matter and design of windows. In 1844, an article in *The Ecclesiologist* discussed the practice of creating new windows which have been falsely antiqued to appear historic. This article addressed techniques used to mimic corrosion pitting and other forms of historic damage.⁷²⁴ The author argued that these approaches should not be pursued by those fabricating new windows. They stipulated that glass painters should look to recreate the styles of medieval glass as they would have appeared when they were first made, without the effects of time which can be seen in actual historic examples: "The eye is not used to see[ing] any thing [sic] but the subdued and sobered colours of ancient glass; what is *was* we must view with the mind's eye; we must compare the two by reasoning, and not by

⁷²⁴ Anon. K., "Stained Glass," *The Ecclesiologist* 3 (1894): 16-20.

Conclusion

our ideas derived from mere examination of ancient glass *as it now is*.”⁷²⁵ Although composite windows were not designed using the exact approaches which the article discusses, this thesis has shown that they were designed to imitate the fragmentation of historic windows altered over time. This style of glazing would have been entirely antithetical to the approach advocated by supporters of an archaeologically-informed interpretation of Gothic design. Commissioning new windows gave patrons also gave patrons the opportunity to control the subject matter of stained-glass schemes far more effectively than one could when purchasing historic stained glass. The availability of skilled glass painters, as well as the increased affordability of new glass, made this possible for a larger number of patrons by the mid-nineteenth century.

In Norwich, this shift to produce more new glass effected the output of Yarrington’s workshop. As early as 1823 he was producing new large-scale figurative windows which depicted the Evangelists and the Apostles (figure 95) for Langley church. In this scheme these figures were originally produced to fill the central light of a three-light window, framed with smaller panels arranged in the composite style. By the 1840s, however, these figures were usually made for use in windows composed of entirely new glass, as exemplified by the c. 1845 five-window scheme at the new Church of St Mark in Lakenham (figure 119). If the workshop had continued to practice after Yarrington’s death in 1846, it seems likely that the glass produced would have continued to evolve into a style more closely resembling other artisans of the Victorian Gothic Revival. A small number of fragmentary schemes were made in the second half of the nineteenth century,

⁷²⁵ Ibid., 19.

Conclusion

but this style was no longer the driving force of technical and artistic innovation for stained-glass artisans.⁷²⁶

As the composite style of glazing fell out of favour, they lost value for later generations of glaziers, conservators, and caretakers, and this has had a detrimental effect on the survival of these schemes. From the mid-nineteenth century ecclesiastical schemes by Yarrington have been replaced by windows which were considered more appropriate for the Victorian Gothic Revival aesthetic. Other works by glass painters from the early nineteenth century were moved to less prominent positions in churches during this period, including the unique East window for the Church of St Margaret, Lowestoft (Suffolk) which Robert Allen painted in 1819 (figures 13&14). This was replaced by a Heaton, Butler, and Bayne window post-1890 and portions of Allen's earlier work were lost before the remains were re-glazed in window sll of the church. The loss of early nineteenth-century schemes continued into the twentieth century, and many schemes were dramatically altered at this time.

The additional stages of alteration, repair, and replacement over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have added further layers of complexity for scholars and conservators when approaching these schemes. One must be able to recognise and differentiate these various interventions before any analysis of the early nineteenth-

⁷²⁶ John Winter's work at the Church of St Peter and St Paul in Brockdish (Norfolk), installed in c. 1851-52, is an example of a later fragmentary scheme. The majority of the glass used at this church is nineteenth century with roundels painted in the style of earlier continental roundels. See appendix II for more details of this scheme.

Conclusion

century scheme, and the historic fragments within the window, can be conducted. Each panel or fragment of pre-nineteenth-century stained glass can be read as a symbol of the initial scheme it was made for, in addition to being seen as an important component of the nineteenth-century composite scheme. Every piece of pre-Reformation English glass and each continental panel thus remains a tantalising reminder of an older stained-glass scheme, many of which have been lost. Tracing the history and continental provenance of these forgotten windows has been the focus of scholarship throughout much of the twentieth century. This approach had a serious impact on the direction of conservation and restoration for these windows as these histories were prioritised over the nineteenth-century schemes. For many involved in the restoration of these windows in the past, the loss of these arrangements was accepted as a necessary consequence of prioritising the older imported panels.

In more recent years, conservators have demonstrated a more nuanced approach to the restoration of these composite windows. The change in approach seen between the 1953 work at Earsham and the 2004 work at Nowton reflects wider shifts in the ethics of conservation. Conservators Ruth and Johnathon Cooke, who worked on window sII at the Church of St Peter, Nowton (Suffolk) following vandalism in 2004, were unable to save the fractured nineteenth-century surrounds, but they replicated the exact design of the original window in new glass (figure 110).⁷²⁷ In recent years there has been a greater attempt to approach the conservation and restoration of historic materials with methods

⁷²⁷ The Rector and Churchwardens of St Peter, Nowton, *The Church of St Peter, Nowton*, 9.

Conclusion

which are both less invasive and more easily reversible.⁷²⁸ Despite this, many composite schemes remain at risk due to a lack of routine maintenance and non-invasive conservation cleaning and care.

This thesis has sought to broaden the approach through which early nineteenth-century composite schemes can be considered. Academic discussions of the construction of historic narratives, the fragment, and sublime lighting in the Georgian Gothic have not previously been extended to the stained-glass windows which were instrumental to the implementation of these concepts. The placement of fragments in windows has largely been read as random, with the main aim being the production of a kaleidoscopic effect with little thought to arrangement or subject matter. The complexities of these early nineteenth-century schemes have been obscured by years of intervention and damaging restoration. This thesis has demonstrated that when one begins to examine the original window designs, one can see that the fragmentation of these window designs was a conscious choice of the glazier, and that the placement of panels was a deliberate attempt to evoke thoughts of a decaying medieval interior. The integral role of stained glass to the Georgian Gothic was well known in the period as can be seen in Lewis' description of a church interior in his immensely popular 1796 novel *The Monk*:

[Lorenzo experienced] melancholy of mind, which accorded but too well with the religious gloom surrounding him. A soft and cooling air breathed along the solitary aisles; the moon-beams darting into the church through painted windows, tinged the fretted roofs and massy pillars with a thousand various shades of light and

⁷²⁸ Guidelines issued by the CVMA outline the ethical principles by which the conservation and restoration of stained glass should be approached (CVMA, "Guidelines for the Conservation and Restoration of Stained Glass," CVMA, 2004, accessed Sept 17, 2021, <https://www.cvma.ac.uk/CVConservationGuidelines2004.pdf>). This document outlines that the treatment of "losses, stopgaps, rearrangements, and later additions [...] must be guided by the principles of minimal intervention and reversibility."

Conclusion

colours. Universal silence prevailed around, only interrupted by the occasional closing of doors in the adjoining Abbey.⁷²⁹

This thesis seeks to redress the previous gap in stained-glass scholarship by reconsidering the instrumental role which composite stained-glass windows played in the creation of the Georgian Gothic interior.

This thesis has focussed on the case study of Norwich due to the significance of this city in the importation of continental stained glass and the manufacture of composite windows. Although the significance of Hampp's role in importing stained glass has been discussed by earlier writers, this study has shown how the city was able to support and develop a thriving trade in composite windows during the early nineteenth century. The antiquarian, artistic, and cultural setting of the city created an atmosphere in which Hampp, the Stevensons, Yarrington, and Zobel were able to revive the art of glass painting through the commoditisation of continental stained-glass imports.

By exploring the design of composite schemes as an expression of an intentional and complex aesthetic, this thesis has demonstrated how the early nineteenth century was an instrumental period in the history of stained-glass production. The technical strides made during this era preceded those of the Victorian Gothic Revival and enabled craftspeople to gain the skills necessary for this later movement. Further to these developments in glass painting, composite schemes required glaziers to hone skills related to the arrangement of panels and fragments. The exact symmetry which these

⁷²⁹ Lewis, *The Monk*, 54.

Conclusion

windows employed called for glaziers to consider the distribution of different types of glass across large windows. Precise cutting and shaping of both new and historic glass pieces were necessary for the correct execution of this style. This aspect of glazing history has not previously been viewed as highly skilled work to the same degree as the painting of glass. It is hoped that this thesis will encourage further study of stained-glass practices and techniques which have previously been assigned lesser value. These studies will allow us to achieve a more complete picture of the dynamic role of stained glass across history.