The Great East Window: Analysis and Hypothesis
by Julie Adams

Julie Adams is a Cathedral Guide who trained in the winter of 2001/2002 and in 2003 joined a group of guides who, under Mary Callé’s direction, researched the windows and trained each other on the stained glass of the Cathedral.

Introduction

Standing at the west end looking down the nave, the eye is normally led to the Great East Window, (Fig 1) which rises prominently above the high altar, and can be seen beyond the quire screen. In this article I shall be considering the content of the window before and after the restoration that was carried out by Edward Baillie in 1852. Much of the window content is clearly not original, but some is, and I will offer a hypothesis on what might have been there when it was first installed by Bishop Fox in c.1520.

Content of the Window before and after the Restoration of 1852

The window is in three tiers, with seven lights (or glazed panels) in the bottom row, and three main lights in each of the middle and top rows. The lower two tiers are single figures set below architectural canopies in a similar style to the glazing of the nave and the clerestory. The top tier makes up a single composition of Christ flanked by The Blessed Virgin Mary and St John the Baptist. The style of the stonework is late perpendicular, similar to that of the Lady Chapel windows.
John Dolbel Le Couteur published his treatise “Ancient Stained Glass in Winchester” [1] in 1920, a comprehensive survey which has never been superseded. In it he identifies most of the contents of the window shown here in the schematic diagram (Fig 2).

Key:-  
\[ \begin{align*} 
    v &= \text{Angel with shield} \\
    w &= \text{Angel with trumpet} \\
    x &= \text{hyssop} \\
    y &= \text{Scroll with Fox’s motto} \\
    z &= \text{scourge} \\
    3(a) &= \text{Blessed Virgin Mary} \\
    3(b) &= \text{Christ in Majesty} \\
    3(c) &= \text{St John the Baptist} \\
    2(a) &= \text{A Prophet} \\
    2(b) &= \text{Sainted ecclesiastic} \\
    2(c) &= \text{Amos} \\
    1(a) &= \text{St Swithun} \\
    1(b) &= \text{“St Peter”} \\
    1(c) &= \text{Jeremiah} \\
    1(d) &= \text{St Andrew} \\
    1(e) &= \text{Haggai} \\
    1(f) &= \text{St Paul} \\
    1(g) &= \text{Sainted Bishop} \\
\end{align*} \]

Fig 2 Outline redrawn by the author, based on a scale drawing by Owen Carter in 1844

Originally, the window was inserted in the 1520s, when Richard Fox was Bishop and his tenure is still proudly announced in the window by two scrolls bearing his motto “\textit{Est Deo Gracia}” - \textit{Thanks be to God, or Thanks are due to God}. There are also four angels bearing shields (Fig 34) with Fox’s coat of arms impaled upon those of the dioceses where he had been Bishop - Exeter, Bath and Wells, Durham and Winchester. (This compares directly with The Langton Chapel where there are four angels at the corners supporting the vaulting, bearing shields with the coats of arms of Langton, Fox’s predecessor, impaled on those of the four dioceses with which he was associated.)

There are two further small lights, one illustrating hyssop, a plant used for purging which also represents penitence and humility, and the other a scourge, both symbols of the passion; these would have sat well with the many examples found amongst the bosses in the presbytery, such as the dice used to draw lots for Christ's robe, the ladder, the hammer and nails, and the pincers.

In 1844, shortly before the Baillie restoration of 1852, Owen Carter, a well known and respected architect in Winchester, made careful scale drawings of what was in the Great East Window, and the drawings were published in book form the following year [2]. We are fortunate that these provide an accurate record of what was present in the window at that time. (Carter also made careful drawings of the windows after the restoration, but these were never published.)

We cannot be at all sure of the original 16th century design for this window, as all ten panels containing individual images of saints or prophets definitely look as though they have been altered to fit. The three figures of the middle row have been truncated, and the figures occupying the five central lights of the bottom row also appear very awkward. The two that fit the best and were thought at one time to have been original, are full length figures of nimbed bishops (with haloes), marked 1(a) and 1(g) on the plan, under matching architectural canopies, but even these images appear not to be part of the initial design as they have been reduced in width. Amongst the other figures, there is a mixture of styles of canopy, indicating that they probably came from different
places. All but two have red backgrounds to the tops of the canopies rather than the customary alternating mix of red and blue. The faces are not a matched set; the faces of the unknown prophet and Amos in the middle row are pale with black features but the other faces are quite strongly shaded.

Robert Horne, a leading reforming Protestant, became Bishop of Winchester in 1560, following John White. It is known that he had, in his time as Dean at Durham Cathedral, removed much of the ornamentation there, including some stained glass portraying the miracles of St Cuthbert [3]. It is thought that he also ordered the removal of some of the glass from Winchester that he saw as being particularly Roman Catholic. If, as seems likely, there had been an image of Christ in Majesty at the head of the window when he arrived in Winchester, he might have wanted this removed. Curiously, the figure of the Virgin seems to have been left in place.

Even more extraordinarily the space between the Blessed Virgin Mary and John the Baptist was replaced by an image of St Bartholomew (Fig 3), which had originally been part of Wykeham’s glazing scheme from the nave. This must have looked incongruous and at the time of the last conservation and restoration of the Great East Window in 1850 to 1852 by Edward Baillie, it was replaced by a new figure “Christ in Majesty” (Fig 6).
For many years the image of St Bartholomew was displayed at the V&A Museum, but more recently it was transferred to the Museum of Stained Glass which is situated in the southern triforium gallery of Ely Cathedral. This glass dates from 1405 - 1422 so is now approximately 600 years old. It appears both dirty and corroded. In spite of this, some of the details are delightful - such as the curly hair and beard, the ornamentation of the robe, and the decoration on the binding of the book he holds in his left hand. This panel is attributed to Thomas of Oxford, who did work at both Winchester College and New College, Oxford.

On 14th February 1852 [4], the Hampshire Chronicle reported that the "window at [sic] east end of the choir is to be restored by Messrs Baillie of Cumberland Market, Regent’s Park at the joint expense of Dean Garnier, the Warden of New College and the Warden and Fellows of Winchester College". This seems an unlikely arrangement as William of Wykeham had no direct connection with our great east window.

Thomas Baillie, brother of Edward and like him a glazier, presented the panel of St Bartholomew (Fig 3) to the newly founded collection at South Kensington.
Edward Baillie was one of 25 glaziers (listed in Martin Harrison’s book “Victorian Stained Glass” [5]), who displayed work at The Great Exhibition in 1851. This was at a time of resurgence in the popularity of stained glass, and the Victorian artists were having to relearn the skills lost during the stark period of the reformists in the 16th century and the Puritans during the 17th century. When compared to the image of St Bartholomew created over 400 years earlier, this panel (Fig 6) is lacking in detail, and there are very few lead lines. It has been specifically designed to fit between the image of the Blessed Virgin Mary and John the Baptist shown below, and the rainbow behind Christ extends into the other two panels. The background colours are well matched but the blues are not as varied, and there is a noticeable difference in the reds used for Christ’s cloak and that of John. The newer panel looks both bolder and darker in appearance. The Christ figure is more likely to be painted with enamel than to be pot metal glass. The facial features are of course typically Victorian, and unsurprisingly the glass appears to be in much better condition than much of the window.

A Detailed Look at the Main Lights

When we compare Carter’s drawing of St Bartholomew with the panel itself, we can see that it is an accurate representation of the figure and it is fair to assume that other figures were equally carefully reproduced, - described by Carter as being “traced from the windows and drawn”. It was reported in the 5th June 1852 edition of The Hampshire Chronicle that the “restoration was now complete and that Owen Carter’s drawings were used for the restoration” [6].

Owen Carter had guessed at the identity of many of the figures and his interpretation frequently conflicts with that of Le Couteur. It is interesting to compare all of his drawings with what is present now, and to conjecture on how many changes were made, and where they were made at the time of the last conservation and restoration.
It does seem strange that the figure of Mary was allowed to stay after the Reformation if a figure of Christ in Majesty was not, and yet this figure could be original. Carter’s drawing of the Blessed Virgin Mary (Fig 7) shows very little difference to the present glass (Fig 8), although the heads appear a different size. The details on Mary’s robe seem to be identical. Above her head are three cherubim in the characteristic colour of pink/red, and these are a typical motif of the early 16th century.

**Fig 9 Tracery from easternmost window of north presbytery aisle**

By contrast, Mary’s facial features do not appear typically 16th century. Since The Joys of Mary were inserted at a similar time to the great east window during the Bishopric of Richard Fox, it is worth looking at the images of the virgin and other female saints taken from the tracery celebrating the Coronation of Mary in the easternmost window of the north presbytery aisle, opposite Gardiner’s chapel. These faces are very pale with features painted in matt black. (Fig 9)
Owen Carter had assumed in 1844 that the figure to the right of St Bartholomew was St John the Evangelist, and Peggy Olivier [7] was ambivalent when she wrote her research notes for the Cathedral Guides in the 1990s. Traditionally the Evangelist would be expected to be paired with the Virgin Mary to either side of Christ crucified, but here Mary and John are depicted in heavenly surroundings. Carter has drawn John wearing a hair shirt with a red robe laid over the top (Fig 10). Also, he is styled as an older man than the usual depictions of St John the Evangelist, whose looks are frequently androgynous, and more usually in Western European art, the Evangelist is shown without a beard. Four cherubs are shown above his head. The two representations are remarkably similar although the heads are of a different scale.
As previously mentioned, the figures from the middle row have been shortened in order to fit the window. The one light which has been considerably altered is the one containing the ecclesiastic nimbed with pale green, in the centre. His robe and book have been reconstructed so that they make better sense. His head is much smaller than that of the prophets to either side. We know that the presbytery clerestory was originally glazed using individual images of prophets on the north and saints on the south, all under architectural canopies. There are no longer any saints on the south side and it leads to conjecture that some of these images may have been moved into the great east window at a later date.

These middle row figures (photographed in figs 13, 15, and 17) display a close match to the 1844 drawings, (figs 12, 14 and 16) but Owen Carter had misidentified them. The left hand figure he had named as Henry VII, but he is a prophet with a prophet’s hat. He suggested Bishop Fox for the central figure but Le Couteur describes it as a sainted ecclesiastic and his actual identity remains unresolved; the face certainly does not resemble the many portraits we have of Fox. The right hand figure was identified as Ethelwulf, but he carries a scroll quoting from the ninth chapter of Amos, verse 6, “Quis edificat ascensionem suam”, (“he that builds his ascension, he”) which seems a conclusive piece of evidence that this is indeed Amos. It is likely that St Ethelwold would have been included in the cathedral glass somewhere, and the letters “Ethe” might have been taken from a pedestal in the same style as that for St Swithun or St Peter and introduced simply to fill a space.

Amos in Fig 17 is placed symmetrically between matching pillars or shafts of a slightly different diaper design to that in the light containing St Swithun. (See below.)

Saint Swithun (Fig 19) is one of only two figures in the two lower rows that fits reasonably well into the space, and is also complete with his name label and a canopy. The image shown in the glass is virtually unaltered from Carter’s drawing. The colours are rich and the image is well ornamented. The late perpendicular window in the background is in keeping with the period for the glass. However, there is just one shaft or pillar to his right, and he is not placed symmetrically within the light, which suggests that the panel may have been cut down widthwise.

In Carter’s drawing (Fig 20), “St Peter” is standing on a pedestal, which bears his name. The pedestal is not a good match to that of St Swithun and neither are the canopies a good match. Carter shows quite a lot of piecing together of glass and this has been rectified to produce a more homogeneous image in the glass at the time of the conservation/restoration in 1850-52. His attribute is missing in the drawing but at the restoration he has been given an enormous gold key, in order to signify his identity. The windows in the background have flattened arches, almost Tudor in design. St Peter is not usually shown wearing a Bishop’s mitre or ermine, even though he was given the title of “First Bishop of Rome”. The image looks as though it has been reconstructed from more than one source. Part of it is more likely to have been part of a warrior King, and it looks as though he was carrying a spear. The mitred head has probably been added, as there is a clear lead line at the neck. More usually, St Peter is shown with a beard and balding hair. Evidence would suggest that this composite figure never was St Peter, but since the 1850-52 restoration, this image has been accepted as St Peter. The rich cloth in the background is very like that in panels 1(f) and 1(g), which indicates it might have been part of the same scheme originally.
Carter’s drawing shows that the image of Jeremiah (Fig 22) was very muddled. There is no pedestal and there are various pieces of architectural detail scattered throughout the panel. Windows of a similar style to those in St Peter’s window have been added to the design at the restoration. The background is a rich red cloth as found in the backgrounds of the figures of Amos and the nimbed Ecclesiastic in the middle row.

St Andrew (Fig 25) is shown with a saltire wooden cross. In the drawing the background is incredibly muddled but that has all been resolved in the restoration. Small fragments of window were in the background but the composition has been altered with enlarged windows similar to those behind the images of St Peter and Jeremiah, and an architectural canopy created. The background is of a rich green cloth.
The image in the drawing of Haggai (Fig 26) shows glass that has obviously been made up from various sources. The head is far too small for the body. There are some fragments of a pedestal very similar to that of St Peter and just a top to the canopy. During the reconstruction a completely new head was given to this figure and again the perpendicular windows added to the background. Haggai (Fig 27) has been given a canopy of the same style as that above Jeremiah so that the window looks reasonably symmetrical about the centre.
St Paul (Fig 29) stands with his sword in his hand. The architectural canopy is shown almost complete in the drawing along with similar perpendicular windows to those we have seen behind other figures. The background cloth is of the same style as that shown behind the “nimbed Bishop” in 1(g). The head is placed at the same height in the panel as the two outermost images - St Swithun and the nimbed Bishop. Given the similar backgrounds of rich blue cloth and perpendicular windows, might this also have come from the same scheme as “St Peter” and the nimbed Bishop? Supposing St Paul, St Peter and the nimbed bishop are all part of the same scheme, where might they have come from? The main windows in the clerestory of the presbytery have four lights across. Could these saints be some of the missing saints from the south side of the presbytery or might they have come from the presbytery aisles? Windows in the presbytery
aisles also have four lights across in the lower tiers, and these might also have been a source of images for reuse.

This light, which Carter identified wrongly as William of Wykeham (Fig 30), appears at first sight to have been designed to pair with that of St Swithun, but the blue background cloth is not present in the Swithun panel. The pedestal was missing and the background is of the same rich cloth as is behind St Paul in 1(f). The perpendicular windows are also present in the background of both the drawing and the present glass. To his left, our right, is a pillar or shaft with a pattern which is different from the one shown to the right of St Swithun in 1(a), so it probably never was part of a pair. There is however part of a similar pillar in the drawing of St Andrew by Owen Carter, which was not used in the restored window. Neither St Swithun nor this saint are placed in the very centre of their lights, which might suggest that the panel has been cut down widthwise in order to fit the space.
To summarise the findings on examining the figures under canopies.

* The lights are occupied by six saints and four prophets.
* All of the figures appear to have been cut down to fit into these lights, and must have come from somewhere else originally.
* There are some figures which appear to have been part of the same scheme elsewhere - they have backgrounds of rich blue cloth, or similar red or green cloth, and windows in a perpendicular style. A few have shafts or pillars.
* The faces present a mixture of styles - possibly from different dates.
* The panels containing Haggai and “St Peter” have been changed considerably at the time of the conservation in the middle of the 19th century.

The Tracery

Fig 32 Carter’s Angels with trumpets and Bishop Richard Fox Motto “Est Deo Gracia”

Fig 33 Carter’s Angels holding shields with coats of arms of Fox impaled on those of his dioceses
(a) Bath and Wells  (b)Winchester  (c) Durham  (d) Exeter

There is no doubt that the angels with trumpets and those carrying shields were copied faithfully from the windows by Owen Carter. The angels are all shown in white robes and not in feathers as worn by the seraphim on wheels in the nave and then copied into the presbytery. (This was actually an earlier fashion which had been superseded by the 1450s.) The angels appear very masculine, unlike some of the other medieval examples we have in the Cathedral, and their hair is swept back to reveal a high forehead - typical of Tudor fashions. Most have been given red wings,
traditionally the colour of fire, but just one has blue wings, the colour of heaven - given to the angel bearing Fox’s Arms impaled on the Arms of the See of Exeter, (which Carter showed as white). Could there be any significance in this? It would make more sense if the shields of Exeter and Winchester were interchanged so that the shields appear in the chronological order of his tenure, and if the angel with blue wings was representing his time in Winchester, towards the end of his days on this earth.

When might the portraits of Saints and Prophets have been introduced?

The process of analysing the great east window has posed a number of unresolved questions. Clearly the great east window is not as originally designed, and many of the elements have been brought in from elsewhere in the Cathedral. It seems very unlikely that any of the single figures under canopies were original to this window. The remaining images give clues as to what might have been there originally; all we have to go on are the images of the Blessed Virgin Mary and John the Baptist against a heavenly background, along with the elements of the passion.

We cannot be sure whether the previous changes were carried out at the time of the Reformation in the 16th century or one hundred years later during the Commonwealth period. The obvious image to have been removed from between the Virgin Mary and St John the Baptist is Christ in Majesty and this was reintroduced in 1852 by Edward Baillie. This group of three figures frequently appear together in Christian Art, in the Orthodox church in a deësis (or deisis), the traditional iconic arrangement, as in Winchester’s own arrangement of icons by Sergei Fyodorov on the feretory screen, where Mary and John the Baptist are looking inwards towards Christ in the centre. In western art, these same figures occur frequently in a scene displaying the Resurrection of Souls, or representation of Judgement Day, sometimes known as a Doom. Examples can be found in illuminated manuscripts, mosaics, in panel paintings, in wall paintings, and a few very rare survivals in windows.

Dooms were encouraged by the early Medieval Church as a way of highlighting the contrasts between the reward of Heaven and the agony of Hell so as to encourage Christians away from wrongdoing and sin. A Doom was usually positioned at the western end, to remind worshipers of their fate as they left the building. If that space was not available, a Doom could be placed at the eastern end of a church, often over a chancel arch, so that it would be constantly visible to worshipers as they faced the altar during services.
One useful contemporary source for looking at changes that took place in the civil war is the description by Lieutenant Hammond of his visit to Winchester in 1635, seven years before the civil war started. This was reproduced in the 1953 edition of The Winchester Cathedral Record. [8] Hammond describes the content of the Lady Chapel windows but frustratingly does not mention the great east window.

In Gale’s History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Winchester, published in 1723 [9], just two to three generations after the restoration of the Monarchy, a description of the great east window appears. “The Great East Window is very remarkable for the Antiquity and Fineness of its painted glass which contains the portraits of several saints and bishops of this church, and is very entire” . . . . . . “which Art (i.e. painted glass) is now almost extinguished.”

In an anonymous History and Antiquities of Winchester published in 1773 [10] and dedicated to Sir Paulet St John, Baronet and Mayor of the City, there is an account of the destruction of the Cathedral at the time of the civil war. “they threw their bones against the painted glass, which they destroyed throughout the church, except the beautiful window over the altar, exhibiting the portraits of several saints and bishops of this church which, being more out of their reach and less exposed than the rest, is still preserved entire, together with a few figures in the windows contiguous”.

Although the evidence is tenuous, the latter account suggests it is unlikely these figures were placed in the window during or after the commonwealth period. Indications are that the portraits of the saints and bishops in the great east window were left untouched at that time. This leads us back to the possibility that they may have been placed there after the reformation, and possibly at the order of the Protestant reformer Bishop Robert Horne, of whom, in his history and survey of 1798, John Milner writes “The appointment of a prelate of his character was a calamity to the city as well as the bishopric. He had been noted at Durham for his devastations . . . .” [11]

A Hypothesis

There was a suggestion from N J H Westlake, an Ecclesiastical Designer, writing between 1881 and 1896 [12], that the window might have been a Doom or pictorial representation of Judgement Day, as exists in the West window of Fairford Church, Gloucestershire. Westlake could be right, as there would have been space for the elements of a Doom if the ill fitting figures were not present.

The latter is not a preposterous suggestion, and following the hypothesis from Westlake, it is revisited in an article by Angela Smith for the Journal of the British Society of Master Glass Painters in 2007 (Vol XXXI) [13].

Richard Fox was closely associated with the planning of the wonderful glass at Kings College Cambridge, which was inserted by Barnard Flower, the King’s Glazier. Fox had been an executor to Henry VII’s will. He was also involved with the late pre-reformation glazing of Fairford Parish church in the 1490s, when he was Bishop of Durham, and it is believed that he was responsible for the choice of design of that glass. Indeed, his portrait is in the Fairford glass; he is depicted as St Mark in the window of the Four Evangelists (Fig 35). Clearly he was familiar with the Doom in the west end of Fairford church (Fig 36), and he may well have wanted to introduce such a composition in Winchester Cathedral. It would have had more impact in the great east window than a continuation of the scheme of saints and prophets.

No matter what the original subject, it is an extreme tragedy that glorious glass, carefully planned and inserted in c.1525, should have been destroyed so few years later, when little more than one generation can have experienced it.
Whilst studying the photographs of our window taken by Roger Buchanan and Simon Newman, I spotted a tiny fragment (Fig 37) in the canopy placed above the prophet Amos in light 2(c) of the current scheme. There is a clear lead line between it and the adjacent glass, so it is a finite piece of glass that has been inserted. It would be amazing if on close inspection it turned out to be the face of a devil, part of the original scheme, and included deliberately by a Tudor glazier, as an act of mischief.

In order to test the hypothesis of a Judgement Day scene, I have tried juxtaposing some of the images from the Fairford Doom onto what we think was original to our great east window. The composition would look perfectly acceptable if the three central panels (deliberately shown blurred) were also replaced with something appropriate. The result is shown below in Fig 38.
Although we will never know the answer, it is fascinating to speculate on the composition of our window when first installed in the 1520s.

**Summary**

This appraisal has covered many aspects of our medieval glass. It has included:

1. Finding one image from the original glazing in the nave, commissioned by William of Wykeham, - that is St Bartholomew, still extant at Ely, and dating back to c.1405.

2. Considering the possibility that some items were incorporated either from the presbytery clerestory originally completed in the time of William Waynflete, or from the glazing of the
presbytery aisles carried out in Fox's time. (Baillie made a valiant effort to unify them in his restoration, by providing similar backgrounds and creating new canopies and pedestals where needed.)

3. Acknowledging the elements that appear to be original to the Great East Window in c.1525 at the time of Richard Fox, most probably the Virgin Mary, St John the Baptist, the angels and the symbols of the passion.

4. Looking at the Victorian restoration which incorporated new elements in 1850-52, such as the figure of Christ in Majesty, as well as other alterations and additions.

5. Presenting a hypothesis on what might have been there initially.

In conclusion, the history of the Great East Window encompasses much of the glazing history of the Cathedral and it is an exciting thought that the story continues with the current conservation project being funded by Friends of Winchester Cathedral.

Postscript

At a Chapter meeting on 25th March 1852, it was “ordered that fifty pounds be paid towards the restoration of the eastern window” [14]. It was later recorded in the Cathedral Treasurer’s book 1852 [15] that £50 had been paid for “restoration of the stained glass E window”. The implication of the Hampshire Chronicle report on 14th February 1852 [3] was that the expense would be shared three ways, so the total cost may have been of the order of £150, and indeed it was perfectly possible for a parish church to commission a new window, albeit smaller, for £50 in the 1850s.
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**Addendum: The Optical Illusion**

When in 2015, I looked at a greatly enlarged photographic image of the great east window taken from the ground two years previously, it looked as though there might just be a fragment of glass with a small beast or devil tucked into the tracery. (Fig 39)

![Fig. 39](Photo: Simon Newman taken August 2013 from the floor of the Cathedral and enlarged and enhanced)

Recently I have been given a copy of a close-up photograph (Fig 40) taken by Anya Heilpern from the scaffolding erected for the conservation; it shows quite clearly that the piece of glass infill is a fragment of gold coloured foliage, not a beast of any kind.
If the close-up photograph is cropped and reduced in size, it approximates to the image obtained on enlarging the photograph taken from floor level. The detail of the foliage was totally lost when viewing over such a long distance, and the lower part of the glass was obscured by the stonework when viewed from below rather than straight on.

We are told that the camera does not lie, but it is sometimes prevented from telling the whole truth. Although I now know that we do not have the remains of a devil in the great east window, there is still strong evidence that the window once represented a Doom.

I am most grateful to Anya Heilpern and The Dean and Chapter for allowing me to use the close-up photograph in this addendum. Anya Heilpern has been researching the Medieval Glass of Winchester Cathedral for her PhD thesis, at the University of York.
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