

Hugh Easton's Neo-Baroque Art and the Stained-Glass Closet in Postwar Britain

Jane Brocket and Dominic Janes

Keywords:

Anglican, Britain, Church of England, Closet, Homosexuality, Queer, Stained Glass, Twentieth Century

Abstract:

Hugh Ray Easton (1906-1965) was a leading mid-twentieth century British designer of stained-glass windows. His works combined neo-baroque style with an aesthetic that was attuned to glamour in contemporary media such as film and homoerotic physique magazines. His work was installed in a large number of Anglican churches as well as in a range of other buildings. He was particularly noted for his war memorial windows including at Westminster Abbey. These featured images of military service personnel, Jesus, saints and angels modelled on an ideal type of youthful, muscular, blond masculinity. The article argues for a reappraisal of Easton's art and explains that the relative absence of critical discussion of these artworks can be explained by homophobia on the part of the artistic establishment and the closeting of same-sex desire within the Church of England.

Stained glass, particularly in churches, is one of the most prominent forms of accessible public art on permanent display in Britain. Hugh Ray Easton (1906-1965) was the designer of more than 250 windows which were installed from the 1930s to the early 1960s, and the recipient of many prestigious, highly visible church, chapel, cathedral, college, and secular commissions.¹ His work stands out from the modernist, often semi-abstract, stained glass of the post-war period because of its conspicuous, brightly coloured, neo-baroque style. His work was in such demand that it featured prominently in many prestigious World War Two commemorations. His entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* states that it was "his stained-glass figure of the young airman that remains one of the defining images" of postwar Britain.² Those airmen had an exalted status as "the Few": fighter pilots who, in the

¹ The authors understand that stained glass on public display may be reproduced in academic critique and the owners of the windows illustrated in this article have duly been contacted. The ownership of Hugh Easton's estate is, however, not currently known and anyone who has knowledge pertaining to that is encouraged to contact the authors.

² Caroline Swash, "Easton, Hugh Ray (1906–1965)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online ed.), Oxford University Press: doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/32960, accessed 27 January 2024.

Battle of Britain that lasted from July to October 1940, frustrated German attempts to achieve mastery over airspace in the south of England. It was this, it was widely believed, that forestalled an invasion in those desperate months before the United States joined the war. It was for this reason that the Battle of Britain window, designed by Easton, and unveiled by King George VI on 10 July 1947, took its place as one of the most important memorials in Westminster Abbey. Planning had been carried out under Lord Trenchard, one of the founders of the Royal Air Force, and thirty-seven Battle of Britain fighter pilots acted as ushers at the event. The window itself showed a series of flying officers in their service dress witnessing the Virgin and Child, the Pietà, Crucifixion and Resurrection.³

Easton's windows combine highly skilled glass painting and a cinematic back-lit brilliance with a wide range of visual references. They repeatedly feature aestheticized, blond, muscular, uniformed or semi-naked male bodies in the guise of airmen, soldiers, sailors, Jesus, saints, archangels, and angels. Despite or perhaps because of their striking appearance, these windows have received very little critical discussion and what there has been has often been dismissive. One suggestion for this in relation to his images of the Few was that they were mostly young men who had been promoted straight from public school. They were, as such, not in line with the ideals of postwar socialism.⁴ But, as one of Easton's handful of critical commentators has observed, "that a successful and prolific artist is often dismissed and at times reviled makes him a more fascinating subject for research."⁵ We will argue in this article that crucial factors explaining the critical neglect of Hugh Easton were homophobia in the art establishment and the closeting of same-sex desire within the Church of England.

Life, Works and Reception

Hugh Easton was born in London on 26 November 1906 and educated, like his father and brother (both doctors) at Wellington College. After leaving at the age of sixteen, he may have spent some time studying art in Paris. He was encouraged, at the request of his father, to take up stained glass by Frederick Eden (1864-1944) and was mentored by Ninian Comper (1864-1960). His training took place at some point in the mid to late 1920s in the studio of W. H. Randall Blacking (1889-1958) in Guildford. He also spent four terms at the Architectural Association in the late 1920s. In the early 1930s he was set up in his studio at 13 St Botolph's Lane, Cambridge by his father. Here he socialised extensively with Guy Burgess, Anthony Blunt, Donald Maclean, and their circle of friends. Until 1935 he used a local firm, Constable, to make his windows, but after meeting Robert Hendra (1912-1968) and Geoffrey Harper (1913-66) he delegated all the practical and painting aspects of the commissions to

³ Michael Snape, *A Church Militant: Anglicans and the Armed Forces from Queen Victoria to the Vietnam War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022), 406-07.

⁴ Garry Champion, *The Battle of Britain, 1945-1965: The Air Ministry and the Few* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 190.

⁵ Adam Goodyear, "Hugh Ray Easton (1906-1965)", *Journal of Stained Glass* 26 (2002), 45-60, at 45.

them in their stained-glass studio in Harpenden. Although Hendra and Harper had worked together before the War, they formed a formal partnership at the request of Hugh Easton in 1947 in order to execute his windows. They found themselves without work after Easton's death in 1965 and died soon after.

There is no evidence of Easton's war record until April 1942 when he joined the press division of the Royal Navy Volunteer Reserve based in the Admiralty, where he served as naval advisor to the Censorship Division of the Ministry of Information. From 1950 he worked from a studio near Sloane Square before moving to Hampstead. He was active in the Society of Master Glass Painters as a committee member, member of the Council from 1951-1955, and judge of the annual stained-glass competition. He died of cancer in 1965 and a memorial service was held for him in Westminster Abbey on 24 September 1965. He never married.

Hugh Easton's windows can be found in a wide range of locations, both in terms of geography and function. They are mostly in churches, chapels and cathedrals in England, from Durham to Cornwall, Suffolk to Wales, but his work can also be found in public schools, the City of London churches and occasionally in secular locations such as Lloyd's of London and the Rolls-Royce company in Derby (fig. 1). Easton's pre-war work differs quite radically from that produced post-war by Hendra and Harper and is mostly located in Cambridgeshire and Suffolk. The earlier windows, made by Constable in Cambridge, are of poor quality in terms of draughtsmanship, painting, and finishing. The overall compositions are weak and rarely fit well in the window and setting. In contrast to his later work the adult figures are smaller and fully clothed, and the naked cherubs and young figures, although muscular, are badly proportioned and wooden.

The transformation in Easton's style after the partnership with Hendra and Harper was formed is remarkable, and it rapidly evolved into that with which he is now associated. The effects of delegating the task of "working up", painting, and making the windows to the fully trained and the highly skilled pair underlines a deep division of labour: Easton was the frontman, using his contacts to obtain high-profile commissions, and getting the credit, while they did much of the work. Easton's post-war style is mostly based on a repertoire of large-scale figures—Jesus, Mary, archangels, service personnel—set against clear backgrounds, many of which were reused with variations according to location. In several schemes the major figure is set above a superbly painted, bird's- or pilot's-eye view of a panorama of the locale, rendered with documentary precision. In St Dunstan and All Saints, Stepney, this is the bombed-out remains of the neighbourhood beyond the church and in St Ann, Portsmouth, it is the dockyard with battleships. These panoramas, which also appear at Halifax and Durham, cannot be attributed to Hugh Easton whose sketchbooks and papers reveal no urban, industrial, or battle sketches. Instead, they are clearly the work of Hendra and Harper. Although their realism and illustrative style are at odds with the baroque figures above, they work to tether that figure to the real world. The physical similarity of Christ and worshipper, which was Easton's design, as in the memorial 'to the men of the sea' at Stepney, has a similar effect (fig. 2).

Windows which are notable examples of Easton's mature style include: St Lalluw, Menheniot, Cornwall (1951), All Saints, Holbeton, Devon (1947 and 1959), St Matthew, Surbiton (1952), St Elphin, Warrington, Lancashire (1947), St John, Morecambe, Lancashire

(1953), Holy Trinity, Coventry (1955), St Paulinus, Crayford, Kent (1948) (fig. 3) and St James, Grimsby (1954). Easton was also a popular choice of designer for public school chapels, including those of Wellington College (1953) (fig. 4), Clifton College (1937-39), and Oundle School (1950) (fig. 5). He was popularly associated with the Battle of Britain window (1946-49) in Westminster Abbey (plus four further windows there), but he also designed windows with Hendra and Harper for several cathedrals including Canterbury (1937-39), Durham (1936-49) and Winchester (1937-39).

He was in great demand for commemorative armed forces windows. Some are in official military sites such as the fifteen lights in St George's Chapel (now Centre) in Chatham, the west window in St Ann, Portsmouth Dockyard (1947), and the twelve-window scheme in St George's RAF Chapel, Biggin Hill (1955). The last features young, blond, male angels sporting a variety of phallic objects including a sword, a cobra and the clocktower of the Houses of Parliament (fig. 6). Other windows can be found in churches such as St Andrew and St Patrick, Elveden (1947), and St Peter Cornhill (1960) which is embellished with the rear views of five soldiers of the Royal Tank Regiment below a figure of Christ (fig. 7). A few of his windows are found in Nonconformist chapels such as Manchester Hartley Victoria College Primitive Methodist Chapel (1951) and Sheffield Unitarian Church (Upper Chapel) (1948).

At Hugh Easton's death the majority of the window cartoons and drawings were in the Hendra and Harper studio. They sorted the worked-up drawings according to who had done the most work on them, but it is not known how many were returned to the family or their subsequent whereabouts. Easton's brother subsequently gave four drawings of male boxers and nudes to the British Museum, but the majority of the archive went to the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. This mainly comprises diaries, scrapbooks and correspondence. The diaries are in two series of identical notebooks. They begin at 80, carefully numbered and dated by Easton, and finish at 180. This means that the volumes before the end of 1930 are missing.⁶ There are also significant gaps during his later years when he suffered poor mental and physical health. Some of the text is in code and many pages have been ripped out. Thus sanitised the diaries present a frankly banal account of his days from the time he got up to what he ate for lunch. Nevertheless, it is clear that his socialising in Cambridge was heavily focussed on friendships with men who were later known to be gay (Arthur Marshall, Anthony Blunt, Dadie Rylands, David Hedley) or bisexual (Michael Redgrave, Donald Maclean, Victor Rothschild). There is no evidence of religious faith but some evidence for the enjoyment of popular theatre and cinema. The books contain sketches of both male and female nudes and studies of muscular backs and shoulders, but also matadors in trim outfits, men in tight trousers or playing rugby, ballet dancers and wrestlers. In his diary of 1942, written when on war service, he comments on his time in bars and parks in London where he observed British, American and Polish soldiers. The time he spent watching men in various locales from Trafalgar Square to the Hampton Court rose garden could well have been cruising for sex rather than simply voyeurism.

⁶ From diary 80 he used cloth-bound artists' Winsor and Newton Sketchers' notebooks (5.5" x 4") bought from Heffers in Sidney Street in Cambridge, then from 1942 he used C. Roberson Bushey sketch books (7" x 4.5").

The surviving letters suggest someone who lived for amusement (which was, as we argue below, a notable queer pose of the interwar years) but the final diaries make for uncomfortable reading. He clearly became mentally ill, was obsessed with drawing and with the cold; he often sat in a little Fiat car all day with the engine running to keep warm. He was taking the anti-anxiety drug Librium and filled his diaries with page after page of manic, scrawled writing. Mentally convinced of his own genius he was, by this time, physically suffering horribly with cancer. All this notwithstanding, what is particularly striking from the earliest diaries to the latest is the lack of discussion of his artistic methods and ideas, little engagement with the wider world of post-war stained glass, and no mention of any religious belief or of attending church. Indeed he rarely even went to the consecration ceremonies of his windows.

At one point, however, he did copy out Thomas Hardy's poem, *The Young Glass-Stainer* (1893):

These Gothic Windows, how they wear me out
With cusp and foil, and nothing straight or square,
Crude colours, leaden borders roundabout,
And fitting in Peter here, and Matthew there.

What a vocation! Here do I draw now
The abnormal, loving the Hellenic norm,
Martha I paint, and dream of Hera's brow,
Mary, and think of Aphrodite's form.⁷

This implied that while the tradition of stained glass was steeped in the "abnormal" shapes of medievalism it was to the classical tradition of the body beautiful (male in Easton's case rather than Hardy's female) that he looked with desire. It was through the queer juxtaposition of those two artistic traditions, infused with a contemporary pop-culture sensibility, that Hugh Easton was inspired to produce work that titillated closeted clerics as much as it riled contemporary art critics.

The most influential disapproving figure was Nikolaus Pevsner (1902-83) whose greatest achievement was the extraordinary 48-volume series, *The Buildings of England* (1952-74), the majority of which he wrote himself. His early academic work centred on the development of modernism in architecture and design. Despite some pro-Nazi leanings and his conversion to Lutheranism he was forced to abandon his academic career in Germany because of his Jewish ancestry. He initially sought a career in Italy but when that proved unsuccessful he moved to Britain where, postwar, he was to lecture at the Universities of London, Oxford and Cambridge. Pevsner's leading biographer, Susie Harries, suggests that he had some casual "homosexual brushes with schoolfriends" and had wondered if he might

⁷ Hugh Easton, undated postwar diary; poem quoted and discussed in Ralph Elliott, "Hardy and the Middle Ages," *Thomas Hardy Journal* 6, no. 2 (1990): 97-108, at 100.

be queer in his youth.⁸ In later life he distained overt displays of deviance such as of those of the “aggressively homosexual” art historian and collector, Douglas Cooper, saying that he did not much care for “all that scent”.⁹ Harries further suggests that many of Easton’s windows would also have been uncomfortable reminders of the “the clean-cut Teutons in some Nazi art of the 1930s”.¹⁰

Twenty-first century attacks on Hugh Easton’s work are less discreetly coded: “[Easton] brings a rather bizarre eroticism into Anglicanism... See his east window at Stepney, where a bare-chested young Christ flexes his abs permanently at the congregation. Put them away, Jesus. And then the east window at Crayford of the four archangels, my Lord. I wish no damage upon this window, but I wonder if it would be happier if you put some flashing lights behind it and installed it in the basement of a Soho nightclub” (fig. 3).¹¹ Pevsner’s sexual ambivalence, expressed in the mid-twentieth century when open discussion of homosexuality was not respectable, by contrast resulted in a subtle tone of patronising dismissal. He did not fully articulate the true nature of his objections, instead couching his comments in euphemisms and coded language such as “dainty”, “sentimental”, “anaemic”, “pasty-faced”, “flamboyant”, “disturbing”, and “obtrusive” which signalled to those who understood them the problematic nature of the windows’ style and content.

For example, of the 1934 window at Pebmarsh, Essex, Pevsner commented in 1954 that Easton’s work is “always reminiscent of line drawings daintily water coloured.”¹² He praised the decision by Eton to commission a window from Evie Hone in 1949 rather than Easton as “a triumph for the authorities... which refused to be satisfied with the anaemic glass put into so many churches of England before and after the Second World War.”¹³ And he referred to Easton’s Wellington College Chapel designs as “quite unbelievably behind the times, and moreover terribly genteel and thin-blooded” (fig. 4).¹⁴ His clear preference was for the modernist work of artists such John Piper (1903-1992), whose windows he did praise. Later critics followed Pevsner despite him neither having expertise in stained glass nor a specialist to advise him.¹⁵ Alec Clifton-Taylor, for instance, in *English Parish Churches as Works of Art* (1974) affected to be shocked by Easton’s designs of “the most sentimental religiosity”; but he did recognize their camp reputation, even repeating some gossip from

⁸ Susie Harries, *Nikolaus Pevsner: The Life* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2011), 18, 23-24 and 82.

⁹ Harries, 764.

¹⁰ Susie Harries, personal communication.

¹¹ James Alexander Cameron, *A Blagger’s Guide to Stained Glass*, 31 August 2014: <https://stainedglassattitudes.wordpress.com/2014/08/31/a-blaggers-guide-to-stained-glass>, accessed 27 February 2024.

¹² Pevsner quoted in James Bettley and Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Buildings of Essex* (London: Penguin, 2007), 624.

¹³ Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Buildings of England: Buckinghamshire* (London: Penguin, 1960), 125

¹⁴ Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Buildings of England: Berkshire* (London: Penguin, 1966), 262.

¹⁵ Sarah Harries, personal communication.

Westminster Abbey to the effect that “it is perfectly understandable that one of the windows [by Easton] should have been nicknamed by the vergers, ‘bath night, darling!’”¹⁶

The Ecclesiastical Closet

It was not simply that Christians at the time were homophobic, although many of them were, but that certain forms of Christianity had become associated with closeted queerness in Britain. Partly this was because, since the nineteenth century, they had provided a rare context in which it was deemed perfectly reasonable for a person not to marry. Such forms of religiosity also offered legitimation for the pleasures of aestheticized engagement with fabrics and performance that were denied in the normative models of masculinity of the time.¹⁷ Queer men and women were duly attracted to what was termed the Anglo-Catholic “high church” within Anglicanism as well as to Roman Catholicism. The resulting culture was often suspected by its proudly Protestant opponents as being androgynous and sexually unorthodox.¹⁸ Life for many queer priests was, it is important to emphasise, founded on a sincere sense of mission. Many of them remained celibate and understood their single lives as being ones of sexual self-sacrifice, or “queer martyrdom”, in the service of Christ.¹⁹

The novel *Sinister Street* (1913-14) by Compton Mackenzie is rich in stereotyping that links queerness, decadence and florid religiosity. The protagonist, Michael Fane, is the object of interest on the part of several men. One such, in a pastiche of Wilde on the tastes of Dorian Gray, is heard to declare: “‘The Church!... How wonderful! The dim Gothic glooms, the sombre hues of stained glass, the incense-wreathed acolytes, the muttering priests, the bedizened banners and altars and images. Ah, elusive and particoloured vision that once was mine!’”²⁰ In this context, it is worth noting that one of Wilde’s school friends said that “Oscar would frequently vary the entertainment by giving us extremely quaint illustrations of holy people in stained-glass attitudes: his power of twisting limbs into weird contortions being very great...”²¹ This is a reference to the alleged peculiarities of bodily representation in Pre-

¹⁶ Alec Clifton-Taylor, *English Parish Churches as Works of Art* (London: Batsford, 1974), 147-48.

¹⁷ Mark D. Jordan, *The Silence of Sodom: Homosexuality in Modern Catholicism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 182, 186-89 and 199.

¹⁸ David Hilliard, “UnEnglish and Unmanly: Anglo-Catholicism and Homosexuality,” *Victorian Studies* 25, no. 2 (1982): 181-210, and Martin Stringer, “‘Of Gin and Lace’: Sexuality, Liturgy and Identity among Anglo-Catholics in the Mid-Twentieth Century,” *Theology and Sexuality* 13 (2000): 35-54.

¹⁹ Dominic Janes, *Visions of Queer Martyrdom from John Henry Newman to Derek Jarman* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015).

²⁰ Compton Mackenzie, quoted and discussed in Howard J. Booth, “‘To Desire, to Belong’: Homosexual Identity in the Lives and Writing of Compton Mackenzie, Norman Douglas and D. H. Lawrence,” PhD Dissertation, University of Kent (1997), 61.

²¹ Edward Sullivan, quoted in Frank Harris, *Oscar Wilde: His Life and Confessions*, 2 vols (New York: Brentano, 1916), vol. 1, 25.

Raphaelite art.²² At another point in Mackenzie's novel Michael meets a young man at the Anglo-Catholic Church of St Bartholemew who invites him home:

"I'll show you my oratory... It *was* a housemaid's cupboard, but it was very inconvenient—and there isn't a housemaid as a matter of fact—so I secured it. Come along."

He opened the oratory door as he spoke, and Michael was impressed by the appearance of it. The small window had been covered with a rice-paper design of Jesse's Rod.

"It's a bit Protty [Protestant]," whispered Mr. Prout. "But I thought it was better than plain squares of blue and red."²³

Queer Anglicanism was strongly associated with medievalist reimagining of the Catholic past in the Victorian and Edwardian periods in the work of designers such as Comper.²⁴ In the interwar years, the time at which Hugh Easton was establishing his practice, this tradition had been partly supplanted by a passion for the styles of the baroque Counter Reformation. A leading force behind this impetus was the Society of Saints Peter and Paul which had been founded in 1910 when Ronald Knox, Samuel Gurney and Maurice Child met in Bruges. David Hilliard, in his article "UnEnglish and Unmanly: Anglo-Catholicism and Homosexuality" (1982), discussed this set and the style that they fostered: "'Anglo-Catholic baroque' was a theatrical, slightly unreal style which reflected the restless gaiety of the 1920s and the postwar urge to reject established social conventions. High Mass in an Anglican church with baroque interior decor, sung to music by Mozart or Schubert, belonged to the age of the Charleston, Theosophy, the Russian Ballet, and the first dramatic successes of Noel Coward."²⁵

The leading designer associated with this movement was Martin Travers, who had briefly been an assistant to Comper.²⁶ He was heterosexual but not respectably so in that he married a divorcee with whom he had already conceived a child. The couple had a difficult and tempestuous relationship. This may partly explain why he only received mainstream recognition late in life, in the form, for example, of a small royal commission of metalwork.²⁷ Travers may have been an Anglo-Catholic believer before World War One, but it is understood that he abandoned his faith in later life. This has led to the suggestion that "there was an element of stage-dressing to the movement, and in later, more cynical times, Travers

²² Susan P. Casteras, "Pre-Raphaelite Challenges to Victorian Canons of Beauty," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 55, no. 1 (1992): 13-35.

²³ Compton Mackenzie, *Sinister Street* (London: Penguin Books, 1960), 176-77.

²⁴ Ayla Lepine, "Ninian Comper's Alabaster Altarpieces in Britain and America: Queer Desires, Holy Spaces," *Theology and Sexuality* 27, no. 2-3 (2021): 95-114; see also Anthony Symondson and Stephen Bucknall, *Sir Ninian Comper: An Introduction to His Life and Work with Complete Gazetteer* (Reading: Spire, 2006).

²⁵ David Hilliard, 205.

²⁶ Rodney Warrener and Michael Yelton, *Martin Travers, 1886-1948: An Appreciation* (London: Unicorn Press, 2003), 7.

²⁷ Michael Yelton, *Martin Travers: His Life and Work* (Salisbury: Spire, 2016), 99.

spoke of himself as an ecclesiastical stage dresser.”²⁸ Peter Anson sailed close to the wind when he implied the femininity of diverse styles of church décor by comparing them with contemporary fashions in clothing. For example, he drew Travers’s baroque furnishings of Compton Beauchamp along with a woman in 1920s fashionable dress in his book *Fashions in Church Furnishings, 1840-1940* (1960).²⁹ Travers, therefore, stands as a precursor to Hugh Easton who showed little sign of active faith.

Bearing in mind the close connections between Britishness and Protestantism it is hardly surprising that the baroque style of the Counter Reformation provoked controversy in Anglican settings. A number of sympathetic commentators on the baroque have, however, approached it as less the style of a particular period and ideology than as a general approach to design and decoration. Peter Davidson, in *The Universal Baroque* (2007), argued that classicism (like modernism) was based on rules and standardisation whereas baroque (like gothic) was not intrinsically authoritarian.³⁰ Homosexuality was widely treated in modern culture as a florid imperfection that could be eradicated through the action of medicine, law and design. To openly embrace the baroque was, therefore, to reject the logic of mainstream rationality in which there was no place for queer love. This was to inspire a dissident, queer-led tradition of camp, allegedly excessive alternatives to modernism in a wide range of genres from fashion to photography and architecture.³¹ This mode, often referred to as the “amusing style”, became prominent in the pages of British *Vogue* especially under the lesbian editor Dorothy Todd in the 1920s.³² This style, which was open to new modes of pleasure in public spectacle including the movies, was derided by its opponents as the trivial expression of mere fashion rather than a serious critical movement in its own right. Easton’s windows do not trivialize their subjects but they do privilege the sensual pleasures of colour and physical form over tasteful engagement with the buildings in which they are installed. The effect, if not modernist in style, was arguably modern in its apparent flippancy towards traditional tastes.

Hugh Easton was part of this hedonistic world. He drew the illustrations for the posthumous publication of the queer novelist Ronald Firbank’s *The Artificial Princess* (1934). She appears decadently crucified in the style of Aubrey Beardsley in a frontispiece captioned “the pearls about her throat bound her closer to the cross.”³³ Such quasi-religious camp is a strong element of Firbank’s work from his novella *Concerning the Eccentricities of*

²⁸ Warrener and Yelton, 36-36; see also Brian Taylor, “Church Art and Church Discipline Round about 1939,” *Studies in Church History* 28 (1992):489-498, at 495.

²⁹ Peter F. Anson, *Fashions in Church Furnishings, 1840-1940* (London: Faith Press, 1960), 324.

³⁰ Peter Davidson, *The Universal Baroque* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 13.

³¹ Stephen Calloway, *Baroque Baroque: The Culture of Excess* (London: Phaidon, 1994) and Jane Stevenson, *Baroque Between the Wars: Alternative Style in the Arts, 1918-1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

³² Dominic Janes, *Freak to Chic: “Gay” Men In and Out of Fashion after Oscar Wilde* (London: Bloomsbury, 2021), 63-66.

³³ Ronald Firbank, *The Artificial Princess* (London: Centaur, 1934), frontispiece.

Cardinal Pirelli (1926) to the scene in *The Flower beneath the Foot* (1922) in which the protagonist is taking a bath:

Lying amid the dissolving bath crystals while his man-servant deftly bathed him, he fell into a sort of coma, sweet as a religious trance. Beneath the rhythmic sponge, perfumed with *Kiki*, he was St. Sebastian, and as the water became cloudier, and crystals evaporated amid the steam, he was Teresa... and he would have been, most likely, the Blessed Virgin herself but that the bath grew gradually cold.³⁴

Church historians have started to draw links between interwar cultural developments and Anglo-Catholicism. For example, the revived shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham on which Travers worked has been compared by Nigel Yates to the cinemas which were, he argues, “the cathedrals of their day, devoted to the silent decorous worship of the Great Stars... [The shrine at Walsingham was] either a cinematic version of religion or a religious substitute for the cinema.”³⁵ The jarring effect of such queer styles of décor in churches was such that, as Ayla Lepine has argued in relation to the work of Ninian Comper, “the counter-cultural and the conventional clashed in aesthetic terms that signalled that which could be spoken—the historical and institutional—and that which could not be spoken (the radical margins in theological, ecclesiastical, and queer terms).”³⁶ Queer church art, for its closeted admirers, therefore, functioned as a silent witness to their desires. To parishioners it often appealed because of its engagement with forms of glamour that were widely understood in popular culture. But the religious dared not talk about its queerness and the critics despised and neglected it due to its anti-modernism and sexual non-conformism.

In this article, therefore, we look at Hugh Easton as an artist who, without sharing the religious tastes of the Anglo-Catholics, was in tune with their queer aesthetics. The effect was sufficiently striking to earn him a series of important public commissions to commemorate the British military martyrs of World War Two. These drew on visual languages of glamorization that had become familiar in the age of the movie star. Such populism on the part of an artist who had never been formally trained set him apart from the more elitist world of modernism in art and design. His frosty critical reception bears some comparison to the rather more famous early cold-shouldering of the young Andy Warhol by an art establishment that admired abstract expressionism and looked askance at a swishy youth emerging from the world of commercial trade design who openly embraced the feminized position of the consumer gaze.³⁷ All this, combined with suspicion of homosexuality, led to a pattern of neglect on the part of critics which this article aims to highlight and to end.

³⁴ Ronald Firbank, *The Complete Firbank* (London: Picador, 1988), 536.

³⁵ Nigel Yates, “Walsingham and Interwar Anglo-Catholicism,” in *Walsingham in Literature and Culture from the Middle Ages to Modernity*, eds Dominic Janes and Gary Waller, (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 131-46, at 143; see also in the same volume, Dominic Janes, “Queer Walsingham,” 147-64.

³⁶ Lepine, 97.

³⁷ Dominic Janes, “Cecil Beaton, Richard Hamilton and the Queer, Transatlantic Origins of Pop Art,” *Visual Culture in Britain* 16, no. 3 (2015), 308-30, at 312.

Heroes and Martyrs

Hero worship played an important role in Anglo-Catholicism. Christ and the early Christian martyrs were viewed as heroes even as persecuted priests of the Victorian period were held up as their modern equivalent.³⁸ In 1926 the Society of Saints Peter and Paul published *A Portrait of Six Christian Heroes* which devoted chapters to five exemplars who were famous including St Ignatius of Loyola and one who was rather less so. This last was George Elton Sedding whose death of shrapnel wounds in World War One is understood to have devastated Martin Travers with whom he had been working in a design partnership. His was an aesthete's death: "In spite of his bandaged fingers he managed to scribble rough designs of jewellery in a sketch-book that he kept at his side."³⁹ The author of this affecting narrative was Kenneth Ingram, a lay Anglo-Catholic who also wrote, elsewhere, on the subject of the need for a new morality in love. He had already, in 1922, described homosexuality as a "romantic cult rather than a physical vice".⁴⁰ It was implicit in the text that men such as Sedding were queer heroes because they provided a model for non-participation in the heterosexual economy of marriage whilst offering service to their community, in this case as a scout leader and soldier.

Related sentiments were widespread at the time when huge numbers of unmarried young men were going to their deaths and distraught relatives wished them to be remembered as heroes rather than as tragic cases of unfulfilled manhood. The sentimentalization of the soldiers who fought in World War One as "lads" emphasizes the age of the conscript army. The love of young comrades in the trenches sometimes involved same-sex desire and such affections should also be seen in the light of widespread understandings of youth as a space with the potential for queer experimentation in settings such as public boarding schools.⁴¹ Figural war memorials lent themselves to homoerotic readings whether they featured bodies made passive by death or images of unconquered manhood. In the early 1920s controversy erupted over the scheme for the Machine Gun Corps Memorial, Hyde Park, London, which was also known as the "Boy David", by Francis Derwent Wood (1871-1926). The nude statue placed between replicas of machine guns was described at the time by Charles Ffoulkes, curator of the Imperial War Museum, as "the most beautiful representation of the human form that we have in London."⁴² The figure was, in fact rather too beautiful and, for a recent critic, duly revealed "the complications that a body that did not conform to acceptable norms

³⁸ Dominic Janes, "The 'Modern Martyrdom' of Anglo-Catholics in Victorian England," *Journal of Religion and Society* 13 (2011), <http://moses.creighton.edu/JRS/pdf/2011-16.pdf>.

³⁹ Kenneth Ingram, *A Portrait of Six Christian Heroes* (London: Society of SS Peter and Paul, 1926), 84-103, at 103.

⁴⁰ Ingram quoted in Hilliard, 204.

⁴¹ Steven Bruhm and Natasha Hurley, eds, *Curiouser: On the Queerness of Children* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004); Martin Taylor. Martin, *Lads: Love Poetry of the Trenches* (London: Constable, 1989), and Dominic Janes, *Picturing the Closet: Homosexual Visibility and Male Secrecy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 119-37.

⁴² Gabriel Koureas, *Memory, Masculinity and National Identity in British Visual Culture, 1914-1930: A Study of "Unconquerable Manhood"* (London: Ashgate, 2007), 91.

of masculinity could instigate in a culture where homoeroticism could provide a challenge to such norms and uncover their shifting and fragile basis.”⁴³

“Here I am, Send Me”, is World War One war memorial in the form of a nude statue of a boy that was erected at Oundle School near Peterborough. It did not face criticism perhaps because its creator was a woman, Kathleen Scott (1878-1947), who was the widow of Captain Scott of the Antarctic. Meanwhile, Easton’s window series, “The Seven Ages of Man” was to be dedicated in the school’s chapel in the wake of World War Two.⁴⁴ This included “The School Boy” and “The Lover” (fig. 5). Easton’s focus in his art was, however, it should be made clear, on young men rather than boys. The private lives of artists were, and continue to be, regarded as potentially problematic for the reception of their work. For example, revelations concerning the incest and abuse of minors by Eric Gill, his sincere Christian beliefs notwithstanding, have led to widespread calls for the removal of his art from public display.⁴⁵ In the postwar period there was far less appreciation of the dangers of child abuse but there was widespread panic about homosexuality. Alfred Kinsey’s research team caused a sensation when they reported in 1948 that male-on-male sexual behaviour was far more widespread than hitherto suspected.⁴⁶ The public image of queer men was that they often displayed exceptionally feminine traits, but this research implied that many ordinary-looking individuals were also involved. This meant that male nudity, even when clearly adult and masculine, could fall under increasing suspicion of impropriety. The context in which the works appeared and the absence of public scandal concerning Easton seems to have satisfied those who commissioned the work, many of whom were friends and patrons, but their content was, nevertheless, open to homoerotic readings then as now.

While the queer nature of this art should not now be seen as problematic questions should still be raised about its racialized aspects. Frederick Archer, a sheet-metal worker at Rolls-Royce, wrote a poem that described the pilot in the widow that Easton designed for that company as that “clean limbed boy, / [who] Embodies all the greatness of our race” (fig. 1).⁴⁷ Similar blond men, many bearing a striking resemblance to the artist himself, appear in window after widow. Other queer artists produced blond Jesuses around this time, including Duncan Grant in paint at Lincoln Cathedral and Jan de Rosen in mosaic at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C. (both were completed in 1959).⁴⁸

⁴³ Koureas, 96.

⁴⁴ Derek Boorman, *A Century of Remembrance: One Hundred Outstanding British War Memorials* (Barnsley: Pen and Sword Military, 2005). (2005), 106-7.

⁴⁵ Fiona MacCarthy, *Eric Gill* (London: Faber and Faber, 1989); Fred Black, “What Are We to Think of Eric Gill? Fiona MacCarthy’s New Biography,” *Chesterton Review* 15, no. 4/1 (1989): 607-25, and Finto Rohrer, ‘Can the Art of a Paedophile Be Celebrated?’, *BBC News Magazine*, 5 September 2007: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/magazine/6979731.stm> (accessed 13 January 2024).

⁴⁶ Alfred C. Kinsey, Warell B. Pomeroy and Clyde E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1948).

⁴⁷ John Morgan-Guy, “The Search for the Ideal Male: The Art of Hugh Easton,” *Journal of Religious History, Literature and Culture* 7, no. 2 (2021): 79-94, at 83.

⁴⁸ Edward Mayor and Judith Robinson, *Duncan Grant Murals in Lincoln Cathedral* (Lincoln: Lincoln Cathedral, 2001), and Dominic Janes, ““Eternal Master”: Masochism and the Sublime

De Rosen's huge vault designs, like Easton's windows, were impossible to hide and, as in the latter case, were the subject of suspiciously little comment. Grant's murals were, by contrast, in a small side chapel, the Russell Chantry, which, soon after it was redecorated, started to be kept locked. Curtains were then pulled over the murals and it was used as a storeroom.⁴⁹ Pevsner did not like them on grounds similar to his objections to work by Easton, namely that they were "curiously naïve and out of touch."⁵⁰ The privileging of blond, white men was, however, by no means the predilection only of queer men. Paul Deslandes has detailed the extraordinarily widespread cult of the poet Rupert Brooke who died of illness while on military service in 1915.⁵¹ It is fair to say, nonetheless, that idolization of an Aryan stereotype was even more problematic in the wake of World War Two.

All this notwithstanding, it was sexuality rather than race that made Easton's work a challenge to discuss. He has to date received detailed studies by two writers. Adam Goodyear published an article on the artist in the *Journal of Stained Glass* (2002) in which, having looked at the archival materials, he provided an overview of the artist's life without engaging with issues of sexuality.⁵² Much the same can be said of his later pamphlet, "*Something Quite Exceptional*": *Hugh Easton and the Battle of Britain Memorial Window for Rolls-Royce* (2010), in which he argues that the artist was a "sometimes controversial figure... Such was the privacy of Easton's life and his ability to keep parts of it 'in watertight compartments', that some... were unaware of his friendships with others. 'Ever the mystery man', as one of his friends described him."⁵³ Same-sex desire is, thereby, implied in this text without being named.

The other analysis, an article by John Morgan-Guy, "The Search for the Ideal Male: The Art of Hugh Easton" (2021), focusses on same-sex desire but does so in a way that sees this as inherently problematic and in need of exculpation. Scrutinising the drapery over the crotches of various of Easton's Christs Morgan-Guy has evidently—although he does not say so explicitly—identified erections.⁵⁴ His response is to explore the degree to which the sexualisation of Christ in Easton's art can be justified by reference to the classical tradition in Western Church Art and by Renaissance depictions of Jesus as fully male by, for instance the rather more famously queer artist Michaelangelo. The theological point being made was that Christ could legitimately be depicted as fully incarnate in the flesh, a fact that Leo Steinberg

at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D.C.," *Theology and Sexuality* 15, no. 2 (2009), 161-75.

⁴⁹ Mayor and Robinson, 15.

⁵⁰ Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Buildings of England: Lincolnshire* (London: Penguin, 1964), 128, discussed in Mayor and Robinson, 45.

⁵¹ Paul Deslandes, *The Culture of Male Beauty in Britain: From the First Photographs to David Beckham* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2021), 123-61.

⁵² Goodyear, see note 4 above.

⁵³ Adam Goodyear, "*Something Quite Exceptional*": *Hugh Easton and the Battle of Britain Memorial Window for Rolls-Royce*, Rolls-Royce Heritage Trust Historical Series 42 (Derby: Rolls-Royce Heritage Trust, 2010), 3 and 28.

⁵⁴ Morgan-Guy, 87, referring to a cartoon of Christ Ascending in the Victoria and Albert Museum Archives, a window at St John's, Shirley and Christ in Glory at St Martin's, Roath.

argued had been subject of what he termed “modern oblivion”.⁵⁵ Easton’s fascination with young, male bodies could likewise, for Morgan-Guy, be justified through a wish to connect with the exaltation of the figure in ancient Greece. Hellenic admiration generated, in the opinion of Kenneth Clark as expressed in his classic study *The Nude: A Study of Ideal Art* (first published 1956), “two powerful emotions which dominated the Greek games and are largely absent from our own: religious dedication and love. These gave to the cult of physical perfection a solemnity and a rapture which have not been experienced since. Greek athletes competed in almost the same poetical and chivalrous spirit as knights, before the eyes of their loves, jousted in the lists.”⁵⁶ What Clark knew perfectly well, but discreetly omitted mentioning directly, was that Hellenic athletes competed in front of their male lovers.

Morgan-Guy points out, quite rightly, that Easton’s diaries do not say much about his personal life. It is suggestive that he had a flamboyant side and, perhaps inspired by reference to friendships with Burgess and Maclean in the 1930s, he is even compared to Ian Fleming. The implicit suggestion, which has no clear basis in the surviving evidence, seems to be that Easton was somehow associated in the communist treachery of the so-called Cambridge Spies.⁵⁷ Easton, it is concluded, was “not immune from feelings of physical and possibly sexual attraction to his male subjects.”** As evidence of this attention is drawn to the figure of “The Lover” in the window at Oundle School who is, for Morgan-Guy, “posed in an effeminate manner” (fig. 5).⁵⁸ There is then a jump to the topic of paedophilia where Morgan-Guy is at pains to assert that the figure of “The School Boy” from the same scheme is not eroticised since “the prurience of Caravaggio is entirely absent; for Easton the male child or adolescent is ‘ideal male’ *in potentia*.”⁵⁹ That is not to say, of course, that the degrees of nakedness in various of Easton’s youths might not have attracted covert attention from certain of his patrons and admirers, however, a significant issue caused by framing the discussion in this way is that it sets up the queer or homosexual artist as a pervert or abuser *in potentia*.

This critique is, in effect, a nervous refutation of earlier homophobic prejudice such as that of Anthony Symondson when he wrote, in 1991, describing Easton as a man of “cloying disposition conspicuous after the Second World War for his memorial windows of over-scaled, ambivalently over-masculine servicemen” and as someone who brought salacious drawings of male youths with him when he came to meet Comper.⁶⁰ Symondson was keen in his biography published in 2006 to assure us of his subject’s sexual normality: “Grace Comper died in 1933; she was his rock. They had a happy marriage and six children but Comper put his work before his family and thereafter he was able to apply himself with undivided attention and greater freedom.”⁶¹ This is despite the fact that Comper had written

⁵⁵ Leo Steinberg, *The Sexuality of Christ in Renaissance Art and in Modern Oblivion* (London: Faber and Faber, 1983), 17.

⁵⁶ Kenneth Clark, *The Nude: A Study of Ideal Art* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1960), 29.

⁵⁷ Morgan-Guy, 80.

⁵⁸ Ibid, 89.

⁵⁹ Ibid, 89.

⁶⁰ Anthony Symondson, “John Betjeman and the Cult of J. N. Comper,” *Thirties Society Journal* (1991): 2-13, at 4.

⁶¹ Symondson and Bucknall, 183.

to the poet John Betjeman of his delight that Easton “used to stay with me sometimes and show me some thirty or more diaries full of the most exquisite line drawings of side and back views of naked youths as on a Greek vase.”⁶² Comper himself possessed a collection of homoerotic photographs of Italian youths taken by Wilhelm von Gloeden (1856-1901) which he enjoyed showing to Easton.

An explicitly queer reading of two of Comper’s alabaster altarpieces has recently been made by Ayla Lepine. One of these is installed in the St Sebastian Chapel at Downside Abbey the dedication of which was arranged by Marc-André Raffalovich who is best known today as a writer on connections between same-sex desire and religion. His *Uranisme et unisexualité: étude sur différentes manifestations de l’instinct sexuel* (1896) just predates the release of Oscar Wilde from prison and the latter’s assumption in exile of the name Sebastian Melmoth. The altar featuring a sensuous figure of Sebastian in alabaster was a memorial to Henry Harcourt Van Cústem, a young man who died in London in 1917. What Lepine says of Comper could also be said of Hugh Easton, namely that he

is no doubt within the queer fold of British visual and ecclesiastical culture, though his work has been either vigorously closeted or simply ignored.... That closeting—a negotiation between different types of visibility and invisibility rather than a simplistic notion of opacity and inscrutability—is in itself a productive aspect of his work and its reception.⁶³

The content of Comper’s work also bears comparison with that of Easton since, as Lepine says, “the heroic Classical male body is a staple in Comper’s church interiors. His designs for the triumphant Christ increasingly featured youthful, blonde, unbearded figures swathed in gold, ermine, and silk.”⁶⁴ Yet these are never as fully sexualised as Easton’s which look not only backward to the baroque but also forward to the coming world of body-builders and pulp fiction covers.

The very much unmarried Hugh Easton produced art that was even less ambiguously homoerotic and so was even more challenging to assimilate to post-war canons of sexual respectability. This was apparently less problematic in the interwar period when he was establishing his reputation. Timothy Jones’s important article “The Stained Glass Closet: Celibacy and Homosexuality in the Church of England to 1955” (2011) helps us to understand this seeming paradox. Jones explained how, in the 1950s, the Anglican Church, through the work of figures such as Sherwin Bailey, accepted sexological views of homosexuality. In the process celibacy was sexualized and the “queer space of nineteenth-century Catholicism and Anglo-Catholicism was compromised.”⁶⁵ In other words, it was precisely as the Church authorities accepted a more liberal stance on sexuality in the 1950s

⁶² Comper, undated, quoted in Goodyear, 13.

⁶³ Lepine, 110.

⁶⁴ Ibid, 110.

⁶⁵ Timothy Jones, “The Stained-Glass Closet: Celibacy and Homosexuality in the Church of England to 1955,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 20, no. 1 (2011), 132-152 at 151; see also Timothy Jones, *Sexual Politics in the Church of England, 1857-1957* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 162-82, on celibacy and homosexuality.

that celibates fell under more intense public suspicion of being homosexual. This coincided with a steady rise in the number of arrests for homosexual offences and a growing public panic about the supposed spread of sexual deviance. Easton's youthful friendliness with the circle of men who became known as the Cambridge Spies cannot have helped his reputation at this time of anti-communist feeling.

The Church of England (and the Roman Catholic Church) submitted sympathetic testimony to the Wolfenden Committee which duly reported in 1957 in favour of the decriminalisation of homosexuality.⁶⁶ Tellingly, however, the law that enacted this in England and Wales, the Sexual Offences Act (1967), was framed only to legalise sexual activity that was kept strictly private.⁶⁷ It was intended, in other words, to sanction the closeted sexuality that the explosion of medical and psychological discourse was threatening. Hugh Easton's work, with its seemingly obvious homoeroticism, became peculiarly dangerous to discuss at a time which same-sex desire was such a matter of public controversy. Stained-glass windows, by their very nature, cannot be hidden or disguised and the solution to their queerness was, most commonly, to leave them judiciously unremarked.

The art of Hugh Easton duly became conceptually trapped between modernism and its alternatives, between Christianity and atheism, between the secular and the ecclesiastical and between national and international cultures. Its re-evaluation stands on understanding the reasons behind its critical neglect and appreciation of the aims of queer art such as this. It involved admiration of the beautiful male figure, but this was not simply an end in itself, but part of an attempt to create reparative relationships with the past. This can be interpreted as a form of "retrosexuality" that aimed to recover a "traditional" place for queer people in respectable society.⁶⁸ Easton worked with models, including himself, to create "a composite figure projected from his imagination."⁶⁹ That that idealised figure was White, male and blond was (and remains) problematic in relation to White supremacy and male privilege. However, its construction was arguably an attempt to deal with a problem outlined by Whitney Davis in relation to the work of the Pre-Raphaelite painter Simeon Solomon who "seized the thematic significance of homoerotic inflections in cultural traditions" but whose pictures "too easily collapsed back into a distaste... for the homoerotic beauty that superficially they seemed to celebrate."⁷⁰ The muscularity of Easton's mid-twentieth-century men places them in the same conceptual world as the postwar physique magazine

⁶⁶ Matthew Grimley, "Law, Morality and Secularisation: The Church of England and the Wolfenden Report, 1954–1967", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 60, no. 4 (2009): 725–741.

⁶⁷ Leslie Moran, *The Homosexual(ity) of Law* (London: Routledge, 2002), 33–65.

⁶⁸ Nishant Shahani, *Queer Retrosexualities: The Politics of Reparative Return* (Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press, 2012).

⁶⁹ Morgan-Guy, 90; see, for another similar example of this practice, Dominic Janes, "William Etty's Magdalens: Sexual Desire and Spirituality in Early Victorian England," *Religion and the Arts* 15, no. 3 (2011), 275–303, at 297.

⁷⁰ Whitney Davis, "The Image in the Middle: John Addington Symonds and Homoerotic Art Criticism," in *After the Pre-Raphaelites: Art and Aestheticism in Victorian England*, ed. Elizabeth Prettejohn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 188–216, at 201 and 205.

photography that sought to assure the queer viewer that masculinity was compatible with same-sex desire.⁷¹

Although his patrons were mostly ecclesiastical, Hugh Easton's work can also be appreciated in the context of the wider development of queer art in the twentieth century. It is productive for instance, to make a comparison with stained-glass-inspired work produced by Gilbert and George such as *Black Church Face* (1980) in which the beautifully symmetrical features of a young man of colour are juxtaposed with a three-light church window. The critic and curator Rosetta Brooks argued that "Gilbert and George's combination of primary colors and photography represents the same unease as in the marriage of the hyperreal Pre-Raphaelite technique and the 'medieval' geometry of emblematic leading design found in the last gasps of this tradition from the turn of the century up to the 1920's and '30s."⁷² The study of Hugh Easton's art is important, therefore, not simply because of the quality of many of his designs but also because of the valuable information their critical neglect gives us about religion, art and sexual politics in the mid-twentieth century.

⁷¹ Martti Lahti, "Dressing Up in Power: Tom of Finland and Gay Male Body Politics," *Journal of Homosexuality* 35, no. 3-4 (1998): 185-205.

⁷² Rosetta Brooks, "Gilbert and George: Shake Hands with the Devil," *Artforum* 22, no. 10, (Summer 1984), 56-60, at 58-59.

Figures

Fig. 1. Hugh Easton, *Battle of Britain Memorial Window* (1949); now in the Rolls-Royce Learning and Development Centre, Derby, © Rolls-Royce plc all rights reserved, photograph © Jane Bocket.

Fig. 2. Hugh Easton, *Memorial Window to the Men of the Sea*, St Dunstan and All Saints, Stepney, London (1949-51); reproduced by kind permission of St Dunstan and All Saints, Stepney, photograph © Jane Bocket.

Fig. 3. Hugh Easton, detail, *East Widow*, St Paulinus, Crayford (1953); reproduced by kind permission of St Paulinus, Crayford, photograph © Jane Bocket.

Fig. 4. Hugh Easton, *Apse Window*, Wellington College Chapel, Berkshire (1950); reproduced by kind permission of Wellington College, photograph © Jane Bocket.

Fig. 5. Hugh Easton, *The Lover*, part of *Seven Ages of Man* series, ambulatory, Oundle School Chapel, Northamptonshire (1948); reproduced courtesy of Oundle School, photograph © Jane Bocket.

Fig. 6. Hugh Easton, detail, *No. 11 Group, Royal Air Force*, part of a set of twelve windows, St George's RAF Chapel of Remembrance, Biggin Hill (1955); reproduced courtesy of St George's RAF Chapel, Biggin Hill, photographs © Jane Bocket.

Fig. 7. Hugh Easton, *Memorial to the Royal Tank Regiment*, east window, north aisle, St Peter-upon-Cornhill, London (1960); reproduced courtesy of St Peter-upon-Cornhill, photograph © Jane Bocket.