Mike Deeming writes: Henry Holiday (1839-1937) was the leading stained-glass artist of the 'Aesthetic movement', which sought to portray ultimate beauty in art. It built on the initiative of the Pre-Raphaelites who sought beauty in early medieval art, and led to the upheaval of the Arts and Crafts movement. Holiday had worked with Burne-Jones and indeed succeeded him at the age of just 24 as chief designer at the major stained-glass makers, James Powell and Sons of Whitefriars. He worked himself into the ground, not least making a complete set of windows for the chapel of Trinity College Cambridge. As a result, he suffered a major breakdown - to recover he joined an expedition to southern India in 1871 to observe a total solar eclipse. He brought back a gazelle as a pet and was known to take it with him when visiting projects – it would be nice to think of the gazelle being led along the South nave aisle when the ‘Suffer Little Children’ window was being considered! Holiday had established his own studio in Hampstead in 1874 where this window was designed and made for installation in 1890.

The window is a great example of aesthetic art in stained glass. The full colours of the Gothic revival windows (deep blues, reds, green and yellows) are replaced by a more muted and subtle palette – pinks, browns, mauves, pale greens; 3-dimensional imagery is introduced and beauty abounds. There is novel use of slab glass and sophisticated leading.

In later life, Holiday became politically active, supporting the Irish independence and women’s suffrage movements. He was a founder member of the Art Workers’ Guild and the Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society. He was also a friend of W. E. Gladstone and of Lewis Carroll for whom he illustrated ‘The Hunting of the Snark’.

The Rev’d John Henry Jacob (1788-1828) was Prebendary and Clerk of Salisbury and the window is a memorial to his son, also John Henry Jacob (1809-60) and his wife Henrietta Sophia (1805-62). It was commissioned by their children, one of whom, also John Henry,
died in 1905 and is commemorated on a plaque in the South Transept.

WHO WAS LONGBEARD?

I came across this name whilst researching something else and Googled to find out about him.

The date is 1196 when English chronicler Roger of Wendover wrote this story. In the City of London, the mayor and aldermen were disturbed by the King’s imposition of *tallage* (an arbitrary tax imposed by the king) and decided to pass the responsibility for payment on to the poorer classes (it was ever thus). The people revolted but the powerful put the whole blame on the most vocal person, William Fitz-Osbert (or Fitz-Robert) aka William of the Longbeard. When the soldiers came for him, Longbeard retreated to St Mary of the Arches (Mary-le-Bow) for sanctuary saying that he was simply resisting an unjust decree, but the Archbishop ordered that he should be dragged from the church.

In order to get at him the King’s party burnt down a large part of the church and conveyed him to the Tower. He was then tied to a horse’s tail and dragged to Ulmet (Tyburn) where he was hung in chains on the gallows along with nine of his family and neighbours. Although he was ‘a noble citizen’ he was regarded as ‘the champion of the poor’ and quoted *For I will divide……the humble and faithful people from the haughty and treacherous….., as light from darkness.*

This is a very sad and unjust story and you may wonder what the connection is with us? Well, the Archbishop is regarded as one of the ablest English administrators in history, but not particularly religious. His name was Hugo Walter - one time Bishop of Salisbury!

THE FATE OF OLD SARUM

I have written about General Pitt Rivers (right courtesy of Salisbury Museum) and Old Sarum before (J&T No.35) but Rosemary Pemberton has forwarded some more information. In 1974 Salisbury Museum acquired around 4,000 letters received by the General between 1881 and 1899. One such letter dated July 1891 was found in the effects of Miss Olive Pye-Smith after her death in 1972 and unusually there is a copy of the General’s letter attached. The letter is hand-written and addressed to Edward Foulger Pye-Smith, a partner in the firm of Salisbury solicitors and also in 1894-5 mayor of Salisbury.

The news of the General’s wish to purchase Old Sarum from the Dean and Chapter for *archaeological explorations* leaked out and caused a great deal of consternation with the public, whipped up by the Salisbury & Winchester Journal. The Pye-Smith letter explains that he wrote to the Journal’s editor (not for publication) stating his
reasons for wanting the site. As the ‘Father of Modern Archaeology’ and the first Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Pitt-Rivers would no doubt have taken great care of the site. He also sited the Larmer Tree and the Farnham Museum as examples of how he would make Old Sarum available to the public for entertainment and education.

However, his patrician attitude to the ownership of land and his disdain for the intelligence of the masses did not aid his case. The public too became polarised when they believed they might not be able to walk over the site as they had always been allowed to do. The Council were happy to see Old Sarum pass to Pitt-Rivers provided they would ensure protection of the rights and privileges of citizens and the physical state of the monument. In the end the Dean and Chapter decided to keep possession of the site until it was transferred to the guardianship of the Office of Works in 1892, no doubt with Pitt-Rivers blessing as the second-best outcome.

Rosemary Pemberton later wrote: When researching what had happened to General Pitt Rivers’ astonishing collection of objects, I found that two of the Constable drawings he once owned were bought by Canon Myers, to whom this window (No.2 in J&T No.55) is dedicated. The two drawings, which were listed in one of Constable’s son’s breakfast room in 1880, were bought by Pitt Rivers in 1887. Canon Myers, who lived at Leadenhall and was reputed to be very rich, bought them from an H. H. Bates of Salisbury in 1930. He left them in his will to Henry Robins, the Dean of the time when he died in 1945 and then the Dean’s widow sold them in 1960. I love the thought that these drawings, produced when Constable was staying in The Close, returned there for a period of thirty years. The drawing of Stonehenge (1820) is now in a private collection and the one of Old Sarum (left, 1829) is at Yale University'.

13th CENTURY JUSTICE

As you know, counties were divided into Hundreds. Each hundred had its own court; these started in the tenth century and weren’t abolished until 1867. The spring and autumn sessions were presided over by the Shire Reeve (Sheriff). Anything smaller than a hundred was the responsibility of the local Constable. In the absence of a police force the only legal opportunity was for the victim to raise the hue and cry in which every able-bodied man was expected to join. The legal phrase was pro toto posse suo; you know how I like connections, well this is where we get our word ‘posse’ (as in cowboy). Crimes at this level would be reported to the Hundred Bailiff.

The law was put on a more formal basis by Henry Il’s Assize of Clarendon in 1166 which established a public prosecution service and a central court of justice. Other effects of the act was the sending out of royal circuit judges (at least once a year to each county) and the framework of a Common Law. As a result the legal profession grew substantially and a new class of lawyer was born, the attorney. Clause 18 of Magna Carta emphasised that the judges were to hear cases of Novel Disseisin, Mort d’Ancestor and Darrein Presentment, all to do with property. There were six circuits known as Judicial Eyres (from the Latin for travelling); you may have come across this word with reference to the New Forest. On return to London they found their advice and judgement was still needed, giving rise to the King’s Bench.
Sheriffs had to empanel a jury and name those believed guilty of murder, robbery, theft or receiving stolen goods. This is the origin of the Jury of Presentment or Grand Jury, still in use in the USA.

Trial by Battle (above, from the Sachsenspiegel* courtesy of Wikipedia) was an archaic method when a financial solution was not offered or acceptable. A group of professional champions grew up that could be hired as substitutes. The defeated called out Craven showing that he had conceded and was then pronounced guilty. As a result he could then be hung, castrated or have his eyes torn out - sounds like the answer to COVID lockdown rebels. Again, for more info, obtain a copy of 1215 by Danny Danziger and John gillingham.

THE SACHSENSPIEGEL

Literally ‘Saxon Mirror’ this was the most important law book and custumal (record of economic, political and social customs) of the Holy Roman Empire. It was written in Middle Low German (a development of Old Saxon) and probably translated from Latin between 1220 and 1235. In a way it is the German equivalent of Magna Carta (there are 4 copies of the original extant) and some of its laws have parallels in modern German law.

The picture above comes from the Dresden manuscript dated between 1295 and 1363 that comprises 92 pages with 924 illustrations. Right is the choosing of the king by the three ecclesiastical princes from the Heidelberg (1300) manuscript. The choice is being made by the Count Palatine of the Rhine, the Duke of Saxony and the Margrave of Brandenburg.