

It is hardly necessary to mention the pre-Christian lunar symbol of the three hares, as the design shows that rabbits or conies are intended, and in any case the earlier symbol would convey nothing to the minds of those who placed the window in Long Melford Church.

FRANCIS SEYMOUR STEVENSON.

---

### ERRATUM.

In the "Obituary," vol. XXI, page 77, one out of three misprints requires correction, the other two being sufficiently obvious. In the last line but five "14th century parishes of East Anglia" should read "14th century painters of East Anglia," the reference being more particularly to artists of the Gorleston School.

F.S.S.

---

### NOTES BY MR. HAYDON WHITEHEAD WITH REFERENCE TO PAPER ON GLASS IN LONG MELFORD CHURCH.

*Proceedings Vol. XXI, p. 63.*

#### THE TRINITY RABBITS.

L. W. HAYDON WHITEHEAD.

In stating that this is not a Trinity Emblem, the writer, on pages 63-66, omits to state that the dedication of Long Melford Church is to the Holy Trinity. The church at South Tawton, Devonshire, is not so dedicated, but it would be interesting to discover if there was ever a side altar so dedicated in that church.

The fact that there is one body and three heads seems to me to suggest a very definite Trinity Emblem. In brief, I take it to be the 15th century pictorial representation of the passages of the Athanasius Creed in which the God-head is referred to.

The glass in question is undoubtedly old English and not foreign glass, and it is as stated part of a larger piece, several fragments exist which I feel convinced can be joined to it. I am endeavouring to trace these pieces and join the tracings together. The original window in which this glass was found is unrecorded it being placed where it now is in 1862.

#### THE LILY CRUCIFIX.

The two pieces of glass on either side of the Lily Crucifix at Long Melford have nothing whatever to do with it. They are (1) different type of glass, (2) probably later glass in date, and (3) were placed in the window in 1909, having been purchased in Cambridge by the then Churchwardens, of Mr. Jopson, who restored and placed old

glass in three north side windows of the church about this time. These two pieces were included in the contract price for the window, the piece below representing the beautiful Gate of the Temple cost an additional £3. The writer states these annunciation pieces are restored; they may or may not be, if so they were restored before coming into Mr. Jopson's possession. The glass in this window comes from *three* sources, the church itself and outside purchase, viz. :

- (1) The ordinary quarries are the old plain glass painted by Mr. Jopson, and belong to the window.
- (2) The Lily Crucifix was taken from the 16th window of the Clerestory upon the south side, from the east (or the 3rd window from the west).
- (3) Purchased as before mentioned of Mr. Jopson.

In the Long Melford Black Book, kept among the Parish Registers, is an account of the Clerestory Glass by Dr. Bisbie, written in 1688, and this has been twice printed (1) by the Rev. Spurdens and (2) by Sir William Hyde Parker in his history of Long Melford.

From the Black Book I quote :—

“ XVIth window on the south side from the east.

In the lesser lights on the top ‘ Nomen Dni est benedictum ’ [The name of the Lord is Blessed].

In the first upper pane only white glass. In the second pane, a flower pot beset with flowers imitating such a picture as in the 32nd page of the Virgin Marie's Office, set forth by Pope Pius V, the book printed at Antwerp in the year 1598. In the third pane the Blessed Virgin sitting in a chair and encircled with this inscription “ Ecce Ancilla Dni Fiat Mihi ’ [Behold the handmaid of the Lord]. In the first and second lower panes only white glass. In the third pane, a man somewhat defaced holding in his right hand a book, and in his left a staff with a cross on the top—by his head is written S'ctus Barthol Sed de illo quære. Underneath is subscribed ‘ \_\_\_\_\_ Isabella uxor ejus \_\_\_\_\_ ’ ”

The glass question dates back to circa 1480 and can therefore hardly be said to “ imitate ” a picture of 1598. Curiously enough the Lily *was* set between an Annunciation picture, although not the present one. More remarkable still is the fact that the Churchwarden had no knowledge of the suitability of the subjects, while Mr. Jopson definitely stated he had some old glass, but it was definitely unsuitable in his opinion. His opinion referred undoubtedly to the style of the medallions, they are absolutely different in type. This makes the suitability from the subject point of view more than ever remarkable.

William Ernly (Earnly) of West Wittering, Sussex, was the first husband of Bridget Spring, the daughter of the “ Rich Clothier,” Thomas Springe III of Lavenham. Is it possible he saw the stain glass in Melford and desired a like emblem upon his tomb ?

L.H.H.W.