

ART. XXII. *On a Sculptured Wooden Figure at Carlisle,*
 No. I. By the LORD BISHOP OF BARROW-IN-FURNESS.
Read at Carlisle, August 29th, 1892.

THE oak figure exhibited has been kindly lent for the purpose by Miss Norman, of Burlington Place, Carlisle.* She does not know certainly how it came into her father's possession, but she believes that it was taken out of the Cathedral during some repairs or alterations at the end of the last century or the beginning of the present one. It is difficult to say whom the figure represents, but it looks like a portrait. My first thought was that it may be one of the Regular Canons of S. Augustine (or "Black Canons"), to whom the Cathedral belonged. The accounts of the dress of the Black Canons given in Dugdale's *Monasticon* do not altogether agree with each other. We read † "Vestitus Canonicorum est tunica candida cum linea toga, sub nigro pallio : tegumentum a scapulis impositum cervicem totumque contegit caput, præterquam a fronte." It appears however that the dress varied at different times and places. "Posterius vero diversis inter se factis conciliabulis alii alia simul cum lineis indumenta corripuere, statutaque condidere." And in another place he says, "Their habit was a long black cassock with a rochet over it," (*i.e.* a sort of surplice with tight wrists), "and over that a black cloak and hood." Probably the cloak and hood were only put on when they went out of doors, as was the case with the Cistercians, who he says "wore a white cassock with a narrow scapulary, and over that a black gown when they went abroad, but a white one when they went to church."

* Since this paper was read, Miss Norman has kindly presented the figure to the Dean and Chapter.

† Vol. vi, p. 41, Edition of 1846.



FIGURE FROM CARLISLE CATHEDRAL,
No. 1.

The same was also the case with the Austin Friars, who "for their habit had a white garment and scapulary when they were in the house: but in the choir and when they went abroad they had over the former a sort of cowl and a large hood, both black, which were girt with a black leather thong." And he adds, "their habit was a long gown with broad sleeves and a fine cloth hood, and under their black garments other white ones, and about their waists a leather girdle fastened with an ivory pin."

While the Monks were always shaved, Dugdale says that the "Black Canons wore beards, and caps on their heads."

On examining this figure, we see that the person represented has a very fine beard of which he is evidently proud. Therefore (if an ecclesiastic at all), he is one of the Regular Canons of S. Augustine. He has over his cassock a scapulary, showing that he belongs to a religious order. He has a leather belt. I think the little protuberance on the extreme left is not a bone pin for fastening it (like that of the Austin Friars), but is a paternoster bead at the end of the string of beads. He has a tippet, and a close cap or hood, apparently not forming part of the tippet, but put on separately. The carver may not have been accurate in his representation of this. All this is consistent with his being a Black Canon, in his house dress, without the cloak and birretta or square cap, in which he would go abroad, or the rochet or linen surplice which he would wear in church. But why should such a person wear a purse and a long knife hanging from the belt?

Mr. Hartshorne tells me that, if it were not for the broad band, the dress might be that of a Franklin or country gentleman of the 14th century, not later than A.D. 1400. And he reminds me that Chaucer says of the Franklin

"An

“ An anelace and a gipciere all of silke
Heng at his girdle white as morwe milk.”

We have in this figure the “Anelace” or big knife, and the “Gipciere” or purse. Can he have been an ecclesiastic who was an official of the Abbey, and wore the knife and purse as badges of his office? or can he have been a civilian, and did the scapular mark him as being in some way connected with the Abbey?

S. MARY'S VICARAGE, WREAY,
CARLISLE, 15 MARCH, 1892.

DEAR FERGUSON,

An examination of the picture you gave me last Friday inclines me to think that it represents an ecclesiastic who was also a judge. The care with which the face and beard are treated, seems to indicate that a likeness was intended; and that we may look for equal care in the details. The chaplet of beads at the sinister side, and the scapular indicate the ecclesiastic. That the object hanging in front is a scapular I think there can be no doubt. Had it been intended to represent the two ends of a choir tippet, an indication of the division would have been visible. The tippet, coif, and hood, indicate the judge. The singularity here is that the hood appears beneath the coif and close to the head, whereas in brasses the coif fits close to the head; pen case and burse are attached to the belt.

I think it is extremely probable that the whole figure is intended to represent an Austin Canon, who was also a judge—a fifteenth century vicar-general or official principal.

As regards the scapular it seems to have varied in size and form—those worn by Carthusians being large and banded together at the sides. Others seem to be narrow, and the front and back not banded together. But this you know without my telling you.

Had the figure been clad in a mantle, buttons would have appeared on the right shoulder.

I trust this explanation will satisfy you.

I am, faithfully yours,

THOMAS LEES.