

1966

The Wearing Apparel of the Women of Westmoreland County, Virginia, 1700-1775

Nancy Lou Oberseider
College of William & Mary - Arts & Sciences

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Fashion Design Commons](#), [United States History Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Oberseider, Nancy Lou, "The Wearing Apparel of the Women of Westmoreland County, Virginia, 1700-1775" (1966). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. Paper 1539624601.
<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21220/s2-gqkr-vh95>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

The Wearing Apparel of the Women
" "
of Westmoreland County, Virginia
1700 - 1775

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of History
The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

*For illustrations
see Archival copy
of thesis.*

By

Nancy Oberseider

1966

ProQuest Number: 10625002

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10625002

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Nancy Oberseider
Author

Approved, May 1966

W. W. Abbot
W.W. Abbot, Ph. D.

Jane Carson
Miss Jane Carson, Ph. D.

John E. Selby
John E. Selby, Ph. D.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to Miss Jane Carson, under whose guidance the research for this study was conducted, and to Dr. W.W. Abbot for his assistance throughout the writing of this thesis. The author is also indebted to Mrs. Marietta Robbins of the Costume Department of Colonial Williamsburg for her aid and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	iii
ABSTRACT.	iv
CHAPTER I. RECORDS AND RESEARCH.	2
CHAPTER II. WOMEN'S WARDROBES AND THE WESTMORELAND COUNTY RECORDS.	13
CHAPTER III. THE MAJOR ARTICLES OF DRESS.	24
CHAPTER IV. ACCESSORIES.	40
CHAPTER V. FABRICS AND MATERIALS.	73
APPENDIX Part I- A Dictionary of Fabrics and Materials.	84
Part II- Examples of Records Researched.	93
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	111

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to present as complete a picture as possible of what the ladies of colonial Westmoreland County, Virginia, wore. It is based on the Westmoreland County Records for the years 1700-1775, especially the volumes of Records and Inventories and those of Deeds and Wills.

The York County Records and the Norton Papers, both of which were also researched for the first three quarters of the eighteenth century, were chosen to provide comparison and contrast, and in nearly all cases these records confirmed the findings from the Westmoreland County Records.

No previous work on this subject has used these primary colonial sources so extensively, and it is through these sources that concrete evidence as to colonial women's clothing can, and has been obtained. It is now possible to discuss details of dress and wardrobe from gowns to accessories to fabrics, and to see the fashion likes and dislikes of Tidewater Virginia's colonial ladies.

THE WEARING APPAREL OF THE WOMEN
OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY, VIRGINIA
1700--1775

CHAPTER I

RECORDS AND RESEARCH

The Young, the Old, the Homely, and the Fair,
To Mrs. Modely's Shop in Crowds repair. . . .
Flowers, Egrets, Lappets, Ruffles, charm their Sight,
And each new Object adds to their Delight.
In Short, each Purse of its Contents was eas'd,
And both the Parties mutually were pleas'd. . . .
(P.D. June 4, 1772; 4:1)

These lines, which appeared in the Virginia Gazette in 1772, provide a contemporary's view of eighteenth-century ladies and their fashions. Precisely what did these ladies wear? What types of gowns, hats, handkerchiefs, and other garments did they prefer? This paper will seek to discover exactly what the women of colonial Tidewater Virginia in general, and those of Westmoreland County in particular, did wear. And although women's clothing is but a facet of the colonial scene, all aspects and details of colonial life are important, and all are a part of our social history. Each new insight, however small, enables us to move one step closer to our goal of truly understanding our nation's pre-Revolutionary years.

The main source on which previous works on women's clothing in eighteenth-century Virginia have been based

have been first, the costume books which discuss the clothing worn in the eighteenth century from a general, fashion point of view. The weaknesses of these books will be discussed in detail below. Second, the Virginia Gazette has been used widely, and although it gives a view of what was probably available to Williamsburg ladies, this attribute does not necessarily make it applicable to all of colonial Virginia. Third, the references to clothing which can be traced through Swem's Index have been used by some, and fourth, the allusions to women's clothing which are contained in the diary of Philip Fithian have been frequently quoted. While these are all excellent pieces of material in themselves, they do not provide a sufficient basis for a thorough study of women's clothing. It should be noted at this time that while there are numerous diaries and travelers' accounts from the eighteenth century, these contain very little information on women's clothing. This is because the majority of these accounts were written by busy men who paid little attention to what the ladies wore, and by travelers, also men, who noted the towns, the political situation, and the economic conditions, but not the ladies' wearing apparel. Other sources, such as private orders and letters, have been used, but these, the costume books, the Virginia Gazette, Swem's Index, and Philip Fithian's diary, are the main sources on which previous works have been based.

As far as I have been able to discover, and as far as the Colonial Williamsburg Research Department and the Colonial Williamsburg Costume Department know, none of the previous studies of the subject of women's clothing in eighteenth-century Virginia have been based on county records, even though these would seem to be the obvious source from which to seek such information. Thus there is a definite need for a study describing exactly what colonial ladies bought and wore, as it can be derived from primary colonial sources, particularly, in the case of this thesis, from the records of Westmoreland County.

Of course, the main purpose of the Millinery Reports was not to tell what Virginia ladies wore. These reports discuss the various milliners who lived and worked in Williamsburg, and by use of the Virginia Gazette these reports give a good summary of what was offered in the Williamsburg millinery shops. A section on colonial women's clothing is given, but this and all other information on ladies' clothing in these Millinery Reports was taken from secondary sources--that is, from various books which discuss eighteenth-century costume in general. These costume books study both fashion trends and details of costume, and some, for example Cecil and Phillis Gunnington's Handbook of English Costume in the Eighteenth Century, are very complete and scholarly. However, to form any conclusions as to what Virginia ladies wore, based on these costume books, is to fall into an obvious trap.

The first weakness of such books is that nearly all of them are studies of outfits worn in England during the period under

discussion. The majority of those which do discuss American colonial clothing concentrate on New England. This leaves a small number which do examine Virginia ladies' wearing apparel, including Julia Cherry Spruill's Women's Life and Work in the Southern Colonies and Mary Newton Stanard's Colonial Virginia--Its People and Customs. While both of these are very good, neither attempts to discover exactly what colonial ladies wore by use of the county records. (Bruce, of course, has done some work on this subject, based on county records, for the seventeenth century.) The second objection to over-emphasis of secondary books on ladies' dress is that these works usually reflect only the top fashions of an era, not necessarily what was worn by most of the ladies, either in England or here.

These works on costume are based on three main sources of information. The first is contemporary descriptions of eighteenth-century clothing. These apply mainly to the wardrobes of the upper class, and especially to fashion-conscious members of this class. Portraits, the second source, were largely done of the very well-to-do, and show only the best dresses these ladies owned. (The only real exception to this is Hogarth's etchings.) The third main source used by these secondary works on costume is the clothes which have been preserved through the years, and that exist today. These were usually the finest dresses these ladies had, and often belonged to nobility or royalty. That is to say, they were special, treasured dresses which were worn only occasionally, and carefully put away.

All of these secondary sources, then, give us a glimpse of

what fashionable ladies of the eighteenth century wore. However, they do not necessarily tell even what the wealthy of Virginia owned, let alone what clothing the average colonial lady possessed. To see this, one has only to refer to the fashion magazines of today--Vogue for example, or even the outfits included in smaller magazines such as Woman's Day. Heaven forbid that any reader two hundred years hence should study some of the fashion articles printed in our periodicals, and think that all European and American ladies in 1965-66 wore dresses like those shown by Saint-Laurent! But this misunderstanding has undoubtedly occurred to a certain extent between us and the eighteenth century.

So all of these general fashion books, while providing good background on basic fashion trends, do not give any concrete help in a search for what Virginia women wore. This, then, is the place where several earlier surveys, not the millinery report alone, have gone astray. The equating of Virginia everyday fashion with English high fashion has led, naturally enough, to a number of misconceptions.

The costume department of Colonial Williamsburg, on the other hand, is not engaged in research work. They are primarily a business enterprise, buying all the needed materials, and making all the clothing worn by the hostesses and workers in the restored area. Some research has been done by this department, but the only county records that have been researched are those of York. Thus it can be stated that the amount of work done on the subject of clothing in eighteenth-century Virginia has been small indeed, and that very little of it has been based on county records.

The best available source of information on ladies' clothing is undoubtedly the county records. Three major sections of these records, while containing priceless data on colonial life, do not contain any information at all on clothing: these are the deeds, the parish records, and the court records. So one must turn to the inventories, wills, and records of estates for a glimpse of colonial wearing apparel.

For this thesis the Westmoreland County Records were thoroughly researched for the years 1700-1775. Most of the information on clothing was found in the inventories of the period. These inventories, especially those made between 1700 and 1750, are highly detailed. They were generally made soon after a person's death, and were supposed to be a list of all personalty. That is, they do not include houses, barns, land, and similar possessions. Some of these contain literally every item in the house and around the grounds, even such items as broken pots, and in one case, a sunken boat. Nevertheless, in regard to the listing of clothing, several obstacles were encountered. First, not all inventories, by any means, contain lists of women's clothing. A greater number do list men's clothes, and a still larger group include scattered articles of clothing in a long list of household goods. This problem was presumably caused in a majority of cases by a simple, natural action--the deceased's clothing had been divided up and taken away before the inventory was made. Second, the lists are often spotty or incomplete in regard to clothing, as though some items had overlooked or ignored. Third, and a major problem so far as

information on women's clothing is concerned, is the fact that these inventories were made by men. This may seem obvious and unimportant, but in regard to women's wearing apparel, men can rarely judge accurately the type of garment, the material used, the value of the garment, and even in some cases the color.

There is less information in the Westmoreland wills than in the Westmoreland inventories because comparatively few women made wills and many who did simply left all their clothing to a certain person without going into detail. However, those wills that do go into detail offer more information on the articles involved than do the inventories. In other words, since these were made by women and the clothing was left to women, more attention was paid to the materials and to the colors, though the values of the garments were usually ignored.

The reports dealing with estates in the Westmoreland records are itemized lists of all the things, including clothing, that the deceased's family needed over a set period of time, usually while the estate was still being settled. Some of these lists were kept by guardians, of the articles bought for orphans. These often extended on and off over periods of two to five years, and show what the "infants" (minors under twenty-one) needed or wanted in the way of clothing, as well as the value of each article.

Although the relation of wardrobe to economic status is difficult to determine and can be done only in ten or fifteen specific cases, there is enough information available in the Westmoreland County records to provide a fairly complete view of what the women

of Westmoreland, as a whole, actually wore in the eighteenth century.

Even though the main emphasis in the research fell on the Westmoreland County Records, the records of another Tidewater county were needed to provide a basis for comparison and contrast. To fulfill this need, the York County Records were researched for the same years (1700-1774) by using first the Colonial Williamsburg Research Department index to these records, and then by checking all entries which contained clothing or materials in the microfilm copies of the York Records in the Virginia State Library. Although there were comparatively few inventories or wills containing ladies' wearing apparel, there were several which contained exceptionally complete wardrobe listings. A number of excellent listings of fabrics and materials were found in these records also, along with the value of these materials. These provided a concrete basis for comparison of both prices and types of fabrics used in Westmoreland and York.

The Norton Papers are a collection of business papers from The Norton Company--a merchant firm with bases of operation in London and Virginia. I used the microfilm copies of these records from the Archives Department of Colonial Williamsburg. Two types of papers were especially useful. These were the orders from private citizens and merchants who sent for a wide variety of merchandise through the company, and the bills of sale in which the Norton Company itself bought items to fulfill orders they themselves had from colonial Virginians. The orders for clothing usually contain more information on a given garment than would be found in the county

records. This is especially true of colors, and to a lesser extent, of materials and fabrics. Approximate values were often given, as the people ordering in Virginia frequently indicated the price they were willing to pay for a given article. The greater attention to particulars found in these records stems from the fact that these orders were undoubtedly overseen by the female members of the families, who naturally knew more, and cared more, about details of color, style, and fabrics than did their fathers or husbands.

The orders from merchants for clothing and accessories indicate the variety of colors and values that would sell best in colonial Virginia, as well as the types and styles of bonnets, shoes, and other garments which were the favorites of the ladies. The Norton receipts show the prices that some items cost in London during this time, especially shoes, gloves, and stays.

The miscellaneous private orders and papers were available through the files of the Colonial Williamsburg Research Department. These were mainly orders (for example those of William Beverley), and these were very similar to the orders in the Norton Papers. Here again it was possible to find information on popular colors and fabrics, for which we can probably thank the ladies of the various families.

The other main sources researched included the Virginia Gazette and the periodicals indexed by Swem's Index. The Virginia Gazette tells us what was actually advertised in colonial Williamsburg, and thus provides a basis for comparison with the findings from the records

of the two counties--for example there were articles advertised which did not appear in the county records at all, but which were probably available in Williamsburg. Of the periodicals indexed by Swem, The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, the William and Mary Quarterly, Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine, and the Lower Norfolk County Virginia Antiquary were especially useful. In these were preserved a variety of orders, wills, and letters which would not have been otherwise available. These included some of Richard Corbin's orders, comments on Virginia women by travelers, and private letters with comments on clothing.

The purpose of this thesis will be to present as complete a picture as possible of what the ladies of colonial Westmoreland County, Virginia, wore. As has been noted, previous works on the subject of women's clothing in colonial Virginia are practically non-existent. The Millinery Reports relied too heavily on secondary works for their information on costumes of the period, and the Costume Department has done very little research into the subject. The books, or rather the chapters in books, which discuss Virginia women's wearing apparel in the eighteenth century, lack the solid basis that the county records can give--a source in which one can find both a sweeping cross-section of colonial ladies and their wardrobes, and also the picture of a number of these wardrobes in depth and detail.

This thesis, then, will seek to add to existing information on the subject of women's clothing in eighteenth-century Virginia by

attempting to fill in at least some of the empty spots on what is almost a bare canvas--to tell what Westmoreland ladies actually bought and wore in the eighteenth century. This discussion will also include, wherever possible, the number or amount of each article owned by Westmoreland ladies, what colors or types of garments were popular, and in some cases, a comparison of Westmoreland fashion trends (as found in the county records) with the high-fashion tendencies of the era in England.

Westmoreland ladies left just enough information in their wills and inventories to whet our appetities for more. One wishes that he could talk to an eighteenth-century Westmoreland lady, even if only for a few minutes, for so much information on colors, styles, fabrics, and other aspects of this subject has been lost forever just because it was common knowledge in the eighteenth century and no one thought to write it down. Nevertheless it is a subject which is both delightful and intriguing--a subject which is indeed rewarding--for as one works, these ladies who lived over two hundred years ago become increasingly real, and surprisingly like the women of today.

CHAPTER II

WOMEN'S WARDROBES AND THE WESTMORELAND COUNTY RECORDS

Westmoreland, lying along the Potomac River in northern Tidewater Virginia, is a region of fields and forests, of marshes and meadows. In the early years of the eighteenth century it seems to have been a land of thriving independent farmers, raisers of tobacco and other staple crops. It was only as the century progressed that the gradual rise of several very well-to-do families can be noted. The Lees, the Washingtons, the Ashtons; these and others, by 1750, held enormous tracts of land with slaves listed by the dozens. Yet, behind them there was still the ranks of the smaller but prosperous farmers and it was these who seem to have continued to be the backbone of the county. Tobacco, judging from the county records, remained the cash crop at least through 1770. Corn and other staples were widely grown for local consumption, and some cotton and flax was raised for local use. Although far from the stores and merchants of the colonial capital at Williamsburg, Westmoreland residents had their own access to England by the sea.

It can be assumed that Westmoreland women were as interested in being "fashionable" as were any of the ladies of that age. The orders that went to England, whether they were for material or or bonnets or laces, contained the repeated fervent plea that the

article sent for be "fashionable." But, though the Virginia and Westmoreland ladies were undoubtedly fashion-conscious, they probably did not slavishly copy London dress, but made additions and omissions on their own. A short survey of women's clothing in the eighteenth century will provide both an introduction to the general fashion trends of the era, and will also help the reader to identify unfamiliar articles of clothing.

The basic outline and features of a lady's dress did not change or vary much between 1700 and 1774. Gowns had very full skirts which reached almost to the floor, but which actually had trains only late in the period or for court wear. Occasionally hoops were worn to make the skirts stand out. The skirts of some gowns were cut so that the wearer's petticoat showed, and this can be called an "open gown." With this type of gown, the petticoat was, of course, very fancy and often matched the dress. The "closed gown" then, was exactly what its name suggests-- the skirt did not have an open panel in front and the lady's petticoat did not show.

Sleeves were tight and stopped about at the elbow where they were decorated with rows of ruffles, flounces, and laces, or with decorative cuffs. Low necklines were in vogue, either "V"-shaped or square, and ranged from modest to extreme décolleté. Tuckers and modesty pieces, and large handkerchiefs were all used to decorate or fill in the neckline. Bodices were sometimes open in front, and this opening was then filled with an ornamental panel called a stomacher.

For outdoor wear, the ladies relied on a variety of cloaks. Mantles and capuchins, for example, were long and full, and usually

had hoods with them, while mantlets and manteels were shorter and hoodless. Straw and beaver hats with low crowns and wide brims were popular, as were silk and satin bonnets. Indoors small caps, including pinnars and mobs, were worn, and these were often decorated with ribbons and laces. A colonial lady's shoes were heavy, with large heels and pointed toes. Glogs, a type of overshoe, were sometimes worn to protect a lady's footwear. This description has given only the general outline of what an eighteenth-century lady wore. Details of dress and accessories will be discussed within the body of the paper.

It is in the inventories that the best view of women's clothing is to be found. Inventories of the period are highly detailed, and usually list the deceased's possessions down to the last broken pot. However most inventories, naturally, did not include a wardrobe of women's clothing. A larger number did mention men's clothing, and a still greater number listed three or four miscellaneous pieces of clothing, at random, in a long list of household goods. Of the inventories that did have detailed entries of women's clothing, several have been selected to show the various economic levels of the county and the type and amount of clothing owned by representatives of each group. It should be noted that no appreciable price variations or fluctuations were found for the period 1700-1774. The slight variations noted with specific articles of clothing will be discussed in the next two chapters with the article concerned.

Of the inventories that indicated that the woman involved was poor, or that she had very little in the way of worldly goods, none

included a list of her clothes. Between this poor group and the average group came several women's inventories which included small yet complete listings of clothing which seemed to constitute a minimum wardrobe. However, these ladies possessed more than the bare necessities in regard to household items. Perhaps this indicates that these women either did not want to have more than a minimum wardrobe, or that the other goods had all been inherited and the woman did not have money to spend on clothing.

Ann Smith, for example, was a "one-bed-gal," but she had an impressive list of household goods. Her clothing, though, included only a minimum: two gowns, one petticoat, an old riding coat, an apron, a pair of shoes and stockings, a hat, a handkerchief, and a parcel of old linen. The total of these articles was only one pound eighteen shillings two pence.¹ Frances Johnston also had a long list of goods, but only a small wardrobe. This included two gowns, three petticoats, four aprons, one pair jumps, one cloak, three pairs of stockings, and a parcel of head linen.²

In the next group, that of ladies who were well-off but not wealthy, the lists of clothing show both greater quantity and greater variety. As a representative of this group, Frances Grace owned four gowns and petticoats: one fancy gown, one of Virginia cloth, one of stamped linen, and one of Shef(field). With these she had a short cloak, an apron, one silk and two linen handkerchiefs, worsted stockings, and a fan. A parcel of shifts, aprons, and other linens, plus a hat, and a parcel of headclothes rounded out her wardrobe.³

Mrs. Elizabeth Stonehouse possessed a similar list of clothing.

Her main garments were two gowns, one of which was duroy, a quilted silk petticoat and one of striped holland, and a mantle and hood. Her smaller items included an old check apron and four white aprons, a pair of stays, four shifts, three double white handkerchiefs, eleven caps, a hat, and a fan. The rest of her clothing consisted of two pairs of stockings, two pairs of shoes, a small parcel of gloves, one pair of gold bobs, a jacket, and two old petticoats.⁴

As an example of the wardrobe of the wealthy, that of Mrs. Charles Ashton can be considered. Mrs. Ashton owned seven gowns including one of thread satin, one of silk stuff, and three of calico. Five of the seven gowns had their own petticoats, but she owned six separate petticoats as well: one of silk, two of stamped linen, one holland, and two fustian. Her list of aprons and linens is impressive: one short muslin and two long muslin aprons, laced; nine shifts, two holland jumps, one fustian jump, one pair bodices, and three stomachers. In the way of headwear the list included four black hoods, a laced hat, two old headcloths and a parcel of head linen and ruffles. Her handkerchiefs, seven in number, were of silk and silk muslin, and her three pairs of gloves were of linen while her mitts were of leather. Rounding out her wardrobe she had two pairs of laced shoes, a satin mantle lined with calico, a swanskin waistcoat, two girdles, two fans, two masks, and an amber necklace.⁵

This magnificent wardrobe is far above those of the middle-class women. Not only does it have a greater quantity of basic items, it also contains a delightful array of nonessential pieces. Other

clothing inventories for women of the upper class are similar.

These and many other inventories were divided into classes on the basis of their total estates and of their house-hold goods. It was only after studying them and preparing to discuss them that the total value of each woman's wardrobe was sought. These fell into well-defined categories, confirming the earlier economic divisions. The clothing of the lower group ran in total from one pound to three pounds: Ann Smith, £ 2.18.2; Ann Hall, £ 2.17.8; Alice Grant, £ 1.15.10; Mrs. James Olive, £ 1.19.0.⁶ Those of the average class ranged from five pounds to seven pounds: for example Frances Grace, £ 6.2.0; Elizabeth Stonehouse, £ 6.15.9; Mrs. Weaver, £ 5.17.0; Katherine Bonam, £ 5.8.6; and Elizabeth Whitliff, £ 7.3.6.⁷ Only two complete wardrobe listings were available for the very wealthy and the totals involved were amazingly close. Mrs. Charles Ashton's clothes were worth £ 34.3.2 and Mrs. Thomas Sorrell's were valued at £ 33.9.8½.⁸ There was then a sharp, long break between the value of the clothing owned by the middle class women and that owned by the very rich.

As noted, not all women's inventories, by any means, listed clothing. This was caused by a simple, natural action: "My mothers Wearing cloathes was not appraised being taken and divided among her daughters at the time of her funerall."⁹ This undoubtedly happened again and again.

After the inventories, the next best source of information on clothing was the accounts of estates, and one accounting in particular. This was of the Richard Watt's estate from 1749 to 1752. That is, it

is a listing kept by Andrew Monroe of what was bought to support the family after Richard Watt's death. This particular list is of interest because the entire account is concerned with Watt's two daughters, Mary and Anne, and the clothing, material, and other items they bought during these years. It gives a unique view of what two wealthy young girls desired in the way of apparel.

They must have had a complete wardrobe prior to 1749, but the amount purchased was surprisingly large. In the four-year period under consideration, the girls bought four gowns, including one of cherryderry, and paid one pound thirteen shillings eleven pence for the making of at least five more. In the way of petticoats, one whale-bone petticoat, one silk quilted petticoat, two cane-hoop petticoats, and a flowered underpetticoat were purchased. Besides these, one pound twelve shillings three pence was paid for the quilting of a coat, and fifteen shillings for the making of two more.

Three cloaks were mentioned: one of best velvet, one scarlet, and one plain. The two velvet bonnets listed probably went with the cloaks since no hoods were found. Four pairs of stays were enumerated including one of superfine (linen) and one of tabby, and one hundred and eighty-five pounds of tobacco were paid to Mr. Robson for the making of stays.

The number of pairs of shoes they bought seems unusually high-- at least thirty-two pair. These were purchased largely in two groups, one in the summer of 1750, and one in the summer of 1751, indicating perhaps the arrival of an annual order from London or an annual visit with the local shoemaker. Calf and calimanco were the favorite materials

with seven and nine pairs respectively. But shoes of silk, black shabby, leather, and Spanish leather, as well as black lace shoes and red heeled shoes were listed. Stockings were another big item, for forty-eight pair were mentioned including two silk, five worsted, seven thread, eighteen plaid, and one yarn. Yet, when it is considered that these were acquired over a three-and-a-half-year period, and were divided between two girls, the number does not seem so excessive.

Accessories included gloves, hats, and handkerchiefs of cotton and silk. Fifteen pairs of gloves were bought for Ann and Mary in these years, including six pairs of kid, four pairs of half-handed, one pair of wash gloves, and one pair of mitts. Besides the bonnets already mentioned, their headgear consisted of four felt hats, one hair hat, and two suits of headclothes. Miscellaneous items purchased were one mask, two fans, two ivory combs, and two pairs of silk garters. The girls also got eight necklaces, two rings, two pairs of buckles, and several sets of stone buttons.

Several hundred yards of materials were bought. The fabrics ranged from linen to brocade, and from alopene to red calimanco. Ribbons and laces to go with the material and clothing were also listed, including black ribbon, figured ribbon, silver and gold ribbon, silk lace, and lace valued at six shillings a yard.

Almost every item was purchased in a number divisible by two, from gowns to rings, and if one girl got a new bonnet, so did the other. This, plus the use of the word "woman's" instead of "girl's" indicates that the girls were close in age and probably in their teens. All of the prices paid were approximately correct for the years involved

as compared with the county records at large, but the total spent between 1749 and 1752 on the two girls is astonishing: £ 580.3.4. The family and the estate must have been extremely wealthy, for the receipts more than covered these expenses.¹⁰

A third source of information, the county wills, was a relatively minor one. Only occasionally did they give views of the clothing owned. Almost all women's wills did mention clothing but usually said that it was to go to one female relative or to be divided among several without any elaboration. A few, however, were more explicit. For example, Elizabeth Tucker left to her daughter Martha Tucker a shift, an apron, a jump, and a muslin handkerchief. To her daughter Mary Woodward went a black gown and petticoat and her best shift. Sarah Minor, another daughter, was to get a black hood, while Rebecca Tucker, the fourth daughter, received a dimity waistcoat, stuff petticoat, and a calico apron. Elizabeth, of course, had more clothing than this, but this shows the garments that she thought were her best, those valuable enough to will specifically to certain persons.¹¹

Considering all economic classes represented in the county records, Westmoreland women seem to have dressed well. A tremendous variety of goods was available; everything the ladies could desire or afford. In general the women were interested in English clothing, but, except for very special occasions, they seem to have preferred simple dresses, especially of cotton. A traveler passing through northern Virginia during these years noted of the girls: "Their Dress is neat and clean, and not much bordering on the ridiculous

Humour of their Mother Country, where the Daughters seem dressed up
for a Market."¹²

Notes for Chapter II

1. Aug. 15, 1716, Deeds and Wills, V, 610, Westmoreland County Records, microfilm, Virginia State Library, Richmond.
2. Feb. 7, 1742, Records and Inventories, I, 278a, Westmoreland Co. Recs.
3. Apr. 6, 1747, ibid., II, 22a-23a.
4. Mar. 3, 1742, ibid., I, 278a-279.
5. Sept. 30, 1724, ibid., 10a-11a.
6. Westmoreland Deeds and Wills, V, 610; Westmoreland Records and Inventories, II, 166a; I, 140a-141; II, 120a-121a.
7. Westmoreland Records and Inventories, II, 22a-23a; I, 278a-279; V, 158-161; Westmoreland Deeds and Wills, V, 442-443; Westmoreland Records and Inventories, I, 64-64a.
8. Westmoreland Records and Inventories, I, 10a-11a, 42-44.
9. June 20, 1716, Westmoreland Deeds and Wills, V, 560-561.
10. June 24, 1752, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, II, 199a-204a.
11. Oct. 1722, Westmoreland Deeds and Wills, VII, 110-112.
12. Edward Kimber, "Observer in Several Voyages & Travels in America," London Magazine (1746), as quoted in William and Mary Quarterly, 1st ser., XV (1906-1907), 158.

CHAPTER III

THE MAJOR ARTICLES OF DRESS

To better understand the clothing Westmoreland women wore, a study of the various major articles of clothing is necessary. This section will discuss gowns, petticoats and undergarments, and cloaks as they were found in the county records.

The inventories of the first twenty years of the century show the woman of average means as having only two or three gowns. Mrs. Morris for example had two gowns, two petticoats, and enough stuff to make a third gown.¹ Katherine Bonam owned three gowns including "a Sorry gown and petticoat old." With these she also had three dimity vests and a waistcoat.² The highest number of gowns and petticoats noted in these years, five gowns and seven petticoats, belonged to Mary Baxter.³ Nearly all gowns listed in this period were listed with petticoats. This could indicate that the two articles of clothing were once a set.

Most of the fabrics employed in the making of these gowns were of the heavy, long-wearing variety. Serge, stuff, cantaloons, and duxoy were all widely used in Westmoreland between 1700 and 1720. It was natural for the people to choose these sturdy woolens, for these were the materials universally worn by farmers and laborers before the advent of cheap cottons. For their better gowns, the ladies chose black damask, silk crepe, and crisp, a type of British

linen. The value of the gowns found ranged from six pounds one shilling for a silk ensemble to four shillings for a rat-eaten gown. The average gown, however, seems to have been valued at five to eight shillings.

It is in the period between 1720 and 1750 that the economic divisions of the county begin to come into focus. Virginia prospered with tobacco and trade as the empire grew in an era of comparative peace. The inventory of a middle-class lady in these years, such as Frances Grace or Mrs. John Olive, lists four or five gowns, indicating a definite rise over the earlier years in the number of dresses the woman of average means possessed.⁴ Among their gowns there was usually one "fancy" dress of satin, watered tabby, or a similar material. These gowns usually had petticoats to match and were valued between one and five pounds. The most popular material for everyday dresses was calico. These demonstrated a wide value range from four pounds down to twelve shillings for a gown and petticoat. This may indicate a difference in quality, or in the age of the garments, or both. Other fabrics used for these "ordinary" gowns were dimity, crepe, stuff, stamped linen, seersucker, and Virginia cloth. A majority of these had petticoats with them, and were valued between ten and sixteen shillings.

The best available minimum inventory for this time period is that of Alice Grant. She owned a sagathy gown and petticoat, a black hat, and a pair of stockings.⁵ The inventory of Elizabeth Whitliffs is similar. She had one gown, a satin petticoat, a hood, a pair gloves, an apron, and a pinner.⁶ Each of these two then,

list only one gown. Admittedly these were the poorest, or at least the lowest in content of the inventories, but it is impossible to believe they possessed only one gown. Two would seem a more likely minimum. This listing of only one, however, could stem from two things: one, the division and taking away of the deceased's clothing before the inventory was made; or two, if these women were really very poor, they might have indeed have had only two, but were buried in one of these, leaving only one to show in the list of their goods and estate.

Among the very rich at this time, the inventory of Mrs. Thomas Sorrell is especially valuable. Mrs. Sorrell had several expensive gowns including one of cotton satin lined with silk, one cut out of India Persian, and one of calimanco. She also owned a gown of stuff, one of half silk, two of crepe, and two "double" gowns. Completing her total of twelve gowns were one of linen and two of calico. Mrs. Sorrell also had a calico riding gown valued at eight shillings and one of satin worth eighteen shillings.⁷ Riding gowns were scarce in Westmoreland throughout the century, and were found exclusively in the inventories of the very rich.⁸

Taking the last twenty-some years of the time period, 1750 to 1773 or 1774, the average Westmoreland lady seems to have had only three or four gowns. This is a small but definite drop from the previous period, and reflects the economic and social conditions in the colony. The prosperity of the second quarter faded with the coming of the French and Indian War. Even though the areas of conflict were far distant, Virginia and the Southern colonies, far more than the other colonies, were affected by external affairs

because of their heavy dependency on exports and credit. Things never returned to "normal" after the war. The political situation grew progressively more tense, and in its wake the economic and trade situation declined. The rich of Westmoreland and colonial Virginia continued to order clothing from England, even through 1773, but credit was not as readily available as before, and the average independent farmer of Virginia would have been among the first to feel the economic setback.⁹ Westmoreland ladies turned to Virginia cloth for most of their gowns though some were made of silk and cotton or tartan. The majority of these gowns, for the first time, are not listed with petticoats, perhaps indicating the increasing popularity of the closed gown. They were valued between ten and twelve shillings each.

The use of separates, that is of a skirt and jacket or waistcoat, should be mentioned. The word "skirt" as we use it today was unknown in colonial times. However they did wear outfits composed of a "waistcoat and petticoat." The women's waistcoats that were found were made of dimity, swanskin, or frize, while the jackets were of flannel, ticking, and ozenbrig. Since nearly all of the inventories included gowns, and so few included waistcoats or jackets, Westmoreland women seem to have preferred the former.

Some picture of the gowns worn elsewhere in Virginia can be gained from the Virginia Gazette and from private papers of the period. Runaways are described as wearing or carrying with them a variety of gowns. Sarah Willmore carried with her a dark-colored camblet, an ash-colored camblet tied at the sleeves with blue ribbon, and a purple

calico gown.¹⁰ Aminta took with her a dark ground calico, a blue and white calico, and an old light-colored stuff gown.¹¹ Mary, a well-to-do lady of Stafford County, ran off with one of the servants. She took with her a striped silk stuff gown, a tartan, and a striped holland gown.¹² Other types of gowns mentioned in the Virginia Gazette included one of red, white, and yellow calimanco, a chintz gown with red flowers, and an English stuff gown with white silk spots in it.

The Beverley papers include orders for a genteel suit of flowered silk clothes "but neither red nor blue because she Elizabeth Beverley has those colours already," and the material for a gown of white calico, the pattern of which was to be worked here in blue silk.¹³ When one of the Nelson daughters got married, her inventory listed a fashionable lustring sacque and coat, a rose white satin sacque and coat, a lustring gown and several pieces of material that were undoubtedly destined to become gowns, including one of purple and white linen, one of dark brown cotton, one of fine corded dimity, and one of colored cambric.¹⁴

No gowns were ordered through the Norton Company, but several were sent to England to be dyed. Francis Leigh's wife, for example, sent one of her gowns "to have Dyed of a Lemon Coulor." Merchants' wives sometimes selected material for gowns that were to be worn in Virginia. Mrs. Elizabeth Perry did this in 1737 for Mrs. Thomas Jones of Williamsburg, and wrote:

I am very glad what I do for my friends in Virginia pleases them. I have done my best endeavors that Misses things should be what she likes, for a walking

gown I have bought a Turkey Burdet for I thought a Cery derry had a too mean a look and tho^{ugh} what I have sent is something dearer it will answer it in the wear. . . .¹⁵

Much of the time, as has been noted, the petticoats were listed with the gowns, and were of a matching material. But, "coats" as a separate inventory entry also occur. In the early years of the century they were made mainly of stuff or calico, but by 1730 a wide variety of fabrics were used: holland, silk, striped linen, fustian and cotton. These were valued from one to ten shillings. Petticoats made of satin were more expensive than these and averaged over three pounds each, although a silk coat lined with silk was also valued at over three pounds.

Later in the century quilted coats increased in popularity, and included blue quilted and lamy (lame) quilted coats. Plain petticoats, like the gowns of the later period, were made of cotton or Virginia cloth. The Norton Papers show that other materials were used for petticoats during these years. Coats of black calimanco, red sarcenet, and black durant were ordered as well as ones of green peeling satin and pink and blue Persian. Black ^{kussels} kussels and black Russel quilts were also requested.

Petticoats mentioned in the private orders included ones of garnet and white colored silk to go with a gown, one of quilted black Persian with pearl collering, a blue satin coat, and a scarlet cloth underpetticoat.¹⁶

Petticoat material was also available in Westmoreland for two shillings two pence a yard, and the making up of two petticoats cost the Barnes estate ten pounds of tobacco in 1738.¹⁷ Most coats must

have been made from the yards and yards of linen that came to the colony, for the word "linen" is used throughout the inventories and wills to stand for all of a women's undergarments.

Petticoats then, as now, were usually worked around the bottom, or edged with special binding, ferreting, or lace. The term "worked" indicated that the owner had finished the bottom of the petticoat by hand by adding some type of handmade edging, for example crochet work, or had decorated the petticoat with embroidery. The great majority of the ladies must have made their own underwear at home, including petticoats, and decorated them themselves. If anyone in colonial Virginia could have afforded to send for undergarments to be made and finished in England, surely the Byrds could have. But the letter quoted below indicates that the family was used to making and working their own. If this was true of the Byrds, it would seem likely that this was also true of the well-to-do families of Westmoreland. The woman being discussed is Mrs. Taylor Byrd's daughter-in-law.

. . . I hear She has writ one an invoice which orders her underclothes to be made and Ruffled in England. I cant but think, She had better make them herself. it would be some employment for her. I am sure it is the most extravagant Fashion in the world to have them made in that manner. . . .¹⁸

Stays were worn throughout the century. In the early years they were called "boddies" or "bodices." Many stays are listed in the Westmoreland records but the material of which they were made is not mentioned. Stays were ordered for Virginia ladies through the Norton Company, and these were of ticking, tabby, tabby lined with silk, linen, and twilled linen. There were also turned stays,

packthread stays, and bone stays. Whalebone seems to have been the usual stiffening agent and occasionally whalebone itself was ordered for stays that were to be made here. In Westmoreland the average value climbed slowly during the century from approximately five shillings a pair to eleven, and even in some cases to twenty by the 1770's. The most expensive stays found were a pair ordered from Williamsburg for Miss Sally Vaulx in 1756. These cost two pounds, seventeen shillings and six pence.¹⁹

In the Norton Papers the price ranged in direct proportion to the size ordered. Girls' stays were four to ten shillings while women's were just over one pound. Very large stays were one pound sixteen shillings. One honest woman ordered "2 pair Stays I dont mind the fashion if they are made easy and full in the Stomick."²⁰

Shifts are included in the lists of women's clothing for all but the first twenty years of the century. These garments were of linen. A new one was valued at ten shillings and an old one at nine pence. A shift was a straight garment, not unlike our modern slips.²¹ Jumps were found only in the inventories of the second quarter of the century. These were a kind of under-bodice worn in place of stays. Fustian and holland were used to make these garments.

A list in the Horatio Gates papers gives the contents of a trunk which probably belonged to Mrs. Gates, and which in any case contained a very wealthy lady's undergarments. There were seven nightgowns mentioned including one of black silk, one of green-striped silk, one of white satin, and one of printed linen. Her petticoats were of a variety of materials, and among them were two of dimity,

five Marseilles white quilted, one of red and white satin, and two linen. Mrs. Gates also had eleven holland shifts, "some new, some worn."²²

These undergarments were worn in the following order: shift, stays, underpetticoat, and then overpetticoat if it was needed. The question invariably arises as to what the ladies wore under their shifts. Unfortunately little evidence is available on this subject. Older women did wear a type of britches, but the rest? Well, what other ladies wore, if anything, was just not discussed or mentioned, either out of eighteenth century modesty or to intrigue twentieth century scholars.

The subject of hoops has been deliberately left until last in this section on underclothing. Petticoats were often stiffened to make the dresses stand out. This is clear from general discussions of the costumes of the times. These studies also discuss at length the various types of hoops popular in the eighteenth century: the bell hoop, the fan hoop, and the oblong hoop.²³ However, only three hoops were found in the Westmoreland records, and these belonged to the Watts sisters discussed earlier. These were a whalebone hoop petticoat, a hoop petticoat, and a cane hoop. The first cost one pound eight shillings, and the last two about eleven shillings each.²⁴ No other hoops of any type were mentioned in the county records. There were not even hints of them. Only four other hoops or hoop-petticoats were found in all of the other records and papers consulted and all of these were included in orders sent to England by the very wealthy. But, if Virginia followed English fashion, hoops should have

been numerous. It is possible that hoops were not discussed or listed simply because they were so commonplace and everyday that it was not considered necessary to list them. But if this applied to hoops, why didn't it apply to shifts, or jumps, or other articles of clothing? Occasionally, as has been noted, hoops were part of the petticoat, and such garments were listed specifically as "hoop-petticoats," but such references were rare. Perhaps hoops were not widely used in eighteenth-century Virginia! This solution is definitely probably from the evidence at hand. Perhaps hoops were worn by the highest social circles and by the very rich on special occasions, but the average woman of the time does not seem to have owned or worn either hoops or hoop-petticoats.

The last major article of women's clothing to be considered is the cloak, and the word "cloak" is used here to represent all garments of this type. Surely every woman needed some kind of outer wrap for Virginia's winters, but surprisingly few cloaks were mentioned in the records, a total of only nineteen. These included a scarlet cloak trimmed with gold lace and valued at five pounds, a scarlet mantellet at one pound, a scarlet mantel lined with calico, and a scarlet cloak worth ten shillings, six pence.²⁵ The clothing bought for the Watts sisters included three cloaks: one of the best velvet, one plain, and one scarlet.²⁶ The few other places that cloaks were noted there was only the laconic entry "one cloak." It is probable that cloaks were valuable and in high demand and that most were either given away or taken away before the inventory was made.

In sharp contrast to this scarcity of cloaks in the Westmoreland

County Records, dozens of cloaks were ordered through the Norton Company. The cloak itself was ordered more than its cousins, occasionally with a hood or bonnet, but mostly alone. Colonial buyers differentiated very carefully between scarlet, a very bright red; crimson, a deep red; and red itself, which had a wide range of shades. Grouping these colors together, far more "red" cloaks were ordered than any other color; for example, one cloak of scarlet duffil trimmed with snail at twelve shilling six pence, and two crimson cloaks with snail at eighteen shillings.²⁷ Mrs. Beverley sent her scarlet cloak to London-"My wife has also sent her old scarlet omba cloak which she desires you'll get new vamped up in such a manner as you shall think fit not being at much expense."²⁸

Blue satin cloaks, ranging in cost from twenty-two shillings to thirty shillings, were next in the popularity scale, followed by those in some shade of white; for example, one fashionable white satin cloak lined and laced very fine with a neat white satin bonnet, or a pearl-colored cloak at twenty-two shillings. Black cloaks were ordered plain and flowered, and one very fine purple cloth cloak was requested.²⁹

The most popular trimmings were lace and snail, but one dove-colored cloak and hood were to be trimmed with nankeens. Occasionally cloaks were lined, as in "a black Satten cloak and Bonnet for my wife the cloak to be inter lined with Flannell."³⁰

Capuchins, cloaks with hoods attached, were also ordered. Black was the favorite color for these garments, and silk and satin

the favorite materials. These cost between one pound and two pounds. Cardinals were shorter cloaks, usually hooded. Originally all of these were red or scarlet, but by the eighteenth century other colors were available. Cardinals were made of cloth or satin, and cost about as much as a cloak. The finest cardinal ordered was "1 black Satin Cardinal and bonnett with Ermine around the cardinal."³¹

Phillip Fithian, a tutor in Westmoreland county for the years 1773 and 1774, was too much in love with his beloved Laura to notice much about what the ladies wore, but he did make a few comments on gowns and cloaks. When discussing a party in January of 1774, he wrote that "The ladies were Dressed Gay, and splendid, and when dancing, their Silks and Brocades rustled and trailed behind them!"³² Later on a summer day of the same year, Fithian describes three of the young girls and their dresses. Miss Washington had on a chintz gown with a light blue stamp, and a sky-blue quilt. Miss Hale wore a white holland gown and a very fine diaper quilt, and Betsy Lee had a shell calico gown. Still later in that same year he mentions Miss Ritchie in a blue silk dress and Miss Betsy of Richmond in one of light chintz.³³

Fithian states that almost every Westmoreland lady wore a red cloak, thereby proving that the women did indeed have cloaks despite the scarcity of this garment in the inventories. With the cloaks the ladies liked to wear a white handkerchief of cotton or silk "to muffle up their heads, and Necks leaving only a narrow passage for the Eyes."³⁴

The ladies of Westmoreland and their clothing help illustrate the wearing apparel of women in various economic classes all over

colonial Virginia. The poorer ladies would have worn gowns of long-wearing material, probably homemade or Virginia made. These garments would have been dyed dark brown with walnuts, or grey with maple bark, or, if they could afford it, deep blue with indigo.

The middle-class woman would have had brown or grey gowns of Virginia cloth for everyday, or perhaps ones of dark prints or checks that had been imported. Her one or two Sunday dresses would have been of some sort of silk or satin, and probably were in blue for this was a favorite color of colonial women. The very rich lady would have used Virginia cloth only for the servant's or children's clothes. Her working dresses would have been of dark cotton or calico, or perhaps of light high-grade wool. Her several dress-up gowns would have been of silk and satin with matching quilted petticoats.

All of these ladies would have owned linen underwear, and many probably had flannel under-petticoats for cold winter days. Whatever their gown or outfit, their outer wrap was a flowing cloak, usually in red, but occasionally in blue, or white. Westmoreland women must have been colorful and graceful as they went about their daily life in colonial Virginia.

Notes for Chapter III

1. Aug. 3, 1719, Westmoreland Deeds and Wills, VI, 490-491.
2. June 3, 1715, ibid., V, 442-443.
3. Nov. 28, 1716, ibid., 54-55.
4. Apr. 6, 1747, June 13, 1750, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, II, 22a-23a, 120a-121a.
5. June 10, 1734, ibid., I, 140-141.
6. July 1, 1727, Oct. 10, 1728, ibid., I, 64-64a, 77a.
7. Dec. 16, 1726, ibid., 42a-44.
8. The sacque or Watteau is often mentioned as being popular in England from 1720 until 1780 with the height of its popularity reached between 1750 and 1770. In spite of this no sacques were found in the Westmoreland Records. The only sacques found were four or five in the private orders and papers consulted.
9. The Sugar Act of 1764 for example laid duties on silk and calico.
10. May 2, 1751, Virginia Gazette (Hunter).
11. Apr. 29, 1773, Virginia Gazette (P.D.).
12. Oct. 31, 1751, Virginia Gazette (Hunter).
13. Nov. 21, 1741, in William Beverley, Letters and Accounts 1734-1748; July 1, 1741, in Beverley Invoice.
14. Thomas Nelson Page, The Old South (New York, 1892), 154-155.
15. Letter of Francis Leigh, Oct. 12, 1771, Norton Papers, microfilm, Archives Department, Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.; Mary Newton Stanard, Colonial Virginia: Its People and Customs (Philadelphia, 1917), 215.

16. See for examples the order of Augustine Smith, enc, June 10, 1767, Norton Papers; and the order of Mrs. P. Dawson, Apr. 15, 1752, William and Mary Quarterly, 1st ser., VI (1897-1898), 124.
17. Jan. 30, 1738, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, I, 203a-204a.
18. Mrs. Maria Taylor Byrd to her son, Colonel Byrd, Nov. 6, 1757, as quoted in the Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, XXVII (1929), 248.
19. Aug. 25, 1767, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, V, 27-28.
20. Order for Mrs. Scott in an invoice for Lord Dunmore, June 12, 1773, in John Norton & Sons: Merchants of London and Virginia, ed. Frances Norton Mason (Richmond, 1937), 328-330.
21. Up until the beginning of the seventeenth century, this garment was called a smock. The name was changed to shift at that time because it was thought a "more delicate" appellation. Early in the nineteenth century the name was changed again, this time to chemise.
22. 1765?, Horatio Gates Papers, III-125, New York Historical Society.
23. The oblong hoop was simply a variation of the other two, and was very wide side to side. It was not the same as the farthingale which was not worn after 1625. See Phillis Cunningham, Costume in Pictures (New York, 1964) especially pages 64 and 93.
24. June 24, 1752, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, II, 199a-204a.
25. See for examples ibid., I, 10a-11a, 12-14a, 239, 252a-253a.
26. June 24, 1752, ibid., II, 199a-204a.
27. Order of John Wilkins for the year 1773, Norton Papers.
28. Letter to Mr. Benj. How, July 24, 1739, William Beverley Papers.

29. See for examples, Invoice of John Wilkins Merct, July 24, 1772; Invoice of Thomas Wynne, Aug. 23, 1768; Invoice of Elizabeth Marriott, Oct. 7, 1773, Norton Papers.
30. Invoice of John Clayton, Aug. 1, 1769, and of James Carter, Dec. 12, 1772, ibid.
31. Order of John Robinson, Jan. 15, 1770, as quoted in John Norton & Sons, ed. Frances Mason, 121.
32. Journal & Letters of Philip Vickers Fithian 1773-1774: A Plantation Tutor of the Old Dominion, ed. by Hunter Dickinson Parish (Williamsburg, 1943), 76.
33. Ibid., 163-165, 203-204, 279.
34. Ibid., 38, 221.

CHAPTER FOUR

ACCESSORIES

The smaller, but none the less significant, articles which these ladies had in their wardrobes are also important to a study of what Westmoreland women wore. These items, to be discussed below, include shoes and stockings, gloves, handkerchiefs, headgear, and other miscellaneous accessories.

The listing of shoes in the inventories of the eighteenth century is very erratic. A majority of the inventories, even those which were fairly complete with regard to the rest of a woman's clothing, simply ignored her footwear. Judging from the information available, the lady of average means in Westmoreland had only two or three pairs of shoes. Perhaps she had others and they were not included. Or perhaps she did not see the need of having more than two or three pairs at one time, even though shoes were fairly inexpensive at about three shillings a pair. The poorer woman's total of only one or two pairs of shoes seems about right proportionally. Even the inventories of the very rich of Westmoreland list only four or five pairs. It would seem, then, that the habit of having a half dozen pairs of shoes in the closet at one time is a modern trait--an idea that was not even considered in colonial Westmoreland.

Despite this noted erratic listing of footwear, it is nevertheless easy to discern that the ladies had a very definite favorite when it came to shoes. This was the calimanco shoe--that is, one covered with a glazed linen fabric which had a pattern on one side. These shoes came in all sizes, including children's, and were popular in what was probably two different styles: plain shoes, and pumps. Also, these shoes were available with French heels, cork heels, and full heels. Around 1735, a pair of calimanco shoes was valued at approximately three shillings, but in 1770 the average pair was appraised at ten shillings. If this does reflect a true rise in price, calimancoes were the only shoes to do so. These shoes came in a wide variety of colors including green, pink, and blue, but Westmoreland ladies preferred black or white.

Calimancoes were also the favorites of the Virginia ladies who ordered through the Norton Company. The price noted here ranged from three shillings to six shillings for the years 1768 to 1773, and again the preferred colors were black and white. How to order the correct size was a problem, and several solutions were attempted. The private orders are the most careful and exact; for example Robert C. Nicholas ordered shoes "to be made by Gresham exactly to the measure A. Nicholas."¹ Some private citizens ordered by size, for John Clayton requested pumps in "Size 7."² The merchants could not send measures or exact sizes, and so resorted to other stratagems. Hart and Marshall in 1770 wanted all their women's shoes to be from "9½ to 9 3/4 Inches Long."³ John Mathews was not even this precise.

He ordered "6 pair black calimanco Shoes little above the middle size."⁴

Calimanco shoes outnumbered leather shoes in the country records by almost two to one. However, for everyday use, it would seem that calimanco shoes would be extremely unsatisfactory. And this would especially be true for areas such as Westmoreland County, as opposed, for example, to the "city" of Williamsburg. Leather shoes must have been far more durable, and more easily obtained. The ratio of calimanco to leather shoes noted in the inventories probably does not give a true picture of the situation. Calimanco shoes were almost certainly imported, and the majority of leather shoes probably were not. This alone would cause calimanco shoes to be valued more highly, and would account for the careful listing of calimancoes in the inventories while leather shoes were more often ignored or simply listed as "a pair shoes." A more likely ratio, all things considered, would have been two pairs of leather to one pair of calimanco.

A variety of leather shoes were available, and Spanish leather was the favorite of Westmoreland. These shoes ranged in value from three shillings to seven shillings six pence per pair, and were usually bound. Calfskin shoes in the county records occur only in the Watts inventory. However, it would seem logical that most of the shoes that were simply labeled "leather" were of calfskin. Yet, one of the Norton orders seems to differentiate very carefully between these two types--"18 pair wo[man's] calf 6 pair wo[man's] leather pumps."⁵ Other types of leather shoes mentioned in the Westmoreland County Records include shammy (chamois), kid, and Morocco. Black,

white, red, and brown were the usual colors mentioned with leather shoes.⁶

Silken and satin shoes were expensive as compared with calimanco and leather, and not many were listed in the Westmoreland records. The average price for those found was about fourteen shillings per pair for those labeled silk, and four shillings six pence for those labeled thread satin or striped satin. Shoes made of these materials must have been anything but durable, and were probably used almost solely for dancing shoes. The Norton Papers do not mention silk shoes, but many pairs of satin shoes were ordered. These shoes and pumps were usually requested in white, blue, or black, but occasionally they were ordered in green or purple.

In the private orders and inventories, several other colors and types of satin shoes appear including one pair of pink satin, one pair of white satin embroidered, and one pair of blue satin shoes "full trimmed," with blue silk stockings to match them (value £ 2.8.0).⁷ Other dress-up shoes found in private orders included Beverley's order for "6 pair of Flowered stuff Damask shoes not laced" for his daughters Elizabeth and Ursula, and "1 pair Silk Shoes for each."⁸

Everlasting shoes were those made of a warp-ribbed woolen. Only three pairs of this material were found in the Westmoreland records. The Norton Papers include orders for almost three dozen pairs, but they were always ordered in lesser quantities than the popular calimanco. The two kinds were approximately equal in price, averaging between four and six shillings per pair, and must have been

approximately equal in quality. The only obvious answer is that there were fashion trends and fads then, just as there are now, and that the ladies of Westmoreland and of Virginia simply preferred calimanco shoes. In both the Norton Papers and the Westmoreland County Records the only color noted for ever-lasting shoes and pumps was black.

Clogs and patterns were evidently widely used in England at this time, but were largely ignored in Westmoreland. Only four pairs of clogs were listed and these were valued at three shillings per pair.⁹

Shoemakers, it would seem, were scattered throughout colonial Virginia. In fact, a majority of the shoes worn in Westmoreland must have been made here in the colony. At least three shoemakers were noted in the Westmoreland County Records. These were James Taylor in 1723, John Rochester in 1755, and Peter Rust in 1762.¹⁰ A number of records of estates include the notation "Cash for shoemaking for one year."¹¹ Calfskin and other leathers were also imported for shoes that were to be made in Virginia. By 1768 a wide variety of shoes were available, for Robert Gilbert had a shop in Williamsburg in which he offered for ladies: "leather, stuff, silk, and braided shoes and pumps, slippers, cork soles, galloches, and clogs."¹² By 1775 a shoe factory had been established in Petersburg to supply Virginia's needs. Their advertisement in the Virginia Gazette offered "a manufactory of Men's boots and Shoes also women's leather, cloth, calimanco, silk and satin Shoes all of which are made after the newest fashion, and equal in goodness and workmanship to any

imported from London, many of the hands having worked with Didsbury and other capital tradesmen in that branch."¹³

The listing of stockings in the inventories and records was also rather erratic, for a majority did not include any stockings of any kind. From the information that is available, however, some general conclusions can be drawn. In the Westmoreland County Records for the period 1723-43, the two favorite kinds of stockings were thread and worsted. Thread stockings (probably of cotton ^{no - linen} thread) were used mainly during the summer months, and the average value of this type was three shillings. Some thread stockings were clocked; that is they had an embroidered or woven ornament on each side of the stocking, extending from the ankle upward for three to five inches. Clocking was usually done in a contrasting color, for example black cloaks on white stockings, and could be of almost any small design from triangles to flowers. Stockings of any kind in the Westmoreland records which were clocked were more expensive, and clocked thread stockings were valued at as much as six shillings a pair.

The worsted hose were used during the winter, and in fact, more than one pair were sometimes worn at once. These worsted hose showed a wider value range than did the thread, going from one shilling to one shilling four pence for the cheapest, to three or five shillings per pair for the clocked or fine worsted. The average value, though, was one shilling six pence to three shillings.

Yarn stockings ranked third in popularity in colonial Westmoreland. These were valued between six pence for an old pair,

and two shillings six pence for a new pair. About ten pair of "nit" stockings were also noted, and the records of the estate of Henry Ashton contain the reference "3 pair Stockings niting for Betty Ashton 4/." ¹⁴

Other types of stockings included washed, cotton, and Virginia. In fact, there are many references to Virginia stockings, but we do not know whether these were thread, worsted, yarn, or cotton.

Virginia-made stockings are particularly found in the records of estates such as the reference in the Barnes Estate where the making of eight pairs of "Virginia" stockings in 1738 cost twenty pounds of tobacco. ¹⁵ The Walker inventory in the York County Records listed English stockings and Virginia stockings side by side and valued them exactly the same--three shillings a pair. ¹⁶

The scarcity of stockings in the Westmoreland inventories and records grows progressively greater as the years go by. Judging by the few which are listed, yarn, knit, and thread stockings continued to be the most popular kinds, and values remain about the same. In contrast to this dearth of stockings in the regular inventories, the records of the Watts Estate (1749-52) list thirty-three pair of stockings bought or made for the two girls, Anne and Mary, during those four years. These represented a wide range of types and prices. Seven pairs of thread were included at four shillings six pence to eight shillings per pair, and the worsted stockings bought for the girls ranged from about five shillings per pair, to eight shillings for "best worsted." Sixteen pairs of plaid were purchased. These were probably used for everyday wear and were the cheapest kind,

costing only one shilling six pence for a pair. Two pairs of silk were included in this listing at sixteen shillings a pair.¹⁷ These plus one lone pair in an early inventory were the only silk stockings mentioned in the Westmoreland records. While such factors as location and livelihood may have caused this, the obvious answer is that silk stockings were just too expensive for most of the people of Westmoreland.

The York inventories show the same two favorites as Westmoreland, thread and worsted. In the York records in general, just as in the Westmoreland records, silk hose were very scarce. The only exception here was the Ives inventory where six pair of women's fine silk hose worth ten shillings each were listed.¹⁸

The Norton Papers reflect much the same picture as do the county records. Thread stockings were ordered more than all other kinds combined. The average price quoted for these was between one shilling four pence and two shillings per pair, though some called "3 thread" stockings cost four shillings. The only color mentioned with these was white. Some orders requested thread with clocks, and these, unlike those in the Westmoreland records, were valued approximately the same as those without clocks. Worsted was the next most popular kind, and again the only color mentioned is white. The only contrast between the Norton Papers and the county records comes in the area of silk stockings. A fairly large number were ordered, eighteen pair in private orders, and five dozen for merchants. These were to be white, white ribbed, white with "clox," clouded with "clox," white with flowered "clox," and dark-colored ribbed and plain

silk. The price for a pair of silk stockings ran high here also-- from twelve shillings to fifteen shillings a pair. The private papers and orders show almost exactly the same picture as do the Norton Papers. Thread and worsted were widely used, and silk, though expensive, was found in these orders and letters fairly frequently.¹⁹

The color of stockings simply is not given in the county records. However, through the other sources it would seem that almost all women's stockings in colonial Virginia were white. The main exceptions to this rule were two-fold. The first is that stockings used by growing girls for everyday were probably either dark-colored or plaid. The second exception is that pastel-colored stockings were occasionally ordered to match satin shoes, or to complement a one-color outfit.

Gloves were another important accessory in a colonial lady's wardrobe. Wash gloves were the type found most often in the Westmoreland County Records. Presumably these were gloves which could be washed, for example of cotton or cotton thread. Several pairs of Virginia gloves were listed, including one pair of "Virginia silk." Kid gloves were not as numerous as wash gloves, yet if one can judge from the Watts Estate, where six pairs of kid gloves were bought within a four-year period, it would seem that more kid gloves were owned by the well-to-do than were found in the inventories.²⁰ Other kinds of gloves found in the Westmoreland records included linen, sheepskin, "died shammy," and half-handed gloves.

There are far more gloves in the Norton Papers than in the

county records. Over twenty dozen pair of kid gloves or mitts were ordered, both glazed and unglazed. White, as might be expected, was the color most frequently mentioned, with purple a surprisingly strong second.²¹ Black ran a poor third, and since several orders requested a given number of kid gloves "different colored," it can be assumed that kid gloves came in other colors as well as black, white, and purple.

Lamb mittens and gloves were the next most-ordered type, and these also came glazed and unglazed, and mainly in white or purple. Other leather gloves listed included chamois, beaver, sham beaver, dogskin, and wash leather. Except for one pair labeled Virginia silk, silk gloves were simply lacking in the county records. Not a great many were ordered through the Norton Company either (at least as compared to the amounts of kid and lamb), only about sixty pair. Silk gloves were requested in sky blue and patterned, as well as the old favorites of white and purple. The private orders mention kid gloves more than any other kind, both white and colored. Eight pairs of red gloves were ordered, so purple was not the only bright color that was worn by colonial ladies.

The value or price of gloves has been left until last because it needs some examination in itself. When the Norton Company went to Robert Price in June of 1772 to purchase gloves, the price per dozen of each of the main kinds bought was as follows: Lamb gloves and mitts 12/ to 14/, Shabby gloves and mitts 13/, Superfine gloves and mitts 14/, and fine wash gloves 12/6.²² If these prices quoted were for a dozen pair, and one would hardly buy or order anything but a

pair, then the London price for a pair of gloves was about one shilling, give or take a few pence. If the price were actually per glove, then a pair cost about two shillings, still a very low price. As strange as these prices sound they seem to agree, all factors considered, with the prices and values noted in the county records. There wash gloves were valued at approximately one shilling four pence per pair, and shammy were one shilling six pence a pair. The same holds true for the prices quoted in the Norton orders. Most orders offered to pay only about one shilling six pence per pair for gloves or mitts--whether chamois, lamb, or wash. There were two exceptions to the above prices. The first was kid gloves. These started at about one shilling six pence a pair, and went as high as four shillings. The second exception was silk gloves which cost, or were valued at, between two shillings and four shillings. Even if the highest values are taken as the best to use, a good pair of gloves, of kid for example, from a London glover, cost far less than a pair of clocked or silk stockings. Even at this low price there were customer complaints. In his order for the year 1769, Thomas Wynne sent for several pairs of gloves and added the comment "The Last Gloves and mitts [you sent] was very ordinary. . . ."23

The word handkerchief in the eighteenth century meant a neckerchief--a fairly large square which was folded diagonally and placed around the neck, coming to a "V" in front. This discussion will deal with this type of handkerchief, and any reference to pocket handkerchiefs will be specifically noted.

In the earliest years of the century, 1700-1722, Westmoreland

ladies preferred silk handkerchiefs (value two to three shillings) above all other kinds. Flowered gauze handkerchiefs were listed in some inventories, but these too were undoubtedly of silk. Two other kinds mentioned were checkered and striped handkerchiefs. These also could have been made of silk, but were probably of cotton or linen.

The inventories covering the next years, 1723-46, contain a larger number of handkerchiefs than do the earlier listings. From the inventories which give complete wardrobes, it would seem that each lady owned two to four of these neckerchiefs. Silk had no real competitors for its number one position, outnumbering all other types three or four to one. Besides plain silk there were also those of silk lace, silk gauze, silk muslin, and sarsenet (a fine, soft silk). Values for these handkerchiefs started at about two or three shillings and ranged up to five and six shillings. India handkerchiefs may have been of silk, or perhaps were of calico or cotton print. These were valued at less than the handkerchiefs labeled silk--only two or three shillings each. Romalls were silk or cotton squares with a handkerchief pattern. The ones in the Westmoreland County Records must have been of cotton for their average value was only about one shilling apiece. Lacey (Lacy?) handkerchiefs were the most expensive type listed, for these were valued at over eight shillings.

The inventories of the next ten years show that silk was challenged by a new type of handkerchief--ones made of linen--and by about 1765, silk handkerchiefs were a thing of the past.²⁴ Linen handkerchiefs were valued between one shilling three pence and two

shillings six pence, and were probably made here rather than imported.

In the Westmoreland Records and Inventories for the year 1755 is the inventory of Neil McMun--a man who seems to have been a handkerchief peddler. Besides his personal clothing, Mr. McMun had nothing with him at the time of his death except handkerchiefs and handkerchief material. There were sixty-six yards of such material, including checked linen, tartan, and striped Holland, and over one hundred handkerchiefs. These handkerchiefs were listed in sets of six, indicating that Mr. McMun had the handkerchiefs packed in these sets by color, or material, or value, or a combination of the three. Prices for these handkerchiefs ranged from six for nine shillings, to six for eleven shillings six pence. Besides these handkerchiefs listed in sets, he had several silk handkerchiefs separate from the others, which were valued at about six shillings each. Since most of the fabric he carried was linen, and since linen handkerchiefs were gaining favor during this time in Westmoreland, it is probable that most of Neil McMun's handkerchiefs were linen.²⁵

As we have seen with Mr. McMun, handkerchief material was bought and sold by the yard in colonial Westmoreland. A number of inventories contained such entries as "fine Handkerchiefing linen containing 12 handkerchiefs" or "3 yds. handkerchiefs 2/."²⁶

Several hundred handkerchiefs were ordered in the Norton Papers. Cambric handkerchiefs were to be spotted or printed and nearly always in some combination of red and white (c.2/6 each). Linen, on the other hand, was ordered only in printed blue and white or purple and white (c.1/8). Silk handkerchiefs showed a wider color range with

purple and white, black, and "colored." India silk for handkerchiefs was also requested, as were Barcelona Handkerchiefs. This last type were fine, twilled silk squares, in solid colors or with designs, and were originally made in Spain but were later manufactured in Great Britain, although the name Barcelona Silk continued to be used. Many orders neglected to tell material but specified color very carefully, and as a whole blue and white was the favorite color combination mentioned. Red and white came next, and was followed by purple and white, Scotch, black, and chocolate.

Twenty bandanas were mentioned along with two pieces of bandana material. The word bandana in the eighteenth century referred to a richly colored silk handkerchief with spots left in white or yellow by the manufacturing process. Only later did it come to mean a cotton handkerchief or head-covering.

About four or five dozen pocket handkerchiefs were also ordered, in the same colors as were popular for the larger handkerchiefs-- purple and white, printed, blue and white, and red and white. Only one order gave prices for these, but if we can judge by this, pocket handkerchiefs were considerably cheaper than neckerchiefs, costing only two to three shillings a dozen.

Insufficient evidence in the York records makes a comparison here impossible, but the private orders agree with the above sources, mentioning cambric, silk, linen, and printed handkerchiefs. This great abundance of printed, checked, and flowered handkerchiefs brings up an interesting point. All of the portraits painted in that era show the handkerchiefs as being plain colored, and presumably of

silk or gauze with lace. It would seem then, that handkerchiefs of these materials, which have already been noted as the most expensive types, were used primarily for Sunday and "dress-up" occasions. The printed handkerchiefs of cambric, linen, and cotton were for everyday wear, since they would not show soil as much as the plain colored ones, were cheaper, and were easier to care for.

Handkerchiefs were sometimes included as part of a set of accessories commonly known as a "suit." These suits usually included a cap, tucker, handkerchief, and ruffles, though occasionally sleeve knots and aprons were added. Not many of these suits were found in the eighteenth-century Westmoreland County Records. Most of the time the inventories simply said "5 sets of head linen 5/" or "a parcel of Head Cloths."²⁷ The Watts girls, Anne and Mary, got "1 Suit of Head Cloths & Shuffels [Ruffles?] & Handkerchiefs £ 9.3.6" and "2 Suits of Head Cloths £ 11.6.7."²⁸

Several of these suits were ordered either privately or through the Norton Company. Peter Lyons, for example, in 1768 ordered a suit of minonett or blond lace "to cost about three pounds." William Beverley in 1740 offered to pay up to six pounds for a fashionable mob with Ruffles pucker [tucker?] and tippet," when in the same order he was only willing to pay five pounds for a silk dress. (Both items were to be for his daughter Elizabeth.)²⁹ The most expensive of these suits found was ordered by George Washington in 1759 when he requested "A Cap, Handkerchief, Tucker, and Ruffles to be made of Brussels Lace or point. . . to cost £ 20." These sets were also made of silk gauze, marionet, and muslin.³⁰

Women, it would seem, are always the same, ever seeking to be fashionable and yet find bargains. Mary Stith wrote in 1728:

Madam; When you come to London, please favor me in your choice of a suit of pinnors fashionably dressed with a Cross knot Role in what ever the fashion requires, with fashionable ruffles and handkerchief. I like a lace of breadth and of a beautiful Pattern that may be plainly seen, fine enough to look well, but not of a superfine costly lace. . . .³¹

With these sets, then, the head covering was a cap. Only a small number of caps were found in the Westmoreland records, and all were in the earlier inventories. In the early years of the century, 1700-1720, there are two references to coifs--the old, sixteenth century term for a close-fitting linen cap. Only a few other references were made to caps that definitely belonged to women. The inventory of the estate of Jane Omohundo showed that she had owned a parcel of women's caps worth ten shillings. Frances Spencer in 1727 had a fine velvet flowered cap worth twelve shillings six pence. Other types of ladies' caps found included ones of silk and linen.³²

In the York records, the Ives sisters owned a number of caps including two lace mobs, eight nightcaps, three quilted scull caps, and nine half-caps.³³ Mobs, by the way, were not found anywhere in the Westmoreland Records, even though they were found in some of the private orders.

The young ladies Pithian met sometimes wore caps of lace and gauze, but often simply had on a "Tuff of Ribbon for a Cap" or a "Ribbon, with a Sprig of green Jessamine."³⁴ A traveler noted in 1746: "Common People wear Woollen and Yarn Caps; but the better ones wear white Holland or Cotton: Thus they travel fifty Miles from Home. It may be cooler [than wearing wigs] for ought I know; but, methinks, 'tis very ridiculous."³⁵

Almost every woman in Westmoreland County in the eighteenth century must have owned some type of hat or bonnet, for nearly every inventory which listed ladies' clothing also included at least one hat of some type. In the early years of the century, felt was the favorite. These hats were valued at between two and three shillings. Several Carolina hats were listed but there was no way to tell whether they were for ladies or gentlemen. The first idea, that these hats came from either North or South Carolina, cannot be proven. The only information that can be found about these hats is that they were also called Caroline, and were always black.

In the second quarter of the century, a variety of hats were noted, with no one kind particularly popular. Felt was still used, though the average value of these was only two shillings two pence. Two ladies' fur hats were listed at five shillings each and were probably of beaver, for beaver hats are specifically mentioned in the Norton Papers and the Virginia Gazette. Also found in the inventories for these years were straw hats and one silk bonnet. The Watts girls bought six hats during the years 1747-52. Two were velvet bonnets costing over a pound each, one was a hair hat, one a furred hat, and two were of felt.³⁶

Three lace hats were also found in the inventories covering these years, and these were by far the most expensive type of hat. These were not necessarily made of lace, but might have been simply decorated with lace. All of these were owned, as might be expected, by very rich ladies. Mrs. Thomas Sorrell owned a gold lace hat worth one pound five shillings, and Mrs. Betty Sorrell, probably a cousin,

bought a lace hat in 1739 from Mr. Richard Jackson for eighteen shillings. Mrs. Ashton, who was undoubtedly one of the county's most wealthy ladies, had a lace hat valued at eleven shillings three pence.³⁷

The inventories for the years 1750-1770 continue to show that nearly every lady owned a hat, but they fail to give any information as to the types. The only information given is the value which ranges from ten shillings for one labeled "new" to two shillings for an "old hat." One pinner was listed, and several inventories referred to a parcel of head linen or head clothes.

The Norton Papers show the overwhelming preference the Norton customers had for bonnets--satin bonnets, to be exact. Slightly over eighty of these were ordered, a few in blue, a few in white, but the vast majority in black, and in "the very highest fashion and newest taste."³⁸ Occasionally bonnets were ordered in other colors, and John Wilkins of Northhampton County was the only merchant brave enough to order silk and satin bonnets in white and "different colors," but not a single one in black.³⁹ It is interesting to speculate as to whether or not this indicates a difference in fashion taste between the York-Williamsburg area and the Eastern Shore. Nearly all the head coverings listed in the Westmoreland records were called "hats," but the Norton customers showed a definite preference for bonnets. There was probably no real difference here; simply the fact that all headgear was a "hat" to the men who made the inventories.

The private orders show the same types as do the county records. Velvet bonnets, beaver hats, and straw hats were requested, usually

in black or white. In 1724 Thomas Jones bought a hat in London for one of his nieces. The bill for the hat went as follows:⁴⁰

Girls blew hatt lined silk	8	6
Rich open silver lace	5	
ribbon band		6
deal box		6
Bought of William Rolfe, London		

In the Virginia Gazette Mrs. Walker advertised in 1752 that she would teach young ladies to make hats, bonnets, and shades (Lacy scarfs which seem to have been worn with bonnets).⁴¹ Many kinds of hats were advertised in the Virginia Gazette that were not found elsewhere. Several of these were made by special companies, such as Thant riding hats and Jubilee bonnets. Other unusual kinds mentioned were calash bonnets, chip hats, riding hats with feathers, and beaver hats with cock feathers.

Hoods were evidently never popular in colonial Tidewater Virginia, and few were found in any of the sources consulted, except, of course, hoods that were attached to cloaks and capuchins. In all of the Westmoreland records, only about ten hoods were found. The materials used for these were silk and muslin, and a short hood was valued at three shillings while a long silk one was worth six shillings. The only color given for hoods in Westmoreland was black. A few of the York records mentioned hoods and, as with caps, it was the Ives sisters who had the best collection. They owned three muslin hoods and an old silk hood valued together at seven shillings six pence, and two black silk hoods worth twelve shillings six pence.⁴² Not many hoods were ordered through the Norton Company either--only eighteen net hoods, eight of black velvet, and three of minionet

(lace).

Very few aprons were listed in any of the county records, and even the inventories which had good lists of women's clothing usually did not include any aprons. This may have been caused in part by the fact that nearly all aprons for home or dress were probably homemade, and perhaps were not considered important or valuable enough to put in the inventories. A number of inventories contained notations such as "8½ [yards] of aproning" or "apron cloth @ 17d."⁴³ Everyday aprons were made of inexpensive linen. These would have had bibs at the top, and long full skirts to protect a lady's dress as she worked. Sometimes aprons were worn as a decoration with an afternoon-type dress. These were often bought as part of a matched set including handkerchief, ruffles, and apron. Probably some fancy aprons were also made at home of silk or fine material, and trimmed with lace and handwork.

The aprons found in the Westmoreland County Records show a wide variety of kinds and values. Muslin aprons were found most frequently: long, short, short laced, and embroidered. The value of the average muslin apron was between two and four shillings, while those that had lace or embroidery were worth six shillings. Linen aprons were the next largest groups, and these were cheaper (two shillings to three shillings). There is no mention of any trimmed linen aprons, which seems to confirm the idea that linen aprons were used for everyday. The five checked aprons found were probably also for household use while the three silk aprons listed were for dress or special occasions.

These same kinds, muslin, linen, and silk, were the ones found in the York records. The lack of orders for aprons in the Norton Papers seems to indicate again that most aprons were made here. Only five were mentioned. Of these two were silk gauze, and a third was to be a "blooming Colour" with ruffles and handkerchief to match.⁴⁴

A group of items which are both clothing and accessories should be discussed briefly. These include girdles, pockets, and decorative articles made of lace and ribbon. Several girdles, worth approximately one shilling each, were found in the Westmoreland records. These were not undergarments, but a type of sash worn around the waist. Two scarfs were also mentioned, and these could have been for use as sashes, neckpieces, or head coverings. Only three pair of pockets were found, indicating that either the dresses usually worn by Westmoreland women had some type of pockets sewed in, or that the ladies simply relied on the large pockets found in the everyday-style aprons.

Even these minor accessories were sometimes included in wills, and Lucretia Burnett of Essex County left to her granddaughter Mary Curran, among other things, one pair of paragon bodies, one new muslin apron and sleeves, one new holland shift, one laced handkerchief, one headdress, a black hood with yellow topknot, and one pair of laced shoes.⁴⁵

Contemporary portraits show that at least for dress-up, the use of decorated sleeves was just as popular here as in England. Such edgings extended anywhere from a simple muslin ruffle to five or six layers of overlapping ruffles of gauze or muslin trimmed with lace.

Three kinds of lace were found most often in the county records. These were gold lace, silk lace, and bone lace. Gold lace was simply lace made with gold threads, and silk laces were those made on or of silk. Bone lace, on the other hand, was made in the West of England, and the name probably came at one time from the ladies' use of fish bones instead of pins to hold the lace in place while it was being made. Bone lace closely resembles crocheted edging.

Not much lace was found in the inventories or wills because not much was kept on hand. When lace was purchased, the buyer almost always had a definite use in mind and hence the lace was soon on a garment. However, the prices paid by Westmoreland residents for laces can be found in the records of estates. Such prices per yard ran about as follows: one shilling for hood lace, three shillings for silk lace, and seven shillings for superfine lace. Seven shillings may not seem expensive but it adds up quickly, for when seven yards of this lace was purchased to go with a cherryderry gown, it cost over two pounds five shillings. Lace was also ordered through the Norton Company, again mainly silk laces (raised and flat), and some blonde lace. Blonde lace originally came from Spain and was called "blonde" whether it was black or white. It was made so that the flowers were slightly raised, and had a heavier, sturdier look about it than most other laces. Black, white, pink, and blue laces were also ordered, as were some cotton laces.

Judging from both the county records and the Norton Papers, ribbons were used even more than laces. Ribbon was used with ladies' handkerchiefs, to decorate hats and caps, for breast knots and sleeve

knots, for eschelles,⁴⁶ and to decorate dresses and other garments. Ribbon was often bought specifically for the purpose of making knots. For example, William Beverley wanted for Elizabeth "6 yards Padusoy ribbon for knots, 2 yards of a colour."⁴⁷ As with the laces, types and prices for ribbon can be found most often in the records of estates and not in the inventories and wills. The types found in the Westmoreland records include gold, silver, figured, black, white, narrow, flowered, and red-striped. Nonesopretty was another type of ribbon used by colonial Virginians. It was named after the "Nancy Pretty," a flower of the Sweet William family that was also called London Pride. Presumably such a ribbon was daintily fringed as is the flower, or perhaps had tiny flowers woven into it. Ribbon was cheaper than lace, and cost only six pence to two shillings a yard.

The amount of ribbon sent for through the Norton Company was very great. Black was the color ordered most frequently, especially black paduasoy (a narrow silk ribbon from Italy), black velvet, and black satin. Pink, blue, and white were the other colors usually requested, and these were always of satin. Figured ribbons were also ordered in quantities and some merchants wanted as much as twenty dozen pieces. When ordered by the piece, ribbon cost from six to sixteen shillings. Exactly how much a piece contained is open to debate. The only figure given is for a piece thirty-six yards long. However, one- and two-yard pieces must have been more normal, for as noted, Beverley ordered two-yard lengths of each color for Elizabeth. When pieces of ribbon were ordered by the dozen, prices were of course cheaper--only five to seven shillings a dozen.

Fans have been called an important part of a colonial lady's outfit, but not every lady in Westmoreland owned one. An estimate based on the records researched would be that just under half of the ladies were thus equipped. Fans were probably used here in Virginia as an accessory with dress ensembles; to take to a dance, or to a party, or to take to church in summer. Most of the fans listed had no information with them except their value--one to two shillings each. The ivory fans found in the inventories were valued much more highly, about ten shillings each. These were, in all likelihood, fans with ivory sticks and handles, rather than solid ivory fans.

The Norton Papers contain orders for fans, but do not give much information about types, either. "Fine fans," "common fans," and "Better fans" are the descriptions used most frequently. There were also fans in cases, black fans, mourning fans, silver wedding fans, and fans sent back to England to be remounted. Fans requested through the Norton Company were cheap also, for a dozen usually cost only from seven shillings six pence to fourteen shillings. Personal family letters contain requests for fans too, as when William E. Waggaman wrote to Capt. Waggaman. "In looking over your letters this day, I find in one P.S. for a Fan . . . I'll get the first good China one I can and send it."⁴⁸

Umbrellas were a new and treasured article in colonial times. In Westmoreland, only about four were found, and all of these were in the inventories of the very well-to-do. The word "umbrella" in the eighteenth century could mean either a sun parasol or a portable protection from rain, and there is no way of telling which type of

umbrella a person owned.

A number of miscellaneous accessories were either mentioned only once or twice in the Westmoreland records, or were absent entirely. These included artificial flowers, pocketbooks or necessaries, muffs, stomachers, ladies' wigs, and masks. All of these items were advertised as being available in Williamsburg, and the first four were ordered through the Norton Company also, but in small quantities. There is no evidence to indicate how widely these accessories were used in colonial Virginia as a whole, but they definitely were not used to any great extent in colonial Westmoreland.

All of a lady's garments and accessories have thus far been considered separately. To help the reader comprehend what a colonial woman wore, several complete outfits will be discussed below. The first three will be ensembles taken from eighteenth-century records, and the next four will be historical re-creations based on available evidence.

In December of 1766 Mrs. William Langhorn sent through the Norton Company for a complete wardrobe for second mourning. First she wanted a piece of dark Ravenly Ray ducape, which she planned to make into a sacque and coat, and a piece of best black India persian, with six yards of ribbon to suit the silks. A piece of calico that was to be black with white shells was probably also destined to become a gown. To go with these dresses she ordered a black persian quilted petticoat an "ell long on the Hip with pearl Collering." Then to wear over these outfits, she requested a large black silk cardinal and, to match the cloak, a plain black silk bonnet.

"A cap, Handkerchief, Ruffles, and apron proper for Second Mourning for a Widow: were ordered, as were two pairs of black silk stockings, one pair of black velvet pumps, four pairs of black leather pumps, and four pairs of black calimanco pumps. To wear with these she wanted a pair of strong black leather clogs, finished with white leather. Next she asked for one pair of black kid gloves, one pair of mitts, and one pair of plain strong knit black silk mitts "for a middle sized Arm." To finish out her wardrobe for second mourning, Mrs. Langhorn ordered a large black gauze handkerchief, a pair of women's black shoe buckles, a black coal necklace in strands, and a large paper fan.⁴⁹

Mr. Augustine Smith ordered a complete outfit for his wife in 1767. This was almost certain to be a gift, and though it was ordered in June, it could not have been given before November or December; for it took between two and three months for Norton in London to receive these orders, and presumably another two or three months for the goods to arrive here. First Mr. Smith requested a garnet and white colored silk made into a sacque and petticoat in "the newest fashion for a tall woman." To go with this, he ordered a cap, handkerchief, ruffled tippet, and ruffles made of basted Brussels lace, and an egret, necklace, earrings, stomacher, and sleeve knots. To complete the outfit, there was to be "a lawn handkerchief to put over the cloaths when decked and a handsome fan in a case."⁵⁰

Another complete outfit was ordered for Mrs. P riscilla Dawson through Messrs. J. Hanbury and Company. The items were to be chosen

by Lady Gooch, and the total value of the ensemble was estimated at approximately thirty-three pounds. Mrs. Dawson wanted a fashionable brocade suit of clothes, a pair of stays, a hoop, a blue satin petticoat, and a scarlet cloth under-petticoat. To go with these she ordered a fashionable laced cap, handkerchief, ruffles, and tucker, as well as a pair of trimmed blue satin shoes, and a pair of blue silk stockings. A silver girdle and a fan were also ordered to complete the outfit.⁵¹

Each of the three ensembles discussed above was a special outfit, for dress-up occasions. The first of the historically re-created ensembles will be similar to the above in that it represents a dress outfit that was worn by the well-to-do women of colonial Westmoreland. Such an outfit consisted first of a pastel thread satin or cotton satin gown, lined with silk, and a matching petticoat. With this she wore a white muslin apron, a silk or silk muslin handkerchief, white thread stockings, and black calimanco shoes. If she were going out, she put on a red satin cloak, a black hood, and a pair of black silk gloves.⁵²

The ensemble given next represents that of the average woman of colonial Westmoreland. It was an outfit she wore for afternoons, or perhaps for semi-dress--neither the best nor the worst that she owned. She had on a gown of printed Virginia cloth or of calico, with a red or blue pattern on a white background. It was a closed gown, and her petticoat, though it was also of Virginia cloth, did not match her dress. Over the gown she wore a white linen apron, and a white linen handkerchief. Her shoes were of black leather, and her stockings of

white yarn or thread. For out-of-doors she had an old red or blue cloak. She did not own a hood to go with this, but relied instead on a hat.

The woman of Westmoreland who was of the poorer class dressed somewhat differently from the two ladies described above. Her gown was of some type of Virginia cloth, probably solid brown in color. Since she wore a closed gown, her petticoat of plain, unbleached Virginia cloth did not show. With these she wore a checked linen apron, and perhaps a handkerchief. Her shoes were of leather (Virginia-made) and her stockings were worsted or yarn. Although she owned a cap or hat, she had no gloves, and no hood. The records indicate that she did not have a cloak, but she must have had something that passed for a cloak to wear in inclement weather.

The ladies who obtained their garments through the Norton Company, or who ordered them directly from England, fall somewhere between the wealthy and the "middle-class" ladies discussed above. The outfit described here would be for afternoons or Sundays. Such a gown was of printed calico, either blue and white, or purple and white. Chances are about fifty-fifty that it was an open gown, and in that case her petticoat matched her dress. If it was a closed gown, her petticoat was of plain, fine cotton or silk. Her cap, handkerchief, ruffles, and apron were all part of a matched set, white in color, and trimmed with lace. Black calimanco shoes were worn with white thread stockings. Her cloak was red or black, and with it she wore a black silk bonnet and white kid gloves.

Taken as a whole, the ladies of Westmoreland County, Virginia,

in the eighteenth century dressed well. "Fashionable" was a magic word to women in colonial times, but they did not try to follow all the fashion whims of England. The records indicate that the ladies dressed neatly, not ostentatiously. I find no attempt to copy the styles set at either the English or French courts in any of the sources consulted. Westmoreland women seem to have preferred simple styles and outfits, and omitted, or at least largely ignored, much that was popular in England in the eighteenth century including, as we have seen, hoops, clogs, pattens, sacques, muffs, stomachers, and ladies' wigs. A number of factors were probably responsible for this variation in fashion-taste, and although it is so obvious that it is often ignored, it is none the less true that life in a new land made for new styles. The climate, the work a colonial lady was expected to do, and even the large-scale, far-flung agriculture that developed here encouraged differences in dress between Virginia and England. Many items, of course, continued to be imported, but the years 1700 to 1774 saw an ever-increasing number of garments and fabrics "Virginia-made," not only as a home industry, but on a regular commercial basis as well. It was an era of beautiful, feminine fashions characterized by sweeping, full-skirted gowns and a passionate love for ruffles and laces--an era when Westmoreland ladies complemented the colonial scene in seersucker and shalloon, calimanco and cherryderry, and nankeen and nonesopretty.

Notes for Chapter IV

1. Invoice of Robert C. Nicholas, Oct. 14, 1771, Norton Papers.
2. Order of John Clayton, Aug. 3, 1769, ibid.
3. Order of Hart and Marshall, Mar. 7, 1771, ibid.
4. Order of John Mathews, Sept. 30, 1773, ibid.
5. Invoice of Thomas Wynne for the year 1769, Aug. 23, 1768, ibid.
6. One other type of leather was mentioned in the Norton Papers. This was dogskin, a kind of leather usually made of sheepskin.
7. Thomas Nelson Page, The Old South (New York, 1892), 154-155; Invoice of Mrs. Priscilla Dawson, William and Mary Quarterly, 1st ser., VI (1897-1898), 124.
8. Order of William Beverley, July 12, 1737, in William and Mary Quarterly, 1st ser., III (1894-1895), 225.
9. The scarcity of women's shoes in the York County Records made comparison on this point impossible.
10. Inventory of James Taylor, Nov. 27, 1723, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, I, 1a; Inventory of John Rochester, Feb. 3, 1755, III, 52-52a; Inventory of Peter Rust, June 29, 1762, IV, 166a-167a.
11. Aug. 30, 1763, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, IV, 189a-190, 191-191a; also June 24, 1752, II, 199a-204a.
12. June 30, 1768, Virginia Gazette (P.D.).
13. Nov. 18, 1775, Virginia Gazette; also in William and Mary Quarterly, 1st ser., XX (1911-1912), 147. This was the advertisement of John Blaney and Company. The two other prominent shoe manufacturers in England at this time besides Didsbury were Gresham and Davis. For comparison, the London prices for several of the kinds of shoes discussed above can be found in the Norton Papers. On August 13, 1772, the Norton Company bought from John Gresham:

24 pair black calimanco pumps @ 6/6
 12 pair black everlasting pumps @ 6/6
 6 pair white satin, 4 pair pink, 4 pair blue, and
 4 pair black satin @ 13/
 2 pair Bath Ford clogs @ 6/

14. Aug. 30, 1763, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, IV, 189a-190.
15. Record for the year 1738, ibid., I; 252a-253a.
16. Mar. 15, 1724, Orders, Wills, etc., XVI, 329-332, York County Records, microfilm, Virginia State Library, Richmond.
17. June 24, 1752, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, II, 199a-204a.
18. Mar. 15, 1722, York Orders, Wills, etc., XVI, 276-277.
19. Several kinds of stockings were advertised in the Virginia Gazette that were not found in any of the county records or any of the orders. These were India cotton, China, raw silk, and flowered galk gauze. This last type cost 15/ per pair.
20. June 24, 1752, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, II, 199a-204a.
21. This large quantity of purple gloves was undoubtedly purchased to complement outfits made from the yards and yards of purple and white dress material that was ordered during these same years, and which will be discussed in the next chapter.
22. Receipt of Robert Price--Wholesale glover at the 23 in Milk Street, Cheapside, June 23, 1772, Norton Papers.
23. Invoice of Thomas Wynne for 1769, Aug. 23, 1768, ibid.
24. As noted in the previous chapter, silk gowns had also faded from general use by this time.
25. Oct. 13, 1755, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, III, 64-64a.
26. June 6, 1748, ibid., II, 62a-66; Dec. 1716, Westmoreland Deeds and Wills, VI, 50-54.

27. See the Inventory of Thomas Sorrell, Dec. 16, 1726, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, I, 42a-44; Inventory of Frances Johnston, Feb. 7, 1742, ibid., 178a.
28. June 24, 1752, ibid., II, 199a-204a.
29. Order of Peter Lyons, Sept. 24, 1768, Norton Papers; Aug. 13, 1740, in William Beverley, Letters and Accounts 1734-48.
30. Order of George Washington in 1759 as quoted in Alice Morse Earle's Costume of Colonial Times (New York, 1894), 40-41.
31. Letter of Mary Stith, May 7, 1728, in Box 1723-28, Jones Family Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.
32. June 30, 1767, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, V, 2-3; June 17, 1727, ibid., II, 266-67.
33. Mar. 15, 1722, York Orders, Wills, etc., XVI, 276-277.
34. Journal & Letters of Philip Vickers Fithian 1773-1774: A Plantation Tutor of the Old Dominion, ed. Hunter D. Farish (Williamsburg, 1943), 163-165, 171-172, 279.
35. Edward Kimber, "Observations in Several Voyages & Travels in America," London Magazine (1746), as quoted in William and Mary Quarterly, 1st ser., XV (1906-1907), 158.
36. June 24, 1752, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, II, 199a-204a.
37. Dec. 16, 1726, ibid., I, 42a-44; Oct. 1736-1739, ibid., 218-219; Sept. 30, 1724, ibid., 10a-11a.
38. For example the order of Hart and Marshall, June 1769, Norton Papers.
39. Order of John Wilkins for July 24, 1772, Norton Papers.
40. Receipt of Thomas Jones as quoted in The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, XXVI (1918), 178.
41. Dec. 1, 1752, Virginia Gazette; also in William and Mary Quarterly, 1st ser., VII (1898-1899), 178.

42. May 18, 1724, York Orders, Wills, etc., XVI, 276-277.
43. May 26, 1725, Dec. 14, 1726, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, I, 17, 44a-46a.
44. Order of June 12, 1773 for Mrs. Scott in Lord Dummore's order, as quoted in John Norton & Sons, ed. Frances Mason, 328-330.
45. John Frederick Dorman ed., Essex County, Virginia, Deeds and Wills No. 13, 1707-1711 (Washington, D.C., 1963), 64.
46. Eschelles—a row of bows down the front of a bodice arranged in descending size from the top to the waist.
47. July 1, 1741, in William Beverley, Letters and Accounts 1734-48.
48. Nov. 10, 1743, Waggaman letter from Bengal to Virginia, as quoted in the William and Mary Quarterly, 1st ser., II, (1893-1894), 103.
49. Order for the use of the estate of Capt. Langhorn, Deceased, Dec. 1, 1766, Norton Papers.
50. Order of Mr. Augustine Smith, June 10, 1767, Norton Papers.
51. Order of Mrs. Priscilla Dawson, Apr. 15, 1752, as quoted in William and Mary Quarterly, 1st ser., VI, (1897-1898), 124.
52. This and the other three outfits that follow are based on colonial sources; in the case of the first three the Westmoreland County Records and for the fourth the Norton Papers and other private orders. These exact ensembles were not found in any inventory or order. Instead, they represent a composite view from which an abstract has, in each case, been prepared.

CHAPTER V

FABRICS AND MATERIALS

A consideration of the fabrics available in Westmoreland County between 1700 and 1774 is pertinent to this study of women's clothes. Some clothing was available ready-made, especially gloves, hats, bonnets, and shoes. Others, including stays, cloaks, and certain types of gowns, could either be purchased as a completed product or made-up as the ladies saw fit. But most articles of clothing for both men and women were not widely available ready-made at this time. Gowns, cloaks, shifts, riding habits, and petticoats were usually made at home, or the material for them was carried to a dressmaker who made the garment to specification. Fabric, then, constitutes a very important part of any view of clothing in eighteenth-century Tidewater Virginia.¹

The variety of fabrics available in Westmoreland in the early years of the century is interesting. In a survey covering the years 1700 to 1720, seventy-three different fabrics were found. Of these linen was the favorite, and while linen was counted only once in the total list of materials, it was available in at least sixteen different varieties. Blue, green, and brown linen, as well as checked and speckled linen, were popular, and ranged in value from five pence a yard to one shilling eight pence a yard. Most of the linen used,

however, was either plain, Scotch, Hamburg, or garlix (German linen). Its price range was almost identical with that of the dyed and printed types: six pence to one shilling nine pence a yard.

In these factors, availability and variety, lay the roots of linen's popularity. Linen could also be made at home, and approximately one family in ten possessed the necessary equipment. Linen was used literally for everything in the way of clothing for Westmoreland women. Gowns, aprons, stomachers, petticoats, shifts, and gloves were only a few of the many articles made from this material.

Sturdy fabrics were used extensively in the early years of the century also; especially dowlas, a coarse linen; shallon, a lightweight woolen; and duroy, a coarse type of woolen. As the century progressed, however, the use of these materials underwent a slow but steady decline in Westmoreland and by the time of the Revolution they had all but disappeared from the inventories of the county. These were not cheap, for they cost from one shilling four pence to three shillings six pence a yard. As a whole these fabrics were used for men's coats, jackets, and breeches, but gowns were occasionally made of duroy, and smocks of dowlas.

Though a great number of materials occur in these early inventories, including estamene, inkle, pemistone, and shag, the only other fabric besides linen and sturdy woolens widely used in these years was silk. Among the types available were silk muslin and silk stuff, but damask was the favorite and sold for about one shilling five pence per yard. Virginia cloth was already available, either printed or plain, and while the exact nature of the cloth was not given, it was probably of

cotton or linen.²

Taking the years 1725-1750 as the next unit, the number of different fabrics used is still high, and reaches about seventy-four. Linen remained the favorite with twenty-one kinds noted. New varieties included clocked, white, princess, and sprigged. Holland, an imported linen, was almost always either printed or striped. It was especially used in these years for gowns, petticoats, and jumps.

Cotton fabrics made a sudden and strong appearance. All but nonexistent on the earlier lists, cotton was now used in stripes and checks as well as white, Whitney, and blue. Dimity and fustian were light cottons, while cherryderry was an Indian cotton. Calico became increasingly popular and was more expensive than regular cotton at an average of three shillings a yard. Broadcloth, especially in red and scarlet, was also entering the field and was by far the most expensive type of cotton at four shillings to ten shillings per yard. The heaviest use of Virginia-made cloth was still in the future, but Virginia cotton did increase in availability during this period. Petticoats, gowns, riding gowns, and handkerchiefs were increasingly made from the cotton family of fabrics.

Silk usage reached its peak during this second quarter of the eighteenth century. Black alamode, silk crepe, damask, Persian silk and taffeta, India Persian, tabby and satin were all found in Westmoreland in these years. Surprisingly, though the cost of these goods was high in comparison with linens and woolens, silk was actually cheaper than broadcloth and even, in most cases, cheaper than calico. Among the ladies' garments made of silk fabrics were gowns, petticoats,

handkerchiefs, hoods and bonnets, mantles, and aprons. Black silk and black crepe were favored for use in mourning clothes. Silk was also used in combination with a number of other materials; for example silk muslin, especially for handkerchiefs, and silk poplin for gowns.

Oxenbrigs, a coarse linen, was used for table and household linen. In regard to clothing it was mainly utilized for servants' clothes, especially for shifts and petticoats, though some jackets and probably some gowns were made of this fabric. Only two wools show any great use in this period, and they were sagathy, a slight woolen-like serge, and camlet, a light-weight fabric made of luster wool. The latter was usually dyed scarlet and was used particularly in cloaks and cardinals.

The midcentury decade, 1750-1760, saw a continuing dominance of linen, silk, cotton, and oxenbrigs. Among the fabrics added to the list at this time, three were especially important. Lawn, a fine linen, was made up mainly into handkerchiefs, headdresses, and aprons; while chints, a printed calico, was used for gowns. A kind of taffeta known as lutestring or lustring was used for gowns, petticoats, and riding habits. Changeable lustring was treasured and among the color combinations mentioned are blue and purple, orange and pink, and pink and sky blue.

The 1760's saw a sharp rise in the amount of Virginia cloth used, and reflected the decreasing trade with the mother country. Almost every inventory included this fabric, and its value and quality range was high: one shilling five pence to twelve shillings six pence a yard.

This was cloth actually woven in Virginia, mainly it would seem, by professional or semiprofessional weavers, Mr. Spencer Ariss of Westmoreland for example. Many homes had spinning wheels and cotton and wool cards, but only about twelve or fifteen had the looms and equipment needed for full-scale weaving. Several inventories included the mention of a certain number of yards of Virginia cloth that had been ordered from the weaver.³

The Reverend Andrew Burnaby noted in his travels through this area in 1759 and 1760 that "their manufactures are very considerable. They make a kind of cotton-cloth, which they clothe themselves with in common, and call after the name of their country. . . ." Linen was also manufactured here, and the inventories occasionally indicate quantities of "dressed" and "undressed" flax, as well as equipment for making linen cloth.⁴

While there was an overall drop to slightly under thirty different types of fabric, linen retained a high position with white (bleached) linen the most popular kind. Cotton and calico were favorites, but the use of silk, or at least the mention thereof in the records, declined sharply. Calimanco, long connected with the making of shoes, appeared occasionally as a material for ladies' gowns.

In the last ten to fifteen years before the Revolution, there is another drop in the number of kinds of fabric in Westmoreland, this time to about sixteen, and there was a heavy reliance on linen and Virginia cotton. The older types of fabric, like sagathy, shallon, silk, and ozenbrigs still appear, but in greatly reduced quantities, indicating another drop in the amount of materials imported. A number

of political and economic reasons, which were discussed in Chapter III, were involved, and Archibald G. Aylett probably expressed the feelings of many colonial Virginians on this subject when in 1770 he ordered "2 pieces best India Nankeen. . . . [If the Duty on Sea is taken off]" (his brackets).⁵

A survey of York County Records reveals several differences in the fabrics used in the two counties. Westmoreland had a number of materials not found in the York records consulted. Among these were humhums, manchester, plush, thickset, and swanskin. On the other hand, just as many types were found in York and not in Westmoreland, including seersucker, moree, hammell, and corroderry.

York continued to have a wide variety of materials long after Westmoreland had begun to concentrate on cotton, linen, and ozenbrige. Far lesser amounts of these three fabrics were found in York inventories. This is especially true of calico and of the great selection of linens used in Westmoreland, only three or four of which appear in York.

The inventory of two sisters in York County provides a glimpse of the fabrics in use there in 1722. The Ives sisters, Elizabeth and Alice, must have been dressmakers for the amount of material they had on hand is far beyond the average, even for colonial days when nearly every home kept a store of yard goods. They had for example one hundred and ninety-three yards of striped stuff, sixty-nine yards of satin, and forty-nine of mantua silk. But a detailed inventory such as this one gives more than the type of fabric used. It gives us a look at the colors that were popular. In the way of silk, the sisters had black Norwich crepe, striped satin, and white sarsenet. Their Persian was

purple, black, and green. Satin came in white, black and white, blue and white, green and white, and cherry and white. Mantua silk was listed in yellow, sky-colored, and striped. In the area of woolens, black shalloon, camblet, and scarlet camblet were noted, as was cherry-colored and white drugget.⁶

The Norton Papers confirm the previous view as to the popularity of linen, ozenbrigs, and cotton. Cheap woolens were ordered literally by the hundreds of yards. Cotton goods and especially calico were requested in almost every order. Unlike the decline in the use of silk, noted in Westmoreland, silk fabric continued to be ordered in fairly large amounts through 1774. But the chief value of the Norton Papers lies in the descriptions given of the materials that were ordered. Here, as in the Ives inventory, some of the kinds and colors of the various materials can be learned.

In the silk family, both alamode and crepe were ordered only in black. Persian evidently came in a wide variety of colors for straw-colored, sky blue, pink, white, and deep blue pieces were ordered. Satin is mentioned as black spotted, bright pink, blue, and green striped, while sarsenet was also green striped as well as gold and white. Silk itself was usually ordered "flowered" while the favorite colors for mantua silk were silver-grey and white.

Calico was requested in coral ground, black and white flowered, white with a small blue running vine, and dark ground with "a small neat pattern the colour gay and lively."⁷ But almost inevitably, whenever calico was ordered, at least one piece of purple and white was included. It was far and away the favorite color for this fabric,

at least as far as the Norton Papers reflect the taste of colonial Virginia. Chintz, the next most popular cotton fabric, came in dark or light ground as well as figured, copper plate, and mosaic ground. Regular cotton was requested in the same colors as the above: especially dark ground, white with flowers, and the ubiquitous purple and white. Broadcloth, in sky, stone, brickdust, claret, and deep blue, continued to be the most expensive of the cottons and was ordered in lesser amounts.

Linen was usually ordered printed, either in blue or purple, though occasionally checked linen was listed. Holland was blue or red striped while the cheaper ozenbrigs came in black, white, brown, and blue. The comment attached to one of the letters in the Norton Papers states that German ozenbrigs and not English was to be sent, reflecting a belief in the superior quality of the former.⁸

Among the wools, serge was ordered in shades of blue and black and fearnought, a stout woolen used for outside clothing, in grey. But durant, a glazed, strong woolen, was requested in blue, pink, white, and black.

Turning to a survey of the prices and values of the materials discussed, no appreciable variations in price were found between Westmoreland and York or between either of these and the Norton Papers. The same holds true for a time comparison for the average price of the main fabrics held steady from 1700 to 1774. That is, there was no major fluctuation in the prices or values of material during this time period. It is also true that neither the county records nor the Norton Papers show any rise in prices as the political situation grew more tense. The orders of 1774 were just as routine as those of 1768.

Based on these three sources then, the average prices for some of the main materials is given below. These prices reflect the range of quality available in each. For example holland was available from one shilling to four shillings six pence in 1710 as well as in 1770. All prices are per yard. Broadcloth 5/6 to 10/; calico 1/6 to 5/; dowlas 1/3 to 3/6; garlix 1/2 to 1/6; holland 1/ to 4/6; linen 1/ to 3/; muslin 2/ to 4/; ozenbrige 6d to 2/; silk 2/ to 5/; Virginia cloth 1/2 to 5/.

Linsey-woolsey, often thought of as a basic early American fabric, was all but non-existent in the records consulted. In Westmoreland, the name appears only once. Linsey-woolsey was probably used in the frontier areas, but by 1700 the frontier was already far to the west of Westmoreland.

The word "stuff" occurs again and again in the county records. This presents an obvious difficulty in attempting to understand its meaning. It can mean a type of worsted cloth; a wool, plain or twilled. It can also mean any fabric that has not yet been made up into garments. Beyond these two there lies the possibility that the assessors simply did not know the name of a certain length of fabric and so called it "stuff." Thus it is hard to say what stuff was, but easy to say that it was widely used. Not only were large quantities of stuff kept on hand as yard goods, but almost every type of garment at one time or another was made of "stuff."

In summary, a vast array of fabrics were in use in Westmoreland County in the first three quarters of the eighteenth century, for in all over one hundred and thirty different kinds of fabric were noted.

Among those which appeared only occasionally were bombase, caddis, crisp, dungear, shagreens, and tammy. Some materials were the same as those we use today- flannel, seersucker, and dimity; while others were complete "strangers"- ducspe, cantaloons, and vermilion. The inventories of the Lees and the other well-to-do families of the area contained great quantities of material. But it is also true that almost every inventory, down to the smallest, had at least a few yards of some fabric on hand.⁹

Notes for Chapter V

1. The making of sheets, tablecloths, and other household linen was also a home industry at this time, and lengths of material were bought for this purpose as well as for clothes. However, an attempt has been made to limit this discussion, as well as the list at the end of this paper, to fabrics known to have been used in the making of clothing in Virginia.
2. Greater quantities of Virginia cloth were found in the York County Records 1700-1720 than in the Westmoreland records covering the same period.
3. Mar. 30, 1714, Westmoreland Deeds and Wills, V, 271-273; Oct. 1, 1739, Westmoreland Records and Inventories, I, 218-219; Aug. 30, 1763, ibid., IV, 191-191a; Aug. 23, 1761, ibid., 147a-148.
4. Andrew Burnaby, Travels Through the Middle Settlements in North America in the Years 1759 and 1760 (Ithaca, 1960), 15.
5. Order of Archibald Covan Ayletts, July 27, 1770, Norton Papers.
6. Mar. 15, 1722, York Orders, Wills, etc., XVI, 276-277.
7. Order of Nathaniel Burwell and of R. C. Nicholas, as quoted in John Norton & Sons, ed. Frances Mason, 146, 72-73.
8. Order of the Virginia Providence Newhunt Co., May 16, 1771, Norton Papers.
9. For a complete listing and description of the fabrics, please see the appendix.

APPENDIX

Part I

A DICTIONARY OF FABRICS

This dictionary is composed of materials found in the Westmoreland and York County Records. A number of fabrics were omitted because they were not normally used for clothing, for example, duck, sheeting, and canvas. Another and larger group of fabrics had to be omitted because no definitions of them were available in either fabric or general dictionaries. These included kussels, cutgees, ponistans, and salune.

Alamode (allamode). A thin, light and glossy silk, usually soft and black.

Allopn (alopene). A mixed stuff of wool and silk or mohair and cotton.

Baize. A loosely woven cotton or woolen fabric in a plaid weave. It came in solid colors, especially green.

Ballandine (balladine). A white silk from Persia or Turkey.

Barnstable stuff. Material from Barnstable, England, a town famous for woolen fabric.

Bearskin. A shaggy kind of woolen cloth used especially for overcoats.

Bombase. A cotton fiber dressed for stuffing or padding garments; cotton-wool, or cotton wadding.

Bombasine. A twilled or corded dress material, composed of silk and worsted; sometimes of cotton and worsted or of worsted alone. In black this material was much used for mourning.

Book Muslin. A thin, white muslin for women's dresses.

Broadcloth. The stoutest and best of the cottons with many varieties. The surface feels felted, smooth, and springy with a short nap.

Brocade. A silk fabric with a pattern of raised figures generally in colors.

Buckram. Originally this was a fine linen or cotton fabric. Later it referred to a coarse linen or cloth stiffened with gum or paste.

Burdett (burdet, burdit). A kind of cotton fabric; a plain-weave cotton calico.

Caddis. A worsted lace, ribbon, or tape. Also a sturdy durable twilled woolen. Also a worsted fabric used by the Scotch Highlanders.

Calico. A cotton first imported from India and later manufactured in England. It is usually colorful.

Calimanco. A glossy woolen, ribbed or plain. Also a glazed linen with a pattern on one side.

Cambric (cambrick). A plain weave soft cotton, or a fine linen fabric calendered with a slight luster on the face.

Camlet (camblet). A fine lightweight plain weave fabric made with luster wool and generally dyed bright red.

Camleteen (cambletine). An imitation camlet or an inferior grade of camlet.

Cantaloon. A worsted fabric manufactured in the eighteenth century in the west of England. It was used especially for women's and children's clothes.

Canton cotton. A cheap cotton used for linings and underwear.

Carsey. See kersey.

Checks. Any checkered material; that is, any material with a small check pattern woven in or printed onto the cloth.

Chenille. A tufted cord used for fringes, etc.; also a fabric made with a filling of this cord.

Cherryderry. An Indian cotton similar to gingham.

Chints (chince). A calico with a colored pattern painted or printed on it.

Cloth. A name given in the most general sense to every pliant fabric woven, felted, or otherwise formed of any fiber. But when used without qualification or contextual specification it is usually understood to mean a woolen fabric such as is used for wearing apparel.

Corduroy (corroderry). A kind of coarse, thick ribbed cotton.

Cotton. A fabric made of the fibers of the cotton plant; generally lightweight and used especially for summer clothes.

Crape (crape). A thin silk gauze, usually crimped.

Crisp. A fine British linen. This was also the original term for crepe in England.

Crocus. Any material colored yellow or decorated with crocus.

Damascus. Any fabric from Damascus, usually either a rich silk or a twilled linen.

Damask. A silk stuff with a reverse pattern on the back. It is similar to brocade but flatter.

Diaper. A linen fabric woven with a small and simple pattern formed by the different directions of the thread with reflections of light from its surface, and consisting of lines crossing diamond-wise with the spaces variously filled up by parallel lines, dots, etc.

Dimity. A lightweight sheer cotton.

Dorcas. A striped muslin.

Dowlas. A coarse linen, much used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Later a strong calico made in imitation of this.

Drab. A thick woolen cloth of yellow, dull brown, or grey.

Drugget. An English fabric woven with a worsted warp and a woolen filling in a plain or twilled weave, or ribbed.

Ducapes. A fine, soft, plain weave silk with a ribbed effect.

Duffels. A coarse woolen having a thick nap or frieze.

Dungear. A coarse inferior India calico.

Durant (durants). A strong, thick, glazed woolen identical with everlasting.

Duroy. A kind of coarse woolen formerly manufactured in the west of England. It is not the same as corduroy.

Estamene. A low-textured worsted fabric made of rather rough or coarse yarn with a two up, two down twill weave. This fabric has a nap fibrous surface effect.

Everlasting (lasting). A hard-wearing woolen resembling serge. Also a warp-ribbed wool used for women's shoes.

Fearnought. A stout kind of woolen cloth used especially for outside clothing.

Felt. A cloth made of matted fibers of wool, or wool and fur.

Ferrit (ferret). A stout tape most commonly made of cotton. When made of silk it was known as Italian ferrit.

Flannel. A soft woolen cloth of loose texture with a slightly napped surface.

Frise (frise holland). The finest grade of linen made in Friesland, Holland, and imported into England in the eighteenth century. The fabric was made one quarter, one half, or one yard wide, and was not finished in any way except bleached.

Fustian. A material with linen warp and cotton weft, usually a printed fabric.

Galgee. Probably a sturdy type of India cotton, for the word "galee" is an Indian term for "abuse" or "to take abuse."

Galloon. Ribbon of spun silk thread, or gold and silver tissue. Also a double lace.

Garlix (garlits, garlix). A German linen, after the Prussian town where it was made.

Garnetting fabric. Fabric made from another material by a process of recovering fibers from hard-twisted thread, waste rags, etc.

Gauze. A very thin cotton or silk made at Paisley, England, after 1757.

Gauze cypress. A light transparent material resembling cobweb lawn or crepe, much used in mourning. Also any material gauze-like. The word "cypress" means dark grey.

Gimp. Silk, worsted, or cotton twist with a cord or wire running through it; used for trimming.

Gingham. A cotton fabric from dyed yarn, originally from India.

Grazet (grazett). A cheap woolen stuff of a grey color.

Half-Silk. The combination of silk with any other fabric, especially linen or cotton.

Half-thicks. A fabric similar to washwhites, being white in color but thinner and lighter in weight. It was also called pressed kersey and quarter-thicks.

Hamell. A domestic fabric; any homemade material.

Holland. A fine, plain weave linen imported from that country. When unbleached it was called brown holland.

Homespun. Cloth made of yarn spun at home; or a coarse, loosely-woven material imitating this.

Housewife's cloth. A middle sort of linen cloth between fine and coarse, for family use.

Huckaback. A stout cotton or linen fabric with the weft threads thrown alternately up so as to form a rough surface.

Humhums. A coarse India cotton cloth.

Incle. A braid trimming or a broad linen tape.

Jeans. A kind of fustian; also a twilled cotton cloth.

Kendal. A type of green woolen cloth. Also the green color thereof.

Kenting (kenton). A kind of fine linen cloth probably originally made in Kent.

Kersey. A coarse narrow cloth woven from a long wool and usually ribbed. It has a highly lustrous nap.

Lastings. See Everlasting.

Lawn. A very fine linen.

Linen. A fabric made from flax, also called Flaxen.

Linbeck. A plain weave cotton fabric of good quality yarn; soft and lightweight.

Linsey-woolzie. Cloth made of linen and woolen yarn. Cotton may be used instead of linen. Either stock is always the warp, and animal fibers are always the filling. Linsey-woolzie was a cloth of loose construction, coarse, and often highly colored. It originated in England, and was originally called "linsey" after the town of Linsey in Sussex.

Lockram. A coarse, plain weave linen fabric of inferior quality, originally made in France.

- Lustring (lutestring). A fine non-lustrous taffeta. Also a fine glossy warp-ribbed silk dress fabric.
- Manchester. Various cotton goods produced in that city.
- Mantua silk. A black or colored silk originally from Mantua.
- Marseilles. A stiff cotton fabric, similar to pique. Also marseilles quilting.
- Mecklenburge. A woollen fabric made with colored silk floral patterns on a ground of colored stripes.
- Mohair. Cloth made of angora wool.
- Moree (moreen). An imitation of watering in inferior stuffs. Also a stout woollen or woolen and cotton material either plain or watered. Occasionally it was combined with silk as in "silk moreen."
- Muslin. Any of a variety of cotton cloths ranging from Indian muslin which was very fine, thin, and soft, to coarse, heavy types of cotton goods.
- Nankeen (Nankien). A Bengal muslin. Also a durable cotton fabric.
- Nonesopretty. A type of tape or ribbon. The name comes from a type of sweet william called Nancy Pretty. Originally nonesopretty was probably fringed or decorated with tiny flowers, but in the eighteenth century the name seems to have been applied to any especially pretty and dainty tape or ribbon.
- Ozenbrigs (Osnabrigs). A coarse linen from Osnaburg. Also later a plain, strong cotton.
- Paduasoy. A strong corded or gross-grain fabric from Padua, Italy. It was also a narrow silk ribbon.
- Parisnet. The prefix "Paris" was simply added to the name of anything manufactured in that city; in this case, Paris net.
- Patent. A kind of finish. It can apply to velvet, yarn, cotton, or flannel.
- Peeling. A kind of satin.
- Pemistone. A kind of coarse woollen.
- Persian. A thin plain silk, fine and lightweight. It usually came in large floral patterns.

- Plains.** A kind of flannel. Also a term used in Great Britain for heavily sized solid-colored cotton fabrics.
- Plush.** A kind of cloth of silk, cotton, wool, or other material having a nap longer and softer than that of velvet.
- Pompadour ground fabric.** Material with a small printed or woven floral effect in soft shades; used mostly on silk fabrics and ribbons. The name applied especially to prints of crimson or pink shade.
- Poplin.** A mixed woven fabric consisting of a silk warp and worsted weft, and having a corded surface. It was often called "silk poplin."
- Prime.** A merino wool used for clothing.
- Rolls.** A bleached linen of medium quality made in Great Britain.
- Romale.** A silk or cotton square or handkerchief. Also a thin silk or cotton fabric with a handkerchief pattern.
- Russel.** A kind of woolen fabric used for articles of attire.
- Russet.** A pure worsted fabric made in England in the 18th century.
- Russia.** A coarse linen or hempen textile.
- Russia diaper.** A term used in England for diaper fabric made of linen with a double diamond pattern larger than that in Irish diaper.
- Sagathy.** A slight woolen stuff; a kind of serge.
- Sarsenet.** A very fine soft silk made both plain and twilled in a variety of colors.
- Satin.** A silk with a glazed surface first made in England after 1685. It is smooth and generally lustrous, with a thick close texture.
- Satinisco.** A low quality satin used for lining.
- Sattenet.** A very thin satin. Also a term used in England for strong cotton fabric made in a satin weave and napped on the back; an imitation satin.
- Scotch cloth.** A textile fabric resembling lawn but cheaper. It was said to have been made of nettle fiber. Also any material made in Scotland.

- Seersucker.** An India cotton.
- Selesias.** A linen cloth originally made in Selesia, a province of Prussia. Also a twilled cotton fabric used for dress linings.
- Serge (sarge).** A twilled worsted or woolen fabric.
- Sergedenin.** A worsted fabric made in England in the eighteenth century.
- Shag (shagg).** A wool and flax mixture used in England. Also any shaggy cloth, for example "worsted shag."
- Shagreen.** A silk used for linings. Also a sized cotton in imitation of leather.
- Shalloon.** A slight, lightweight woolen.
- Shel (Sheffield).** Any fabric from Sheffield, England.
- Shenell.** See Chenille.
- Shrewsbury plains.** Any material made in that city. They also produced white and broad-reeled thread.
- Silk.** Cloth made from the fine, strong, lustrous fiber produced by certain caterpillars (silkworms).
- Snail.** A fine trimming, approximately like chenille.
- Stuff.** A textile of common wool, plain or twilled. Also a fabric which has not yet been made into garments. Also a fabric of any kind, sometimes specifically a worsted.
- Swanskin.** A closely woven flannel.
- Tabby.** A watered silk, Also an old British term for fabric made with a plain or taffeta weave, usually with a moire or striped finish. Also a plain weave worsted fabric such as moreen.
- Taffeta.** A crisp, lustrous, plain fabric figured or printed; changeable and moire effects were popular. It was formerly called taffety.
- Tamarine.** Probably a kind of woolen cloth.
- Tammy.** A fine worsted dress fabric often with a glazed finish. It was also called tamis and tamie.
- Tani.** A broadcloth made in China. Also a two-ply silk yarn.

- Tanners wool, fabric made of.** Any material made of pulled wool; that is, wool from the pelts of dead sheep. It was considered inferior, harsh, and flat.
- Tartan.** A kind of woolen cloth woven in stripes of various colors crossing at right angles so as to form a regular pattern. The name is also applied to silk and other fabrics having a similar pattern.
- Thickset.** A strong corduroy with short, thick pile back made in Great Britain and used for work clothes.
- Ticking.** A strong, closely woven fabric in plain, twilled, or satin weave.
- Ticklinburg.** A coarse fabric made of linen mixed with cotton. Named after a town in Germany.
- Turkey gauze.** A term used in Great Britain for jacquard fabric generally made with floral figures on gauze ground with plain-weave borders.
- Velverette.** A cotton velvet often made in ribbed effect or printed. Usually made wide.
- Velvet.** A silk fabric having a thick soft pile of short erect threads. Also a similar fabric with a cotton or linen back.
- Venetians.** A closely woven cloth having a fine twilled surface, used as a suiting and dress material.
- Vermilion.** Originally a fine scarlet wool. Later a cotton cloth dyed scarlet.
- Virginia cloth.** Originally a coarse, inexpensive fabric made in colonial Virginia of hemp or flax, usually mixed with cotton. Later any fabric, especially cotton or linen, made in Virginia, and presenting a wide value and quality range.
- Washwhites.** One of the best grades of kersey, white in color. It is also called swimmers.
- Welch cotton.** A fine flannel generally hard woven; or a loosely woven flannel made with woolen or cotton warp.
- Wool.** Material made from the soft, curled covering of sheep.
- Worsted.** A woolen fabric or stuff made from well-twisted yarn, spun of long-staple wool combed to lay the fibers parallel.

APPENDIX

Part II-A

The following women's wardrobes, taken from the Westmoreland County Records, have been chosen to give a general view, and range from examples of the wardrobes owned by the very wealthy to minimum wardrobes owned by the poorer ladies of Westmoreland.

1. Inventory of the Estate of Thomas Sorrell
Records and Inventories Volume I, page 42a-44
December 16, 1726

...			
To 1 Womans Gold Lace hatt	1	5	
To 1 Womans Suite of Cloaths of Cotton Satten lyn'd wth Silk	4		
To 1 D ^o of Stuff	1		
To 1 D ^o of half Silk	1	5	
To 1 D ^o of fine half Silk	1	10	
To 1 D ^o of black Crape	1		
To 1 Womans Double Gown	1		
To 1 Womans Callico riding Gown		8	
To 1 D ^o Satten for a Woman		18	
To a Suit of Womens Cloaths cut out of India Persian	4		
...			
To 3 prs Womens Wash Gloves 15 ^d p ^r 1 p ^r Mittens. . .	24		7
To 2 p ^r black Silk Gloves		10	
...			
To 2 small Girdles at 1s 1 Sarsenett hoods 5s		6	
To 1 black hood 5s to India handkerchief		8	
To 2 Silk D ^o		6	
To 5 Suits of head linen at 5/ Each	1	5	
To 2 p ^r Sleeves & 2 handkerchiefs		5	
To 2 Muslin Aprons 8/ 1 D ^o Hood 3/		11	
To 5 aprons @ 4/ per 1 3/4 black ribbon. . .	1	2	7 1/2
To 2 ^m pins 18d, 4 fans @ 2/ 2 p ^r boddices 5/		8	6
To 3 prs womas Shoes @ 3/ per pair		9	
To 2 pr woosted Stockins, 1 pr Thread D ^o		7	6
To 1 Double Gown of Callico 35/ 1 Callimanco D ^o 85/	3	10	
To 1 Linen Mantua Gown 15/, 2 flaxen Petticoats 10/	1	5	
To 1 old Crape Gown & Petticoat 2/6 1 old Gound Callico 1/		3	6
To 1 Callico Gown & Petticoat 20/ . . .	1		
To 1 Silk bonnett 2/ 1 ps tape, 1 p ^s Nonsopretty		2	8
	Total	£ 33. 9	8 1/2

2. Inventory of the Estate of Charles Ashton
Records and Inventories Volume 1, page 10a-11a
September 30, 1724

To 1 Silk stuff Gown & petticoat	3	--	--
To 1 Callico Riding Gown	--	15	--
To 1 Callico Gown & Petticoat	4	--	--
To 1 Silk Petticoat	--	10	--
To 1 Stamp't Linnen Petticoat	--	4	--
To 1 Swanskin wastcoat	--	2	--
To 1 p ^r of Scarlett Stockens	--	4	--
To 1 p ^r of Lac'd Shoes	--	5	--
To 2 holland jumps & 1 D ^o Petticoat	--	10	--
To 3 fine White Linnen aprons	--	8	--
To head Linnen & Ruffells	2	10	--
To 3 black hoods 1 old d ^o	1	5	--
To 2 3/4 yds of Ribbon . . .	--	8	--
To 2 womens girdles	--	2	--
To 1 Silk Gause handkercheif's Silk Muzlind:	--	10	--
To 2 fans		4	6
To 6 Linnen Aprons	--	15	--
To 5 yds of Ribbon	--	10	--
To 3 Silk laces 1 amber Necklace 3 small necklaces	--	7	3
. . .			
To 1 callico Gown & Petticoat	1	15	--
To 1 Stamp't Linnen Petticoat	--	8	--
To 1 thread Sattin Gown & Petticoats Lin'd with Silk	6	--	--
To 2 fustian Petticoats 1 D ^o jump	--	8	--
To 1 p ^r of Paragon Boddiss & Stomicher	--	5	--
To 1 old Gown & Petticoat	--	8	--
To 1 p ^r of old Lac'd Shoes		2	6
To 9 women Shifts	4	--	--
To 2 Long, Muzlin aprons 1 Short d ^o lac'd	1	--	--
To 3 double handkercheifs 2 Single d ^o 2 p ^r of Linnen Glove 2 d ^o Stomechers	--	10	--
To 5 yards of Ribbon		7	6
To 4 yds of Ribbon	--	6	--
To 3 yds of Ditto	--	2	--
To 1 p ^r of Gloves 1 p ^r of Mittens	--	2	6
To 2 Masques	--	6	--
To 1 Lac'd hatt 1 p ^r of Leath ^r Mitt ^s		11	3
To 1 Silk Muzlin handkercheif	--	6	--
To 6 3/4 yrd of Bone Lace		13	6
To 1 powder box 1 m of pins		1	2
To 1 Sattin Mantle Lin'd with callico	--	12	--
. . .			
To 1 Sattin handkercheif	--	10	--
. . .			
Total	E 34	13	2

3. Inventory of the Estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Stonehouse
Records and Inventories Volume 1, page 278a-279
March 3, 1742

To 2½ yards of Brown Linen		2	
. . .a womans Hatt 6/		6	
. . .			
To a quilted Silk Petticoat 7/6 and a old hood 6 ^d		8	
To a Gound and Petticoat	1	10	
To 1 D ^o old check apron 8 ^d and 1½ yards of Check Linen		1	10½
To 1 D ^o 10/ 1 Check apron 9 ^d and a Striped Holland petticoat 7/6		18	3
To 10 womens caps 5/ & 1 pillow case and Napkin		5	8
To 3 old white aprons 6/ 1 D ^o new 3/		9	
To 3 Double handkerchiefs white		3	9
To 1 old Shift 9 ^d an old D ^o 1/ and a D ^o 5/ and a D ^o new 10/		16	9
To 1 old Cap and a pr of Pockets 2 ^d		2	6
To 1 old fan 2 ^d old pair pocketts 2 ^d D ^o Stockings 2 ^d			6
To 1 old Duroy Gound 3/ 1 old Mantle and old pr Stays 2/2		5	2
To 1 womans Jaccoat & 2 old petticoats		6	
. . .a pr womens Stockings 3/6		3	6
To a pr womens Shoes 1/3 ^d a pr of do 2 ^d		1	5
. . .			
To a Small parcel Cotton three old Gloves			6
. . .			
To 1 pair Gold Bobbs 12/10 ^d and an Iron Chain		15	0
	Total	6	15
			9

4. Inventory of the Estate of Frances Grace
Records and Inventories Volume 2, page 22a-23a
April 6, 1747

• • •				
To a Tamey Gound & Petecote	1	5		
To 1 womans Short Cloak		15		
To 1 Virginia Cloath gound & a Tamey Quilted Coat		10		
To 1 Apron 3 hank ^s some old Stockings		7		
To 1 Shef Gound & Petecoat		15		
• • •				
To 1 Stamp ^d linen gound & petecoat		10		
To a parcel of Shifts aprons & other linens		15		
To some old wooling Cloths		2	6	
To 1 Womans Hat		5		
To 1 p ^r womans wosted stockings & a faun [fan?]		5		
To 2 linen handkerchifs & 1 Silk D ^o		5		
To a pr of Specticles a Kussey & thimble		2	6	
To a parcel of Head Cloaths		5		
	Total	£ 6	2	0

5. Inventory of the Estate of Katherine Bonam
Deeds and Wills Book 5 page 442-443 Recorded June 3, 1715

• • •				
A gound & petty coat old	0	15	0	
2 very old gownds & petty coats	0	14	0	
A Sorry gown & petty coat old	0	8	0	
A p ^r of Bodies Stomacher & Westcoat	0	10	0	
• • •				
2 p ^s w ^d growest ^a silk lace. . .	0	02	0	
A gold ring	0	17	6	
• • •				
3 dimity Vests 6 aprons a p ^r of Stockins Caps & other lining trunk all old	0	12	0	
• • •				
A muslin apron som head cloaths & severall other ling. things	1	10	0	
	Total	£ 5	8	6

6. Inventory of the Estate of Adam Weaver
 Records and Inventories Volume 5, page 158-161
 August 28, 1771

. . .					
To 1 Virginia stript Cloth Gown 10/.					
To 1 D ^o 10/, To 1 D ^o 12/.	1	12	0		
To 1 Womans Hatt 5/. To 1 Quilted Petticoat					
14/. To 1 Old red Cloak 8/.	1	7	0		
To 1 Virginia Cloth Peticcoat 8/. To 1 D ^o 5/.					
To 3 Shifts 15/.	1	8	0		
To a parcel of Old Cloths 2/6 To 2 Aprons					
& 1 Mantle 10/.	0	12	6		
To 1 Lawn Handkercheif 4/. To 3 Linnen					
D ^o 2/6.		6	6		
To 1 Ribband and 1 Lace 1/. To a parcel of					
caps 6/.		7			
. . .					
To 1 Apron, 1 Peticcoat, & 1 Jackett	0	5	0		
. . .					
	Total	£	5	17	0

7. Inventory of the Estate of Elizabeth Creed
 Records and Inventories Volume 1, page 176a-177
 May 3, 1737

. . .					
To one Callico Gound & pedicoate	0	12	0		
To one CanCan Gound & Calliminise pedicoate	0	16	0		
To one old Gound and pedicoats and one pair					
of Bodesies	0	14	0		
To a parcel of old clothes a black hood and					
two pair of Stockens	0	13	0		
To a remnant of honey Comb Cloath Some					
thread a remnt of tape	0	3	0		
To one old Blew Coate two Silk handireffs	0	4	0		
	Total	£	3	2	0

8. Inventory of the Estate of Frances Johnston
Records and Inventories Volume 1, page 278a
February 7, 1742

. . .	To 3 p ^r of Womens Stockings 5/	1 wom ^e Cloak	0	13	
. . .	To 4 Check aprons 2 p ^r pockets	1 p ^r Jumps	0	3	6
	To 1 Gound and Petticoat		0	10	0
	To 2 petty Coats and 1 Gound		0	12	6
	To a parcel of Head Linnen		0	18	0
. . .					
	Total		£	2	1 0

9. Inventory of the Estate of Alice Grant
Records and Inventories Volume 1, page 140a-141
June 10, 1734

. . .	To 2 yds Check Linnen @ 20d			3	4
	To 1 Black hatt at 5/			5	
	To 1 pare womans Stockins @			2	6
	To a Sagethy Gown and petty Cote		1	5	
	Total		£	1	15 10

10. Inventory of the Estate of Ann Hall
Records and Inventories Volume 2, page 166a
August 8, 1751

	To 1 Silk & Cotton Gown 10/	To 1 Tartan D ^o 16/	1	6	0
	To 1 Virginia Cloth D ^o & Coat 12/	To 1 Blue			
	Quilted Coat 1 old Blue Cloak 1 old hatt 3/		0	15	0
	To a Parcell of Sun. [Sundry?] wearing Cloths 16/			16	
. . .	To 1 p ^r of old Shoes 8d				8
	Total		£	2	17 8

11. Inventory of the Estate of Frances Carter
(An example of valuing an estate in pounds of tobacco.)
Deeds and Wills Volume 3, page 431 August 1, 1706

. . .	To 4 striped handkerchiefs	T	80
. . .	To a Parcel of linen fine & course		3000
	To a Parcel of woolen Cloath		3000
. . .	To 3 p ^r of shoes and a small p'cell of silk		200
	Total		6280 Lbs.

APPENDIX

Part II-B

99

Representative entries from the accounts of the Sherman and the Sorrell estates, showing the kind of material and information which can be gained from these accounts.

William Sherman: An account of Goods brought and made use of absolutely necessary for the deceath children and family.

	Tob
1733 To 4 yds dowlase at 16 P yd	.224
To 1½ yds Rusia Linen @ 7lb P yd	.10
To 2½ yds fine wide Linnen at	.60
To 4½ yard Seasuckers at 36lb P yd	.160
To 5 yards Callico at 32 lb P yd	.160
To 1 Pair womens worsted Stockings	.40
To 1 Pair D ^o s Gloves	.16
To 1 fan @	.24
To 5 yds fine Callico @ 36 P yd	.180
To 2 pair wo ^s worsted Stockings @ 36 P pr	.72
To two pair Small Yarn Do at 15	
2½ yards Kersey	.93
To 20 yards Virginia Cloath @ 20 P yd	.400

Records and Inventories Vol. 1, p. 230a

Mr William Sherman Estate

(Goods & services necessary for children and family since his death.)

To 3 p ^r womens Shoes 9/ 1 pair Clogs 3/	0	12	0
To 1 p ^r D ^o 2/6 1 p ^r Thread Stockings 2/9	0	5	3
To 2 p ^r worsted D ^o 1/9	0	3	6
To 2 pair White Gloves 2/ 2 p ^s Necklace 14d	0	3	2
To 1 pair Studs Set in Silver 1/6 1 p ^r brass d ^o 2d	0	1	8
To 8 yards Lace 4/ 2 pen knife 9d	0	4	9
To 1 fan 1/ 2 Cotton handkerchief 2/	0	3	0
To two Silk laces 1/ 1 Straw hatt 2/2	0	3	2
To 16 yds Irish Holland @ 26/8	1	6	8
To 2 pair wo: Shoes 5/ 2½ yds Dowlace 2/6		7	6
To 1 Scarlett Cloak 10/6		10	6
To 1 pair wo: worsted Stockings 1/9		1	9

Wharton Randell, Guardian

Records and Inventories, Volumes 1, page 239 Sept. 1, 1740

Estate of Thomas Sorrell Account: (debt against since death)

To Paid Margt Shaw for weaving 41 yards of Cloath for you at 31 lb Tob p yd.	123	Tob
.....		
To two pair Womens shoes @ 4/6 p pair	9	0
To 1 pair Womens Gloves	1	
.....		
To 1 pair Womens Stript Silken Shoes @	4	6
.....		
To paid M ^r Richard Jackson for a Laced hatt for Mrs. Betty Sorrell Cash	18	
.....		
To two pair Womens Shoes for Betty and Winneg Sorrell @ 4/6 p pair	9	0
.....		

Records and Inventories Volume 1, page 218-219.
October 1736-October 1739

Part II-C

The following is a paraphrase of the most important items to be found in the account of the estate of Mr. Richard Watts- that is the articles bought for the two orphan girls Anne and Mary Watts. The account was kept by Andrew Monroe. Records and Inventories Volume 2, page 199a-204a
June 24, 1752

The most important articles of clothing bought for the two girls were:

1749				
Dec. 2,	1 pr. callimanco shoes	1 pr. leather ditto	13	
	Making two gowns		6	
	1 pr. stays		1	12
	1 cherriderry Gown		1	18
	7 yds. of lace		2	5 6
1749/50	Feb.			
	Paid to a Shoemaker	150 pounds of Tobacco		
March,	1 pr. stays	2 pr. callimanco shoes	1	18
	Paid for quilting a coat			11
	4 yds. Dove Colored Silk		1	8 0
1750	1 pr. silk shoes had of Mr. Hanson		0	15 6
	2 stay hooks		0	2 6
July. . .				
	Paid for Gown making		1	5
	1 pr. necklace, 13 yds. ribbon, 7 yds.			
	Do. all had of Mr. Pasley		225	Tobacco
	1 gold ring		1	6
	1 mask			3
	Paid for gown making			8
	Paid for knitting			7
1750	May 30			
	1 pr. Superfine stays		3	13 6
	4½ yds. garlix			7 6
	1 suit of head clothes & sheffels & handkers		9	3 6
	1 whale bone hoop petticoat		1	8
	1 pr. gold bobs with stones		4	6
	1 silk quilted petticoat		2	14 6
	1 pr. best kid gloves			3 6
	1 best ivory fan 2m pins			12
	1 velvet bonnet		1	1 6
	1 pr. superfine gold buttons Bristol stones		2	8 9
	21 pr. stone buttons set in silver			5 3
	5 yds. superfine lace		1	11 6
	1 best velvet cloak		5	8 9
	1 pr. women's black gloves			2 6

	2 pr. women's calf shoes 5/ 1 pr. Do. white heeled last	1	0	0
	1 pr. silk shoes 2 pr. callimanco Do.	1	7	
	1 pr. black shammy Do. 1 pr. Spanish leather Do.		14	6
	1 velvet bonnet		14	6
	1 pr. kid gloves 2/3		2	3
1750 Sept.				
	1 pr. women's silk hose 1 pr. calf shoes	1	6	0
	2 pr. women's best worsted stockings		16	
	2 necklaces		9	
	Paid for a fan 3/2		3	2
	2 painted boxes		4	5
Dec.				
	2 gowns		14	
	1 pr. red heels shoes 1 pr. gloves		9	4
Jan. 1751/2				
	1 woman's hair hat		18	9
	2 pr. worsted stockings		11	2
	1 fine linen handkerchief			
Feb. 5,	2 pr. black lace shoes 1 pr. Morocco Do.	1	14	0
March 5				
	1 furred hat & band 1 plain	1	6	
	Paid Wm. Robson for making stays 185 Tobacco			
1752 April 7				
	Paid for quilting	1	1	3
	2 pr. women's best thread stockings		13	6
	1 pr. callimanco shoes		1	
	7 pr. plaid hose 13/		13	
	1 woman's scarlet cloak	1	5	
	1 necklace 2 yds. ribbon		6	6
	1 C Superfine necklace		6	
July				
	Paid for gown making		7	6
	1 cane hoop 1 cloak	1	11	6
	4 cotton handkerchiefs		12	9
	1 pr. yarn stockings 2 yds. callico		10	6
	1 pr. silver buckles with Bristol stones	3	10	
	1 silk handkerchief		6	6
	1 pr. women's callimanco shoes			
	1 pr. Tabby stays	1	12	
	1 pr. silk stockings			
August				
	2 pr. calf shoes 1 pr. Spanish do.		16	

	1 pr. silk shoes	1	15	9
	1 flowered underpetticoat			
	2 pr. calf shoes	1	2	
	1 pr. silk Do.			
	2 suits head cloths	11	6	7
	1 hoop petticoat		12	10
	1 pr. "sizers"			
	1 pr. stone sleeve buttons set in silver		6	
	Felt hat		8	5
	1 pr. worsted stockings			
	1 woman's scarlet saddle silver lace & silver fringe			
	& coat £ 18.18	18	18	
Oct.8	4 pr. women's stockings		16	
	2 pr. thread Do.		17	
	4 pr. half handed gloves		12	
	Paid to Charles Jones for 2 petticoats		15	
	11 pr. plaid stockings			
	1 felt hat			
	2 pr. necklaces		2	10
	1 pr. silk shoes		12	6
	1 pr. wash gloves			
1752.	1 pr. calf shoes 5/		5	
	2 necklaces			
	2 pr. thread stockings			

The types of material and fabric bought during the period for Anne and Mary were:

fine calico, fine chince, shallon, silk, white linen, brown linen, dowlas, green plains, wrapper, ozenbrigs, blue frize, plaid, cambrick, India dimity, cotton, allepean, muslin, tanny, damask, red calimanco, garlix, China taffety, flowered lawn, fine holland, scarlet shallon, plain lawn, brocade, lustring, scarlet camblet, narrow check, wide check, plains, black velvet, buckram, princess linen, white calico, kersey, druget, swanskin, Irish linen, Irish holland, fearnothing, and half-thicks.

Types of ribbons and laces bought were: silk laces, white tape, nonsopretty, gold ribbon, hood lace, gauze ribbon, figured ribbon, black ribbon, white ribbon, silver ribbon, and superfine lace.

This is just a summary of what was bought for Anne and Mary Watts, and is not complete by any means. The total amount spent during the period December 1749 and December 1752 was £ 580.3.4. This did not include the value of the tobacco given in trade for goods and services. Neither did it include food, schooling, or household items.

APPENDIX

Part II-D

Representative examples of the willing of clothing and materials, as they were found in the Westmoreland County Records, are given below.

1. The willing of clothing to daughters.

Will of Elizabeth Tucker

Deeds and Wills Volume 7, p. 110-112 Recorded Oct. 1722

". . .Item I give bequeath and devise to my daughter Martha Tucker. . .a shift an apron a jump muzzling handkercheif & a primer. Item I give to my daughter Mary Woodward my black gown & petticoat my new primer and best shift. Item I give to my daughter Sarah Minor my black hood. Item I give to my daughter Rebecca Tucker my dimity wastcoat, stuff petticoat, and callico apron. . . ."

2. The willing of clothing to close relatives.

Will of Frances Wiggington

Deeds and Wills Volume 8, p. 199 April 25, 1733

". . .Item I give to my Cousin Barara Davies. . .two Suits of Cloths and two Shifts, and two paire of Shoes & two paire of Stockens. Item I give to my Cousin Elizabeth Canaday one Black Suit of Cloths and a Gould Ring. Item I give to my Cousin Frances Davies One Gound and peticote, And one Gound and Peticote to my Cousin Ann Davies. Item I Give to Ann Banister. . . one Suite of Clothes, two Shifts and one pair of Shoes and Stockens. Item I Give to my Godson Thomas Martin one Gould Ring and a new Bible. Item I Give Gerrard Davies one Gould Ring. Item I Give to y^e Negro Boy Thomas belonging to my daughter Elizth Wright a Suit of Cloths. . . ."

Will of Martha Rust

Deeds and Wills Volume 10, page 124-126 May 28, 1745

". . .Item I give to my cosen Mary Cox one muslin apron one flour flowered handkerfer one Black hud one yard of Ribbon, two yards of fine linnen one small piece of Calugo one black hat one pair of Gloves one pair of Gold bobs one pair of silver clasps and one Gold ring and one stud and my Calugo Gound. Item I give to Mary Hall all the rest of my wearing apparel.

. . .

3. The willing of clothes to friends.

Will of Ann Hall

Deeds and Wills Volume 11, p. 281 April 17, 1757

". . .Item I give unto Ann Crummit my blue Cloak & blue Quilted petticoate and check apron, old wearing Hatt. Item I give unto Elizabeth Minir [Minor] daughter of John Minor, one Silk & Cotton Gown. Item I give unto John Muses two daughters Ann Muse & Elizabeth Muse a Country Cloath Gown & a Tartan Gown & a blue Shalloon petticoat Equally divided. . . ."

A. The willing of clothing and materials to housekeeper
(Clothing was also occasionally willed to slaves and indentured servants.)

Will of William Mills

Deeds and Wills Volume 13 Page 137 March 28, 1758

". . .Item I give and bequeath unto Easter Elliott my house Keeper. . .all the linen maid and unmaid all the cotton maid and unmaid and all the Wolen made and unmaid. . . ."

Part II-E

The York County Records

1. Inventory of Elizabeth and Alice Ives
Orders, Wills, Etc. Book 16 Page 276-277 March 15, 1722

. . .			
6 pr. women's fine silk hose 10/	3		
2 pr. ditto beaded 8/		16	0
7 pr. ditto 7/	2	9	0
2 pr. wom's slippers 4/6		9	
1 worked waistcoat & 1 do cap	2	10	0
2 stomachers 4/		8	
10 ps. of silver and gold Laces for shoes		15	
. . .			
2 women's fanns	1		
2 pr. Women's cloggs 4/		8	
. . .			
1 Wom's Quilted Coat		19	?
. . .			
5 sutes NightCloths	1	5	0
3 Muslin hoods one old Silk Do.	0	7	6
3 Muslin Handkerchiefs and 7 Silk Do	0	12	0
4 Muslin Aprons	0	17	0
2 linen Ditto	0	0	6
4 pr. Ruffles	0	4	0
2 lace mobbs	0	2	0
3 plain Do & 5 Nightcaps	0	5	0
7 Shifts	1	15	0
1 pr. thread Mittens 2 Wash leather Do	0	0	6
3 pr. Kid Gloves	0	2	6
2 old fans	0	0	6
2 pr, Holland Sleeves with ruffles	0	1	0
3 Quilted Scull Caps 9 half Caps	0	2	0
3 Waistcoats 1 Stomacher	0	2	6
2 pr. Shoes 1 pr. Clogs	0	3	0
1 Gown and pettycoat Ash Colour	3	0	0
1 Crepe Gown & black petticoat	1	15	0
1 Stripe Sattin gown & blk petticoat	2	0	0
1 Silk Gown	0	15	0
1 Stripe Camlet gown	0	7	6
2 Quilted Coats	0	7	6
1 red Stuff petticoat	0	7	6
1 knit petticoat	0	7	6
2 pr. Stays	0	2	6
1 pr. worsted and 8 pr. old hose	0	3	0
2 black Silk hoods	0	12	6
1 furbelow Scarf old	0	15	0
2 Short Silk Aprons	0	5	0
. . .			

1 woman's hat	0	2	6
1 scarlett cloak and velvet hood	2	0	0
1 Camlet cloak & hood	1	0	0

2. Inventory of Henry Dyer

Orders, Wills, Etc. Book 14, January 15, 1710 p. 67-68

To 1 Stuff Gown; Callico Petticoat and Apraing	1/	5/--
To 1 p of bodys 2 silk gowns	1/	10/--
To 1 new Stuff petticoat & 1 Damous Gown a parcell of old fring	1/	7/--
To 1 old Gown & Petticoat 1 head dress & Sleeves and a Strip Muzlin Apraing	1/	--/--
To . . . 2 old hoods a handkersher		
To 3 old seikells 3 yds. Damous	0/	15/--

3. Will of James Orlando

Orders, Wills, Etc. Book 15, pages 529-523 Made November 21, 1719

"Legacys given to his Daughter as followeth
 1 New Stuff sute womens Cloaths 1 old Callico D^o 1 Sattin
 sute not made 1 flannell 1 Virginia Cotton petticoat 1
 Riding gound a parcell of Lace for a petticoat 1 hatt
 Shift. . . a pr womans shoes 1 p^r Silk Stockings 1 p^r Cotton
 D^o 2 Muzlin aprons 2 sutes Ruffles 2 Gauze handkerchiefs
 1 sute of head Cloaths 1 Silk lace a pcell Ribbon one silver
 Chain 1 small box Containing 4 Gold Rings 1 Silver thimble
 & g' in portugal money & Trunk Containing the above
 articles to the value of £ 14. 7. 9. . . ."

Part II-F

Example of the descriptions of clothing that can be found in the advertisement for "run-away" servants in the Virginia Gazette.

Hunter, May 2, 1751 (3:2)

"Ran away from the Subscribers, [Robert Vaule and John Elliott] living in Westmoreland County. . .a white Servant Woman. . .Sarah Willmore, alias Willmott, about Twenty-three Years of Age; . . .had on when she went away, a dark colour'd old Camblet Gown, much stain'd with Tar, a blue quilted Coat lin'd with Yellow, and a pretty good furr'd Hat: 'Tis likely she may change her Apparel, having stole an Ash colour'd Camblet Gown, tied at the Sleeves with blue Ribbons, a purple colour'd Callico Gown, a white Dimity under Coat work'd round the Bottom, and a Thunder and Lightning, alias German Serge Coat, trimm'd with black Glass Buttons; with many other things too tedious here to mention. . . ."

P.D. May 6, 1773 (3:2) Advertisement of William Black of King and Queen County

"She [Sarah, age 22] carried with her several Changes of Apparel, among which are remembered a red & white Calico Jacket & Petticoat, a white Holland and blue Flains Ditto, a red Flannel Petticoat, a purple Cloth Cloak, a black furred Hat, with a Gold Band, Button, and Loop, a black Silk Hat, several white Linen Shifts and Aprons, . . .a Pair of English made Leather Shoes, and several Pairs of Thread, Cotton, and Worsted Stockings, with a small red Leather Trunk. . . ."

Example of the orders of William Beverly
New York Public Library Letters and Accounts 1734-48

Invoice of things for Elizabeth Beverley Virg^a Nov. 21, 1741

a p^r of white tabby stays
a head dress (if fashionable) & everything suitable or a mobb
&c if head dresses are not wore.
a set of knots- a bone hoop coat--
a velvet hood.
a girdle. . .
a gentile suit of flowered Silk Cloaths or what is fashionable
(but neither red nor Blue because she has those colours
already) to cost about £ 12.
a quilted petticoat
a cheap plain Riding habit
. . .

APPENDIX

Part II-H

110

From the Poet's Corner, P.D. June 4, 1772 4:1

Advise to Country Ladies against the introduction
of London Fashions among them.

Fraught with each Fashion in its highest Taste,
The Milliners from Town return in Haste,
The Young, the Old, the Homely and the Fair,
To Mrs. Modely's Shop in Crowds repair.
Vers'd in th' important Articles of Dress,
She ne'er despair'd of meeting with Success.
Flirtilla turns each Box with Transport o'er,
Then cries, this Suit of Linen I adore!
But come, dear Modely, prithee show us more.
I hear you've brought the sweetest Fashions down,
Pray tell us what is chiefly worn in Town?
Why, Ladies, I believe you'll all agree
That none has more Variety than me.
Pray did you ever see a better Lace?
This Head dress, Mem, would much become your Face,
Look at these Earrings, at this Necklace too;
I think I never saw so fine a Blue.
Here are great Choice indeed, Darinda said,
Modely, I'll take these Ruffles and the Head.
I find they make their Clokes extremely short,
And pink'd all over; what a pretty thought!
These Hats too, I suppose, came lately down?
Yes, Mem, no other Sort is worn in Town.
I was at the Rehearsal, Mem, and there
Saw how the Ladies dress'd and wore their Hair,
To Ranelagh two Nights I likewise went,
To mind the Fashions was my chief Intent;
And I assure you, Ladies, I brought down
What was most worn by Quality in Town.
The Ladies with a Smile her Taste approv'd,
While o'er each Box their Eyes with Transport rov'd.
Flowers, Egrets, Lappets, Ruffles, charm their Sight,
And each new Object adds to their Delight.
In short, each Purse of its Contents was eas'd,
And both the Parties mutually were pleas'd. . . .

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources--Manuscripts

- Beverley, William. Letters and Accounts 1734-1748. New York Public Library; Transcripts in the Research Department of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.
- Custis, Daniel Parke. Misc. Mss. Custis. New York Historical Society; Transcripts in the Research Department of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.
- Gates, Horatio. Horatio Gates Papers III-125. New York Historical Society; Transcripts in the Research Department of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.
- Norton, John, and Sons. The Norton Papers (1762-1774). Microfilm copies from the Archives Department of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.
- Prince William County Records, Will Book C. Photostats in the Virginia State Library, Richmond, Va.
- Rathell, Catherine. Misc. Mss. Rathell. New York Historical Society; Transcript in the Research Department of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.
- Surry County Records, Book 7 Wills and Book 8 Wills. Photostats in the Virginia State Library, Richmond, Virginia.
- Westmoreland County Records 1700-1774. Records and Inventories Books 1-5, and Deeds and Wills Books 3-15. Photostats and microfilm copies from the Virginia State Library, Richmond, Virginia.
- York County Records 1700-1775. As indexed by Colonial Williamsburg; all entries mentioning clothing or materials were then checked in the microfilm copies at the Virginia State Library, Richmond, Virginia.

Primary Periodicals

- The Gentleman's Magazine. 1731-1750: London.
- The Virginia Gazette (Williamsburg). Various editions, 1730-1775. As indexed in Lester J. Cappon and Stella M. Duff's Virginia Gazette Index for the Years 1736-1780. 2 vols. Williamsburg, 1950.

Printed Primary Sources

- Anburey, Thomas. Travels Through the Interior Parts of America in Two Volumes, Vol. 2. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1923.
- Burnaby, Andrew. Travels Through the Middle Settlements in North America in the years 1759-1760. Ithaca: Cornell Press, 1960.
- Cresswell, Nicholas. The Journal of Nicholas Cresswell, 1774-1777. 2d ed. New York: The Dial Press, 1928.
- Essex County Records, Deeds and Wills No. 13 (1707-11). Abstracted and compiled by John F. Dorman. Washington: np, 1963.
- Fithian, Philip Vickers. Journal and Letters of Philip Vickers Fithian 1773-1774: A Plantation Tutor of the Old Dominion. Editor Hunter Dickinson Parish. Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., 1943.
- Hunter, Robert. Quebec to Carolina in 1785-86; Being the Travel Diary and Observations of Robert Hunter Jr. a young Merchant of London. San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1943.
- Mason, Frances Norton, ed. John Norton and Sons, Merchants of London and Virginia, 1750-1795. Richmond: The Dietz Press, 1937.
- Orr, Lucinda Lee. Journal of a Young Lady of Virginia (1782). Baltimore: John Murphy and Co., 1871.

Secondary Sources--Costume Books

- Cunnington, Cecil W. Handbook of English Costume in the Seventeenth Century. London: Faber and Faber, 1957.
- Cunnington, Cecil W. and Phillis. Handbook of English Costume in the Eighteenth Century. Philadelphia: Dufour Edition, 1957.
- Cunnington, Phillis. Costume in Pictures. London: Studio Vista Limited, 1964.
- These three books are the most complete and competent available on women's fashions, covering the period under consideration.
- Davenport, Millia. Book of Costume Vol. 2. New York: Crown Publishers, 1948.
- Descriptions of eighteenth-century costumes, based on paintings of that era.

Earle, Alice Morse. Costume of Colonial Times. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894.
A dictionary of colonial fabrics and clothing.

_____. Two Centuries of Costume in America. New York: 1903 (also 1894).
Mainly New England but some notes on Virginia.

McClellan, Elizabeth. History of American Costume. New York: Tutor Publishing Company, 1937.
Good text and drawings, based on actual American dresses.

Powys, Marian. Lace and Lace Making. Boston: Charles T. Banford Co., 1953.
To identify types of lace mentioned in the county records.

Schwab, David B. The Story of Lace and Embroidery and Handkerchiefs. New York: Fairchild Publications, Inc., 1957.
Types of lace and handwork.

Secondary Sources--Other than Costume Books

Beckett, R.B., ed. Hogarth. Boston: Boston Book and Art Shop, 1955.
English engraver of the eighteenth century. Shows everyday clothing.

Borenus, Tancred, ed. English Painting in the Eighteenth Century. Paris: The Hyperion Press, 1938.
Portraits of English ladies of the eighteenth century.

Bruce, Alexander Philip. Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1907.
Discussion of clothing and materials of seventeenth-century Virginia.

Faulkner, Harold Underwood. America: Its History and People. Washington, D. C.: Harper Brothers, 1944.
Information on economic conditions in the eighteenth century.

Haynie, Miriam. The Stronghold: a story of historic Northern Neck of Virginia and its people. Richmond: Dietz Press, Inc., 1959.
Notes on clothing sent to the Northern Neck from England during the eighteenth century.

Hume, Ivor Noel. Here Lies Virginia. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
Archaeological view of colonial life.

Millinery Shop Research Reports. By various workers at the millinery shop. Colonial Williamsburg. Reports on the milliners of colonial Williamsburg and on operation of the Margaret Hunter Shop.

Morton, Richard L. Colonial Virginia 2 Vols. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960. Political and economic history of Virginia.

Stanard, Mary Newton. Colonial Virginia, Its People and Customs. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1917. Section on dress includes items not found elsewhere, for example orders and letters from eighteenth-century Virginia.

Spruill, Julia Cherry. Women's Life and Work in the Southern Colonies. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938. General information on eighteenth-century women as well as section on clothing in the eighteenth century.

Journals and Historical Series

Lower Norfolk County Virginia Antiquary, 1897-1906.

Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine, 1919ff.

Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, 1893- .

William and Mary Quarterly, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd series, 1892- .

Dictionaries

Carmichael, W. L., George E. Linton, and Issac Price, eds. Callaway Textile Dictionary. La Grange, Ga.: Callaway Mills, 1947.

Craigie, William, and James R. Halbert eds. A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles 4 Vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Encyclopedia of Textiles. By the editors of American Fabrics Magazine. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

Linton, George E., et al. eds. The Modern Textile Dictionary. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1954.

Marks, Stephen S., ed. Fairchild's Dictionary of Textiles. New York: Fairchild Publications, Inc., 1959.

The Oxford English Dictionary. 12 Vols. and supplement.

Wright, Joseph. The English Dialect Dictionary 6 Vols.
London: Henry Frowde, 1898.

Wright, Thomas, ed. Dictionary of Obsolete and Provincial
English 2 Vols. London: George Bell and Sons, 1893.

VITA

NANCY LOU OBERSEIDER

Born in Fort Monroe, Virginia, August 6, 1940.

Traveled widely in the United States and Europe.

Graduated from Warwick High School in Newport News, Virginia, in 1957. Two years at East Carolina College in Greenville, North Carolina. Junior year on scholarship at the East-West Center at the University of Hawaii. Received A.B. from the University of Maryland in June 1963.

Entered the College of William and Mary in September 1964 in the Department of History.