'Cutting One's Coat According to One's Cloth': the Clothes of an Unremarkable Woman in the Seventeenth Century

Barbara Allison

SUMMARY

Several projects to transcribe the probate documents of Oxfordshire have given local historians the opportunity to study a variety of aspects of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century life. This article looks at one aspect revealed by these documents – women's clothing. It examines the women who made bequests of clothes and tries to discover what a yeoman's widow might have worn, based on a detailed inventory of 1631, that of Elizabeth Temple.

Probate documents provide one of the most important sources of information about the lives of people in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, making it possible to examine their housing and furniture, their trades, agriculture, and clothing, as well as their family and business relationships, and to build up a picture of life in towns and villages.[1] A number of projects to transcribe the probate documents for the market towns in Oxfordshire have been undertaken. Those for Thame, Woodstock, Chipping Norton, Burford, Banbury, and Bicester have been transcribed, and those for Deddington and Henley are in progress.[2] These projects will provide local historians in the county with an invaluable source of information for the early modern period.

This study looks at the evidence for women's clothing in the transcripts for the parishes of the West Oxfordshire market towns of Burford, Chipping Norton, and Woodstock. The documents can help to answer specific questions about the items of clothing 'ordinary' women wore, the fabrics and colours used, and whether these changed during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Before addressing these questions, however, the documents need to be examined to assess the characteristics of the women in the transcripts.

WOMEN'S PROBATE RECORDS

The probate documents used in this analysis were proved in the church courts of the diocese of Oxford in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But a few were proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury and usually concerned women whose assets were located in more than one diocese.

Table 1 shows the number of probate documents that survive for women in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries for the parishes of Burford, Chipping Norton, and Woodstock. Of the three, Burford was the largest, with a population in 1641 of about 1,100 people, Chipping Norton had about 1,000, and Woodstock about 600.[3] But the survival rate of documents is much higher

1 See Antony Buxton, 'Domestic culture in early seventeenth-century Thame,' *Oxoniensia*, 67, 2002, p. 79**;** Joan Dils and Deirdre Schwartz, *Tudor and Stuart Shrivenham* (Reading, 2004); Barrie Trinder and Jeff Cox, *Yeomen and Colliers of Telford* (Chichester, 1980).

2 Transcripts for Burford, Woodstock, and Chipping Norton are at ORO; the Burford transcripts will shortly be available online.

3 The population estimates are based on Barbara Allison, 'The towns of West Oxfordshire in the late seventeenth century: their populations and hinterlands' (Oxford, M.Sc. dissertation, 2005). The parish population for Burford and Chipping Norton can be obtained by multiplying the total parish data on p. 8 by 3. The Woodstock data is on p. 19 and that for the three towns on p. 11.

TABLE 1. WOMEN'S PROBATE DOCUMENTS

	Burford	Chipping Norton	Woodstock	*Totals*
POPULATION estimate for 1641: parish (town)	1100 (1000)	1000 (850)	600 (600)	
PEOPLE with probate documents of all types 1500–1700				
Total of men & women	453	553	342	*1348*
Total of women	73	91	64	*228*
WOMEN with wills and/or inventories	63	81	52	*196*
Women with inventories only	12	10	6	*28*
WOMEN with wills:	51	71	46	*168*

for Chipping Norton, which, with documents for 553 people, is about a hundred people more than Burford and two hundred more than Woodstock. Of the surviving probate documents, 228 concern women, and 196 of them are wills and inventories, documents which may include details of clothes. Of these, 168 women's wills survive, the difference accounted for by women for whom there is only an inventory surviving.

Women in this period were described by their marital status – wife, widow, or spinster – although even this was sometimes omitted from the documents. However, the property of married women belonged legally to their husbands, so they did not normally make wills.[4] Those who did make them, and for whom inventories were drawn up, were overwhelmingly widows: out of the total of 228 women with probate documents, 190 were widows, and only 6 were wives. The remainder were spinsters or women whose marital status is unknown.

It is likely that the majority of these women were not young. Some evidence to support this can be found in the wills. Many women made bequests to grandchildren: in Burford, for example, twenty-three out of the fifty-one women who made wills mentioned their grandchildren in them. As women tended to marry in their middle 20s in the early modern period,[5] a woman was likely to be in her late 40s to early 50s before becoming a grandmother. Evidence from other sources, such as parish registers, also rarely give ages, either for men or women. For example, the Burford burial register gives the ages of only four out of the seventy-two women who left probate documents, probably because they were 'aged' and in their 70s and 80s.

The fact that women were described by their marital status adds to the difficulties of determining their social status. It is apparent from the details in men's wills and the value of their estates that many local probate documents concerned the 'middling sort' – yeomen and husbandmen, local businessmen, such as tanners and butchers, men involved in local government, who acted as appraisers and overseers of one another's estates, and whose names appeared in town records. It is possible to identify the husbands of about four in ten of the widows whose probate documents survive, and the results are shown in Table 2. The women's husbands have been identified from their (putative) husbands' wills, and cross-checked with their own wills for family members. Other sources have not been used. In all, the husbands of eighty-four women can be identified along with their status and/or occupations.

The total number of husbands with identified occupations is greater than the number of women, as some women married several times.

[4] There were some exceptions, such as when an agreement had been made on marriage that a woman might dispose of some or all of her property as she wished. See the will of a married women, Alice Jones (Burford, 1639): 'I give … fourscore pounds … by virtue of certaine articles indented at our marriage, I had power to dispose [of]'. In general, see Tom Arkell, Nesta Evans, and Nigel Goose, eds, *When Death Do Us Part: Understanding and Interpreting the Probate Records of Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2000), p. 22.

[5] See Keith Wrightson, *English Society, 1580 to 1680* (London, 1982), pp. 67–8.

TABLE 2. WOMEN'S HUSBANDS

Number of women	**Burford**	**Chipping Norton**	**Woodstock**	***Totals***
With probate documents	73	91	64	*228*
Who were widows and wives	65	75	56	*195*
Whose husbands can be identified	39	38	31	*108*
Whose husbands' status/occupation can be identified	30	29	25	*84*
Number of husbands by status/occupation				
Gentlemen	3	3	10	*16*
Yeomen & farmers	7	4	2	*13*
Husbandmen	3	6	1	*10*
Shepherds & labourers	0	2	3	*5*
Vicar	0	1	0	*1*
Clerk	1	0	0	*1*
Innholders	2	0	3	*5*
Craftsmen & tradesmen	17	13	8	*38*
Totals	*33*	*29*	*27*	*89*

The largest groups are the 'middling sort', as expected and described above, but there is also a sizeable group of gentlemen. They include men such as Sir Lawrence Tanfield, lord of the manor of Burford, and the innholder of Woodstock, John Gibbs, who is described as a gentleman by his contemporaries. At the other end of the social scale there are a few labourers, such as Katherine Evan's husband, Owen, from Chipping Norton. The differences between the three towns is interesting, with more gentlemen coming from Woodstock, more yeomen from Burford, and more husbandmen from Chipping Norton, which has the large rural village of Over Norton in its parish. But this sample concerns only the identified husbands of the women in the probate records, and so is not a good sample of all men and their occupations and status in these parishes.

How rich or poor the women were is also difficult to assess. The best proxy measure is the size of the inventories made after they died. But the inventories only measured 'moveable goods' and often omitted assets such as land and property, and debts.[6] Jane Gibbs of Woodstock (1692) for instance, mentioned in her will the £100 her brother owed her, but this debt was not included in her inventory.

Assessing women's wealth on the basis of their inventories may also give a misleading impression of their standard of living or position in society. Many widows were left the use of their husbands' possessions for their lifetimes, and at their death the goods had to be passed to the heirs named in their husbands' wills. A woman with a seemingly small estate might well have enjoyed a much better standard of living than the size of her estate implies. One such example is Elizabeth Temple of Burford, who died in 1631, and whose inventory is discussed below. The goods in the inventory were valued at only £2 3*s.* 2*d.*, but she had the use of the 'goods and chattles' mentioned in her husband's will, worth £45 5*s.* 6*d.*, for her lifetime. Because she had only a lifetime interest in these goods, they did not count as part of her estate.

Despite all these caveats, it is still useful to look at estimates of the minimum size of the women's estates, given either by their inventory values, or from the total of monetary bequests in their wills if no inventory value exists, as an indicator of wealth. Table 3 shows that estate estimates can be made for 159 out of the 196 women who left wills and/or inventories, and that about three quarters of them had estates estimated at under £100. This was mainly due to the large numbers of women with estates of low value in Chipping Norton.

[6] See Arkell, Evans, and Goose, eds, *When Death Do Us Part,* pp. 30–4, for further discussion

TABLE 3. WOMEN'S WILLS AND INVENTORIES BY SIZE OF ESTATE

	Number of women			
	Burford	**Chipping Norton**	**Woodstock**	***Totals***
Number of women with wills and/or inventories				
Total	63	81	52	*196*
Estates where the inventory value is known, or money bequests can be calculated.	53	65	41	*159*
Wills & inventories by estimated estate value				
Small: up to £20	17	29	15	*61*
Medium: £20 to £100	17	27	13	*57*
Large: £100 to £500	15	9	13	*37*
Very large: over £500	4	0	0	*4*
Total	*53*	*65*	*41*	*159*

TABLE 4. CLOTHING IN WOMEN'S PROBATE DOCUMENTS

	Burford	**Chipping Norton**	**Woodstock**	***Totals***
Number of women				
With wills and/or inventories	63	81	52	*196*
With wills and/or inventories that mention clothes	44	56	31	*131*
How clothing is mentioned				
Only total value of clothes given in the inventories	15	16	13	*44*
Clothes left to named legatee in the will	8	2	6	*16*
One to three garments mentioned	7	11	7	*25*
Over three garments mentioned	14	27	5	*46*
Total	*44*	*56*	*31*	*131*

TABLE 5. WOMEN'S WILLS AND CLOTHING BY SIZE OF ESTATE

	Number of women			
	Burford	**Chipping Norton**	**Woodstock**	***Totals***
Number of women with				
Wills and/or inventories	63	81	52	*196*
Wills	51	71	46	*168*
Wills with details of clothing	18	34	13	*65*
Wills with details of clothing where the estate value can be estimated	12	26	11	*49*
Wills with clothing by estimated estate size				
Small: up to £20	3	12	3	*18*
Medium: £20 to £100	3	12	2	*17*
Large: £100 to £500	4	2	6	*12*
Very large: over £500	2	0	0	*2*
Total	*12*	*26*	*11*	*49*

In conclusion, the women in this sample were likely to be in their 50s or older, the widows of local tradesmen and craftsmen, and have estates estimated at under £100. There were exceptions – younger widows without grandchildren mentioned in their wills, the widows of gentlemen and of labourers, and a few women with very large estates.

WOMEN'S CLOTHES IN THE PROBATE DOCUMENTS

Of the 196 women with wills and inventories, clothes are mentioned in 131. Generally a total figure for their value is given in inventories, as is the case for forty-four women, while in wills women either left all their clothes to named people, or individual garments to particular friends and relatives. It is in the wills that occasionally more detailed descriptions about the range of garments and their fabric, trims, and so on can be found (see Table 4).

Chipping Norton has a particularly good set of wills and inventories which describe clothes in some detail for thirty-eight women, while Woodstock has relatively few, only twelve. The wills in particular reflect the women's own concerns, and it is interesting to see if women with smaller estates, and therefore less to bequeath, were more particular about who should inherit their clothes.

Table 5 shows that there were forty-nine wills in which women gave details about their clothes, and where it is possible to estimate the minimum size of their estate. Inventories are excluded, as they reflect the appraisers' priorities, not the women's. Overall, there are roughly the same number of wills for each estate size, except those over £500. There certainly is no clear evidence that women with smaller estates were more likely to go into detail about who should inherit their clothes than women who were better off.

WOMEN'S CLOTHING IN WILLS

Typically, then, in their wills women either left 'all my Apparrell wearinge Lynnen and Woollen',[7] to named people, or they listed the recipient of each garment. The most common way they differentiated their clothes was to describe them as 'my best' or 'my everyday' or even 'my worst'. This implies that legatees were able to distinguish the best from, say, the third best, and that there may have been little else to distinguish such garments. Katherine Howtchyn of Chipping Norton, for example, left her 'best gown a kercheffe and smock' to her daughter Susan in 1556, obviously thinking Susan would know which gown she meant. However, a few women did go into more detail about fabrics, trims, and fashion: for example, in 1592 Florraunce Condall of Woodstock bequeathed 'My mockadow gowne with velvet cape and best hat to Margaret Wilkynson my goddaughter', and to 'Joan Fletcher, widow, one olde worsted kyrtell'.

The 'status' of a particular garment could be important, because it was an indication of its value. From the medieval period onwards clothes were precious items and were one of the ways in which people held their wealth. This meant that they were bequeathed by both men and women in the same way as money, land, property, and valuable household items. Evidence from the probate documents supports this notion of value by suggesting that clothes might be remodelled – unstitched, recut, and resewn into new garments. Alice Bocher of Burford, for example, left one of her red petticoats to her grandson in 1556 'to make him a cote'. Joane Band of Chipping Norton left her grandchildren 'one petycoat a smocke and a wastcoate to make them cloathes' in 1614.

Clothes could also be used as pledges for cash loans. In 1631 the inventory of Nicholas Temple referred to 'a goune, a hatt being a paune for 11 shillings'. And of course they could be sold in the local market, for there is evidence for second-hand clothes dealers in England from the thirteenth

[7] Will of Jane Carrick, 1627, Chipping Norton.

century onwards.[8] A possible example is provided by Margaret Androwes of Chipping Norton, who in 1578 left her 'beste frocke' to Thomas and Anne Mysson, probably her grandchildren. Since Thomas could not have worn it, the intention was probably that they should sell it and share the proceeds. Bequests of clothes, like those of household items, could also be seen as a way of recognizing social obligations to relatives, friends neighbours and servants: 'a need to thank and acknowledge small favours … a sense of attachment to material goods … to help out family and friends in need.'[9]

WOMEN'S CLOTHING IN INVENTORIES

Inventories usually provided less detail about clothes than wills. When appraisers listed a woman's assets, they would just give a total figure for the value of the clothes. Anne Rawson of Burford's inventory of 1621 is typical: 'the testators wearing apparel praised at 5s'. It is perhaps worth making the point that appraisers were men, who would have been unlikely to have had the same interest in clothes as women. Predictably the same method was applied to clothes in their own inventories, which were also given a total value.

Occasionally more detail would be given of women's clothes, as it was for Jane Hutchins of Chipping Norton in 1628. Here the appraisers listed her clothes individually and gave them the overall value of £6 6*s.* 8*d.* Even more occasionally they would make a full list of clothes, giving the value of each item. A good example is that of Elizabeth Temple of Burford.

ELIZABETH TEMPLE

Elizabeth Temple was the widow of a Burford man, Nicholas Temple, and she was buried in July 1631, about six months after her husband. Nothing is known about her directly: she died intestate, and neither her marriage nor the baptisms of any children is recorded in the parish registers, which began only in 1612–13. There are some details of her husband's relatives in his will – cousins of the same surname, and his son-in-law, Francis Morris. Francis could have been the husband of Nicholas's (and Elizabeth's?) daughter, or he might have been Nicholas's stepson, perhaps from an earlier marriage of Elizabeth, or he might have been married to the child of a previous wife of Nicholas. There is no direct mention of children or grandchildren. It is difficult to judge therefore how old Elizabeth was when she died. Her husband was a yeoman: he described himself as one in his will, and his peers agreed, as they also called him a yeoman in his inventory. Yeoman is a difficult term to define in this context, because it was more usually applied to substantial farmers. Nicholas does not appear to have been one. There is no mention of crops or animals or agricultural or trade equipment in his will or inventory. He left an estate worth £45 5*s.* 6*d.*, of which £24 12*s.* 10*d.* was accounted for by money he had lent out. It is possible that he was not actively engaged in either farming or trading but lived on the interest from loans. In that case, his status as a yeoman derived from his wealth, rather than from farming or landholding. He does not appear to have been a prominent townsman – he is rarely mentioned in other Burford documents – so it probably owed little to his position in the town.

There appear to have been some other 'urban yeomen' in Burford. In the probate documents forty-two men are described as yeomen, and only ten of them are clearly farmers. Of the remainder, fourteen appear, like Nicholas, to have had no connection with farming. Nicholas's

[8] Rodney Hilton, 'Lords, burgesses and hucksters', in *Class Conflict and the Crisis of Feudalism* (London, 1985), pp. 198, 201. For the early modern period see Beverly Lemire, 'The trade in second-hand clothes: consumerism in pre-industrial and early industrial England', *Journal of British Studies,* 27 (1988), pp. 1–24**;** Donald Woodward, 'Swords into ploughshares: recycling in pre-industrial England', *EconHR*, 38 (1985), pp. 175–91.

[9] Amy Louise Erickson, *Women and Property in Early Modern England* (London, 1993), p. 209.

assets of £45 5*s.* 6*d.* are midway in size compared with the other so-called yeomen: of eleven out of the fourteen for whom there are inventory values, five have less and five have more assets than Nicholas. 'Urban yeomen' seem to have been of middling status, not part of the urban elite in larger towns, but distinct from the mass of the people. In small market towns, they could form part of the local elite, and serve as burgesses: in Burford for example, a third of the yeomen who left probate documents can be identified as burgesses.[10] It is possible that some of them did originally spring from rural yeoman stock, for there was considerable migration from country to town at this period.

Nicholas left his estate to Elizabeth for her lifetime, and then it was to go to his 'cossen' Ambrose Berry, a long-lived Burford tailor, who died in 1690 'aged 87', according to the Burford burial register – a rare example of the age of the deceased being stated. Ambrose was also the administrator for Elizabeth's estate: she clearly had no other relatives with a prior claim to act in the probate process. He did not appraise Elizabeth's possessions for her inventory, but his influence may have caused a more than usually detailed inventory of her clothes to be made, especially as her only other possessions were a few coins.

Elizabeth was the widow of a man of middling status in Burford. Her role would have been to 'see that her husband was comfortable, that his children were fed, clothed, disciplined, and educated, and that his servants behaved themselves and worked hard'.[11] She was expected to have the practical skills necessary to achieve these objectives and to be fully occupied in doing so. John Fitzherbert in *The Boke of Husbandry* (1548) lists some of the jobs expected of a women: baking and brewing, making butter and cheese, growing vegetables and herbs, preparing meals, cleaning and washing, perhaps growing hemp and flax and preparing them for spinning, making household items, such as napkins and blankets, making linen items, to say nothing of supervising her servants and children.[12] This meant that Elizabeth's clothes needed to be practical.

ELIZABETH TEMPLE'S CLOTHES (see Table 6)

What were these practical clothes? Elizabeth's clothes were, as might be expected, a collection of inner and outer garments, with some accessories. The garment worn next to the skin was the smock, the seventeenth-century term for what was later known as a shift and then a chemise. It was a loose, all-enveloping dress, rather like a modern long-sleeved nightdress. It was almost certainly made of linen. The neckline might have varied, being either bound with fabric, or with a collar, or even V-shaped. It was unlikely to have been very low for women such as Elizabeth. The sleeves might have had cuffs, or possibly were only wrist length to allow them to be rolled up for working. The neckline and cuffs of the well-to-do might have shown above the outer garments, and even been edged in lace. The length of the smock might indicate status: if a woman did not have to do a lot of manual work, her smock and other garments would reach the ground. Elizabeth's probably did not.

Over her smock Elizabeth might have worn her pair of bodies, a garment like a corset, but possibly made well enough to be on view. It was sleeveless, probably made of linen, with stitching down the front to form thin channels into which boning of whalebone, dried reeds (which were called 'bents'), or wood could be inserted. There was usually a wide central channel into which a piece of wood was put. The bodies was lined and also faced with a better quality, woollen fabric. Elizabeth might have worn her pair of bodies under a more loosely made jacket in winter, or her bodies alone in the summer. Although they were on sale locally – a mercer in Charlbury, for

[10] I am grateful to Heather Horner for the data on Burford yeomen and burgesses.

[11] Alison Sim, *The Tudor Housewife* (Stroud, 1996), p. 31.

[12] There are several editions of this book. See, e.g., J. Roberts, ed., *Fitzharberts* [sic] *Booke of Husbandrie* (London, 1598), bk 4, ch. 29, pp. 175–8.

TABLE 6. INVENTORY OF ELIZABETH TEMPLE, 1631

An inventory of the wearing apparrell
of Elizabeth Temple Wedowe decessed
taken the ith day of October 1631 vizt
and praysed by those p(ar)ties hereunder written

Imprim(is) j cloth goune at	v s	vj d
It(em) 2 cloth wastcotts at	iiij s	
It(em) 2 red petticotes at	xij s	
It(em) 2 White smock petticotes at	iij s	
It(em) j hatt & band at	3s	4d
ij smockes at	iij s	
It(em) iiij charcliffes at	viij s	
It(em) 4 canvis approues & j Holland apperne	3s	4d
It(em) j gren lynciwolsy apper(ne)		4d
It(em) 4 partlets & j ould partlet more	iiij s	
It(em) j pere of gloves		xiiij d
It(em) j pere of shoes		xiiij d
It(em) j pere of bodis		vij d
It(e)m monney in her purse		xiij d
Sum(m)a totales	xliij s	ij d

Praysers

David Hewes
Richard Wyat
his marke
David Berry

Probate was granted on 16 March 1632 to Ambrose Berry the administrator of her estate

Elizabeth Temple, 1632, Oxfordshire Record Office, MS Wills Oxon 175/1/3

example, had both large and small bodies for 2*s.* and 1*s.* 4*d.* each[13] – only one pair of bodies is found in each of the inventories for Burford, Chipping Norton, and Woodstock. The price implies that they were worn by the 'middling sort'. If women did not wear bodies, then any support they needed would have come from stiffening, quilting, or boning in other garments they wore.

One study suggests that boned bodies came into fashion in the 1590s and spread down the social scale to ordinary young women during the reign of James I. The few mentions of bodies that occur in the wills and inventories of the less well-off are in those of young girls or unmarried women. This may provide a clue to Elizabeth's age.[14] She could have been a girl at the turn of the century and so only in her 30s or 40s when she died.

Over the top of her smock Elizabeth would have worn her petticoats. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, 'petticoat' had several meanings. Petticoats might be petticoats in the modern sense – an underskirt, typically worn under a gown. But by the end of the sixteenth century ordinary women wore 'separates', that is, a jacket and a skirt, and by then 'petticoat' had also come to mean a skirt. Elizabeth had both sorts of petticoat – two smock petticoats, clearly underskirts, and two red petticoats, which were probably her skirts. Her red petticoats were worth a great deal more than her white (that is, undyed) smock ones – 6*s.* each, compared with 1*s.* 6*d.* each, which indicates that the red ones were her skirts. Both were likely to have been made of wool. Elizabeth's top garment was referred to as a waistcoat. In the seventeenth century this was the name given to a fitted, sleeved, collarless short jacket. It would also have been made of wool and might well have been stiffened further with lining fabric and even cardboard. A surviving example of a boy's jacket, found in the walls of the merchant's house in East St Helen's Street, Abingdon, is stiffened with paper and with a coarse, gummed linen, possibly buckram.[15] Jackets would have been tailored to fit at the waist and then to flare out slightly over the hips.

Elizabeth also had a cloth gown. Seventeenth-century gowns came in several styles. They could be like modern dressing gowns, that is, sleeved, loose gowns, worn over other clothes and tied at the waist. They could also be fitted at the bodice and left open in the front of the skirt, so that the petticoat showed. They could be for informal wear, a sort of leisure dress, for protection in inclement weather, or for best, as a way of smartening up everyday wear.[16]

Elizabeth's cloth gown was valued at 5*s.* 6*d.*, which was less than the average value of 6*s.* given for her red petticoats. Similarly, her cloth waistcoats were worth 2*s.* on average. It may be that this lower value was due either to the use of a superior fabric to make the red petticoats or that they were newer garments. But another reason is possible. The petticoats might have contained more re-usable fabric than the gown,[17] and a lot more than the waistcoats, and so would have fetched a better price when sold. This is despite the fact than both gown and waistcoats would have had more workmanship in them, from the cutting out of the fabric pieces to the addition of the lining and stiffening and the more complicated sewing. The red petticoats would probably have been only two straight pieces of fabric gathered on a waistband, requiring no stiffening, and with easy sewing. This admittedly small piece of evidence indicates that the second-hand value of an item of clothing could lie in the quantity of material that could be recycled.

Elizabeth's smocks, bodies, petticoats, waistcoats, and gown were her main items of clothing. She also had numerous aprons, both an essential part of everyday wear and also a fashion item. A woman would have had several qualities of apron, some for chores and some for best. It is clear

[13] David Vaisey, 'A Charlbury mercer's shop 1623 [1632]', *Oxoniensia*, 31 (1966), p. 111.

[14] Jane Huggett, *Clothes of the Common Woman, 1580–1660* (Bristol, 2001), p. 13.

[15] Leanne C. Tonkin: 'Brought back into the light of day – unlocking a facet into boyswear production in the early seventeenth century', M.A. dissertation (Southampton, 2007), pp. 8–11.

[16] Huggett, *Clothes of the Common Woman*, p. 18; Norah Waugh, *The Cut of Women's Clothes, 1600–1930* (London, 1968), p. 25.

[17] For estimates of fabric used in metres, see the reproduction garments in Huggett, *Clothes of the Common Woman*, pp. 35–8.

which were which for Elizabeth: her canvas ones (canvas was a less heavy cloth then than now) were for work, perhaps her holland one for summer best, and the linsey-wolsey one for winter. One possibility is that this apron, because it was valued at only 4*d.*, was a mere slip of an apron, and therefore just for show.[18] Elite women also wore aprons. There is one on the effigy of Lady Elizabeth Tanfield (one of the women in the Burford probate documents) on her tomb in Burford church (see Plate 10).

Elizabeth Temple had four 'charcliffes' and five partlets. 'Charcliffe' was probably a local word for neckerchief, a square piece of fabric, probably linen, folded in half triangularly and put round the shoulders. It does not occur elsewhere in local documents. A partlett was a varied garment: it could be a fabric infill, worn over or under the low necklines of the time for modesty, or a type of collar worn over a waistcoat or gown, or a sort of upper bodice worn for warmth. It appears to have been a normal part of everyday dress, as well as a fashion item, and valuable enough to be mentioned occasionally in wills. It could be made of any fabric. Elizabeth had several, and some would have been for best.

Elizabeth's inventory lists also her hat and band. In this context the band was likely to be a piece of ribbon or something similar tied round the base of the crown of the hat, rather than its more usual meaning of a collar. She also had one pair of shoes and a pair of gloves. At this time no distinction was made between left and right shoes; they were both the same. Both shoes and gloves, at 1*s.* 6*d.* a pair, were valuable.

Some items which a respectable woman of the time would have worn are not in the inventory, which illustrates one of the problems of using inventory evidence to reconstruct domestic circumstances. The deceased's family might well have removed items before the inventory was made. In Elizabeth's case her inventory was made in October 1631, two months after her death, for reasons that are not clear, and valuable items could have been removed in the interim. At the other end of the scale, appraisers would include only clothing that they felt had any value: they might omit items which were in use but possibly not worth much, such as clouts (or rags), used as nappies. There is no mention of Elizabeth's coifs, which were close-fitting linen caps, often at this time embroidered and worn with a triangular forehead (or cross-) cloth over the top. Coifs are rarely mentioned in wills, but cross-cloths are slightly more common. Elizabeth would have worn stockings as well as shoes. These were likely to be knitted (probably on three to five needles),[19] could have been of any length, and were probably held up by a garter. There is no mention of knickers, or drawers, to use the seventeenth-century term. This is not surprising, for evidence suggests that few women wore them before the eighteenth century.[20] There is also no mention of any protective outer garments, unless Elizabeth's gown is counted as such.

WERE ELIZABETH'S CLOTHES TYPICAL?

Given the problems of assessing Elizabeth's wardrobe as a whole, how typical were her clothes? For comparative purposes, Table 7 summarizes the information about clothes from the probate records of all three parishes. There is no other Burford inventory which gives a woman's clothes in such detail as Elizabeth's, but in her will of 1604 Joane Taylor of Burford bequeathed her clothes to her daughter in such a way as to give the impression that she was listing all of them. She referred to 'my three Gownes', 'twoe of my best white Apernes', and so on. Remarkably she didn't mention any waistcoats. It may be, given the date, that her gowns were her main item of clothing and that her petticoats were underskirts, designed to be worn with her gowns.

[18] I am grateful to Mary Hodges for this suggestion.

[19] Huggett, *Clothes of the Common Woman*, p. 29; Ninya Mikhaila and Jane Malcolm-Davies, *The Tudor Tailor* (London, 2006), p. 39.

[20] C. Willett and Phillis Cunnington, *The History of Underclothes* (London 1951, repr. New York, 1992), p. 52.

TABLE 7. CLOTHING LEFT BY SEVENTEETH-CENTURY WOMEN

Name & Place	Date of Inventory	Details of the main clothes	Value of clothes	Total Inventory value (if known)
1. Burford				
Joane Taylor	1604 (Will only)	3 gowns 1 petticoat 1 under petticoat 3 smocks 4+ aprons A cloak	Not known (will only)	Not given
Elizabeth Temple	1632	1 gown 2 waistcoats 2 petticoats 2 smock petticoat 2 smocks 6 aprons 1 pair of bodies, etc.	£2 2*s.* 0*d.*	£2 3*s.* 2*d.* (but her husband's inventory was £45 5*s.* 6*d.*)
2. Chipping (& Over) Norton				
Margery Cross	1595	2 gowns 1 waistcoat 2 petticoats 2 smocks etc	£1 0*s.* 0*d.*	£4 2*s.* 4*d.*
Alice Deacon	1600	1 gown 3 waistcoats 3 petticoats & 2 half kirtles 2 smocks	16*s.*	£6 8*s.* 6*d.*
Jane Hutchins	1628	3 gowns 2 cloaks 4 petticoats, etc.	£1 11*s.* 6*d.*	£92 15*s.* 2*d.*, of which £80 was debts owed to her
Edith Fisher	1662	3 gowns 3 waistcoats 7 petticoats 1 pair of bodies a riding suit, etc	£15, including her purse & Bible	£173 2*s.* 6*d.*
Mary Hathaway	1671	1 gown 4 waistcoats petticoats other apparel	£5	£94 17*s.* 6*d.*, including about £70 of money & debt owing to her
3. Woodstock				
Florraunce Condall	1592 (Will only)	3 gowns 2 kirtles 1 waistcoat 2 petticoats 2 smocks etc	Not known (will only)	Not given
Alice Rayner	1626	3 gowns 3 petticoats 4 pair of bodies £8 worth of silk clothes 3 hats	£10 10*s.* 0*d.*	£218 17*s.* 8*d.*, of which £157 10*s.* was owed to her

Five inventories which do give more details of clothes (but without the detailed prices attached to Elizabeth's) survive for Chipping Norton. They appear very similar: gowns and petticoats occur in all of them, and waistcoats in four. A similar impression comes from evidence for the Woodstock women's clothes, although there is an inventory for only one of the two, Alice Rayner's, dated 1626. She had four pairs of bodies, as well as some expensive, but sadly unspecified, silk clothes worth £8.

Two out of the nine women, Alice Deacon and Florraunce Condall, had kirtles or half-kirtles. Kirtles were originally one piece, shoulder-length garments worn under a gown and over a smock. In 1538 Isabelle Tanty of Chipping Norton had a 'gown ... and a under kyrtyll thereunto'. By the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century the meaning of the term was changing. By then a kirtle probably meant a skirt, but with a bodice, probably in the same material, to hold the skirt up. Petticoats may also have had bodices as a way of holding them up, but were just as likely to have been kept in place with a waistband and ties. Half-kirtles have always meant skirts with bodices. Alice Deacon had three petticoats and two half-kirtles in her inventory: the appraisers easily distinguished between the two types of garment, which suggests that her kirtles had bodices and her petticoats did not

From the slight evidence given here, it is possible to suggest the type of clothes that a respectable woman would have possessed. She would probably have had between one and three smocks, perhaps a pair or two of bodies, two to three petticoats, several waistcoats, several gowns, and numerous aprons. Her gowns might have been her main garment, but for general wear it is likely that she would have worn one or more petticoats and a waistcoat over her smock.

FABRICS AND CLOTHES: LINEN AND WOOL

It is clear from the probate evidence that most clothes were made from linen or wool. The phrase, like that in the will of Mary Silvester of Burford in 1654, 'all my weareing apparrell both Linnen and Woollen' is very common. Taking linen first, it could have been made from flax, hemp, or nettles and then woven to make many different varieties of the fabric. *The Plain Dealing Linen Draper* of 1696 lists twenty-five different linens suitable for making smocks and men's shirts.[21] Smocks, aprons, coifs, cross-cloths, and kerchiefs were all commonly made of linen.

Linens were manufactured in Britain and also imported, where their names reflect their places of origin: the Charlbury mercer's inventory of 1623[22] contained linens called hollons (from Holland) and osenbriges (from Osnaburg), though by this time, similar linens were being made in Britain and possibly sold using the continental name. It is not uncommon to find quantities of hemp, and linen spinning-wheels (also called 'torns'), in Oxfordshire inventories, which implies that some women spun their own home-grown hemp. Fitzherbert's household manual lists some of the duties of a farmer's wife as growing her own hemp and flax, and from them making sheets, shirts, and other things.[23] It does not make clear whether the housewife should weave and then sew her linen clothes. The absence of references to looms in the sources, however, suggests that the spun thread was woven by local weavers. Very occasionally a document describes a fabric as 'home-made', as does Joane Browne's of Woodstock in 1624. It is likely that this meant home-spun but woven by a local weaver.

Hemp generally made a coarser linen than flax. Appraisers appeared able to distinguish between hemp linen and better quality flax linen, such as hollands, and would often specify the fabrics used

[21] Quoted in Margaret Spufford, *The Great Reclothing of Rural England: Petty Chapmen and their Wares in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1984), p. 118.

[22] Vaisey, 'A Charlbury mercer's shop', p. 112.

[23] *Fitzharberts Booke of Husbandrie*, p. 176.

in table linen. The lack of such specification of the linen garments in the inventories here implies that they were made from the coarser hemp linen. In only one inventory, that of Anne Rogers of Burford of 1629, is the linen for a smock specified as hollands. Several women had aprons made of hollands, and Elizabeth also had canvas aprons for workdays, and a linsey-woolsey, a wool-linen mix, apron for best.

It is likely that the linen garments, such as smocks and aprons – unstructured, loose clothes – were made at home. Mercers' and chapmen's inventories contain many types of cheap linen cloth, thread, needles, hooks and eyes, ribbons, and other haberdashery items suitable for home sewing. But women's inventories rarely contain sewing items: in Chipping Norton in 1618 Judith Averell had £4-worth of 'sempstrie ware', but this was the sewing equipment used to make shoes, for her husband had been a shoemaker.

There were also many different types of woollen fabric, the most common ones in the inventories being 'cloth' and 'stuff', both used to make gowns, petticoats, and waistcoats. 'Cloth' had more than one meaning and was used both to describe a range of fabrics and as a generic term. Here it probably meant a heavy, plain woven woollen material, one of 'the old draperies'.[24] The 1640 inventory of a Chipping Norton mercer, Mark Preston, suggests that he sold five grades of 'cloth', at prices ranging from 8*d.* to 18*d.* per ell. This might have been woollen cloth, or it might have been linen, as it was more usual to price linen in ells and woollen cloth in yards.[25] Robert Morris suggests that as woollen 'cloth' is a heavy fabric, it was rarely used for women's clothing,[26] except for outer garments such as cloaks, but the evidence from these three Oxfordshire parishes shows that 'cloth' was used to make all the most commonly worn garments.

'Stuff' is also a generic term, but clearly used to refer to a range of lighter, worsted fabrics. Usually the testator and appraisers just described the fabric of a particular garment as 'stuff', but occasionally they would be more specific and write 'serge' or 'tammy'. These lighter weight materials were used to make gowns and petticoats. Mark Preston had in his shop a yard of green 'say', a thin fabric similar in appearance to serge, valued at 1*s.* 6*d.* Often 'stuffs' were mixed fabrics, using worsted and, for example, silk.

Most woollen clothes appear to have been made by tailors rather than housewives. Their skill lay in cutting out the fabric economically and carefully fitting it on to the clients. Occasionally glimpses of this can be found in wills: in 1576 Joan Fryers of Burford left her maid 'my fries gown that is a makinge at the Tallers'. It is possible that much of a tailor's business was the reprocessing of existing clothes, obtained as legacies or bought second-hand from markets and fairs.

Tailors' inventories can be puzzling. Few mention any fabrics, certainly not in any quantity, nor do they include second-hand clothes or partially completed garments, though they may have accessories and trimmings. For example, in 1605 a Burford tailor, Fulk Midwinter, had only remnants of material and a few oddments, such as ruffs and bands, in his inventory. Other local historians have found a similar lack of fabrics in tailors' inventories.[27] Tailors probably obtained their fabrics from local tradesmen, such as mercers and woollen drapers, only when they had a customer. One such mercer was John Minchin of Burford: in his inventory of 1694 he had over £145 worth of 'woollen cloth, serges and stuffs' in his Burford shop and probably the same fabrics in his shop at Filkins. He also stocked silks, linen goods, and at the end of the seventeenth century the new imported Indian muslins made of cotton. On the other hand, customers such as Elizabeth Temple might have bought the fabrics they wanted from the local large mercer and taken them to the tailor to be made up. Both probably occurred. Perhaps because of this, there were few rich

[24] For more detail about traded fabrics, see Nancy Cox and Karin Dannehl, *Dictionary of Traded Goods and Commodities 1550–1820* (sponsored by the University of Wolverhampton, 2007): *www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=739* (accessed 13 March 2009).

[25] Ibid.

[26] Robert Morris, *Clothes of the Common Woman, 1580–1660* (Bristol, 2000), p. 45

[27] See Trinder and Cox, *Yeomen and Colliers in Telford*, p. 65.

tailors at this time, judging from the inventory values, and as more money was likely to be made by trade rather than manufacture, it is likely that customers bought their own material. By the end of the century, however, this may have been changing. A Chipping Norton tailor, Robert Busby, had as much as £10-worth of 'Lyninge Cloth Coarse and fine' in his shop in 1684.

The colours of fabrics were occasionally given. The most common are red (for petticoats), white (meaning bleached but undyed), black (associated with mourning), and once or twice green and shades of brown. A few women had clothes made of silk fabrics: taffeta and grogram aprons are mentioned, a silk gorget, and several silk gowns.

It seems likely that a yeoman's widow such as Elizabeth Temple had heavyweight clothes in a narrow range of fairly dark colours. Special winter clothes, such as furs or outdoor cloaks, are not mentioned, leaving the impression that people put on more layers when the weather turned cold. For special days a best apron and partlett might be added.

What did Elizabeth's clothes look like? It is not the purpose of this article to discuss this question in great detail. Very few clothes worn by 'ordinary' women survive. There are some representations, either in woodcuts[28] or in drawings, such as those of Wenceslaus Hollar.[29] The Hollar drawing of a Country Woman, made in 1643, forms the basis of attempts to reconstruct the garments. One example is shown in Plate 11. In it the model is wearing a smock, waistcoat, and petticoat, with an apron, neckerchief, and coif.

READY-MADE CLOTHES

It is clear that small ready-made items were on sale. Thomas Harris, the mercer in Charlbury in 1632, sold stockings and belts, as well as large and small bodies, while Frances Davis of Chipping Norton had over twenty-one coifs in 1668, of which some were 'black work' or embroidered with black thread, as well as caps, hoods, and gloves, and eight thousand pins! According to his inventory of 1668, the Burford chapman Robert Davis sold gloves and hoods and 'one little bundle of made wares', worth £1 10*s.* The Chipping Norton tailor Robert Busby had twenty-one pairs of bodies, worth £3 3*s.* and ten pairs of 'fustine drawers' (fustian drawers for men) in 1684. But there is no evidence that tailors or mercers stocked larger ready-made garments, such as smocks or gowns.

CHANGING FASHIONS

The probate evidence, slight as it is, can be used to see if the garments women wore changed during the period. The main undergarment, the smock, is mentioned in inventories from 1556 to 1659. In her will of 1699 Katherine Andrews of Chipping Norton referred to her smock as a 'shift'. This was the eighteenth-century term for the same garment, and is a nice example of an early change in the use of words. The *Oxford English Dictionary* says that the change in word occurred because shift was regarded as a 'more "delicate" expression' than smock. Of the other linen garments, coifs are rarely mentioned, although until the 1630s aprons and neckerchiefs frequently appear.

Gowns also featured in the records throughout the period, but it is likely that the shape and use of the garments changed over time and with changing fashions. In 1556 Alice Lambarde of Burford had two 'frocks', one lined with fur, which were probably loose gowns. 'Cassocks', loose overcoats, are mentioned twice in the late sixteenth century. From the middle of the seventeenth century mantuas (also called manteau or mantos) became fashionable. They were loose gowns,

[28] See Morris, *Clothes of the Common Woman,* pp. 17–38, for illustrations and a discussion of the problems of using this source.

[29] For illustrations, see, e.g., www.z.about.com/d/womenshistory/1/0/1/1/hollar007d.400.jpg (accessed 31 July 2009).

probably made of lighter fabrics, 'the bodice unboned, joined to an overskirt, which had a long train behind and open in front' so that the fine petticoat could be seen.[30] Anne Draper, a wealthy Burford widow, who left over £870 in bequests in 1687, had three mantuas, one of black 'crape', a silk fabric, and two made out of fine wool. Each had its own petticoat. This is the only reference to mantuas in the documents. Because they were unstructured gowns, women could make them, and slowly a new craft developed, that of mantua-maker.[31] Another early use of a word in connection with women's clothes occurs in the records: Mary Hathaway of Chipping Norton had a 'sute [suit] of clothes' in 1671, according to her will. Charles II introduced the fashion for three-piece suits in the early 1660s, at that time meaning breeches hidden by a long waistcoat, and a coat, all made from the same fabric. Probably Mary Hathaway had several items of clothing, perhaps a waistcoat and petticoat, or a gown and petticoat, all made in the same material.[32] This is one of only two instances of the word 'suit' in connection with women's clothes in the documents, the other being 'a rideing suite', which occurs in the will of Alice Morgan of Burford in 1694.

References to petticoats are also found throughout the period, though it usually is not clear whether the garment is an underskirt or the skirt itself. Kirtles are commonly mentioned in the sixteenth century and into the seventeenth, though they were becoming old-fashioned by then. Margaret Ward of Burford in her will of 1625 is the last one to mention a kirtle.[33] She was probably an elderly lady who had kept the clothes of her youth. She was certainly old enough to have grandchildren, one of whom received a bequest.

Waistcoats are not mentioned as often as other garments, though they do occur throughout the period. Perhaps this was because they were tailored to fit, so less easily adapted to another person's shape and less welcome as bequests. The same could be said of pairs of bodies. They appear only in inventories, not in wills, and in one inventory in each town in 1626, 1632, and 1666. This would confirm other studies, which argue that the wearing of pairs of bodies had spread down the social scale in the first few decades of the seventeenth century. They were one of the few ready-made garments found in small-town tradesmen's inventories up to 1684, so clearly they were still worn by ordinary women well into the Restoration period.

References to partlets and neckerchiefs, especially in the Burford and Chipping Norton documents, are frequently found up to about the 1630s, but after that they disappear. They may have been the same garment,[34] although partlets and 'kerchiefs' occur together in most of the documents. Wealthier women mention scarves rather than neckerchiefs. Anne Rogers of Burford had several in 1629, and Anne Draper of Burford bequeathed 'to my daughter Claridge . . . my long alamode scarf' in 1687. This thin, glossy, black silk scarf was to go with her black crêpe mantua. The Burford chapman Robert Davis sold scarves, along with caps and hoods, as did other mercers and chapmen.

DISAPPEARING CLOTHES

Many studies have shown that women gradually stopped bequeathing clothes towards the end of the seventeenth century, and this study supports that conclusion. Out of almost 200 women whose probate documents survive, 168 left wills. From 1500 to 1599 about half of the wills mention clothes (27 out of 51 wills); and half from 1600 to 1649 (34 out of 68 wills). In the final period,

30 C. W. Cunnington, P. E. Cunnington, and Charles Beard, *A Dictionary of English Costume, 900–1900* (London, 1972), p. 133.

31 For a study of the development of this trade for women, see Elizabeth Sanderson, 'The new dresses; a look at how mantua-making became established in Scotland', *Costume,* 35 (2001), p. 14.

32 Cunnington, Cunnington, and Beard, *Dictionary of English Costume*, p. 207.

33 Margaret Ward is described as 'Mrs' in the burial register, a signifier of status.

34 For discussion see Huggett, *Clothes of the Common Woman* p. 26.

1650 to 1699, the number drops to about a third (18 out of 49). Most of this fall occurs in Chipping Norton and Woodstock.

In the sixteenth century women sometimes gave the impression of going through all their clothes when they made their wills, deciding who should inherit which garment. Joan Mitton of Chipping Norton in 1530 is a good example: 'to Anne ... my daughter my best gown ... to my daughter Alice my third gown, to Alice grene my fourth gown'. She did not make any cash bequests, except to the church.

In 1636 Margaret Brayne of Chipping Norton left her 'middlemost gowne' to her daughter, but did not say who got the best one or the others. Dorothy Gregory of Woodstock left her 'best gowne and my best petticoate' as well as a petticoat and other garments in 1661, but these wills were no longer typical. Increasingly wills were a long list of bequests of money rather than possessions. As an example of this change, in 1692 Alice Morgan of Burford left a long and detailed list of cash legacies, worth over £160, to twelve people. Her sister was among them and received £20. She was one of only two people to be left any clothes – a silk gown, a petticoat, and a 'rideing suite'.

A number of reasons have been suggested for this change. Clothes may have become cheaper, and so because they had more of them, people appreciated them less as a legacy.[35] But clothes were still valuable, especially to the poor, as the large number of court cases in the eighteenth century concerning the theft of clothes demonstrates.[36] Perhaps the beneficiaries in the wills, possibly younger people of the aspiring middling sort, no longer wanted to recut and resew the heavy serviceable fabrics of the older generation, preferring the new lighter weight imported fabrics, such as cotton muslins. As one historian suggests, 'Their dress became fine and fashionable, rather than serviceable'.[37]

In the early seventeenth century executors, distributing a woman's assets according to the terms of her will, had to share out her clothes as well as other possessions. In the second half of the century the onus must have been on executors to convert clothes into cash in order to fund the legacies, as they did with other assets, using the developing second-hand clothes markets. Despite contemporaries' comments to the contrary, money, that is, coinage, seems to have become more readily available and acceptable as a way of holding and bequeathing wealth, so that clothing, along with other possessions, was losing its importance as a way, albeit minor, of passing on wealth.

CONCLUSION

Any conclusion drawn from this small sample must be tentative. Elizabeth Temple appears to have been an unremarkable seventeenth-century woman of middling status: she wore a linen smock, with a pair of bodies over it, and for day-to-day use a waistcoat and petticoat, made out of heavy, durable wool in sombre colours. She wore a coif to cover her hair and a neckerchief over her shoulders. She protected her clothes with an apron. To smarten up this ensemble she had several special aprons and several partlets, a hat, and a pair of gloves, and she could wear a gown if the weather was bad. She had a change of clothes, but not as many as other women for whom probate evidence exists, although it is possible that the inventory is incomplete, and that some of her clothes were removed before it was made.

If she had married a much wealthier man, Elizabeth's gown might have been 'garded with velvet', as was that of Joane Silvester of Burford in 1591; her smock might have been made of 'Hollan

35 Spufford, *The Great Reclothing*, p. 125.

36 See, e.g., Elizabeth C. Sanderson, 'Nearly new: the second-hand clothing trade in 18th century Edinburgh', *Costume,* 31 (1997), p. 41.

37 John Rule, *Albion's People: English Society 1714–1815* (London, 1992), p. 85. See also Beverley Lemire, 'Second-hand beaux and "red-armed Belles": conflict and creation of fashions in England *c.*1660–1800', *Continuity and Change*, 15 (Dec. 2000), pp. 395–400.

wrought with black silke and Gold', or she might have had a 'crimson scarfe wroughte with silver', like Anne Rogers of Burford in 1629. But she had to make do with more modest attire. She died intestate, so her wishes about the disposal of her clothes are not known. Her will might well have revealed more detail about them. Other women, especially in the second half of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth century, were very specific about who should inherit their garments, a reflection of the economic and social value of clothes. But by the end of the seventeenth century cash was replacing clothes as a bequest. For historians this means that probate documents become less useful as evidence for what the ordinary women of small market towns wore.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My grateful thanks go to the editor, Diana Wood, for all her help and advice; and also to all the paleographers in the Burford Probate Group, the Chipping Norton Historical Research Group, and the Woodstock Society's Local History Group. Without their hard work and perseverance, it would not have been possible to write this article.

Plate 10. Effigy of Lady Elizabeth Tanfield, Burford Church. (*Photograph by author.*) [Allison, p. 44.]

Plate 11. A suggested reconstruction of the clothes of a non-elite seventeenth-century woman. (*Photograph by courtesy of Kay Sayers.*) Patterns for the garments were taken from *www.paulmeekins.co.uk/patterns/reconstructinghistory/RH101.* [Allison, p. 48.]