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ABSTRACT

Had on and Took with Him:
Runaway Indentured Servant Clothing in Virginia, 1774-1778. (May 1996)
Bryan Paul Howard,
B.A., University of Colorado;
M.A., The College of William and Mary
Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Donny Hamilton

The clothing of 18th century runaway indentured servants and convicts is described in detail in advertisements seeking their apprehension and return. As such the descriptions offer unique glimpses of a class of material culture, namely clothing, as it was used in everyday life by a segment of the colonial population for which there are few comparable documentary sources. This study uses a variety of data and contemporary writings to look at the clothing of servants and convicts as described in the Virginia Gazette between 1774 and 1778. Extant clothing and archaeological finds are used to create a technological background. Documents, including diaries, merchant records, and plantation journals were among the many sources used to help create the social context. Two-hundred and one runaway descriptions are then examined and analyzed, providing the basis for a selection of graphic illustrations depicting the runaway’s attire.

The importance of interpreting archaeologically retrieved artifacts from both etic and emic perspectives is also stressed. Material culture studies must analyze data not only from a current perspective, but must endeavor to conceptually place it back into its systemic context, and experience it from the point of view of those who originally used it. To neglect this facet of object analysis is to study the present more than the past, for artificially imposed classifications are reflective of the observer, not the observed.

Finally, archaeological, historical, and material culture studies must be made attractive and appropriate for the general public as well as colleagues. Without community involvement, the potential for meaningful dissemination of information is lost. As wardens of a shared cultural heritage, it is the responsibility of all persons conducting research within these fields to see that the findings are suitably prepared and presented to all.
This dissertation is dedicated to all those who left everything they ever knew in search of a better life in a new land.

It is also dedicated to Ethel Alfetta Howard, who instilled a sense of appreciation for the past in her son, who in turn passed that on to me.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Historical archaeology is popularly associated with digging. While this is true, excavation is merely a tool employed to provide data for the study of the past. In this field, researchers are fortunate to have a large variety of sources for additional data, most of which are not exhumed from the earth, but rather contained in the documentary and material records.

This study, while falling under the umbrella of historical archaeology, is a study of material culture. It is an examination of objects in a systemic context; an endeavor to take material culture observed in present contexts, and place it back into those social contexts of which they were once a part. Some of the material was recovered through excavation. More was recovered from 18th-century printed sources. Additional clues were provided from surviving pieces which have been curated over the years. As such, this study is firmly embedded in the growing interdisciplinary realm of material culture studies. By the analysis of objects made and used by past peoples, perhaps a better understanding between their world and ours may be achieved, and bring us closer together in time.

In this light, this dissertation examines a specific class of material culture which plays an integral part of everyday life, clothing. Specifically, it will concentrate on clothing of a subgroup of the colonial population in America that has been largely overlooked; unfree, non-slave labor (indentured servants and convicts). Furthermore, it deals only those who ran away. The field is additionally narrowed to males, as most servants were men and few females ran. It is also limited to 1774-1778, which covers a time when political upheaval was rapidly altering colonial America. Finally, the study deals only with those servants and convicts that appear in runaway advertisements in the Virginia Gazette.

While traditional archaeological studies often center on durable material objects, such as wine bottles or ceramics, a reading of 18th-century literature, especially personal writings, shows the objects we tend to emphasize were not always those of interest to the people who used them. Clothing, unlike bottles or ceramics, often appears in personal writings with a frequency proving of the important role it played in day to day life. John Harrower, for instance, an indentured servant in Virginia, kept a diary from the time he left Scotland in 1773, until his untimely death on a Virginia plantation in 1776 (Harrower 1963). Nearly every week, and sometimes more often, Harrower wrote something about clothing. He kept detailed lists of what he owned. He described it by weave, color, and value. He wrote home to his family in Scotland about it. He looked forward to obtaining new articles, and took care of those he had.

Clearly, clothing was an important aspect of Harrower’s material world. These objects, so important to Harrower and those around him, are seldom well represented in the archaeological record.

This dissertation follows the format of Historical Archaeology.
There is evidence, in the form of buttons, buckles, clasps, and the occasional preserved textile fragment, but these clues are typically glossed over in the archaeological literature, and relegated to technologically oriented descriptions devoid of their original social context.

Archaeologically well represented objects, on the other hand, such as earthenware bowls or tobacco pipe stems, are often studied in detail to derive information about the past. While these studies add insightful information, it can also place an undue importance on these objects that was not present with those who used them. While Harrower's journal is filled with references to his clothes, he does not take notice of the ceramics or pipes which must have surrounded him. Those objects we find to be important were not necessarily so then, and this can change our perceptions and interpretations about the past. Even realizing this, archaeologists too often place more emphasis on the artifact than the behavior it represents, which is, after all, the goal of anthropological studies. It is easy to find archaeological literature detailing rims of earthenware milk pans, but quite another matter finding one placing them in a social context.

While information gathered from objects gives a glimpse into past lives, it is often an etic view. This is especially true unless we look at objects that had a daily conscious presence in those same lives, such as clothing did, and attempt to understand it from an emic view. Because clothing was of daily interest, we have information not only from our outsider's view, but also from their insider's perspective, as they left written words telling us how they saw their world, and the place those objects had in it.

This dissertation looks at clothing from both perspectives. The technological aspects are examined from a present, etic viewpoint, as well as imposed interpretations as to what the clothing might have meant to those who owned it. It also covers an emic view, using contemporary textual sources and illustrations created by those in whose world it existed, was observed, and was worn. Together the two approaches shed more light on the subject than either alone, and hopefully provides greater insight into the colonial American world, and those whose lives shaped it.

BACKGROUND

Nearly every historic period excavation report includes clothing related objects. Most do a competent job in describing the artifacts, and several go into great detail to delineate and classify clothing related objects (cf. Abbit 1973; Apuzzo 1992; Bryant 1988; Calver and Bolton 1950; Davis 1982; Emilio 1911; Olsen 1963; Neumann and Kravic 1975; Noël Hume 1985; South 1964; Stone 1974). Few, however, take the next step and provide an adequate picture of how the artifacts fit into the whole from which they derived, and how this fits into the daily lives of the people under investigation.

This is not to say extensive research into what artifacts can tell us about the systemic context has not been undertaken, for surely it has. The systemic context is how the object participated "in a behavioral system" (Schiffer 1987:3). Using objects we can deduce relationships, rediscover manufacturing technologies, look into consumption trends, or suggest possible links to status, wealth, and availability. These are useful
lines of inquiry, but also tend to deconstruct artifacts back into separate components, when in fact they are part of a compound object, in this case an item of apparel. While each component is important, it is the whole that has the most meaning.

The specific data set—runaway, non-slave, unfree laborers—was chosen for two main reasons. First, they represent a significant population that has been largely overlooked in professional literature. Because servants were seldom active participants in creating written records, but were rather written about, studies usually have had little information to work with from their own point of view.

Current research trends have also largely bypassed this segment of society, concentrating more on other historically “silent” groups along ethnic or gender boundaries. The methodology utilized for these groups may also be applicable to the servants, for they share many of the same attributes of these other social classes, including economic and social power constraints which hindered them from making more visible marks in the written record.

The second reason for choosing this population was the richness of the data contained within runaway advertisements. Few sources provide such detailed, contemporary descriptions of material culture in a living system. Because descriptions were printed with the intent of identifying individuals, and were written for the moment rather than posterity, we can assume a degree of accuracy unparalleled in information for this class of society.

That we have very detailed descriptions of runaways’ clothing is fortunate, for there are few other sources containing such information. With the exception of livery (ornamental clothing for highly visible servants of the socially affluent), few surviving examples of clothing from this class are known. No examples of common clothing could be located with specific attribution to a servant in Virginia prior to the 19th century, nor were any known to exist by leading authorities who were consulted. For that matter, only a few surviving examples of indentured servant’s clothing could be identified from any of the North American colonies for this period. One, housed at the Smithsonian Institute, is a cotton suit of circa 1775, given to an apprentice in Rhode Island after his indenture had expired. The others are a few examples of leather breeches which may have been used by slaves and servants. No other extant non-livery servant garments of this period were located that have an American provenance.

Surviving servant clothing is not represented much more fully in Europe. After conducting extensive museum inquiries and literature searches in both Scotland and England, Margaret Spufford concluded “working clothes of the seventeenth century and eighteenth century are virtually non-existent” (1984:130). A few items do survive, but most are from personal servants. Examples that represent more typical working class clothes, both in Europe and America, are primarily fragmentary specimens, retrieved from anaerobic conditions, such as burials or well-shafts.

To date, nothing significant has been published in regards to clothing of Virginian non-slave servants of the 18th century. Inquiries to the most likely source of such studies, the Costume Design Center at Colonial
Williamsburg, suggest this topic has not been researched in any depth (Hill, personal communication). The vast majority of research on clothing for this period deals primarily with the upper and upper middle classes (cf. Baumgarten 1986; Callister 1975; Colonial Williamsburg Foundation [CWF] 1974; Cunnington 1970; Cunnington 1957; Cumming 1981; Halls 1973; Los Angeles County Museum [LACM] 1983; Parsons 1923; Ribeiro 1985; Sichel 1977; Tozer and Levitt 1983).

On the other end of the social scale, several more recent studies have focused on clothing of African-originating slave populations (cf. Baumgarten 1988; Starke 1990a; Starke 1990b; Warner and Parker 1990; White 1991; White and White 1995; Williams and Centrallo 1990). Military clothing of this period is also fairly well documented, (cf. Copeland 1974; Gallup 1991; Goodwin 1962; Katcher 1973; Katcher 1981; Kemp 1973; Klinger and Wilder 1974; Lefferts 1971; May 1990; McGregor and Mollo 1987; Peterson 1968) although much less so for the colonial militia than of the regular forces.

Some research has been undertaken on the subject of clothing and textiles for the middle and laboring classes (cf. Copeland 1975; Copeland 1977; De Marly 1986; Dunlevy 1989; Earle 1971; Lister 1972; McCombs 1976; Montgomery 1984; Prude 1991; Riggs 1988; Sichel 1977; Warrell 1975; Warwick et al. 1965; Wilcox 1963; Williams-Mitchell 1982). Most, unfortunately, are not as detailed as could be hoped. Copeland's (1977) Working Dress in Colonial and Revolutionary America, for instance, while otherwise well done, covers all groups in a generalized manner which necessarily leads to a cursory treatment of the subject, and largely ignores regional variation. Many of the other works are targeted towards theatrical costuming or casual interests, and perpetuate stereotypical views without offering hard data to back them. When data is offered, it far too often either treats all regions as essentially synonymous, or uncritically applies far too much data from European sources directly to America. One article on servant clothing avoiding these pitfalls was located, but it deals almost exclusively with female attire in England, and not at all with colonial society (Buck 1974). Nonetheless such research can offer insightful perspectives on servant clothing backgrounds in Britain.

Another set of studies which involve clothing of the lower classes emerge from living history projects. In the beginning, most of these studies were geared towards military settings, but recently more emphasis has been shifting to civilians as well. Most tend to be based on middle or lower middle free white classes (cf. Gilgun 1993; Gehret 1976; Hicks 1976), but vary greatly in quality of research.

Nothing in the literature covers the targeted group and geographic area sufficiently. Most seem to repeat generalizations based on geographically or culturally scattered information, or tend to base conclusions on a few extant specimens without detailed consideration of whether the pieces are representative of the typical, or were simply preserved because they were unique. Of those studies which do deal with the lower and servant classes, most use blanket statements as to the appearance of the presumed material culture, and there is rarely strong data offered to back up the assertions.

Newspaper advertisements for runaway servants offer a more unbiased account of the clothing runaways took with them. As descriptions intended to portray a runaway as he was last seen, the ads also
present the clothing as it was being worn in day-to-day life, and thus provides insights into the social structure in which the servants and their clothing existed.

PROCEDURE

Clothing does not survive well in archaeological settings due to the propensity of organic materials to decay rapidly. Except for durable components, such as buttons, buckles, hooks, clasps, and the assorted textile fragment, few clothing items are ever found. Nonetheless, a sizeable, and primarily untapped, data base of archaeologically recovered clothing components does exist. These collections, from former excavations, were used rather than extracting additional, and repetitive, information from the ground.

Most archaeological material on clothing has not been thoroughly examined beyond technological information and provenance, and even less has been conceptually reconstructed into its original living system rather than simply its archaeological context. Unfortunately this is the case for much of what is recovered for all artifact types, especially in salvage operations, which do not receive the funding necessary to conduct more intensive research. It is crucial that this material be used by other researchers, for otherwise it has been salvaged to no avail.

While there is a sizeable selection of clothing related artifacts to work with, other sources of information are still required to accurately reconstruct clothing from the components found in an archaeological setting. Unfortunately for the study of clothing in general, and for the lower classes in particular, comparatively few original garments from the 18th century survive. Several collections throughout the United States and Europe do preserve a sampling of clothing from this period, but they are, by and large, only representative of the upper classes. This is not surprising, for in times when cloth was often hard to come by, few common garments would be preserved in favor of re-use or being worn until no longer serviceable. Therefore, what is generally preserved is the uncommon and unique, or that which had taken on special meaning, perhaps for association with an individual or event. Enlisted men, for example, vastly outnumbered officers in the American Revolution, yet no known American enlisted regimental coat has survived intact (Katcher 1981). Officer’s regimental coats, on the other hand, are disproportionately represented, as officers were a small fraction of the men who served, yet several examples survive. That enlisted coats were not preserved accentuates the fact that extant examples are rarely common pieces.

The same principle of selective preservation applies to civilian wear as well as military garments. While thousands of pairs of common trousers, for example, existed in colonial America, no surviving specimen from this period is presently known to exist (Kidwell 1976:33). Leather breeches, for which preservation should be better than cloth, share similar poor survival rates. Although several pairs have survived, few are attributable to the lower social strata considering the amount once in existence. Preserved clothes provide excellent resources for a guideline, but cannot be used alone to reconstruct the garments worn by indentured servants.
Another traditionally rich database for clothing related issues are probate records (cf. Beaudry 1988; Benes 1989; Shackel 1992; Trautman 1989; Trautman and Bartsch 1988). Although potentially a source of information for the targeted population, probates are extremely rare for indentured servants while still in their servitude. Even after freedom, the less affluent classes are perpetually under-represented in probate documentation (Main 1975; Sweeney 1989:36). Studies in Massachusetts comparing probates to the known population revealed that "a man in the wealthiest 40 percent on a tax list was over... five times as likely to have his estate inventoried as a man without property or in the poorest 20 percent of those owning real property" (Smith 1975:105-106). Furthermore, it has been argued that Virginia probates are notoriously lacking for all classes through a conscious decision of the society (Gill and Curtis 1979:71).

Probate documents are also less useful for servants during their servitude, which is the focus of this study, as most probates are biased towards the later stages of life (Hawley 1989:29; Main 1975; Smith 1975). At this time, wealth and material possessions are disproportionately accumulated (Main 1975; Smith 1975). While some servants were older than the norm, most in this study were in their 20's or 30's (Appendix A). Smith found in Massachusetts that "older decedents were more likely than younger ones to... have inventories taken of their estates" (1975:105). In fact, Smith found that only an approximate 14% of those decedents under age 50 had inventories taken after their death (1975:105).

In addition to these drawbacks, probates are suspected of frequently omitting many items, such as clothing. Carr and Walsh found in a study of Charles County, Maryland that "inventories of clothing, especially from small estates, is missing often enough to arouse suspicion" (1980:82). They go on to lament that the "concealment of clothing or other small items deprives us of information about life style that we would like to have but affects the total value of an estate very little" (Carr and Walsh 1980:82). The runaway descriptions can clearly fill in some of these gaps.

The reasons clothing may not have always appeared in probate inventories of less affluent people could be one of several factors. As the inventory was often delayed for some time after death, family members probably had already claimed a great deal of the clothing for themselves (Carr and Walsh 1977:4; Carr and Walsh 1980:82). Furthermore, small portable items of little value, may be missing from inventories due to deliberate omission, casual omission, or from being lumped together with miscellaneous items (Deetz 1977; Hawley 1989). The potential probate trail for indentured servant clothing is not only virtually non-existent, but what might be recorded is likely representative only of an "atypically prosperous segment of the population" (Smith 1975:106), and may tend to report the more valuable clothing a servant might have had, and not necessarily what was worn daily.

Probates have, nevertheless, been used successfully to study clothing. Probate records were used to reconstruct clothing in 17th century Massachusetts (Trautman and Bartsch 1988; Trautman 1989). Deficiencies of using this method alone were noted by Trautman. One problem was the fact that they seldom contained enough information to deduce clothing ensembles, which often had to be guessed at to reconstruct how they
were used in a living context (Trautman 1989:57). The runaway advertisements on the other hand, in most cases clearly indicate which garments were being worn in conjunction with which others in day-to-day life.

Diaries, journals, and letters are a major source of information which can provide emic insight into material culture in systemic contexts. Although subject to personal limitations and biases, these sources can bring artifacts to life in a way seldom available through other means, as they are animated in the words of the original consumers. Unfortunately, while this may be the best source for understanding a servant's attitude towards clothing, few writings survive that are directly attributable to an indentured servant or convict in the 18th century.

The most notable work related to this study that has survived is the journal of John Harrower ([1773-1776] 1963). Harrower was a Scottish indentured servant in Virginia. His is the only journal currently known for the period written by an indentured servant in Virginia (Riley 1963:xiii). Fortunately, Harrower's time and place of indenture fall exactly within the period under consideration. His term of service was to last four years between 1774 and 1778, the same dates as the target of this study. Harrower's death, however, brought on by disease, cut his life short in 1776. The two years he did record offer a very enticing glimpse into the life of a servant. His entries record considerable details about life for one in his position, including numerous mentions of clothing, adding insight into the role they played in his daily existence. The frequency with which he mentions his apparel attests to the relative degree of importance he, and presumably his fellow Virginia servants, placed on clothes. Furthermore, as a result of his unexpected death, his diary was preserved as it was written, and published some 200 years later, unlike many journals which were published in the lifetime of the author, and subject to later-life editing.

In a dearth of sources written by servants themselves, master's provide us with the most details of the clothing a runaway had. The primary source of information for this study comes from advertisements for runaways appearing in the Virginia Gazette between 1774 and 1778, written for the most part by masters or overseers. A total of 201 individual descriptions (for a total of 199 individuals, as two servants ran at least twice wearing different clothing each time) make up the database used in this study. The ads provide a wealth of descriptive details and typically devote much attention to apparel. This in itself is a clue to the importance of clothing in the society, as well as a method for the visual reconstruction of the apparel when combined with artifactual evidence.

Not only are masters generally the authors of the descriptions, but they frequently had an intimate acquaintance with the clothing contained in them. Masters usually provided cloth for clothes, or ready-made clothing, and would have specific knowledge as to what the servant wore. Overseers saw the servant at work in his daily habit, and, considering the sparse wardrobes most owned, would also quickly learn to associate specific clothes to an individual.

In addition to the ads, plantation records and journals offer considerable insight into the clothing that
servants wore. Included are entries concerning weaving or purchasing cloth for servants, and how the servants were to make cloth into clothes. There is also information about ready-made clothes given to the servants, as well as how often clothes were issued and how much was spent on apparel for the servants.

It is regrettable that, as far as descriptions of clothing go, we are at the mercy of the describer and not the wearer. Because of this, a certain measure of bias is expected in the ads, for they were about people felt to be beneath the authors in the social order. Runaways were also defying society by the act of running, and so some class bias is surely present in the ads.

Although this situation creates a strong potential for bias, the primary function of an advertisement was to depict a fugitive accurately, to effect his return. This being the case, it may therefore be assumed the descriptions are reliable records of what the servants wore. While descriptions will incorporate cultural baggage, such as elitist attitudes towards underlings, or reflect differing judgements, based on economic standing, on when an article of clothing is to be considered as worn out, most bias seems to manifest itself in observations of character and deportment rather than clothing. While slanting a description of a fugitive's character might serve a master's social needs, altering a description of the clothes he wore would only serve to hamper efforts to identify and return him. The descriptions, therefore, may indeed be quite accurate as to what the runaway actually had and wore in day-to-day life.

The fact that the data set in this study are runaways should be remembered. It means the group under examination is a special subset of indentured servants, for only a small percentage ever ran away (Bailyn 1986:350). Not only are they runaways, which sets them apart from the majority of servants, but they are also the runaways who had descriptions published, which again is a subset of a subset, for not all runaways resulted in advertisements seeking their return.

Motivations for advertising or not advertising a runaway were varied. For many it was a question of economics. Prude (1991:129) claims that in the 1770's the average cost of placing an advertisement to be a "modest but real" approximate 10 shillings, insinuating advertisers were more likely to be wealthy. While not a large sum, the fee may have precluded some from placing an ad. On the other hand, those who had the most to lose by a servant running might also have the most to gain by his return. Having invested a higher percentage of their capital in a servant, the advertising charges may be worthwhile.

Economics were not the only motivating factor for advertising. Plantation records of both George Washington and Landon Carter show many more servants ran than were ever advertised for (Meaders 1993), and both planters could easily afford the costs involved in placing a description. Washington especially, it seems, wished to avoid advertising in some papers, apparently for personal reasons such as fear of social disapproval (Meaders 1993).

Proximity to a printing office may also have influenced whether an ad was placed or not (Prude 1991:129). The closer a master was to the paper, the easier it was to place an ad. All issues of the Virginia Gazette examined for this study were printed by various publishers in Williamsburg, Virginia. Of 201
descriptions in the study, all but six list a place of residence for the servant or master, and five of those specify a jail where the runaway was being held. Armed with this information, proximity to the publisher is easy to ascertain. A look at the distribution of the residences of the runaways (Appendix B) shows that Williamsburg is in fact well represented compared to other localities, although most areas of Virginia are represented. The value of this observation is questionable though, without further information on the master.

It may also be expected that a higher percentage of skilled laborers were advertised for than unskilled labor, as the former were generally more valuable. If this is the case, a large number of runaways with specialized skills should be present. The compiled data of the Virginia Gazette runaways (Appendix C) does in fact suggest most were trained in some trade. To confuse matters though, knowing a servant's trade does not equate to knowing his occupation when he ran. While he may have been in the trade of a tailor or weaver, his master may have bought his contract for a field hand, or for other tasks.

Finally, we must remember that every master would have his own reasons for advertising or not, just as every servant would have his own reasons for running or serving out his time. Masters on good terms with a servant might be more lenient when he ran. If the servant had been habitually troublesome, on the other hand, an advertisement might be generated immediately without any time given for the benefit of the doubt.

The question of what motivated a master to advertise, and therefore describe the clothing of a runaway, is not the focus of this study. What is of concern is the actual clothing the servant took with him. This is how he presented himself to the world, and helped define who he was. The runaway advertisements, combined with other documentary, archaeological, and curated evidence, can be used to create visual glimpses into a systemic context for a group of artifacts rarely fleshed out in the literature. Hopefully translating these sources of information into tangible graphic windows to the past, through a series of drawings, will shed light on the variety of clothing worn in a day-to-day situation by indentured servants and convicts in Virginia in the mid 1770's. Perhaps this will enable us to more fully understand this population that has so often been overlooked in our collective cultural heritage.
CHAPTER II

INDENTURED SERVANTS AND CONVICTS

Before any study can be undertaken on the material objects of a group of people, a basic understanding of that population must be presented. The clothing in this study was worn by men who, for various reasons, were serving time as non-free labor. Much has been written about the labor system as it evolved and developed in colonial America. More attention has been given to slavery than non-slave servitude, but several studies have examined the question of indentured and convict labor (cf. Alderman 1975; Bailyn 1986; Smith 1947; Smith 1961; Van der Zee 1985). To understand servant clothing in a systemic context, we must understand the context in which the wearers lived.

From the very beginnings of colonization in the Chesapeake, labor was in high demand. Estimates on the destination for indentured servants show the effect, for as many as 90% went to just three colonies, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia (Bailyn 1986:243). Agriculture, naturally, accounted for a significant number of the servants sought, but so too did other endeavors, such as iron production, construction trades, transportation needs, and many other industries and services that evolved in the colonies (Bailyn 1986).

Labor came in two basic ways; free and unfree. In the 17th and 18th centuries, free laborers were usually enticed from Europe by seemingly generous offers. Indeed, skilled laborers could readily secure work in most areas, and were eagerly sought, as attested to by the large number of advertisements for appearing in newspapers and broadsides. Unskilled labor, which was desperately needed to maintain the plantation system, was harder to come by.

To entice unskilled laborers to come to the Americas, promises of high wages and profit sharing were offered. These, however, were frequently discovered to be misleading (Alderman 1975). Stories reaching home of harsh conditions and intolerable climates dissuaded many from voluntarily going to the plantations. As the labor supply situation grew worse, solutions came not through improved conditions, but through increases in the use of forced labor. Unfree labor was more cost effective for the plantations, without having the obligations necessary to attract free labor.

Unfree labor could always be had in the Chesapeake, but it would only flourish after the firm establishment of large and small scale plantations and industry. Three main channels provided the unfree workforce, slave labor, indentured labor, and convict labor. Essentially, all three were slaves, not just those with darker skin (Van der Zee 1985:29), but at least the latter two groups had greater prospects of hope.

The process of indentured servitude usually began in Europe. The reasons for entering into an indenture varied for every individual. Most went into the contract voluntarily, though often out of sheer desperation, but charges of outright kidnapping were occasionally voiced (Alderman 1975; Bailyn 1986; Van der Zee 1985). For the most part, it is not unfair to state that economic hardship was the single most influential factor that pushed people into selling themselves out of their homeland. The new country offered
hope at a time when money ran short and opportunity was scarce.

John Harrower, as a typical example, left his family behind in Scotland in 1773 to seek work, ending up in London. The situation there was not promising. Harrower was literate and so had an advantage in seeking employment. Even so, he records his disappointment when applying for a position, as he found “more than a dozen of Letters before me, so I had but expectation that way they being all well acquainted and I a stranger” (Harrower [January 22, 1774] 1963:16).

More disappointment follows as he experiences the hardships around him. Harrower witnesses “many Hundreds... starving for want of employment, and many good people... begging” in the streets of London (Harrower [January 24, 1774] 1963:17). At last, running out of money and hope, Harrower writes “this day I being reduced to the last shilling I had was obliged to engage to go to Virginia for four years...” (January 26, 1774] 1963:17). More fortunate than most, Harrower ended up serving as a school master. Countless others followed this pattern of job seeking leading to London and other ports (Bailyn 1986:176) and ending on the plantations of America.

The other major way indentured servitude could begin was by breaking the law. Convicts appear among the servants with regular frequency, for the sale of felons to the colonies was found to be quite attractive to most involved on the European side of things, sometimes even the convicts themselves. Not only could the homeland rid itself of undesirables, but people sentenced to death or long imprisonment could get a second chance by going to the colonies. Deportation of convicts became a popular way to rid problems from Europe, both criminal and political (Alderman 1975; Smith 1961). For the years of this study, up to 1776, close to 960 convicts were transported annually to the American colonies (Bailyn 186:295). Although the colonials seldom welcomed such immigration, it was tolerated as a source of providing white slave labor rather than black or more expensive free labor. Convicts were economically attractive purchases because their term of service was longer on average than voluntary indentures (Bailyn 1986). The severity of the crime generally determined the length of servitude, but most ran seven years, although sentences for fourteen years or even life could also be handed down.

To be a convict could mean a variety of things. The list of crimes which could send one to the plantations numbered over 200 in the 18th century (Bailyn 1986:292). Tough codes calling for capital punishment, for even what would today be considered minor crimes, actually resulted in fewer executions, but greater numbers of deportations (Bailyn 186:292), as death sentences were commuted in favour of deportation (Alderman 1975). Not all deportations resulted in servitude, for in some cases they could purchase their own contracts if they had the money (Bailyn 1986:261).

While many convicts were guilty of serious criminal acts, even the offence of being in debt could send one to a transport ship, bound for America. One prisoner was reportedly sent into servitude for a failed attempt, while drunk, to “snatch a handkerchief from the body of a person in the street to him unknown” (court records quoted in Bailyn 1986:293).
Whether convict or voluntary servant, the next step in the process was getting to America. In 1774, Janet Schaw, a lady from Scotland, recorded in her journal the experience of a servants on their way to America. Schaw was travelling with her brother to the West Indies, then on to North Carolina. A few days out to sea, she was startled to discover the captain had smuggled aboard a number of people, and had kept them locked in the hold until well away from land (Schaw 1934). Unlike most ships carrying servants, who went through official channels, this captain chose to bypass governmental administrators.

Schaw’s initial reaction to the emigrants was surprise they were even on board, and then disgust. When they first appeared on deck, after a night of very rough weather, Schaw reported the “smell which came from the hole, where they had been confined, was sufficient to raise a plague aboard” (Schaw [1774] 1934:30). Schaw’s aristocratic tendencies soon faded as she came to know them for people in distress. She was deeply touched when the ship passed the home island of the group, and she watched them sorrowfully view their familiar world fade into the horizon.

Later Schaw learned their story more fully. They had been forced from their homes by harsh landlords and a poor economy, so gathered what possessions they had and set out for a new home. Having run low on money, the group found they could only afford a portion of the passage fare, and so were obliged to bind “themselves slaves for a certain number of years to pay the rest” (Schaw [1774] 1934:55).

Shipboard conditions endured by those Schaw observed were typical of all people traveling to the colonies, especially those of lower standing. Rough seas caused sickness, disease often broke out among the tightly packed passengers, food and water went foul, and the ever present threat of death demoralized the entire company. John Harrower wrote almost daily during his crossing of the increases in sickness, the foulness of the quarters, and the souring temperament of passengers and crew alike. Janet Schaw described one especially strong storm, when the emigrants were confined below deck,

without air but what came down the crannies, thro’ which also the sea pounded incessantly… No victuals could be dressed, nor fire got on, so that all they had to subsist on, was some raw potatoes, and a very small proportion of mouldy brisket. In this condition they remained for nine days, with scarcely any interval, (good Heavens! poor Creatures!) without light, meat or air, with the immediate prospect of death before them; from the last indeed they should have found the only comfort (Schaw [1774] 1934:49).

Having ridden out the terrible storm, Schaw’s emigrants faced yet another disaster. Each family had been allowed a timber chest to stow away all their worldly possessions. These trunks were “without mercy or distinction thrown into the long boat [towed behind the ship], and as that was under water for near fifteen days, the consequence was the glue had given way, [and] the chests [had] fallen to pieces, and every thing was floating promiscuously above the water” (Schaw [1774] 1934:55).

Despite the harrowing conditions of ship life, the emigrants were not without moments of happiness. During a stretch of especially fine weather, Schaw recorded the ship’s company and passengers amused themselves on deck with “cards and backgammon… the sailors dance horn pipes and Jigs from morning to night; every lass has her lad, and several chintz gowns have been converted by our little taylor into jackets for
the favourite swains" (Schaw [1774] 1934:68).

In the West Indies, the emigrants, originally headed for America, were "disposed of to their hearts contentment" at St. Kitts. The tailor also found work in his trade, with arrangements that included "a good table and as much rum as he can drink" (Schaw [1774] 1934:116). Miss Schaw then added of the rum, "this last article never fails to make room for new adventures."

When arriving in the colonies, servants typically underwent a regular routine. First, they were cleaned up as best as possible to facilitate the sale of their indentures, and to get better money (Bailyn 1986; Smith 1947). After several weeks on board the tightly packed ships, amongst the filth associated with below decks passage, the servants were in sore need of this.

More than one observer commented on the stench. About 1817 Henry Fearon wrote of a newly arrived ship, "their clothes, if rags deserved that denomination, actually perfumed the air" (in Van der Zee 1985:81). Andrew Leitch, seeking a convict just off the Justitia, likewise mentioned a foul odor associated with recent arrivals. In his description of Ralph Emanuel, Leitch states that while "well dressed", he would "easily be discovered... To those used to the Smell of Servants just from a Ship... unless they have procured new Clothes" (Virginia Gazette [VG], Dixon and Hunter [D&H], April 22, 1775).

Having arrived at port and made as presentable as possible, the captain or an agent would then begin the business of selling the indentures. While conditions varied, many servants were kept locked on board ship to prevent their escape. Those sailing under more lenient captains were occasionally housed on shore, or even given temporary liberty without supervision.

Some sales were pre-arranged, and the buyer came to pick up the new servant upon learning of the arrival of the ship. Others were sold on stops made along the way to the main port, as buyers and conditions presented themselves (such as Schaw and Harrower both observed). Most, however, were disposed of at a public sale, often announced in newspapers upon a ship's arrival. It is this group that accounts for the majority of sales.

Servant sales were essentially the same as a slave auction, with interested buyers analyzing each person's physique and talents in detail. One servant described his ordeal, saying they were told to "strip naked, so that the prospective purchasers could see that we had perfectly developed and healthy bodies" (Buettner 1828:26 quoted in Bailyn 1986:327). It was not uncommon for sellers to exaggerate a servant's skills, in hopes of raising the price, or conversely, failing to mention certain aspects of a servant's character or health (Smith 1947). Those who were not sold in a short time were often sold at discounts, as the longer they remained unsold, the more money they cost the shipper.

Individuals who still went un-purchased were often taken up by "soul drivers" (Alderman 1975; Bailyn 1986; Harrower 1963; Smith 1947). Soul drivers were men who bought servants either in groups right off the ships, or collected the hard to sell servants and marched them inland "like a parcell of Sheep until they can sell them to advantage" (Harrower [May 16, 1774] 1963:39). In this way they could reach the more remote
planters and industries who generally did not frequent the sales. Few colonists looked favorably upon such activities, but it was accepted as part of the system under which they lived.

The hardest to sell were the sickly, troublesome convicts, or those with no skills to offer. Servants who had skills were usually bought first even if the majority of their term was to be taken up with field labor. Having other skills they could be used during seasonal lulls for non-agrarian services, or rented out to neighboring planters. A great many people who signed indentures were in fact skilled tradesmen and artisans. Bailyn estimates that of those leaving the port of London (77.5% of all those leaving England), fully 67% came from artisan backgrounds, and only 20.4% were unskilled labor (1986:179). Under better economic conditions, many would likely have been in the average working class had they not fallen on hard times. These statistics seem to be well supported by information gleaned from the runaway descriptions in the Virginia Gazette. Nearly 80% of the servants had a trade listed (Appendix C). Of those with no trade or skills noted, we might assume unskilled labour, which would fit well into Bailyn’s estimate of their numbers.

When contracting their indenture in Europe, a person with a skill to offer had a greater chance of securing better terms than those who had little or no training. The length of service was often standard, four to five years being most common (Bailyn 1986; Harrower 1963; Galenson 1981; Smith 1947), but ranging up and down the scale according to the needs and negotiation skills of all involved (see Galenson 1981). A servant Janet Schaw sailed with obligated himself to two terms to allow his wife and child to remain free, and yet have their passage paid (Schaw [1774] 1934).

Highly skilled artisans could often get a pre-signed contract keeping them out of the tobacco fields or iron works. In addition, length of required service could be shortened as their value to a purchaser increased. While valued skills could get a shorter term, a lack thereof could increase the length of the indenture (Bailyn 1986; Galenson 1981). Whether seeking out an indenture on their own accord, or lured into one by a professional procurer, by the 18th century most redemptioners did, at least, arrive in America with a defined termination date for their service.

Once the actual term of servitude began, the experience of the servant was highly variable and is difficult to generalize. A sizeable portion of servants worked for small planters or town tradesmen. Many of the latter lived within the same household as their master. Those serving masters with several servants or larger plantations were often quartered together in small houses. If engaged in field labor, the servant likely worked under conditions similar to, if not even alongside, slaves. If engaged in a trade, it is likely that the life of the servant was not appreciably different from that of free tradesmen, with the exception of certain rights to personal activities such as entering into a marriage or conducting personal business without the master’s consent.

While the majority of masters probably treated their servants fairly, overall, conditions must be viewed as reasonably harsh. While obviously overstating the case, William Eddis, described the system in 1770 as “worse than Egyptian bondage” ([1770] 1969:38). Many cases of ill treatment are recorded in the
annals of "white slavery", as many people considered the thought of being indentured (Bailyn 1986:346).

Much like the slave system, families could easily be split up upon arrival in America, and sold to
different masters (Smith 1985:224). Most colonists viewed servants as little above slaves or convicts in status,
for few believed anyone of reasonable character would voluntarily go into servitude. Legally their status was
higher than slaves, if only slightly, for they could bring cases to court about abuses, but rarely succeeded when
they did (Alderman 1975; Smith 1961). One ex-servant noted that when one did bring the master to court, "it
is as ten to one if he does not get his Licks for his Pains, as I have experienced upon the like Occasion, to my
Cost" (William Moraley quoted in Van der Zee 1985:153). A servant's word was rarely taken over that of
a master, just as a gentleman's testimony generally was deemed more believable than a tradesman's.

Whipping or branding for offenses was legal, as long as the punishment did not overstep certain vague
limits (Van der Zee 1985:29-30). It was perfectly acceptable to place an iron collar on a troublesome servant
(Alderman 1975), and indeed runaways do appear in the Virginia Gazette with such shackles. Numerous court
cases attest to the fact that not all masters treated their servants with commendable justice. Tales of murders,
beatings, starvation, ill health, and generally miserable conditions contrast sharply with the generous wages,
clothing, and near paternal treatment others received, such as that enjoyed by John Harrower at Belvoir. John
Harrower is a prime example of the uppermost end of the scale in ease of service. He was provided with
ample food, clothes, housing, and respect. Most servants, were not so lucky, even when serving kind masters.

Certain transgressions committed while under an indenture could lengthen the time of service, such
as unauthorized marriage or running attempts (Alderman 1975; Bailyn 1986). Most of the servants in this
study, if they were ever caught and returned, likely had their indentures prolonged as a result. In Virginia at
this time, two days were usually added for every one spent away (Bailyn 1986:350), although earlier the
extensions could range in years rather than days (Alderman 1975:65).

The factors that drove a servant to running away were varied (Alderman 1975; Bailyn 1986; Van der
Zee 1985). Many left due to harsh living or working conditions. Others grew weary of the servile life, having
come to America with greater expectations. Some servants left because they missed their family, and more
than one runaway was predicted to be heading for a wife or kin known to be living elsewhere. Finally, some
ran for no other reason than deciding they had had enough, and felt no special obligation to anyone but
themselves. Nicholas Cresswell observed two servants run, who were in his party in the Virginia frontier, and
could only comment "What can be their motives for running away in this wilderness Country I cannot

Convicts may have felt a stronger desire to run, for among all those entering indentured servitude,
they were the ones forced by law rather than circumstance to give up their freedom. Convicts probably had
the highest running rate of all non-slave servants in the 18th century. In Virginia, Bailyn reports an estimate
of 5% ran (1986:350). This comes as no surprise, considering attitudes towards convict labor. Not only was
harsh treatment of convicts legal, it was often expected, as "humane treatment... would only encourage further
convict dumping on the part of the Mother Country” (Van der Zee 1985:51).

The estimated percentage of non-convict indentures who ran is not stated for Virginia, but said to be less, perhaps similar to Pennsylvania’s almost 3% in the 1770’s (Bailyn 1986:350). Bailyn seems to feel 3% high, noting that the rate was about half of that in the preceding decade, but it should also be remembered that the runaway rate in the 1770’s would have been affected by the war with Britain.

One runaway convict, Charles White, was reported to have been disgusted with the movement for independence. Before escaping from the Marlborough Iron Works, White was heard to say “atrocious things in respect to the dispute with Great Britain” and apparently tried to enlist on a British warship using the name of Johnson (VG, D&H, July 6, 1776; November 29, 1776).

Virginia Governor Lord Dunmore encouraged such behavior by proclaiming “all indented Servants, Negroes, or others (appertaining to Rebels) free, that are able and willing to bear Arms, they joining his Majesty’s Troops” (Dunmore, November 7, 1775). One interesting slave notice in the Virginia Gazette, for a Charles, belonging to Robert Brent, shows the effect this proclamation had. Describing Charles, Brent wrote “there is reason to believe he intends an attempt to get to lord Dunmore” (Purdie, November 17, 1775 supplement).

At least three runaways in this study had dealings with Dunmore, although all before his 1775 proclamation. Henry Reed and John White, both of Herring Bay, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, ran in July of 1774, and both were seen in August at Dunmore’s plantation in Virginia. A third runaway, William Smith, living at Newcastle, ran on December 10, 1774, and carried with him “a discharge from the Earl of Dunmore’s clerk” (VG, Pinkney, December 29, 1774).

Others ran to enlist in the American army, for patriotism, or to collect bounties and avoid field labor. Ralph Chillingsworth, a runaway servant from England, left his home in Richmond on December 3, 1775. He was later “seen in Williamsburg... and said he had enlisted in a company at York Town” (VG, Purdie, December 28, 1775). It may be that Chillingsworth followed the throng of American volunteers towards Norfolk, culminating in the Battle of Great Bridge less than a fortnight after he ran (Noël Hume 1966). Pension records show Chillingsworth eventually served with the 6th and 10th Virginia regiments.

Later in the war, servants were offered freedom from their indentures to enlist in the army under some circumstances, although General Washington seemed unfavorable to servants in the army. Others were sold into the army, a practice which the Nicholas Cresswell commented upon, “Great numbers of recruiting parties are out to raise men, but can scarcely get a man by any means, tho’ their bounty is 12£. None will enlist that can avoid it. They get some servants and convicts which are purchased from their Masters, these will desert the first opportunity” ([December 14, 1776] 1924:176).

Because the statements we read are written by those from whom the servants left, we seldom are given a runaway’s true reason for flight. Several advertisements proclaim that ill treatment was not the problem (Smith and Wojtowicz 1989). Charles, the slave believed fleeing to Dunmore, according to Brent, left “from
no cause of complaint, or dread of a whipping (for he has always been remarkably indulged, indeed too much so). Reasons are occasionally offered though, as with Charles, must have only left "from a determined resolution to get liberty, as he conceived, by flying to lord Dunmore" (Purdie, November 17, 1775, supplement). Charles, incidentally, was later known to have been taken by a white runaway servant of Andrew Leitch’s, who sought several fugitives in this study. Leitch was apparently a dealer in servants and convicts. Most masters simply attributed running to low levels of character (Prude 1991). Without exception, though, we only get the runaway’s point of view through his master.

Bailyn (1986:351) states that most convicts ran on their way to their new homes, before ever arriving. Some runaways in the *Virginia Gazette* followed this pattern, detected through wording in the ad, or knowing the seeker to be a servant importer. More, however, judged on the ads, seem to have ran after settling in. How long a servant resided somewhere before running is rarely able to be constructed from the ads, but we are generally given the date of departure. Due to problems involved with running in the winter, most runaways probably left in warmer times. The time of year (if noted) each servant ran is presented in Appendix D. The warmer months did in fact show a higher rate of running in this study group.

Regardless of when or why a servant left, their main concern was recapture. Travellers in 18th century America could be jailed for no reason other than suspicion of being a runaway. If they had no papers to prove otherwise, they could be held for weeks, or even months, while the jailer sought a possible owner. Publicly funded rewards were offered for turning over undocumented strangers and capturing runaways (Van der Zee 1986:153). Special incentives were also offered by masters, and the sentence "above what the law allows" is common when discussing a reward. Further hinderance to the fugitive came through laws which forbade giving assistance to runaways. This extended both to individuals rendering aid, and to ships from taking them out of the colony.

No matter if a servant served faithfully or was troublesome, eventually the indenture came to an end. At the conclusion of their term, most contracts stipulated the servant would receive "freedom dues" (Alderman 1975). These were often specified in the indenture, but many were left open, only specifying them as the "custom of the country" (Smith 1947). This was guided by local legislation or general consensus. Often freedom dues included a small amount of currency, a new suit clothes, a marketable trade or skill, and in some cases, a portion of land or an animal. Most servants who had served faithfully received their bounty with no complaints, and were occasionally rewarded with a bonus if well liked by the master. In cases where the master did not provide what had been promised, the newly freed servant could take the master to court, and frequently won if he had his contract in hand. Those unwise enough to leave the contract open to the custom of the country were usually dependent solely upon the generosity of the master.
CHAPTER III
CLOTHING BACKGROUND

Studies on the role of clothing in cultures are numerous. Musings on its importance to human society are ancient, with references going back nearly as far as written languages. Clothing is often mentioned in Egyptian, Greek, Hebrew, and Roman texts, normally in the form of advice. Ovid, for example, counseled young men to ensure their toga fit well before pursuing women, for first impressions were crucial to the game (Ars Amori Book 1 line 514). Likewise, the Bible offers many references to clothing. Many are quite specific, such as "Thou shalt not wear a garment of divers sorts, as of woollen and linen together" (Deuteronomy 22:11, KJV). This, incidentally, was a common practice by the 18th century.

In the 1500's Erasmus noted that from clothing one could "infer the state of a man's character" (Erasmus, in Roche 1991:6). This concept was an old one indeed, appearing in writing a good two millennia before. In the 17th century, numerous books appear relating this principle to readers, especially the connection of dress and appearance to morals, religion, and public perception (e.g. Bosworth 1693; Brathwait 1652; Compassionate Conformist 1683; Courtin 1671; Marques n.d.). The 18th century held the same beliefs just as firmly, if not even more so.

To understand 18th century thought on clothing, it is beneficial to look into the psychology of clothing in general. The theories for why clothing is almost universally worn among humans can be broken down into a few broad categories. These are protection, modesty, immodesty, and adornment (Horn and Gurel 1981; Gurel 1979b). While none of these theories can be applied universally, all cultures can be seen to subscribe to at least one, if not more.

By the 18th century clothing was a very complex issue, encompassing all of the theories mentioned above. Protection from the elements was important. The climates of Europe and the American colonies were varied, requiring clothing to fend off cold, as well as covering the body from the hot sun. Protection, of course, is perhaps the most susceptible to adaptation in specific environments.

Geographical comparisons of different colonies, stemming from the same cultural traditions, might elucidate this concept, although no studies were located tackling this issue from that perspective. The warmth of the West Indies, for example, should be evident in clothing inventories, whereas the cold of northern colonies should also be reflected in what items are present. A preserved letter from Stephen Hawtrey, a student at the College of William and Mary, exemplifies this, when he advises his brother "Your Cloathing in summer must be as thin and light as possible... the thinnest Stuffs that can be made without lining" (letter dated March 26, 1765 quoted in Baumgarten 1986:13). Another letter, by a British officer near Charlottesville, explains that cotton clothing is a "necessity" in the hot Virginia summer, and relates that he and his fellow officers therefore "now wear cotton habiliments" (Anburey [August 4, 1779] 1789:426).

Nicholas Cresswell also commented on climate and clothing. On two different occasions he observed
arriving Hessian troops, and both times commented they seemed "too heavily clothed for this hot country" (Cresswell [May 24, 1777] 1924:222). Cresswell specifically noted their footwear, writing "I can't conceive why they wear boots, they must be inconvenient and troublesome in the hot and woody country" ([June 4, 1777] 1924:231). Of Virginian women, Cresswell noted "Few or none of them wear stays in the summer and there are but few that wear them constantly in the winter", which, he added, "may be the principle reason why they have such good shapes" ([July 19, 1777] 1924:270). In other areas of the world, however, stays were deemed an essential part of the female wardrobe, and to be without them was to be in a state of semi-undress.

Modesty was certainly a large factor in the 18th century, ingrained from birth through social, cultural, and religious reinforcements. As a predominantly Christian society, modesty concerning the naked body was understood beginning with Adam and Eve in Genesis: "And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons (Genesis 3:7). Not only was this passage enough to convince the average 18th century person of the moral necessity of covering the body, but other passages dealt with the subject as well. Nakedness was a form of humiliation, "Thy nakedness shall be uncovered, yea, thy shame shall be seen" (Isaiah 47:3). Numerous verses equate being unclothed with being humbled. These writings had their effect, and it is reflected in 18th century writings from all walks of life.

While modesty as a theory for wearing clothing stems from views on nakedness, modesty can also be applied, based on religious/cultural learning, as avoidance of the appearance of pride. In 1783 an anonymous author laid out how religious considerations should affect dress. In A Treatise on Dress, the reader is instructed that "many things with which both men and women adorn themselves [are] superfluous, unnecessary, of dangerous and evil tendency, and clearly forbidden in holy scripture" (Anon. 1783:iv). High fashion, the author believed, was a plan through which Satan "plunges those who follow it into hell" by "charming their minds, and setting them bewitched after gay, shining, and costly apparel" (Anon 1783:iv). Modest apparel, on the other hand, would alleviate this source of temptation. The author cited the basis for this view as 1 Timothy 2:9: "In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array."

Regardless of the influence of religious values, immodesty in clothing was also a large part of 18th-century clothing. Immodesty is the theory that by covering certain parts of the body, a psychological construct is created whereby the hidden area is more mysterious and therefore becomes more desirable (Langner 1991). It can also work by covering the body in such a way as to make its shape more appealing. In the 18th century, this concept of immodesty was well understood. An examination of the paintings of Boucher, Fragonard, or even Hogarth clearly show an interplay between clothing and eroticism. The fall of the neckline of a gown or the position of a garter are often suggestive of the principle. Women's stays or men's chest pads helped shape the body to a culturally defined image of an attractive form. Clothing was specifically chosen for just such reasons, especially when attending public functions such as a masquerade (Town 1774), or going
for a stroll "to see and to be seen", as Moritz wrote, in Vauxhall or Covent Garden ([1785] 1965:46).

One 18th century writer confesses this relation to his own clothes and relationships, "I was arriving at that age when the two sexes begin to look at each other, consequently wish to please; and a powerful mode to win is that of dress. This is a passport to the heart, a key to unlock the passions and guide them in our favour" (William Hutton quoted in Marshall 1956:175).

Indeed, many tailors prospered for their skill in manipulating clothing for such ends. Breeches and stockings cut properly could shape the leg and calf. Necklines on dresses could subtly or blatantly emphasize the breasts. Hoops and rolls under petticoats could exaggerate the waistline, while fake parts could even be fitted to the body a bit farther down to accentuate the female posterior profile. Common "mobs and handkerchiefs answer the end of covering, but the main purpose of dress is to reveal" (Town 1774(2):132).

Clothing as a form of adornment in the 18th century was also a highly developed art. None more exemplifies this than the Macaroni, men notorious for their obsession with dress and appearances. While high fashion was often considered a sign of refinement and status, being overly concerned with clothing classed one as a fop. Sometimes this was meant as a compliment, but more often an insult. By the American Revolution, a fop was defined as a "coxcomb, a man of small understanding and much ostentation, one fond of dress" (Sheridan 1780).

To be fond of dress certainly was not unique to fops. Nearly everyone from King George to field slaves had some fondness of dress, excepting perhaps those who held strong religious or moral convictions against it. Slaves in the American colonies and the Caribbean were often documented as having spent much of their hard earned extra cash on fine clothes (Ward 1988:243-247; White and White 1995).

The clothing people chose (or were forced) to wear also sent some very distinct messages to those around them. Clothing is "impossible to wear... without transmitting social signals. Every costume tells a story, often a very subtle one, about its wearer" (Morris 1979:7). Often what clothing says to a viewer is a conscious decision, but clothing can also reflect less blatant ideologies. These messages need not be overtly intentional, but can be read into choice in clothing by more intent observation.

This idea was well understood to the 18th century mind. The saying "clothes make the man" dates back many centuries, and was often applied in 18th century literature. Almost all authors discuss the fact that clothing is used to form social opinion of a person, or place that person into a culturally defined status, usually based on expense, though not always (a Buddhist monk's robe for instance is modest, yet signifies a respected social strata).

A book published in Philadelphia in 1772 entitled The Miraculous Power of Clothes, and Dignity of the Taylors, exemplifies the concept of clothing as a crucial aspect of social success. The work begins with "Clothes make men. In those few monosyllables is hid an inexhaustible treasure of wisdom" (Mentz 1772:3).

It then shows how proper clothing can instantly transform the way one is treated. A story is related about an honest man, who wishes to have an audience with an important individual, but dresses in "mean attire". He
is snubbed by the servants, and never gets his audience, even though he is a man of high ideals and character. Then walks in "a gilded fop". Even "empty as his head is, it is admired because it is dressed after the French mode" and he is immediately given an audience, and his every word treated with respect (Mentz 1772:5).

Regardless of the actual merits of each person, judgements are made by appearances, and clothing is a major aspect of that perception. The honest and wise man, meagerly dressed, was dismissed. Nothing of his character alone, when presenting himself to those who did not know him for who he really was, could "procure him that degree of regard in thirty years, which in four and twenty hours he might acquire by means of a rich suit" (Mentz 1772:3-4). His meager dress "disgraces all his merits" (Mentz 1772:4). By simply changing into fine clothes, "he, who but a few hours ago... was the laughing-stock of the servants... is now the admiration of the quality! His merits are known and acknowledged, because fine clothes are seen" (Mentz 1772:7). Conversely, the story goes on, if the fop were to put on "the plain suit of an honest patriot and his somewhat antique periwig; how silly does his honour look. He goes to the opera, in the same box... but he is laughed at" where he was once, due to his dress, deemed a fine gentleman (Mentz 1772:6).

While Mentz's work plays up the concept and uses satire to make deeper social comment, he nonetheless clearly makes the point that in popular social perceptions, "clothes make men and merit" (1772:10). Simply by observing dress, one "can discover impudence staring from the bold cock of a Kevenhuller[a style of hat], parsimony skulking in a darned stocking, coquetry spread in an hooped-petticoat, and foppery dangling from a shoulder-knot" (Town 1774 Vol. 3:47).

Although Mentz's story of how dress affects the treatment one receives was hypothetical, Nicholas Cresswell, an English traveller in America, found this out firsthand. He arrived in the colonies in 1774, and after a time went into the Virginia frontier. His time in the backwoods took a heavy toll upon his clothing, and when he arrived at Fort Pitt on August 14, 1775, he described himself as now in "very shabby dress" (Cresswell 1924:101). Out of money, the following day Cresswell "applied to four people in town to get cash for my Bills on Mr. Kirk, but my appearance prevents my success" ([August 15, 1775] 1924:101). People in the settlement, not knowing him personally, were hesitant to trust his letters of credit, because he did not look the part of a credible borrower. Cresswell records on the 16th of August at having no better luck: "No one willing to supply me with a little cash, tho' I have applied to every man in town... Oh, the disadvantages of a ragged dress!" ([1775] 1924:101). Fortunately for the impoverished man, one resident finally came forward and honoured his letter of credit, enabling him to improve his immediate circumstances.

These cases exemplify why people of all cultures and classes endeavor to obtain clothing which sends the signals they need or wish to be perceived by those who view them. For many in the 18th century, the illusion of wealth, and those character attributes often associated with it, is what was desired, so clothes were sought in imitation of their economic betters. In response to this situation many European countries, including Virginia, enacted sumptuary laws, regulating the wearing of certain status items and clothing (Noël Hume 1982; Phillips and Staley 1979). These had, for the most part, fallen into disuse by the 18th century though,
and people were reasonably free to wear whatever they could obtain.

Others chose clothing to send messages about their philosophy on life or religion. The demure colors of a Puritan or omission of buttons by some religious communities clearly state ideology. Eighteenth century group identity can also be seen through uniforms, professional clothes, or even the "common negro clothes" mentioned so often in runaway slave descriptions.

Clothing was not only seen as a means of expressing one's place or thoughts. Besides being a sort of mirror emitting a reflection of a person's character, dress was also believed to be a determining factor in it. Clothing was said to have a "natural influence... upon the wearers" with such power that it actually dictated behavior (Town 1774 Vol 3:45). A young man, for instance, "may buy courage with his regimentals, and orthodoxy may be purchased... with a gown and cassock by the young smart from universities" (Town 1774 Vol 3:48). A letter from "Eutrapehis Trim", (actually written by Town), takes the thread on, stating "physicians may be furnished from [his] shop with gravity and learning", as well as him sewing some piety into "pudding-sleeves" for country parsons (Town 1774 Vol. 3:49). Afterwards, casting off the apparel, the person could cast off the demeanor inherently attached to it. Though written as satire, Town obviously saw this attitude about him in English culture.

A changing of clothes could raise a person's perceived station in life. While it was certainly shallow at best, many 18th century people likely subscribed to the theory. This may have been related to the fact that acquiring fine clothes was not so easily done as today. When someone did acquire them, chances were that they had somehow managed a rise in wealth or status, both of which were usually directly attributed to character. A day laborer was unlikely to be able to afford a coat laced with silver in a fine fabric, so one who wore such a coat must obviously be important. In the Connoisseur of 1774 we read, "Thus, if a chimney-sweeper or a plough-boy put on a suit of embroidery, a sword, bag-wig, & c. they will at the same time invest themselves with the internal dignity of a person of quality" (Town 1774 Vol. 3:48). Again, though written as a parody, Town makes an important commentary on the role often attributed to clothing by a large segment of society at all levels.

What then, may we deem representational clothing of the period? For the elite this question is fairly well covered. Numerous personal writings, treatises, probate documents, paintings, engravings, drawings, and even extant clothing help to complete that picture. For the middle and lower classes the available information sharply tapers off. Fewer of each kind of information is available as status and wealth decrease, though some does exist down the social ladder. Other documents and sources become increasing important as the traditionally utilized sources dwindle, including legal documents, merchant records, and newspaper items, to name but a few. What research has been done often covers far too wide a spectrum, necessitating the perpetuation of sweeping generalizations. While this is true for most classes in colonial America, "there are relatively few details available on exactly what was worn by an American of a specific socioeconomic level in a definite geographic area at a particular date (Kidwell 1976:33). We must now call for more targeted
studies in order to advance our understanding.

CLOTHING IN GREAT BRITAIN

By the 1770’s, clothing of the fashionable in Europe was becoming quite international. The distinctive folk costume of regions and cultures were retained by some, but by and large were disappearing in favour of more universal fashion. For most of Europe, and certainly for Britain, fashion was largely influenced by France. Throughout Europe, “by 1760 French standards in taste and fashion were universally adopted” (Ribeiro 1984:15), and the courts of Louis XV and Louis XVI were seen as the epitome of style. Men of little talent or virtue were nonetheless “admired because [they were] dressed after the French mode” (Mentz 1772:5).

High fashion, of course, was followed primarily by the uppermost classes, and by those in more urban settings. As one descended the social hierarchy, dress became more conservative, just as it did the farther from court one went. Everyone was, nevertheless, undeniably influenced by the higher fashions to some degree. Changing fashion is often explained as a process of adoption by a few, mimicry by the many, and abandonment by the few again in favour of a new style. In this way a cyclic trend keeps fashion evolving through time.

What constituted “in fashion” by the upper and middle urban classes in England was largely set at court, or by those who had some contact with it. In a strong class system, most everyone looked to their social betters for guidance in such matters. This was true not only in the cities, but even in the countryside, where locals could always look to their own gentry. While earlier in the century style in dress of courtiers had been quite ornate, by the 1770’s, the ostentatious tastes of the preceding years were dying down, only kept alive by the assorted leftover macaroni and fop (Ribeiro 1984). The conservatism of the country gentleman was spreading, and rising political ideals of democratic society had their quieting effects on clothing as well.

The strict formality of court dress, even as it became more muted, was still largely confined to those nearest the seat of government. As Carl Moritz, a German traveller, described it, the “farther you go from the Court towards the City... the more middle-class they become... Formal dress is therefore not yet worn and the usual summer dress is a short, white waistcoat, black breeches, white silk stockings and a tail-coat generally of dark-blue cloth- so dark that it looks almost black. Dark colours serve them best” (Moritz [1785] 1965:69).

What Moritz was observing was one of several differences in dress that could be perceived when viewing what any particular group or class chose to wear. For England, most authors suggest distinct visible differences were usually exhibited in the dress of the varying social layers of society. Moritz noted that the color schemes of those further from court tended to be fairly conservative, lights and darks. In contrast to Moritz’s observation, Bushman offers that the upper classes were particularly fond of “bright rich colors” (1992:70). While Bushman does not state so, this preference was probably more true earlier in the century
than it was in the 1770's. This can be correlated to a rising interest in Indian cottons and chintz in the second quarter of the century (Lemire 1991), for cottons held color well, unlike wool, which tended to fade when cleaned too often (Bushman 1992:70). Cottons, however, were lobbied against by the wool industry and their availability suffered for several decades.

In contrast to the bright colors of the upper classes, the lower classes are said by Bushman to have been more apt to be seen in "dull, natural browns, greens, and off-whites" (1992:70). While this may or may not hold true for England, by 1789 in France no such hard color lines could be drawn (Roche 1994:138, Table 15). In addition, legislation calling for the regulation of cottons by 1721 as well as overwhelming evidence of the lower classes' affinity for prints, suggests they too, as in France, could be found wearing colors as bright as anyone else, but probably more limited in the quality of the fabric and degree of adoption.

Being "in the fashion" could be determined by many factors. It depended not only upon things such as choice of color, but also local preferences, how one's garments were cut, and what textiles were used. Both fiber content and weave, for instance, came into play. A pure silk was generally more fashionable than a silk and wool blend, or a more base fabric such as fustian or linen. Likewise, a fine dimity outshone a common twill or jean. The upper classes naturally tended to favor higher quality, more expensive fabrics and weaves, while the lower classes commonly went for the more durable ones, but out of necessity, not preference. If they chanced upon a better fabric at good price, it would end up in the wardrobe, regardless of its practicality to a member of the working class. Appearances, it should be recalled, were often more important than reality.

In England there were no hard rules as to what lower classes would or would not own as far as textile type. Defoe lists several textiles he saw for sale in Stourbridge Fair, which was frequented by the middle and lower classes. Included in the offerings were "Yorkshire cloths, kerseys, pennistons, cottons, & c. with all sorts of Manchester ware [cottons], fustians, and things made of cotton wool; of which the quantity is so great they told me there were near a thousand horse-packs of such goods from that side of the country" (Defoe [1724] 1991:38). He then goes on to say that besides a dealer in "Norwich stuffs only" that "Western goods had their share here also, and several booths were fill'd as full with serges, du-roys, druggets, shalloons, cantaloons, Devonshire kersies, & c." (Defoe [1724] 1991:38).

In Paris, textile preferences of the different classes were tabulated by Roche (1994:138, Table 14), listing percentages for textile types at the beginning of the French Revolution. There is a distinct preference for silk (38%) by the upper classes, followed by cotton (25%), wool (18%), and linen (17%) with another 2% of miscellaneous types. Domestics, on the other hand, top out at 40% for cottons, followed by wool (26%), miscellaneous (14%), silk (12%), and linen (8%). While these figures may not accurately reflect English tastes, there may be at least some correlation, considering the English affinity for French fashion.

Along with the textiles employed, status was ascribed to clothing depending on the trim. This included the use of lace, and the kind it was, as well as things like buttons and embroidery. Gold and silver lace were typically only found on the clothing of the more well to do. Lace of different material was more
abundant in the other classes, but in general the everyday clothing of the working classes were not embellished with such finery. Even so, their "Sunday" clothes might well have had a little extra trim if they could afford or otherwise acquire it. Additional accessories were also considered, such as the type and number of buttons, or a variety of other small details.

The cut of the clothing was also related to status. The higher classes tended to have more fashionable cuts, which were typically closer fitting to the body. Loose clothes were often indicative of apparel meant to be worn while at work. The pattern of working coats reflected more practical matters. The long coats of the upper classes were often replaced by shorter versions, or even jackets with little or no skirts at all by those who needed freedom of movement. The upper classes did begin to adopt more relaxed clothing though, as society began to embrace the ideology associated with the "country gentleman" and dress more casually.

The middle and lower classes in Britain are not so well documented as the upper, but some descriptions have been handed down. Most of the textual clues we have regarding these classes come from the writings of those of higher status, describing what they observed from their own vantage point. Daniel Defoe offers several descriptions of common dress in the earlier years of the 18th century, and points out how cosmopolitan the dress of all classes in England had become. In his 1727 *The Complete English Tradesman*, he notes that in an ordinary suit may be represented cloth from Yorkshire, Berkshire, Norwich, Wiltshire, Lancashire, and even Scotland, stockings made of yarn from Westmoreland, a hat from Leicester, buttons from Cheshire, Birmingham, or Warwickshire, garters from Manchester, and shoes from Northampton.

Other travellers offer further insight into the working people of Britain, the class who generally gave rise to the clothing traditions transported with the servants. Almost without exception, they agree that the less affluent in England were tolerably well dressed compared to their social equivalents on the Continent. "All the farmers I saw here", wrote Carl Moritz, "were dressed in good cloth and good taste. (Not as ours are, in coarse smocks). In appearance they are to be distinguished from townsmen less by their dress than by their natural dignity" ([1785] 1965:128).

While the image of bedraggled peasants is often conjured up in modern depictions of the 18th century poor, that image may likely be applicable to smaller percentage of the destitute in England than sometimes assumed. Contemporary drawings and paintings, by artists such as Hogarth and Rowlandson, for instance, commonly depict the commoner in street and country scenes, but only rarely are the subjects attired in true rags. While Moritz does imply that the most destitute were to be seen in worn clothing, he adds that "hardly a beggar can be espied who doesn't wear a clean shirt under his tatters" (Moritz [1785] 1965:34).

Cleanliness was mentioned several times by Moritz. As a traveller on foot, he was especially prone to becoming dusty, and quickly learned with what scorn he was treated when appearing that way, by all classes. At a roadside inn he was treated quite rudely, and at another he perceived himself a "shock and eyesore to the servants. The maid muttered as she showed me to a room where I could tidy up my dress a little" (Moritz [1785] 1965:116). Later they tried to send him packing without giving him a room for the night,
but in the end he prevailed and ended up being allowed to share one. He was refused a second night’s lodging altogether though, as his appearance seems to have been more important than his ability to pay.

Even though Moritz himself was often soiled from a day’s walk, he confessed it “gives me real delight… to meet so many people from the highest to the lowest class neatly and cleanly dressed. Not a man pushing a wheelbarrow but he has his white underclothing,” (Moritz [1785] 1965:33). When passing through Oxford he observed clean garments were “especially important here. In the afternoon, as I was out walking in linen not too clean, I heard two women talking at their doors in a small street: ‘Look at that fine gentleman,’ said one, ‘and he prefers to wear not even a clean shirt!’” (Moritz [1785] 1965:139).

The notion of English commoners dressing well also struck Voltaire on a visit in 1728. Upon observing people whom he mistook for the more well to do, “it was with some surprise that he realized he was in fact watching ordinary men and women, even apprentices and streetwalkers, dressed up to imitate their betters and strolling about as though they were fashionable idlers” (Jarrett 1986:15).

Moritz relates such behavior in references to Ranelagh in 1782. He writes that “none of the lower classes go there unless dressed in their best” ([1785] 1965:47). Such outings stand in sharp contrast to the more casual attitude he encountered in Haymarket Theatre, where flying oranges went whizzing past or struck his hat, and the fop behind “who continually put his foot on my bench in order to show off the flashy stone buckles on his shoes” (Moritz [1785] 1965:61). It was perhaps the young boys in crowds like this whom Moritz described as more apt to go about with their shirts open. Furthermore, “this free and natural dress is worn until they are eighteen or twenty” when “it is discontinued in the higher classes, but is retained among the common people” (Moritz [1785] 1965:68).

When differentiating between the fashionable and not-so-fashionable, many aspects would obviously be used. Even little nuances such as the cock of a hat, the placement of a knee garter, or the tightness of a sleeve would be judged as fashionable or not. From contemporary observers, we learn that there were few hard rules as to who would adopt such modes, for it is not uncommon to read of a common servant going about his or her business with a mix of working and fine clothes. A bit of silver lace picked up at a street market could be applied to a hat, and worn with a suit including stockings with large holes. A pair of silver buckles could be found on shoes with toes sticking through, or an apprentice seen wandering the parks of London on a Sunday in clothes to rival those of his master.

Where the common people of England obtained their clothing is a mixed lot. By far the majority would have been sewn up from purchased textiles. Considering the developed state of the textile industry in England, it is likely that the bulk of cloth acquired for clothing was commercial rather than home produced. Defoe mentions attending several fairs where all manner of cloth was offered for sale, and such public markets probably provided the best opportunity for acquiring textiles. Peddlers would also have offered cloth for sale, along with various accessories.

Even so, some people, especially agrarians with less access to markets and more access to raw
materials, could produce at least some of their own cloth. Piece work was fairly common, whereby different individuals performed various tasks in the production sequence. One person would shear the sheep, another comb or card the wool, yet another spin, and still another weave and pass it on for finishing and dyeing. From here it went to the one who cut out the clothes and sewed them up. Several diaries show this entire process in the colonies, from growing or obtaining the fiber for spinning, through the process until finally ending up with usable cloth (e.g Carter 1965; Harrower 1963).

Most new clothes would be sewn up by a local tailor once cloth had been obtained. The employment of tailors was not confined to those with more expendable income, and it would not at all be uncommon for an ordinary worker to hire someone to sew up at least certain elements of his clothes, especially in more urban settings. In London alone, by 1752, there were an estimated 15,000 journeyman tailors at work, along with another 1,000 Master Tailors (Ginsburg 1972:64). Generally work could be contracted for very reasonable prices, especially if one were willing to trust less experienced journeymen or the numerous freelance tailors working illegally outside of the established guilds (Ginsburg 1972).

Among the working classes, when money could not be spared as easily for professional services, some items would be more likely to have been sewn in the home than others. Basic items, such as shirts, were apt to be home produced in certain areas. This could either be in the form of using purchased or bartered cloth, or homespun in those places where there was available land for growing flax or keeping sheep. In other words, homespun was more likely the prerogative of the rural worker than the urban, who had little opportunity to produce the raw material necessary to spin or knit into clothing.

John Harrower, for instance, lived in an area of Scotland rich in sheep, and so set out on his way to London bearing Scottish home-knit stockings to sell along the way. This assertion is further supported by the investigations of Sir Frederick Eden, writing in the late 18th century. He found that “only in the most northerly counties and parts of Scotland did one find labourers’ families in which a substantial portion of the family’s clothing was made at home” (Lemire 1991:178).

Although most new clothes were likely made to order using new cloth or reused pieces from older items, ready made clothes were also available from several sources, especially in urban centers and sea ports. Most such establishments targeted the lower classes, and were known as “sale or show shops” (Figure 1) (Ginsburg 1972:67). These merchants carried common clothing “ready made, or prepared immediately” for anyone willing to buy (Herdford Sunday School 1789:56).

Sailors were often the intended customers, for unlike the more settled population, they had fewer opportunities to obtain clothing from established social networks, and so were more likely to be in need of ready made clothing than other laborers. Thus, “slop shops” as they were often termed in seaports, frequently carried a variety of jackets, trousers, shirts, great coats, and assorted apparel.

While new clothing was available, the most likely source for made-up clothing to be purchased in Britain would have been second hand clothes. The second hand trade in clothing was thriving in Europe, and
Mary & Ann Hogarth
from the old Frock shop the corner of the Long Walk facing the Clysters. Removed
to y. Kings Arms joyning to y Little Britain -
gate near Long Walk sells y best & most Fashi-
onable Ready Made Frocks, suits of Fustian,
Ticken & Holland, stript Dimity & Flannel
Wajcoats, blue & canvas Frocks & blue coat Boys
Likewise Fustians, Ticken, Hollands, white 
stript Dimitys, white & stript. Flannels in y piece.
by Wholesale or Retail, at Reasonable Rates.

Figure 1
Ready-Made Clothing Shop Tradecard
(London, circa 1730-1740)
several studies have shown how extensive it was (Ginsburg 1980; Lemire 1991; Lemire 1988; Roche 1994; Spufford 1984).

Second hand clothes were traded and sold in an essentially unrecorded market system. Because new manufactures were not involved, little government regulation was in force, and hence few references appear in any but merchant and buyer’s records (Ginsburg 1980). Several groups dealt in used clothes in England, including specialized dealers and peddlers, (a large number of whom were Jewish), and tailors, who often took in used clothes as partial payment on new, as well as sold clothes made up but rejected by those who commissioned them. Some merchants also bought and sold used clothes as a sideline, but apparently not to any great extent (Lemire 1991:65).

The condition of used clothes could range from never worn to virtually rags. When worn beyond usefulness, rags could be sent to paper makers to be recycled in that fashion. Most used clothing that was sold was probably in reasonably good condition, or at least repairable. Because by the later 1700’s “fashions became more generally uniform across the nation and the classes of society” buying used clothes “a year or two old would not offend” (Lemire 1991:64). Thus, in more style conscious London, clothes might be consigned to second hand dealers more quickly by the fashion slave, but this did not make the garment less desirable elsewhere by one who looked to better his social appearance with nice clothes. The second hand trade not only afforded an opportunity for the less wealthy to buy decent clothing, but also a chance to do a bit of social climbing by obtaining garments from higher classes.

Personal servants of the upper classes also had a great deal to do with clothing redistribution in Europe. Receiving cast off clothing from the master or mistress was said to be “perquisite” of the job (Ginsburg 1980:121; Marshall 1956:177), and the clothes could either be worn, traded, given, or sold. Apparently this custom was a major “source of cheap finery for many Londoners” (Marshall 1956:177).

The prices charged for used clothing were naturally related to various factors, such as overall condition, trim and lace, buttons, textiles, and cut. As a generalized rule, one could expect to pay approximately one quarter to one third of the new price of the article when buying it used (Ginsburg 1980:122-123).

The availability of used clothing was not ubiquitous though. The trade was essentially confined to areas near larger urban centers, and London was the center of the trade. Thus, town laborers had greater opportunities to tap into this source than did country dwellers, who were less likely to have purchased second hand apparel (Ginsburg 1980; White and White 1995). This, combined with other social pressures, also probably meant townsmen were generally more finely dressed from day to day than those in the outlying areas.

Second hand clothes were not only obtained through trade or barter from dealers. Estate sales were another source of clothing, and advertisements and probate disposition returns occasionally attest to this. Clothing was also frequently willed to family and friends, or less formally distributed to family members after a death.
Finally, another rather significant source of used clothing should not be overlooked; theft. Newspaper accounts seeking articles stolen are numerous in British papers (as well as prominent features of runaway ads in Virginia). In fact, clothing theft sent several convicts to the colonies, some for as little as the purloining of a handkerchief (Bailyn 1986:293).

The availability of clothing, both new and used, was not necessarily the main issue in obtaining clothes for the less affluent. Rather than availability, it often boiled down to economics. For the truly poor, buying new clothes was rare. This is not to say they could never purchase clothes, for a beggar in a good neighborhood might be able to earn 20 shillings a week (Phillips 1949:84). The more likely source though was charity, from individuals or the parish. Parishes oversaw the care and clothing of the poor, and even published manuscripts detailing the most economic way to provide them with apparel (cf. Herdford Sunday School 1789). Adult males, however, were not eligible for such public charity, and had to rely on private sources.

The majority of the population was not in this severe situation though, and earned wages enabling occasional purchases of clothing. The wage earning power of British workers varied considerably from year to year and area to area. Even those with steady work often "found buying clothes a real problem because only a very small proportion of the weekly earnings could be set aside for this purpose" (Marshall 1956:175). One had to save up over time, in anticipation of the eventual purchase of non-essentials, or replacement of essentials such as basic clothing.

William Hutton, writing about his time as an indentured apprentice in England in 1759 put it in these words: "clothes came as sluggishly as food... I envied a new coat: I had the wish to earn but not the power". Later he writes "I made shift, however, with a little work and a little credit, to raise a genteel suit of clothes, fully adequate to the sphere in which I moved" (quoted in Marshall 1956:175-176). The hard earned suit was later stolen though, and it took him several years to replace it (Marshall 1956:176).

Hutton's situation may have been somewhat typical of the class of indentured servants in Britain, though it is difficult to say if his peers earned expendable money for clothes with more ease or difficulty. His story does serve to remind us of the value placed on clothing in his circle, and how dear it came at times.

While most extant studies on British clothing are biased towards the upper classes, hopefully future studies can better flesh out descriptions of the lower classes. Due to the paucity of preserved examples in museums, and a lack of detailed attention in the literature, perhaps interdisciplinary material culture studies on lower class clothing in Europe could offer much to the elucidation of the matter.

CLOTHING IN AMERICA

Eighteenth century clothing in America, for European originating people, was mostly the same as in Europe. One foreigner in Pennsylvania observed at mid-century that "both men and women dress according to the English fashion" (Mittelberger 1960:89), and apparently the observation held true for the other colonies as well. With few exceptions, those immigrating from Europe to North America retained their habits of dress
as best they could. Even up to the eve of the Revolution, colonists still considered themselves British (as did many during the war), and servants were most often freshly arrived from Europe.

Some clothing modifications would be necessary to account for varying climates, and additional items such as leather moccasins were adopted from the indigenous population. Even so, colonial fashion was still largely dictated from the mother country. Indeed, for most of the colonial period the majority of apparel components continued to be imported, even if cut and sewn in the colonies.

While the time it took fashion trends to arrive in America varied, the frequent arrival of merchant ships ensured colonials were kept up to date. In 1771 William Eddis commented, “The quick importation of fashions from the mother country is really astonishing. I am almost inclined to believe that a new fashion is adopted earlier by the polished and affluent American than by many opulent persons in the great metropolis” (Eddis [1771] 1969:57).

Similarly, Kidwell and Christman quote an earlier observer as saying, “There is no fashion in London but in three or four months it is to be seen at Boston” (unattributed quote 1974:19). Not only would those desiring to be up with the times like this speed, but it would also benefit those involved in the tailoring and textile trades, for evolving fashion meant more profit.

As in Europe and Britain, the lower classes in America seem to have done their best to emulate their social betters in clothing style. Such “emulation models of society are based on the idea that wealthy or high-status individuals are the first to acquire new (and expensive) items of material culture and that such high-status goods are coveted by members of lower classes to whom those goods eventually trickle down” (Potter 1992:118).

This imitation was not done indiscriminately, as Philip Fithian, a plantation schoolmaster reminds us: “After School I waited on the Ladies in the Dining-Room the conversation was on Fashions which instantly introduced the oddity of Miss Panton. But Miss Corbin with a Snear, & with ill-nature enough, swore She would not think of imitating such a thing as her!” (Fithian [April 5, 1774] 1943:124).

In the 1750’s, Gottlieb Mittelberger, a German, noted this particular fondness of dress in Americans (1960:74). His travel journal through the colonies records that the “apparel of the men, especially the English, is generally very elegant and this applies to farmers as well as the other ranks” (Mittelberger 1960:89). He even went so far as to surmise that female English servants in America dressed as well as the gentry in his native Germany.

Hugh Jones echoed this sentiment, visiting Virginia a few years earlier. In Williamsburg he found the inhabitants “live in the same neat manner, dress after the same modes, and behave themselves exactly as the gentry in London” (Jones 1724:32). This aspiration to the better sort was so strong that Jones was compelled to write “for the most part they are much civilized, and wear the best cloaths according to their station; nay sometimes too good for their circumstances” (Jones 1724:43).

While many commented on the fondness of dress in Virginia, few were as explicit as the Reverend
Jonathan Boucher, who wrote circa 1759,

Solomon in all his Glory was not array'd like one of These. I assure you, Mrs. James, the common Planter’s Daughters here go every Day in finer Cloaths than I have seen content you for a Summer’s Sunday. You thought (homely Creatures as you are) my Sattin Wastecoat was a fine best, Lord help You, I’m noth’g amongst the Lace and Lac’d fellows that are here. Nay, so much does their Taste run after dress that they tell me I may see in Virginia more brilliant Assemblies than I eve c’d in the North of Engl’d, and except Royal Ones P’haps on any Part of it (Quoted in Baumgarten 1986:11 from Maryland Historical Magazine VII 1912:5).

In contrast to this picture of finery in Virginia, in Europe there is often a depiction of tattered clothes worn by those of lesser stations. Some authors apply this European view directly to the colonies, with statements such as ‘The poor must have been very visible in eighteenth-century America, in clothing characterized as ‘half worn’, ‘moth eaten’, ‘much wore’, ‘old and ragged’ ‘torn’, ‘greasy’, ‘wretched’” (Kidwell and Christman 1974:21), but relatively few first hand sources bear this out, except for instances caused by interrupted supplies during the Revolution. In America Mittelberger noted “no beggars are to be seen; for every township feeds and takes care of its poor” (1960:51). This is not to say that well worn clothing was not frequently worn by the non-slave servile class in America, but it is safe to say those Mittelberger encountered at least, were not generally as ragged as those in Europe.

Nicholas Cresswell, an Englishman arriving in the Chesapeake in 1774, echoes this observation immediately. He reported that the inhabitants “Game high, spend freely, and Dress exceedingly gay” ([June 6, 1774] 1924:21). William Eddis also commented that he felt the slaves in America were on the whole better clothed than those he knew of in the West Indies ([September 20, 1770] 1969).

Most early accounts describe American dress as nice compared to elsewhere. Eddis writes that in the south, “they.... impair their health and their fortunes by splendor of appearance and magnificence of entertainments... nor are opportunities wanting to display superior elegance” ([1771] 1969:57-58). Perhaps this is what motivated Peter Collinson to advise his friend, John Bartram, to purchase a new fine suit before he traveled to Virginia, for “these Virginians are a very gentle and well dressed people, and look perhaps more at a man’s outside than his Inside” (Jones 1724 quoted in Morton 1956:202).

By the start of the Revolution, problems had begun to arise in obtaining supplies from abroad for items such as clothing, and this obviously had effects on Virginia. Eddis, Harrower, and Cresswell all mention in their writings that sometime in 1774 trade was interrupted. Within a few years it picked up again, not only through legitimate routes, but also via privateers and clandestine trade partners from Britain engaged with American merchants through the West Indies.

Even so, in January of 1777, Nicholas Cresswell tells us of the effects of the trade interruptions; “Every necessary of life is at an extravagant price... Poor people are almost naked. Congress or Committee of Safety or some of those infernal bodies have issued an Order that every one that is fortunate enough to be possessed of two coats is to give one to their naked soldiers” ([January 8, 1777] 1924:180). Cresswell’s statements should be seen as subjective though, for his view of sufficient dress may have been on a higher
standard than that of others.

More objectively, Cresswell lists the current prices charged for cloth, and relates it to pre-war prices to show the difference. Of Yorktown merchants, on May 1, 1777 Cresswell recorded.

Linen cloth at 30s/- and 37s/- per yard such as they usually sold at 3s/- and 3s/6d. per yard. Woollen cloth, if red, green, buff, or blue or any colour fit for uniforms, at £5 and £6 per yard, such as they usually sold at 18s/- and 20/- per yard. Buttons and trimmings if suitable at whatever price they please to ask... In short, everything bears a great price. Their imports in particular, owing to the little value of their paper Currency and the total want of specie (Cresswell [May 1, 1777] 1924:210).

Unfortunately, Cresswell did not mention whether his pricing list adjusted for inflation in the value of currency and wages, both of which would have great impact on the real costs involved in buying the merchandise he mentions.

The ability to procure new clothes during such times of economic stress were, naturally, related to personal wealth more than anything. Obvious differences must have begun to develop throughout the war based on such economic-market factors. Perhaps because of such things, when comparing the clothing of the upper, middle, and lower classes in America, certain generalizations have been settled upon over the years, based on assumptions of logic in what was affordable. Some of these assumptions are supported by contemporary documents, diaries, and descriptions, while others should be seen as more fluid in application than once believed.

Nicholas Cresswell, for instance, was forced to live a life of poverty due his political convictions. Had he openly worked for wages, he would have been held liable for military service against his King, a thought he abhorred. Even so, he frequently endeavored to obtain luxuries, sometimes at the expense of necessities. In May of 1776, for example, he wrote he must get "some new clothes, as mine begin to be shabby and it is absolutely necessary to me to keep up a genteel appearance, tho' I can badly afford it" (Cresswell [May 21, 1776] 1924:143).

Many times Cresswell spends his meager savings on goods or services that are only for the purpose of keeping up his image. While his social background class placed him just below the gentry, he did not want to appear to be a beggar. That thought shows up numerous times when he thinks about returning home, and a good way to avoid this stigma was to obtain decent clothing, an action doubtless repeated by many in similar circumstances.

What then, as regards clothing, would differentiate the classes? In England, some authors have noted color as a possible source of variance. In America, bright colors do not appear to have been as important to the upper classes, although some certainly preferred them (Bushman 1992:70). Among the middle classes, more subdued colors were often preferred, and in fact wearing very colorful clothing might be considered "a breech of good taste" in some circles (Bushman 1992:70). Similarly, Bushman suggests there was a more muted tone to the trim and buttons, although in America, "buttons were apparently an obsession", but, in portraits, "did not usually glitter" (1992:71).
As in England, textile choice between the classes seemed to be largely based on economics. Most authors generally conclude that fine cloth was preferred by those who could afford it, and more coarse material was used by those who could not. As Kidwell and Christman put it, "whether imported or homemade, the fabric used by the poorer sort shared a common quality of coarseness. Above all, the differences in the fabrics worn by the rich and by the poor must have been a very obvious difference in texture, the smooth as opposed to the rough" (1974:23). While the logic of such blanket statements seems sound from a 20th century perspective, when weighed against observations of 18th century writers, as well as information on the availability of domestic cloth of quality rivaling imported types, we must be willing to concede that many non-upper class people in America succeeded in procuring better cloth than is commonly ascribed to them.

Arrival in the Colonies

Several descriptions of the appearance of indentured servants survive giving us a glimpse at how they looked upon arrival in the New World. Servants disembarking in America came in varied states of dress, from rags stinking from the Atlantic voyage to well rounded wardrobes, and both are represented in contemporary writings.

Upon arrival, it was to a servant’s best advantage to look presentable, especially if his indentures were yet to be sold. For this reason, many likely held some clothing in reserve, or cleaned as best they could what they had upon reaching port. In the British army, it was not uncommon for soldiers to turn their regimentals inside-out while on board ship to keep them clean (Cuthbertson 1768), and the servants may well have imitated such preventative measures.

Cleaning up is described by an ex-convict servant (or a perhaps a hack writer) by the name of James Revel. He stated that upon arriving at port, the servants "that had clean linnen put it on/ Our faces shav’d, com’d out our wigs and hair. / That we in decent order might appear" (quoted in Bailyn 1986:326). Looking like wretches would certainly lessen their chances of obtaining service with a master of the better sort, and for the transporters, a decrease in income, so "every effort was made to spruce up the servants and convicts, many of whom, after weeks at sea and months of travel… arrived sickly, filthy, and in rags" (Bailyn 1986:325). In Williamsburg, a group of newly arrived servants was seen by a recently settled London weaver; "I never see such pasels of poor raches in my life som all most naked and what had cloths was as black as chimneys swipers" (1758, quoted in Bailyn 1986:326).

John Harrower, unlike those observed in Williamsburg, seemed to arrive none the worse for wear. Although he was certainly soiled from the voyage, he managed to arrive at his destination with a fairly extensive wardrobe, and the only clue we have to his uncleanness comes from his master ordering him to have all his dirty clothes washed before going on to the plantation. In an entry dated June 10, 1774, Harrower listed what clothing he had on his arrival in Virginia:

Below is an Inventory of the Cloaths &ca. I brought to Belvidera with me Vizt.
One Superfine Brown Cloath Coat full mounted
One Do. vest Coat
One floor'd [flowered] Silk Do.
One fine marysled [marseilles] Do.
One Brown Duffel Do.
One pair new Black Stockins Britches
One pair new Doe Skin-Do.
One pair flannen Drawers
One pair Osenburgh Do.
Six Ruffled Shirts
five plain white Do.
One Cheque-Do.
One Blew Cloath Jacket
Seven Musline Stocks
One Black silk Cravate
One pair Ribbed Cotton Stockins
Ten pair, worsted Do.
One new Hatt and one Do. Wigg
five pocket Napkins
two hand Towels
two pair Trousers
One pair Shoes; with Pinchback shoe, stock & knee buckles
One Trunk, with fine lock and hinges
Several other Articles besides what are here mentioned but are too tedious to mention (Harrower 1652:45-46).

While Harrower’s listing seems quite extensive for what we consider typical of an indentured servant, based on what we see carried and worn by runaways, it should be recalled that these were all of his belongings and runaways only took what they could wear or carry with them. We also have little idea of what was actually brought over by servants other than Harrower at this time, for many detailed accounts such as his simply do not exist. Janet Schaw does mention the immigrants she traveled with as having trunks with them, containing, among other things, more clothing. Whether the majority of new servants were able to bring such luggage with them or not remains somewhat speculative.

Others, we know, came to America with only what they wore on their backs. One potential buyer, looking for a shoemaker, went on board a newly arrived ship bearing Dutch servants, and made his desire known. Upon delivery of his request in their native tongue, (for none spoke English), "the poor fellows came running up with unspeakable delight, no doubt anticipating a relief from their loathsome dungeon. Their clothes, if rags deserved that denomination, actually perfumed the air. Some were without shirts, others had this article of dress, but of a quality as coarse as the worst packing cloth" (Henry Fearon, c. 1817 in Van der Zee 1985:8).

Another former servant's autobiography mentions his poor clothing upon arrival. William Moraley left London about 1725, after having run out of money, which "soon reduced [him] to going about unshaven, wearing a worn-out, uncombed wig, a torn, unwashed shirt, and stockings riddled with holes" (Moraley 1743 in Van der Zee 1985:147). Later we learn he also had a coat, but that he traded it for "a quart of rum"
(Moraley 1743 in Van der Zee 1985:149). Upon arrival in Philadelphia, he went to his master in New Jersey, where he was "stripped of his rags, and given in their place a torn shirt and an old coat" (Van der Zee 1985:150).

Many potential servants were in fact at their lowest just before signing on. A great number who ended up this way, traveled to London in search of work, and finding none, quickly used all the resources they had. Some resorted to pawning their clothes for cash. John Harrower even fell into this, selling his "old Duffle coat to the Boatswan for 4/Str." on his way to America (February 19, 1774] 1963:21).

If a person was exceptionally reduced in clothing when he signed on as a servant, he might be supplied with some apparel from his agent. If he looked too ragged to sell to a planter, "merchants at Gravesend and other exit ports" would issue coarse clothing (Bailyn 1986:326), although no doubt adding the expense to the price of the indenture.

What the servants left Europe with then, varied considerably. While most came from a social stratum not at the very bottom of British society, many were, by the time they resorted to selling themselves into servitude, quite financially destitute. It would not be unreasonable to assume that as they boarded the ships, many were in clothing worse than ever before in their lives, or at a minimum, below what they were accustomed to. After weeks of travel on foot for the most part, their clothing would be somewhat worn. They typically ran low on money, and would not be able to replace articles easily, and many sold off pieces for food or shelter in London, or the center to which they had journeyed before signing their indenture papers. Those such as Harrower, who were able to retain a reasonable selection of clothing, were probably more fortunate than the rest, but we will never know for sure what most servants brought with them, for the records are primarily silent on this matter.

Sources

Once in Virginia, the servants were in a new cultural system through which they would sooner or later supplement their clothes. The sources for obtaining clothing in Virginia mirrors most of that discussed for England. As a colony of Britain, North Americans were naturally expected to be consumers of products from the mother country, as well as suppliers of raw materials.

Although some past works make assumptions that colonials were somehow deprived of clothing variety and new fashion due to their distance from Europe, quite the opposite was true; colonists had extensive options when needing or desiring to acquire new clothes. If anything, they were more likely than their British counterparts to have a wider selection of imported clothing items from around the world. Due to laws regulating trade in Europe, and the propensity to smuggle from anywhere and everywhere in many of the colonies, a greater assortment of items were available to the American consumer than could be found in English markets. Jones noted this on his visit to Virginia, commenting that "Several sorts of apparel they have as cheap, or cheaper than in England, because of the debenture of such goods upon their exportation thither"
(Jones 1724:52-53).

The Caribbean island of St. Eustatius, for example, regularly sent both legal and illegal cargoes to Virginia. While in port there, Janet Schaw remarked on the assortment of commodities available. In 1775 she recorded in her diary on the "vast traffick from every quarter of the globe", and "but never did I meet with such variety" (Schaw 1934:135-136). She went on to say

from one end of the town of Eustatia to the other is a continued mart... Here hang rich embroideries, painted silks, flowered Muslins, with all the Manufactures of the Indies. Just by hang Sailor's jackets, trousers, shoes, hats etc... I bought a quantity of excellent French gloves for fourteen pence a pair, also English thread-stockings cheaper than I could buy them at home. I was indeed surprised to find that the case with most of the British manufactures... (Schaw 1934:137-138).

While obviously not everyone in Virginia had access to such markets as Schaw saw in the West Indies, they did have greater opportunity for international trade than did those in Britain. Perhaps it is for this reason that travelers often remarked on the fine dress of Americans when compared to Europeans of the same class.

In America, as England, the majority of textiles used for clothing came from commercial suppliers. Shop keepers in Virginia frequently listed newly arrived goods. Advertisements in the papers abound which give detailed lists of what they have to offer. Robert Adam, of Alexandria, was a typical importer, whose merchandise was much the same as the many others. In his announcement, he offered:

Just imported from London... Sacking... Hempen Rolls, Brown Ditto... Irish Linens... Brown and white Sheetin... British Osnabrugs, German Ditto... Camblets plain, checked, and striped. Scotch Plaid... Wool Cards, Tow Ditto, Cotton Ditto... White Cotton, coloured Ditto, White Flannel, Red and Scarlet Ditto. Duffils, Bath Coating... Embossed Flannels, Checked and Striped Ditto. Half Thicks, Sagathies, Duroys, German Serges, Casimirs, Superfine Broadcloths, Super Ditto, Fine Ditto... Drabs, or Drilling. Primed Cotton and Linen, [and] Checks... Cotton and Linen (VG, Purdie and Dixon [P&D]), August 20, 1772.

Merchant records also give good evidence on the extent of importation. John Norton & Sons (Mason 1937) for example, with offices in Virginia and England, record exporting and importing virtually every fabric being produced in the Empire at that time. Many sales were commissioned directly by the consumer, that is special ordered, but other merchants clearly show bulk imports of textiles for the general retail trade.

To supplement the range of imported textiles, the colonies also produced their own. While never in a quantity approaching that imported before the Revolution, domestic textile production did supply certain segments of society with a portion of their apparel. Most accounts suggest the industry was not large in colonial times. Andrew Burnaby, for instance, describes the textile business in Virginia as "very inconsiderable" (1775:12). Certain events did, however, promote country manufacture, so output varied over time depending on the economy and politics.

The variety of textiles being produced domestically is wider than generally acknowledged. There is a distinct tendency in the literature to class most domestic textiles into the "coarse" category, when in fact all
manner, from very coarse to very fine, were produced. Most cloth in Virginia was woven of wool, flax, hemp, and cotton, although some silk was also used, but primarily from imported thread. Silk production never proved feasible in Virginia, and very few attempts succeeded to the point of repetition.

Of the fabrics woven in Virginia, advertisements and account books show the selection was very large. Gardiner Flemming, for example, working in Richmond, advertised between 1773 and 1776 all of the following textiles: "damasks, diaper, Manchester stuffs [cottons], gauzes, cotton velvets, cut or uncut thicksets, jean, fusian, dimities, serges, callimancoes, linens, woolens, plain and striped cotton cloth, coarse Negro coating, figured cotton counterpane, and mosquito curtains" (quoted in Gibbs 1978:37).

George Washington had textiles woven for himself and for others, by his own weaver, Thomas Davis, between the late 1760's and the early 1770's. Meticulous accounts were kept of the affair, and have survived. Like Flemming, Davis could produce a plethora of textiles, including all sorts of linens, wools, cottons, and even some silks.

Besides seldom acknowledging the great variety of textiles colonial weavers could produce, most authors have also delegated cotton to a very insignificant percentage of American clothing until after the Revolution. This is largely due to generalizations for all of colonial America being made from information gathered on more northerly sections, where wool and flax were more prominent. Wool, flax, and hemp were major fibers used in Virginia cloth manufacture, and their presence is adequately addressed in the literature. Cotton, however, is frequently purported to have been fairly uncommon in colonial clothing, when in fact there is considerable primary evidence that a very large amount of cotton was being spun, woven, and worn in Virginia, the colonies south of her, and the West Indies. (cf. Anburey 1789; Carter 1965; Dohla 1990; Fithian 1943; Gibbs 1978; Harrower 1963; McCombs 1976).

Cotton's importance in these areas seems to be directly linked with three factors. First, as tobacco prices fell, planters found more profit in diversifying their crops, and cotton was among the many they chose. One British officer wrote home in 1779 that Virginians were more apt to be planting it than their customary tobacco due to its increased value to the society (Anburey 1789:423). Many counties offered premiums both before and during the Revolution in Virginia for growing cotton, along with similar ones for wool and flax. Numerous advertisements in the Virginia Gazette offer cotton cloth, raw cotton, carded cotton, and cotton ready for weaving.

First hand accounts of cotton's importance to clothing in Virginia during the period are also plentiful. Nicholas Cresswell traded barrels of bread in Barbados for cotton as a "venture", for "This article sells well in Virginia" (Cresswell [September 8, 1774] 1924:35). John Harrower discusses cotton's abundance with his wife in a letter dated December 6, 1774: "There grows here plenty of extrem fine Cotten which after being pict clean and ready for the cards is sold at a shilling the pound" (1963:76). Later he mentions getting five yards of cloth per pound of cotton.

A captive Hessian soldier by the name of Johann Dohla, similarly relates his encounter with cotton.
in Virginia,

This grows abundantly here at Yorktown and in the region. Our entire camp stood in such a cotton field... A stalk often bears ten or fifteen balls...[and] a ball gives a handful of cotton, because it is pressed and held so tightly therein... We made bed covers and floor mats of it in our tents, on which we slept... ([September 11, 1781] 1990:162).

Yet another captive, a British officer taken at Saratoga, saw much the same as did Dohla two years later. Thomas Anburey wrote a letter on August 4, 1779 from a plantation near Charlottesville back home to England. "The shrub which supplies our manufactures with cotton, is much cultivated in this Province, and the inhabitants of the lower sort, through the scarceness and difficulty of procuring clothing for themselves and their negroes, pay greater attention to it at present than tobacco" (Anburey [1779] 1789:423).

Anburey then goes on to explain how prevalent the cloth resulting from the cultivation of the plant has become:

for since the inhabitants have been deprived of our English cottons, they manufacture a sort themselves, little inferior to that made at Manchester, and almost all the families in this Province, both male and female, are clothed with their own manufacture, the superior class as an example to their inferiors, who are compelled by necessity (Anburey [1779] 1789:426).

Finally, the captive officer comments that even some of his own clothing is now made from cotton:

The weather being so extremely hot, woollen cloaths are insufferable, therefore from necessity, and as is the custom of the country, the officers wear cotton habiliments; the cotton of which mine is made I obtained from my landlord, and saw the whole process of its growth and manufacture, from the seed being sown, till it came out of the loom (Anburey [1779] 1789:426-427).

John Mitchell also ascertained the state of cotton in the American south. Comparing it to that grown in Turkey, he says "it is much better and longer staple" (Mitchell 1767:146). It was not, however, "so long at West India Cotton, but it is whiter, and wears white, when the other turns yellow" (Mitchell 1767:146-7).

The ability to weave cotton alone was directly related to the staple length, as well as the spinning equipment at hand. While we have a great deal of evidence pointing to pure cotton textiles in pre-Revolutionary Virginia, much cotton was also regularly intermixed with other fibers, such as flax, wool, or even silk, to create a more broad selection of textiles, and with additional strength over cotton alone.

Although cotton was obviously an important crop for textiles in the southern colonies, wool and flax were still more crucial to the homespun movement and the domestic textile industry. Wool remained probably the single most important textile fiber in the American colonies up to the Revolution and for many decades beyond. The development of quality wools, however, was sometimes hindered in pre-war times through politics, as selective breeding had to be practiced, and British laws governing the importation and exportation of sheep often prevented this.

Flax was produced in Virginia from an early date, but was never a major export of the colony. Its cultivation diminished as the more easily processed cotton gained popularity in the years leading up to the Revolution. For those who did cultivate flax, after labor intensive processing, often performed by slaves, it could be woven into a variety of linen products. Harrower (1963) and Carter (1965) both describe the process
in reasonable detail.

Hemp, unlike flax, was a fairly significant export item of the colony. Between "1765-1783, hemp definitely became the major staple in the Valley of Virginia (although not in the Piedmont or Tidewater), and Virginia was the leading hemp producer in North America" (Herndon 1963:92). The cultivation of hemp topped out during the war, when hemp products such as rope and sail duck (along with some coarse cloths) was most in need (Gibbs 1978; Herndon 1963; Herndon 1966). Even so, the "hemp industry in Colonial Virginia was never one of major proportions", although it was also not insubstantial (Herndon 1966:311).

Nicholas Cresswell observed fields of hemp in his travels into the Virginia frontier. He wrote of the plant, "I have seen Hemp 14 feet high. I am not a judge in this article, but I have been told by people that are, it is equal in goodness to the Riga Hemp. It is a pity the cultivation of this useful plant is not more encouraged in this part of the world. It would be a means of saving large sums we pay to Russians annually for this article, among ourselves" (Cresswell [April 13, 1775] 1924:198).

Hemp fibers were commonly mixed with flax, and sometimes woven alone. As with flax, hemp processing was rather involved, and hemp mills were not in general use in Virginia until after 1776 (Gibbs 1978:11). Unless a person knew the correct methods, he or she might be expected to get only half as much useful fiber from the same poundage of plant as one who was well versed in the art (Herndon 1963:90).

Regardless of its components, homespun cloth seems to have been produced widely in the colonies, but normally only for personal use in comparatively small quantities. Very little seems to have made it to public markets, and most produced was likely used quite locally. Governor Fauquier of Virginia reported "that no merchant would know where to purchase 100 yards of homespun cotton or linen if he had a sale for it" (Clark 1929:209), but he did admit that the "planter's Ladies spin the Cotton of this Country, and make a strong coarse Cloth" and that they sometimes came into town and sold small quantities (Fauquier to the Board of Trade, December 17, 1766, Fauquier 1983:1409).

Besides the plantation and home weaver, there were several textile manufactorys opened up in Virginia in the 1760's and 1770's. By the mid 70's, commercial weaving was taking place in the cities of Fredericksburg, Norfolk, Petersburg, Richmond, and Williamsburg, and in the counties of Albemarle, Augusta, Caroline, Chesterfield, Fairfax, Gloucester, Hanover, Henrico, Louisa, Lunenburg, Mecklenburg, Nansemond, Prince George, Stafford, Surry, and Westmoreland (Gibbs 1978:37). It was probably at such commercial enterprises that the more complex weaves were undertaken. The mill at Henrico, which began operations in 1766, auctioned off its assets in 1780, including quantities of "flax, hemp, tow, West India and Virginia cotton, thread, spun cotton, cotton cloth, and stockings, [and] cotton cards", along with some tools of the trade (VG, Dixon and Nicholson [D&N], February 5, 1780:3).

Precise quantities produced from these operations, however, remain speculative. The manufactory in Williamsburg, for instance, offered textiles for sale to the public in only a few advertisements. Gibbs suggests this to mean their output was not substantial, although Herndon disagrees saying it "appears to have
been considerable" (1666:303). Herndon apparently offers for evidence the same advertisements in the *Virginia Gazette* as Gibbs reviewed. Included in one sale some was "four-hundred yards of Hempen Linen" and "a Piece of fine Linen wove with a Satin Stripe, in imitation of Corduroy, very proper for Summer Breeches" (D&H, July 25, 1777).

George Washington kept precise accounts of the produce of his weaving house, and reports a total of about 1300 yards of linen, wool, linsey, and cotton for his own use in 1768. Landon Carter also offers some figures, estimating the production of his "weaving boy" should be eight yards in 13 hours, but only required seven from him (Carter [March 31 1758] 1965:212). Advertisements for domestic cloth, both plantation and commercially woven, appear in the *Virginia Gazette* on occasion, but they are never numerous in comparison to the amount of imported textiles.

Although the import trade in cloth was brisk, there were interruptions which affected availability and encouraged more domestic production. This was especially pronounced in the late 1760's when boycotts were called for to protest political matters. The result was the spawning of the largest activity in home production to be seen until well after the Revolution. As part of the "homespun movement", patriotic Americans were encouraged to forego imported textiles in favour of that woven in the colonies, as well as other articles of apparel and goods. Not coincidentally, advertisements for country manufactured cloth seem to proliferate between about 1767 and 1768 in the *Virginia Gazette*, including a large upsurge in mentions of cotton. Northern colonies, however, do not seem to mirror this growing use of cotton until after the Revolution, suggesting interesting leads for geographical comparisons in future studies.

The boycotts notwithstanding, demand for imported fabric only declined slightly (Gibbs 1978), and imports continued in the southern colonies almost unchanged, or even slightly up from before the boycotts, unlike New England, New York, and Pennsylvania who saw significant decreases in imports from Britain (Cunningham 1993:189). Such regional differences are typically ignored in discussions on dress in colonial North America, and perhaps explain some of the stereotypes that are imposed upon Virginian clothing of the period. What is true of New England clothing is not necessarily true of the other colonies.

Boycotts of imported British goods were also called for during the Revolution. In 1774, the Virginia House of Burgesses abided by a call from Boston to cease trade with Britain, and passed resolutions encouraging this action. Prince George County furthermore proclaimed "that to be clothed in the Manufactures fabricated in the Colonies ought to be considered as a Badge and Distinction of Respect, and true Patriotism" (cited in Gibbs 1978:19). Patriotism, combined with premium offers and, perhaps most significantly, a dwindling supply from Europe, probably meant domestic textile manufacturing hit its peak during the war. Continued newspaper editorials calling for more use of domestic cloth may suggest a noticeable portion of the population had not yet conformed to the patriots' preferences.

Besides the self-imposed boycotts, open hostilities between the colonies and Britain touched off another major impediment to the importation of goods. Although the shipping traffic slowed significantly
during the war, it did not stop. Merchant advertisements in the Virginia Gazette continue to include a large assortment of imported European goods throughout the war, although there were definite periods where it was harder to obtain than others, mostly related to the presence or absence of British ships. British ships could mean one of two things to the Virginia consumer. They either prevented an American ship from landing, or they were captured by privateers and had their contents sold at public vendue. While generally speaking it was American privateering that provided the goods to the colonials, sometimes even British privateering aided them.

Much of the goods imported to America during the war were still originating in Britain, but typically routed through the West Indies. There, at neutral ports, it was easier for both source and final destination to be disguised from the prying eyes of British authorities. When Admiral Rodney, for example, took the Dutch island of St. Eustatius, he found a large quantity of British goods. These were owned by British merchants on St. Eustatius and nearby St. Kitts, and were routinely sold to American agents (Rodney 1789). He therefore justified taking all the commodities on the island as a war-prize, and the goods were publicly auctioned. Ironically, a great deal of the merchandise Rodney hoped to prevent from reaching the rebels was purchased by agents who sent it directly to America (Howard 1991).

Even with the influence of boycotts and war, the international look of clothing commerce was glaring throughout the period under question. It was not uncommon at all to find a checked shirt from cotton woven in India, a waistcoat of Virginia Nankeen, a coat from the woolen mills of England, breeches from leather tanned in the colonies, stockings knit on a small Scottish Island, shoes from a London cordwainer, and a hat bound with silk ribbon imported from China. The world market system was securely in place, and in many cases, helping direct the course of fashion.

Capitalism both fueled and dictated the availability of textiles to the inhabitants and servants in Virginia. Whether obtaining imported or domestic cloth, individual economics had a great deal to play in the matter. Much of the purchasing power of Virginians was tied to the world economy, and especially dependent on the tobacco market. When prices for tobacco fell, so did the ability to afford goods. While it would be tempting to say that in times of economic down slumps, homespun cloth would save revenue, the fact is that was true only in certain cases. If one had abundant time and land to produce the raw material, homespun could save hard currency. If one had to support slave or servant labour, however, to spin and weave, or detour energy from the cultivation of higher paying crops, importing usually still made better economic sense.

George Washington calculated his costs either way for a quantity of cloth he desired, and concluded that importing would cost him £105.7.3, whereas home weaving would total £76.7.4 for the same quantity. He then added that the difference of £28.19.11 would have to suffice for the costs of spinning and the upkeep of a spinner, among other incidentals, and that in the long run he would be better off importing (account book reproduced in Gibbs 1978). His records show he did a mix of importing and home weaving, probably as much for politics as economics.
Likewise,Governour Fauquier observed that,

During the time of Uneasiness, on Account of the Stamp Act, there was a strong Attempt made to convert their hemp into Ostabrigs, but I believe that Scheme is quite at end, on their discovering that they could import them much cheaper than they could make them. And this must always be the Case as long as they have plenty of Land (letter to the Board of Trade, [December 17, 1766] Fauquier 1983:1409-1410).

Three years later, Robert Wormley, a weaver for Robert Carter, wrote, "I am well convinced there is nothing to be made by weaving at 5d. coarse & fine; I shall therefore only carry it on for the conveniency of getting my own work done." (Wormley diary, Swem library archives, College of William and Mary, quoted in Gibbs 1978:31). He simply could not compete with cheap imported goods at the going rate. Washington confirms this general price rate for weaving in the late 1760's. His account book, reproduced in Gibbs (1978:Appendix.III), lists the variety of cloth being woven, including the price per yard being charged. These are summarized by Gibbs (1978:89) as follows:

- linen, cotton filled with wool, linen filled with tow, woolen cloth at four pence per yard; woolen plaied, wool birdeye, linen, linsay plaied, woolen, plain or striped cotton, cotton and wool, herringbone at sixpence per yard; plain, striped, and plaied cotton, bed ticking at ten pence per yard; striped or plain cotton, cotton M's and O's counterpane, cotton birdeye. Roman M, hucabuc, linen, fustian at one shilling per yard; cotton birdeye, hucabuc, plain or striped cotton, jeans twilled at one shilling three pence per yard; cotton jump, stripe cotton birdeye, cotton striped with silk, jeans twilled, birdeye diaper, plain cotton, carpet at two shillings per yard; India dimity, cotton, cotton jeans twilled, jump stripe, cotton and silk, striped cotton at two shillings sixpence per yard; jean twilled, plain or striped silk and cotton at three shillings per yard (Washington's accounts with Thomas Davis).

Obviously, similar cloths could be bought at varied price structures. The differences in cost were related to the quality and difficulty of the weave. Landon Carter wrote in his diary that "Abraham Clark who weaves my cloth course and fine for 4d [but] says he must [have] 12d for my bed ticks" ([September 20, 1770] 1965:495). Harrower paid "one shilling per Yd. for Weaving" when he commissioned the weaving of "cotton cloth wove Jeans" for a summer short coat [June 26, 1776] 1963:156. This is the same price William Simmons advertised as his fee for weaving in an advertisement of January 13, 1774 (VG, Rind). The cotton Harrower had woven in 1776 was purchased also, at 2s. 6d. per pound, and the tailoring cost him another 5s. In 1774, however, he reported cotton selling at one shilling a pound, probably reflecting the inflationary effects of war (Harrower [December 6, 1774] 1963:76).

John Wily, in estimating the cost of a yard wool of "Negro cloth" in 1769, also offers a breakdown of the prices. He calculated it at "a pound of good clean wool at 1s. 3d. the spinning a pound... at 10d. and the weaving a yard (which will take near a pound) at 4d. in all 2s. 5d. [per yard] (Wily in Gibbs 1978:89). Apparently the price had not risen much by 1775, when Nicholas Cresswell estimated wool sold at 1s. 6d. per pound in Virginia, and others estimated similar weaving costs within a few pence per yard.

Once cloth or enough money to purchase it had been obtained for making clothing, as in Britain, it was usually taken to a specialist for sewing, and not just by the more affluent. Tailors frequently advertised
in newspapers, and commented on their ability to create all the latest fashions. Thomas Orrel, for instance, was sure to inform the public when he set up shop in Williamsburg, that "those gentlemen who chose to employ him may depend upon having their work done in a neat manner, and in any fashion they choose" (VG, Purdie, January 19, 1776). Another tailor, Edward Wall, from Richmond county, included in his advertisement the prices for specific work, cloth and accessories presumably included. For a dress suit the price was £1:5:0, for a plain suit £1:1:6, and for a Newmarket 10 shillings (VG, Rind, March 3, 1774).

The professional tailors in Virginia could be a variety of people. Many were servants themselves, and working on the side for extra money. As many as thirteen of the runaway servants in the Virginia Gazette were tailors, as well as some in related trades such as shoemakers, stocking weavers, stay makers, a dyer, a flax dresser, a hatter, one or two leather breeches makers, and even a peruke (wig) maker (Appendix C).

That many actually pied their trade is also evident. Thomas Scott, for example, was a convict tailor. When he ran, he took with him a "pink coloured Duroy coat" and a "red Poplin waistcoat", both cut out but not yet sewn (VG, P&D, July 28, 1775). Richard Caddeen, who placed the ad, also speculated "I make no doubt of his having got them made up, and wearing of them" (VG, P&D, July 28, 1775). It is quite probable that Scott stole clothing he had been preparing in his capacity as a tailor. He also stole "some silver lace, with which I imagine he will lace his Hat" (VG, P&D, July 28, 1775).

Janet Schaw encountered two servant tailors on the Jamaica Packet. During the voyage one converted "several chintz gowns... into jackets for the favourite swains" of the female emigrants on board (Schaw 1934:68). Even slaves who knew the crafts were generally allowed to do contracted work on their own time, as the spinners Harrower mentions in his journal.

Tailors were widely available in the colonies, and it would not have been difficult nor costly to secure the services of one. Several diaries mention the employment of tailors, and not only those written by people of stable means. Nicholas Cresswell, living in near total poverty while trapped in America, used tailor’s even though he often barely had enough money to buy his dinner. Just prior to his being able to leave for England, he wrote from on board the brig Edward (where he was living to save money), "I have got two pair of drill trousers made here, the stuff cost 12/ and the rogue of a tailor has charged me 18/ for making them. I am very confident that I could have had them made in England for half a Crown" (Cresswell (June 2, 1777) 1924:230). Obviously the circumstances allowed for the tailor to inflate his fees, but even so, he found work.

Earlier in the war, John Harrower recorded the employment of tailors several times, besides those previously mentioned. In January of 1775, he reports "having got a present of piece of Lead coul’d Cloath from Miss Lucy Gaines [a fellow servant] I got made in a Vest by Kidbeck the Taylor for which I have this day paid him 31/½ Curcy" (Harrower [January 19, 1775] 1963:82). Later that year, Harrower has Nancy Beck alter two more waistcoats for him (June 24, 1775) 1963:101).

Again, on July 14, 1775, Harrower writes, "This evening I recd. my Brown Coat I brought to this Country with me new mounted and turned by One Kid: Beck a Taylor for doing which I paid him six shillings"
(1963:102-103). Turning was the act of taking apart the garment and flipping the cloth, so the worn and faded exterior became the interior, and the formerly protected interior gave new life to the coat.

The fact that Harrower hired a tailor for this task says something about the general use of their services, for this would have been easily performed at home, for no special tailoring knowledge would have been required. It may be that as a servant, Harrower had fewer social and family ties that would give access to people with sewing skills. In other words, without family, a servant would be more likely to have to hire out his clothing work, even the simple tasks, unless he were able to do it himself.

Besides general tailoring, Harrower also hired other apparel specialists to do work for him. In May of 1776 he bought a new hat and a few days later wrote, "I sent my Hatt to Toun by Jacob to be Dressed Cutt round & trimmed with binding" (Harrower [May 31, 1776] 1963:153). The apparel work he had done for him extended beyond these items though. Harrower also mentions having his shoes repaired, as well as having a "Srett Stock Buckle" mended (June 24, 1775) 1963:100. The frequent use of tailors and other craftsmen does not mean that a significant part of the clothing in colonial America was not made up at home, but it does suggest that those who left written accounts tended to use tailors recurrently.

The traditional view of home sewing of garments may hold most true for rural settings, and especially those with more extended social circles, large families, or slaves and servants who could do the work. Generally, sewing would be done by females, either the wife or daughters of free families, or, on a plantaition, by slaves or the planter's own family, who would perhaps oversee work done under them as well. Almost without exception, where instances of home sewing are mentioned, it was the task of women, excepting soldiers and sailors.

Janet Schaw mentions the sailors on board the ship she was on were quite skilled at sewing. While she mentions no clothing they made, she does marvel at their dexterity in repairing the damaged sails, complimenting them by saying they worked "as cleverly as any sempstress with her needle" (Schaw 1934:66). Although it may not have been all that uncommon for sailors to construct some of their own clothing, diaries of a few sailors of the period suggest they purchased most of it, while mending some themselves when required (cf. Herbert [1847] 1968; Kelly 1925; Nagle 1988).

As in England, the most likely articles of male clothing to be sewn in the home would be shirts, shirt-shirts, and other simple garments. Naturally some home sewers, both female and male, would excel at the craft and produce quality garments rivaling the best professionals. Few sources mention patterns, but they were available at times. In the absence of a paper pattern, one way to produce more complex clothing in the home was to take apart existing garments. Soldiers' diaries occasionally describe this process of pattern making, especially when needed to procure presentable clothing for wear on a furlough after a long campaign. Harrower also mentions this practice, when he writes, "After breakast I went & found Miss Molly White & left with her cloth to make me two Winter Stocks & a Stock to make them by" (January 3, 1775) 1963:128.
In journals we also read of clothing being made up on the plantation, using both home woven and imported textiles (cf. Carter 1965; Harrower 1963). Most references to this practice indicate plantation-made clothing was intended primarily for slaves rather than for white servants or the master and his family. Harrower specifically notes that the flax was spun "in order to make coarse linnen for Shirts to the Nigers", but then adds, "This being the first of the kind that was made on the plantation", as well as noting the warping was done by John McDearmen, a specialist (October 1775) 1963:121, 123.

While certainly some of the servant clothing in this study was home produced, like that Harrower mentions for Colonel Daingerfield’s slaves, we cannot be sure how much. Considering what scant evidence we do have, we must weigh the fact that most writings suggest the largest proportion of clothes were sewn by hired specialists, whether they were professional tailors or simply skilled neighbors. John Harrower used both sources to get new clothing made up, and probably typifies the situation in Virginia.

If clothing were to be obtained ready made rather than custom sewn, there were several sources to provide it in colonial Virginia. The most common source would have been used clothing. Used clothes could find their way back into circulation in several ways. In Europe we have already seen a thriving second-hand retail trade, and for parts of the American colonies this held true as well. There was surely some commercial sales of used clothing taking place in Virginia, although evidence is hard to find. It was not, apparently, ever anything like in Europe or even the more northerly colonies.

Virginians seem to have had a more intense desire to present finer outward appearances in dress than their station should always warrant, in comparison to their European or American counterparts. Commercially available used clothing, while cheaper, appears to have been frequently snubbed in Virginia. Store records in Williamsburg show that “several merchants returned used clothing on consignment from England, explaining that it would not sell in Virginia because Virginians were too proud to wear it” (Baumgarten 1988:70 note 88, citing Harold Gill, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation). It is impossible to know if this clothing was rejected due to the fact that it was used, or perhaps because it represented low quality items that the shippers could find no market for in England.

It is possible though, that at least some of the imported used clothing, as well as a domestic supply, made its way into the hands of masters for issue to slaves or servants. There is little evidence to support that assumption (Baumgarten 1988), but in a market where obtaining clothing as cheap as possible was often to the purchaser’s short-term benefit, it may have taken place more often than is recorded. Most documents on issues at plantations suggest servant and slave clothing was made up from purchased or home-woven cloth, or, mostly for slaves, bought in stop shops which purveyed cheap, although low quality, new garments.

Used clothing was also sold, bartered for, or otherwise traded by individuals. In Europe this business was often carried out by Jews, who travelled the streets buying and selling individual articles (Ginsburg 1980). Samuel Kelly, a sailor going ashore in the West Indies in 1781, reports selling “Adventures” for the sailing-master in much the same way. Among the wares he mentions are "plated buckles, ribands, men’s and
women’s shoes, etc.”, and adds, “like another Jew, called at the doors and addressed the ladies that I discovered in the balconies” (Kelly [1781] 1925:32).

Indentured servants also participated in such occasional bartering. In a Virginia Gazette advertisement, for instance, Irish born Bryan Drum was said to be “fond of spirituous liquor, and it is probable (being without money) that he will dispose of his clothes to get it” (Philip Cassay, VG, D&H, February 18, 1775). Harrower also exemplifies informal barter on his way to London prior to signing his articles. He leaves home with a large supply of Scottish stockings, selling them all along his journey, carefully recording the price he receives. He also buys and sells clothing accessories, such as buttons and lace, to supplement his income apparently more than his wardrobe. In addition, Harrower accepted clothing items as payment for teaching local children in the plantation school on occasion. Doubtless, numerous other servants built up their apparel collections in such piece-meal methods.

In Europe it was long considered the right of the servant to procure the used clothing of the master’s family, and this occasionally occurred in Virginia as well. In some colonies, however, slaves had been "specifically forbidden... to wear the cast-off clothes of their owners" (South Carolina legislation of 1735), but this did not seem to be enforced at any time (White and White 1995:159). In fact, giving cast-offs to slaves or servants could work to the master’s advantage, for it served as an inducement to appropriate behavior as a subservient. Even so, the evidence that survives suggests this practice was not widespread in Virginia, and "that only favored or close personal servants... benefitted from the practice" (Baumgarten 1988:39). As with many other stereotypes of what colonial clothing was like, this practice seems to have taken on more emphasis from late 19th and early 20th century views of the past than hard facts.

Nevertheless, we do see clothing being given, on occasion, to slaves and servants. Governor Botetourt, for example, seems to have bestowed clothing on his butler, who in turn may have sold it to other slaves or even masters (Baumgarten 1988 note 29, citing Graham Hood). John Harrower likewise received gifts of used clothing, but mostly from friends. His master primarily issued him new items, although he did present Harrower with a stock buckle that needed repairs. On May 21, 1775 Harrower writes, "This day I had sent me a present from Mrs. Porter in Fredg. two silk Vestcoats and two pair cotton britches all of them having been very little wore by Mr. Porter" (1663:97). William Porter owned a 400 acre plantation and was a merchant in Spotsylvania. Harrower knew the Porter’s through teaching two of their sons.

Gifts of clothing from friends or acquaintances was not uncommon. Other diarists mention this several times. Charles Herbert was given a pair of stockings on January 28, 1777 from a seaman on board a ship who had captured them (1668:21). Jacob Nagle, also a sailor, likewise allowed a woman to keep his black silk handkerchief which had been stolen by his own captain and given to her by the thief (Nagle [1781] 1988:31).

Nicholas Cresswell gave clothing or accessories to several people during his stay in America, most notably to a friend billeted in town as a captive British soldier. To him he presented "a shirt, hunting shirt,
jacket and blanket." Another person gave the man "leather to make himself a pair of breeches" and Cresswell said he would see that someone sewed them up ([February 1, 1777] 1924:183). Cresswell's most laudable gift was to "a Woman with two small children in great distress" he came across in Old Town, Maryland, after his return from the wilderness. Upon her, Cresswell wrote, "I bestowed my last shirt except that I had on" (October 13, 1775] 1924:125). Janet Schaw also witnessed gifts of clothing among the emigrant servants she travelled with, especially from the unmarried women to their favourite sailors (Schaw 1934).

Another manner in which finer clothing ended up in the hands of servants and slaves was not based on generosity. Theft seems to have been a common method of acquiring new clothes. Nicholas Cresswell fell prey to this in 1776, writing on October 21st that he "Intended to have gone to Leesburg to-night, but some Villain has stolen my surout coat" (1924:166). Several notices in the Virginia Gazette describe stolen clothing, as well as runaway ads mentioning clothes purloined by the refugee, either from the master, overseer, or even his fellow servants. This same pattern is recognized among slaves, although they were said to have "more usually... stole from whites" (White and White 1995:159).

Whether slave or servant, if running away, the clothes could be retained for personal wear, but if not, they would be sold or traded off to avoid detection. Among slaves, clothes seem to have functioned "as a form of currency" (White and White 1995:160). Considering the similarities of situation, it is probable that the same was true among indentured servants.

Often the sight of a slave or servant in clothes considered to above his station would arouse suspicion of theft, and land the wearer in jail pending investigation. A number of servants were jailed merely on suspicion, though not quite so readily as blacks who happened to be about town without supervision. James Gordon and his wife, for example, were incarcerated in Isle of Wight, Virginia, by Micajah Wills, the jailor. Wills advertised the couple were arrested for "strolling about without an Occupation" (VG, D&H, October 27, 1774:3). The Scottish dyer admitted he been a servant, but he now carried a discharge from his master in Maryland. Wills said he felt the document may have been forged, and so the pair were jailed.

Ready-to-wear clothes could also be acquired from the recently deceased. Unlike soldiers, such as Moses Hall of North Carolina, who told a tale in his pension application of trying on various hats on the battlefield until he found one that suited him, (quoted in Dann 1977:204), the general population obtained clothing through probate or sales. Auctions of clothing from an estate were not uncommon, and advertisements regularly appear in the newspapers announcing them. One example of clothing thusly acquired comes from a deserter description of James Vaughn in July 1776. Vaughn was a member of the 6th Virginia Regiment, encamped at the College in Williamsburg. Among the clothing he had with him was "a green broadcloth coat trimmed with silver lace, which he purchased at Dunmore's sale" (VG, Purdie, July 5, 1776 postscript). Dunmore's sale was not one of probate, but rather belongings left behind when he fled Virginia, but the mechanism was the same.

Within most family situations, clothes could be expected as inheritance. Numerous wills testify to
this fact, but for servants, it seems a less likely source. Most servants were newly arrived from Europe and lacked the family and social units required to participate significantly in such systems. Some servants may have been in their master’s or friend’s wills, or have family in the colonies, but for the most part, they would be in the minority, and this source of clothing would not be one of great import.

The survival of everyday clothes for long periods of time seems very unlikely. All evidence points to clothes having a relatively short life span during this period, due in most part to heavy wear caused by small wardrobes. An interesting journal entry which sheds light on how long clothes lasted comes from Nicholas Cresswell. On April 28, 1775 at the Yaughagany River, Virginia, Cresswell writes, “Left part of my clothes with Mr. Crawford till my return” (1924:67). Three months later he returns for his clothes, and exclaims, “These rascals have wore out all the clothes I left here” (Cresswell July 17, 1775 1924:97). Unfortunately Cresswell gives us no specific details on what damage was done to his clothes in that short time, but he does say it reduced his wardrobe and annoyed him greatly.

Other journal entries of Cresswell hint at quick wear of his clothing, as well as loss due to storage problems. On returning to Alexandria, where he left in the spring of 1775, Cresswell finds not only is he now trapped in the colonies, but “To add to my distress, the Moths have eaten two suits of my clothes to pieces” ([October 19, 1775] 1924:126). The whole of his circumstances rested heavily upon his mind, for upon reflection, Cresswell writes on New Year’s eve, “This is the last day of the year 1775, which I have spent but very indifferently. In short I have done nothing, but wore out my clothes and constitution” (1924:134).

Perhaps the best evidence we have for how long clothes were expected to last among the labouring classes is the frequency with which servants, slaves, soldiers, and sailors received new clothing. By custom, these groups generally received new clothes twice per year, one summer allotment, and one winter. Account books, court records, and diaries all seem to bear this out. While the actual issuing of clothing varied, it was normally recognized that a season’s clothing would need replacement each year.

This did not, of course, mean it was always received, for that was usually left to the discretion of the master, or availability on the market. John Harrower’s master seems to have been among the more generous ilk, for Harrower’s diary enumerates many days in which some new article of clothing was dispensed to him. William Hust, on the other hand, found himself serving a master on the opposite side of generosity, and took him to court. After hearing the case, it was decided that the master, William Miller, had not properly clothed him according to the law, and “Ordered the said Miller [to] Give him one Cotton and Kersey Jacket and britches, 3 Ozna[^] shirts and... 1 pair shoes and stocking, [and] 1 hat” (Spotsylvania County, Minute Book, 1755-1765, p. 96 quoted in Smith 1947:246). Among the runaways, issued clothing is apparent in a few cases, recognized by several servants belonging to the same master wearing identical clothes.

Once clothing had been obtained by whatever means, it inevitably would become worn. Because clothing was hard to procure at times, especially in the years covered by this study, it took on a greater value than it would carry in post-industrial times. This in turn meant more care would be taken in mending. John
Harrower makes several entries in his diary concerning such practices. On December 16, 1773, for instance, he tells us he "received my short Coat from the Taylor & paid him 6d. for mending it" (Harrower 1963:5). Five days later he reports spending the whole day "employed in mending my Stockins" (Harrower 1963:5). The following day he "gave out [his] velveret Britches to mend" (Harrower 1963:6).

Another writer, Louisa Susannah Wells, a Loyalist on her way from Charleston to London, tells us of mending her stockings. By her voyage in 1778, the war had reduced her material world "for the want of British Manufactures" (Wells [1779] 1968:1). When her stockings became so worn as to require repair, she resorted to darning her "stockings with the ravellings of another" (Wells [1779] 1968:2). In a similar line of recycling, she described how they "flossed our old Silk Gowns to spin together with Cotton to knit our gloves" (Wells [1779] 1968:2). Even the supplies used to sew were hard to come by at that time, for "In the Country the Ladies were forced to use the thorns of the Orange Tree instead of pins" (Wells [1779] 1968:2).

While the expertise of tailors, and of women like Miss Wells, may have made such clothing repairs hard to detect, others were quite visible. Several cases of home repair appear in the servant ads, a couple of whom were described as wearing "much patched" clothing, or using cloth of a different color to make the repair. Charles Farthing, for instance, was able to be spotted in a crowd by his "Kersey breeches patched on the seat with red" (VG, Purdie, January 31, 1777).

George Washington apparently had a problem with slaves stealing cloth sacking for such repairs, for he was advised to start using "Coarse Sacking of European Manufacture (which a Negro could not mend his Cloaths with without discovery)" and marked on both sides (Anthony Whiting to Washington, in Baumgarten 1988:44).

Nicholas Cresswell, an English traveller, offers a similar story of make-shift mending which bears mention. After returning from a rugged trip through the Virginia frontier, he entered the tavern of one Mr. Gibbs, at Redmont in Berkeley county. While there, he wrote in his journal there were "Two Young ladies lodged there who gazed at me as if I was a wild man of the Woods. They and my ragged breeches caused me to spend a disagreeable evening" (Cresswell [October 13, 1775] 1924:125). The following morning the embarrassed man "Got up early... and mended my breeches with a piece of my shirt lap." He then "Shaved and made myself as decent as my circumstances would admit" (Cresswell [October 14, 1775] 1924:125). Presumably such obvious patching would be a mark of the lower classes more than any other, and perhaps served as one of the more distinct signs of class differentiation in apparel. Soon after Cresswell replaced his worn breeches in favour of something more to his genteel taste.

Finally, one last word should be said about appearances. Every individual who described clothes, either their own or those of others, had their own personal view of what was fine, worn, and what was a rag. Nicholas Cresswell, the son of an English yeoman, seems to have had a fondness for clothes that affected how he deemed the condition of what he wore. Some self descriptions mention worn out clothes, with details as to patching, that seem to truly indicate clothes in a marked state of disrepair. At other times, however, he still
indicates his clothes are below par, yet we see him attending a play in New York with a British officer and sitting in a box with General Piggot. While we can never tell just what those clothes looked like, we can assume they were acceptable enough for such public outings, even though to Cresswell they were still considered very humble attire. Thus, what to one is "half-worn" to another may be perfectly good, and yet another worn beyond use. Thus, for the clothing of indentured servants, these matters must be viewed as highly subjective, based not only on what the individual saw as acceptable, but also on what those around him viewed in that manner.
CHAPTER IV
BUTTONS

The primary goal of this material culture study is to conceptually reconstruct clothing worn by servants in colonial Virginia in their daily lives. In order to understand the whole, each component must be examined before being reunited in a unified context, that which is suggested by the runaway descriptions. The following chapters treat garments as a whole, which are then related to one another in visual reconstructions.

A section treating a component independently of a garment type may seem counterproductive to the goal of avoiding deconstructive analysis of clothing artifacts. For buttons, however, this is deemed appropriate because most were interchangeable on a variety of garments, and so they can be discussed in a technical manner as a group. There is typically no difference, for example, from a metal button worn on a waistcoat compared to that on the coat other than size. Similarly, buttons used to fasten breeches could also normally be used on a jacket, or even holding a cockade loop on a hat. Thus, while other components such as shoe or breeches buckles will be found within their respective clothing item section, buttons are presented as a preliminary to the items they were employed upon.

Unfortunately, only a few runaway descriptions offer sufficient details to allow precise determination of button types employed on any given garment. Of the 201 individual descriptions, less than 20% mention buttons of any sort. Nonetheless, those that do describe buttons offer basic data to work with (Appendix E). This, combined with archaeological evidence, enables us to speculate on the range of variation the buttons worn by the servants may have fallen under. Thus, while for most of the garments the precise nature of the buttons cannot be stated, a realm of possibilities and probabilities can be presented.

Few sites have been excavated that can be positively identified as containing material culture that belonged solely to indentured servants. Therefore, to get a representative view of buttons in use among the general population, and those available to the servants, a variety of sites of the period were examined that contained buttons.

Several artifact collections from colonial period sites in Virginia were examined. The majority of this information was gathered in Williamsburg in the collections of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and the College of William and Mary’s Center for Archaeological Research. Most of these buttons were recovered in the Williamsburg area as well as a significant collection from Virginia Beach. A smaller number of buttons were examined among the holdings of the Yorktown Victory Center and Colonial National Historic Park, both in Yorktown, Virginia. The latter two collections were primarily recovered in or near Yorktown.

Most buttons of this period in America were made in Europe (Holroyd 1783:11; Noël Hume 1985:92). In fact, the button making industry was quite developed in Britain, and their manufacture, both by hand and mechanized methods, was conducted by specialized tradesmen. Holroyd had no fear of losing this source of commerce, even after the Revolution, for "This will be one of the last manufactures which the Americans will
go into" (1783:11). He also showed no concern for competition, for "Britain supplies [the] great part of Europe with this article [and] it cannot be questioned from whence the Americans will import it" (Holroyd 1783:11).

Because of the common source for imported buttons, to supplement the Virginia archaeological collections personally examined, a variety of excavation reports from other sites were also used to build a repertoire of the button types in existence in America in the 1770's, and available to Virginia consumers. Buttons from all sources were selected for study based upon context. Sites were chosen which were close in date to the servants under consideration. Some were so precisely dated that deposition could be assigned to within a few hours, such as the sinking of the Betsey at Yorktown, but most were not as exact. They did, however, come from contexts generally associated with occupations and deposits between the 1760's and 1780's.

Of the buttons mentioned in the Virginia Gazette runaway descriptions, at least four major categories can be defined: metal, horn, cloth, and stone. Hair buttons were also mentioned, along with twist buttons, and are classed under cloth buttons. Stone buttons also include glass or paste set into metal, and all occurrences were for sleeve buttons.

Archaeological data suggests wood and bone buttons were also common on clothing, although no description made specific reference to these materials. This may be due to the fact that many wooden and bone buttons were actually components of buttons included in the cloth or metal categories, as well as the possibility that they were used for fastening less conspicuous openings such as shirt cuffs or collars.

In addition, two-hole leather disc buttons were recovered from the Machault, a French warship sunk in 1760 (Davis 1982; Sullivan 1986). No comparable specimens were noted in other literature or collections examined, but differential preservation may well account for such omissions.

Shell buttons were also sporadically used by the 1770's. They do not occur with any regularity in most American archaeological contexts of this period, but a few advertisements show they were beginning to be available in Virginia. Sarah Pitt, for instance, listed "pearl buttons and studs" among the goods she had just imported on the Jenny for sale in her Williamsburg store (VG, P&D, April 19, 1779 supplement). John Harrower mentioned shell buttons, purchasing "1½ Dozn. Mother of Pearle buttons for my white morsyld Vest" on December 26, 1774 (Harrower 1963:79). Because none of the runaway servants were described as wearing shell buttons, and they are not generally common at this time in most Virginia sites, they are not included in the following discussion.

Importers such as Piit were the primary source of buttons in Virginia until the 19th century. While domestic manufacture certainly took place, imported buttons made up the bulk of the supply. Numerous importers before the Revolution listed a wide variety of buttons available, from "gold basket buttons [and] silver plaited do." (William Lewis, VG, P&D, July 4, 1770) to "plain and best horn" buttons (Mary Dickenson, VG, P&D, April 19, 1770 supplement).

Increased domestic manufacture was stepped up during the Revolution. Large numbers of American
made buttons are present in military sites of the period, and are well represented among those interred in Williamsburg with the casualties of Yorktown. Even with the hindrances of importing, continued advertisements in the newspapers show imported buttons were still an important trade item, and imported buttons continued to dominate the market until the nineteenth century (Noël Hume 1985:92).

The groupings presented in the following sections are condensed from the assortment actually in existence. In general they represent those buttons mentioned in the advertisements and those found more commonly on sites of the period. This is not an exhaustive description of buttons found in colonial America.

**METAL BUTTONS**

The most common button material listed in the descriptions is metal. While this may be true, it should not be interpreted as meaning metal buttons were the most common type worn by the runaways, only the type most frequently noted in the descriptions. Besides those using the generic term metal alone, other qualifiers used for buttons in this category include white metal, common plate or plated, pewter, silver, yellow metal, brass, and gold.

Common archaeologically, but not specifically named as such in the advertisements, would be tin-alloys, or tin plating on a copper-alloy base. The latter group would probably be what was referred to as common plate. White metal is "generally classified as 'pewter', although they may range in composition from high grade tin through various combinations of tin, lead, and other inferior materials" (Olsen and Campbell 1962:346). Silver and silver plate may also have sometimes been lumped in this category when not more accurately described.

In basing judgements during artifact analysis for white metal buttons, specifically on tin versus pewter alloys, determinations were made solely on physical attributes, not metallurgical analysis. This was primarily accomplished through the weight, appearance of concretions, and deterioration properties of the artifact which are often somewhat indicative of the base metals used in construction.

Although pewter encompasses compositions of tin, copper, lead, and antimony (Cronyn 1990), for purposes here, tin-alloy is considered those metals with high tin and copper contents and little or no lead, and pewter as tin-lead alloys with little or no copper but significant levels of lead. This distinction was also apparently made in the 18th century, for one British officer, Bennett Cuthbertson, stated, "The buttons of the cloathing of a regiment (if white) should always be made of good metal, and never of pewter, as it otherwise will be impossible for Soldiers to preserve them in that state of brightness, which at all times must be insisted upon, particularly if they are figured with the number of the Corps" (Cuthbertson 1768:85-86).

Although Cuthbertson called for such quality control among military buttons, the fact is that a large number were made with lower grade pewters, high in lead, and these can usually be detected through their advanced deterioration in comparison to tin-alloys in the same soil. This process began upon finishing the original casting, and the problem with keeping the pewter buttons shiny is the rapidity with which lead
oxidizes, turning the pewter a dull grey. Tin-alloy on the other hand, more readily retains its silvery surface.

Although few military buttons used the technique, (officer's excepted), another method to keep buttons shiny was to have them plated or gilded. Plating was common by the 1770's, and an inexpensive way to make base metals look more expensive. Silver plating was not yet refined enough to make it economical, and buttons plated with silver were usually done so only on the face (Noël Hume 1985:90). Tin plating, however, was quite inexpensive, as well as fairly easy to perform, and, as tin-alloy buttons, retained their shine better than other silver colored platings. Perhaps these qualities explain why among the plated buttons examined in the Virginia collections, tin-plating was by far the most common. Colloquially, these were probably termed "silver plated", as well as "common plate" or even just "plate." John Harrower uses the term silver plated to describe a dozen waistcoat buttons he bought on December 10, 1774 for 1 shilling (Harrower 1963:77).

Yellow metal buttons were primarily copper-alloys such as brass or Pinchbeck, a metal resembling gold. The term might also have included gold buttons, which were certainly rarely more than gilt or plated. Gilding is a process of putting a gold plate on a base metal, usually a cooper-alloy. Gold plating was actually quite economical, and a very small amount could gild a very large number of buttons (Noël Hume 1985:92). John Harrower, for instance, was able to purchase "15 bigg Double Gilt buttons at 4/9" in 1775 (Harrower [July 1] 1963:101). While polished brass or Pinchbeck buttons could answer the desire for yellow buttons, gilding would provide better color, with less tarnishing, at little extra expense.

Among the runaway descriptions, buttons listed simply as metal could theoretically be of any of the above compositions, including composites of a metal shell over a wood or bone back. This latter style was identified by South as the most common occurring button at Brunswick Town (burned 1776) (1963; 1964).

The types of metal buttons represented in the Virginia collections mirror those seen at other 18th century sites, ranging from one piece solid cast buttons to composites of three or more parts. A representative sample of metal button types encountered from Virginia sites of the late 3rd and early 4th quarter of the 18th century are found in the following sections, etically classed by manufacture technique, although emically they are more properly grouped by visual appearance or material.

Solid cast one piece buttons

One piece solid cast buttons (Figure 2) are defined as those with the shank and face cast in the same mold in one operation. Most often these are made using either pewter or copper-alloys. Of this type examined from several Virginia sites, by far the majority were pewter based, with comparatively thick shanks and eyes, and showing to some degree a casting seam on the reverse of the face, resulting from the three-piece molds most often used in their production. Some shanks are cast with the eye integral to the process (Figure 2a, 2b, 2d, 2e, 2f, 2g) while others are drilled after casting a solid shank on the button back (Figure 2c). Generally, those with drilled eyes have more angular shanks than those with cast eyes. Copper-alloys seem to employ drilling more often than pewter buttons, probably due to the casting properties of each metal.
Figure 2
Buttons, Integral Shanks
Although most buttons were intended to be attached with thread, some were attached by a stronger method. British Captain Bennett Cuthbertson wrote that it is best if "buttons are fixed on firm, with strong leather thongs run through the shanks" (1768:86), which, in turn, pierced the fabric. The shanks and eyes of solid cast buttons were often best suited for this technique, unlike some shanks, such as the turret, which would not readily allow it.

Turret shanks (Figure 2d) are found in solid cast buttons with drilled eyes, as well as buttons with cast in eyes. All examples noted during this study are attributable to military contexts, mostly of French units, although examples of some Connecticut regiments feature this shank type as well (see Albert 1976:13). France, however, manufactured buttons for America, and the origin of the Connecticut buttons in question has not been established.

The face of the majority of solid cast buttons examined were flat. Convex or domed examples were also noted, but were more popular in the years preceding this period. Decorations on the faces varied considerably, although the most common variety were without decoration of any kind. Others were plated and/or stamped or engraved after casting. Molds were also used to create raised relief designs in the initial casting. Motifs ranged widely, but most were geometric or floral, though some quite abstract. Also included in this category are a large number of military buttons with various regimental designations. Backs to American made buttons of this type are often found with mold seams, and occasionally even remnants of a casting sprue, although post-casting finishing could obliterate such evidence.

Although it was not quantified, it appeared that more mold decorated solid cast buttons from the Virginia collections and in published sources were pewter than copper-alloys. Solid cast copper-alloy buttons noted in the collections tended to be plain, or decorated with post-casting engraved designs. This is likely a result of the significantly lower melting point for pewter, and its greater ease in casting than compared to copper-alloys.

**One piece buttons with attached shank**

Buttons with shanks made from a separate piece are very common among the excavated examples of this period in Virginia (Figure 3a-3j). A large number of this type were cast, with shanks applied during the casting process. Cast-in shanks are found made from iron and copper-alloy wire. The shank, pre-looped to form an eye, was set into the mold, and the button cast around it.

Shanks could also be attached to cast buttons afterwards, with brazing or solder. Also present in this attachment category are buttons made from stamped copper-alloy disks, which always featured soldered shanks. Soldered shanks could be applied to a variety of button types, but were only noted on copper-alloy or silver buttons among those examined. Soldered shanks could, however, be expected on buttons of other alloys. Among the soldered buttons examined, only copper-alloy material was noted for the shank component, although the sample available for study was quite small.
3a  Tin-alloy, copper shank  
Williamsburg, VA, post 1770

3b  Tin-alloy, iron shank  
Fredericksburg, VA, c. 1760-1770

3c  Cu-alloy  
Williamsburg, VA, post 1770

3d  Diderot, c. 1760-1770

3e  Tin-alloy, copper shank  
Spotsylvania County, VA, c. 1770-1780

3f  Tin-alloy, iron shank  
Stafford County, VA, c. 1760-1780

3g  Cu-alloy  
Fort Michilimacac, MI, c. 1769-1781

3h  Cu-alloy  
Palace Burials, Williamsburg, VA, 1781

3i  Cu-alloy  
Williamsburg, VA, post 1755

3j  Silver with gold rim  
Betsey, York River, October 1781

Figure 3
Buttons, Attached Shanks
Buttons with attached shanks are found both with flat faces and convex or domed faces. Decoration is as that found with the solid cast buttons, utilizing mold cast decorations, lathe engraved designs, hand stamped surfaces, or mold cast decorations. A greater number were left undecorated, or with a plain plated surface. Many specimens in this category have a series of circular grooves on the reverse, called spun backs. These were created in the finishing process by lathe turning, as pictured in Diderot ([1771] 1959:443).

Another type of cast button that is a one piece with a separate shank is cast with a hollow interior, around the shank (Figure 3g). On the reverse are two air holes to allow gases to escape, and otherwise very much the same in appearance as several two-piece varieties discussed below. No examples were examined in the Virginia collections, although Stone found a large number at Fort Michilimackinac in a British military context of circa 1760-1780 (1974:53).

Cast two-piece metal buttons

Buttons made from two cast pieces and soldered together were well established by the late 16th century (Noël Hume 1985:88). The technique was still commonly employed by button makers through the first half of the 18th century and several decades beyond. Buttons of this type are more common in the years before the 1770's, but are still found in securely dated contexts throughout this period. Excavations at the Governor's Palace in Williamsburg revealed buttons of this type in burials associated with casualties from the siege of Yorktown in late 1781 (Figure 3h). Identical specimens were recovered at Fort Michilimackinac in a context suggesting civilian use between 1760 and 1780 (Stone 1974:54).

Three shank attachments are used on the soldered two-piece buttons. The shank can be attached by having the back section cast around it, having the shank soldered on after casting the two pieces, or the shank cast as a piece of the back part, and then drilled.

South (1964) states that most of buttons of this type have an undecorated face, although some may have raised mold produced motifs. Examples from Michilimackinac (Stone 1974) were of both varieties, but the majority featured plain faces, as South found in Brunswick Town. Examples from the Palace burials in Williamsburg were also of the plain variety. Plating would be possible on this button, but no mention is made as to its frequency by Olsen (1963), South (1963, 1964) or Stone (1974).

Stamped two-piece metal buttons

Two varieties can be classed in this section. The first variety features a metal face, usually decorated from molding or stamping, and a stamped metal back, joined together with a crimp (Figure 3i). The shank is typically secured through a hole or soldered. A filler is generally added to give the button more strength, often of clay or wood. A few specimens of this type were recovered from Fort Michilimackinac (Stone 1974), but only one in Brunswick Town (South 1964). No examples were examined from the Virginia collections.

One especially interesting advertisement in the *Virginia Gazette* mentioned buttons that were quite
probably of this type. James Digin, of Boston, borrowed a horse from Samuel De Val in Richmond in November, 1775. By January he had not returned the animal, and so De Val placed an ad seeking Digin. His sky blue coat was said to have buttons “which had lost their tops, and had wax substituted” (VG, Pinkney, January 10, 1776). Although not specifically stated, Digin may have used red sealing wax, which is harder when cool than other waxes. He cold even have decorated the buttons with an impression, for if Digin had access to sealing wax, he may also have had the opportunity to use a seal.

The second variety is a rather simple technique utilizing two flat stamped metal disks, held together by a rim, and having a separate attached shank. One example of this form comes off the wreck of the Betsey, scuttled in 1781 (Figure 3). It is made with silver metal disks and a gold band, and had an engraved design with traces of gild remaining. This type of button does not appear to be especially common on sites of this period, and probably represents a finer quality button infrequently found on working class clothing.

**Metal face and or bone wooden back**

Although a composite button, this type is classed here as a metal button, for in the wearing, nothing but the metal would be apparent. The button is manufactured with a thin stamped metal face, most often of copper-alloy (brass), with a bone or wooden back crimped into the face (Figure 4a, 4b, 4c). Stone (1974:54) notes most also feature a filler between the face and back, often of clay, which gave the button more substance and durability.

The bone or wood back usually has a slight curve and rim, and every example examined had four to five drilled holes (Figure 4d). Original garments at Colonial Williamsburg show this type of composite button was generally attached using a single, very strong and thick thread through each of the four holes coming to a central point, where it was sewn into the cloth. The occasional fifth hole, in the center, was a result of a manufacturing process (see bone below). The fifth hole, if present, was apparently not used.

The metal face of the buttons are almost always decorated from a stamp mold, and most or all were plated or gilt. Among the runaway descriptions, three garments were buttoned using what were probably this type of button. All were basket buttons (ornamented with a basket weave) (Figure 4a, 4b). Two were gilt, and the third silver plated. Solid cast basket buttons were also made, however, and are another possibility.

South (1963, 1964) found the composite brass face and wood or bone back button variety to be the most common style excavated from the ruins of Brunswick Town. Most came from the "Public House-Tailor Shop" which burned with the town in 1776 (South 1964:113). As Noël Hume (1985:91-92) points out, these could represent unsold (and hence unwanted) buttons just as well as a stock of the most popular ones ready for future sales. Stone (1974) notes this type appears in civilian contexts of circa 1760-1781 at Michilimackinac, and Olsen dates the style from 1700-1790 (1963:553).
Figure 4
Buttons, Wooden-Backed, Bone, Wood, and Thread
BONE AND WOOD BUTTONS

No runaway description specifically mentioned bone or wood buttons. We can be sure, however, from archaeological evidence, that they were present on the clothing of the indentured servants. Button backs (Figure 4d) of both materials were used as parts of metal buttons (discussed above), and for bases of cloth covered buttons (see cloth buttons), as well as fasteners on their own. When used alone, these buttons would most likely appear on shirts, both at the collar and the sleeves, but could be used on other garments. Sailors on the Virginia State Navy Vessel Hero, for example, were issued jackets with wooden buttons in 1776 (Copeland 1977:21).

Archaeologically speaking there are more bone buttons surviving than wood, although this is probably because bone is more durable in archaeological conditions. Wood was likely the more common material. Most surviving garments with cloth covered buttons use wood for the base rather than bone, but large numbers of bone buttons are excavated from some sites that produce few or none of wood.

Production evidence for bone buttons is ample at many locales. Unlike metal (civilian) buttons, which were mostly imported at this time (Noël Hume 1985:92), bone buttons could easily be made in one’s spare time. A large body of evidence for this production comes from military sites of the Revolutionary period, where bone button blanks, waste material, and even cutting tools (see Calver and Bolton 1950) are found. The majority of these site-produced bone buttons have a central hole, the result of the drilling tool used to cut them from flat sections of bone. Some feature no additional holes, but others were subsequently drilled further, adding a usual four more evenly spaced holes (Figure 4e).

Locally produced bone buttons could be used to replace backs from metal stamped buttons, as described above, as well as covered with fabric. Those bone buttons which were not drilled with additional eyes would have been used for cloth covered buttons. To date there is little evidence that these single hole bone buttons had a wire shank inserted, either in the form of one found in this position, or from staining on preserved bone buttons due to contact with metal wire. Buttons of this type examined by the author from Virginia and American Revolutionary War era sites in the Caribbean did not show any definite signs of wear in the hole area, suggesting the method of attachment was not related to the hole, but that it is purely a by-product of the manufacturing tool.

Surviving garments using cloth over bone bases seem to be predominately silk waistcoats, and only rarely sturdier fabrics (Baumgarten, personal communication). That the bone blanks are so commonly found in contexts suggesting use on work clothing, however, such as military camps, may indicate cloth covered bone was more common than preserved clothing suggests.

Another type of bone button also appears in this period, that of a flat face with a turret shank and drilled eye. Although all specimens noted for this study were of bone, it may be possible that the button was occasionally made of wood as well. Only one example of this type was recovered from Brunswick Town, and presumably no examples were located at Fort Michilimackinac. One example came from Virginia Beach (site
44VB138) in the assemblages examined (Figure 4f).

HORN BUTTONS

Buttons made of horn are mentioned several times in the runaway descriptions. All but one mention refer to black horn buttons, and the one not specifying black calls them high top horn buttons. John Harrower mentions horn buttons, noting that on December 14, 1774 he "Sold ½ dozn. horn Buttons at 3¼" (Harrower 1963:78). Horn buttons are rarely recovered in excavation due to the poor preservation of horn. No archaeologically recovered 18th-century examples were located for this study.

Horn buttons were mostly made from common cattle horns, although they could be processed from hooves as well. Two basic methods could be employed to transform the raw horn into buttons. The tips of the horn are solid, and can be cut in cross-section, and finished as is. The high top horn buttons mentioned in the descriptions are possibly manufactured using this technique, probably cut in angular facets, unless they were stamped in molds after being processed by the second technique.

The more widespread method of manufacture, and the one which would produce the most uniform buttons from horn, was to produce a flat horn sheet and stamp or cut the buttons from it. A raw horn was boiled, in water or oil, and when softened, split and pressed into a flat sheet. Disks could be cut or stamped by hand from the sheets, but press molds were also employed for the task. The latter could feature engraved dies to produce a raised decoration, but probably are not the type of horn button typically encountered. The flat disk buttons were drilled with two or four holes. As a final finish, many horn buttons were dyed to produce a more even black color. While black seems to have been by far the most common color of horn buttons, they were apparently also occasionally dyed in other colors. One inventory of sailor's clothing, published in 1759, lists a "blue kersey jacket, with blue horn buttons" (Robinson 1912:327). Some horn buttons would also be left in a natural state, but these, as non-black dyed buttons, seem to be in the minority.

Although horn buttons could be made locally quite easily, their commercial manufacture was long established in England. Members of the occupation claimed "the said Trade of Horn-Button Making hath been a Trade constantly used, in and about Sheffield duerieg the Memory of Man" (The Horn-Button Makers Reply to the Answer to their Petition [HBM], circa 1704). Furthermore, they suggested that the "Horn-Button Trade is mostly follow'd... in Yorkshire and Derbyshire", and that the bulk of their produce was "mostly sent abroad, and worn in Foreign Parts" (HBM 1704). Of those horn-buttons which remained in England, it was said they were "only worn by Labouring People, who otherwise would wear Hooks and Clasps" (HBM 1704). The military also found use for the horn-buttons, for Cuthbertson recommended them for use on gaiters, saying "small horn or metal buttons without shanks, are best adapted" to them, for shanks would cause discomfort to the wearers (Cuthbertson 1768:100).

Although the Horn-Button Makers claimed several hundred people were solely dependent upon the business, as well as several thousand more employed by the trade, they admitted their output was not
considerable for, "Horn-Buttons are not made by any Engines, but by Molds and Presses, which make not above one or two Buttons at a Time, and they take much Labour preparing for the Molds, and Presses; nor can Two Persons, nor two Hundred make Horn-Buttons sufficient for some Counties" (HBM 1704).

CLOTH, HAIR, THREAD BUTTONS

Cloth covered buttons

Buttons covered with cloth were very common in the 18th century, perhaps being the most common type employed. While some are mentioned in the runaway descriptions (Appendix E), many more examples are probably represented on the garments which did not have buttons specified. If the buttons were of the same fabric as the garment, detailing them would be redundant. Thus, as cloth covered buttons were so common, in many cases where buttons are not specified, they may well have been of this variety.

Prior to the 1770’s several Acts of Parliament in England forbade the wearing of cloth covered buttons. Even so, their use continued, and the laws banning them were rarely enforced. Opponents to the use of cloth covered buttons complained to Parliament that despite the Acts, "Taylors continue to make Buttons and Button-holes of the same Materials the Cloaths are made of" (RHO 1699).

Cloth covered buttons were generally made using the "shreds, which otherwise are of no use" (RFS 1698), pulled around a button base and secured with stitching or thread. Numerous examples were located for study, some very well preserved on extant garments, and others from archaeological contexts. Base buttons on extant garments were found to be made of metal and wood, and the archaeologically recovered samples were metal covered with cloth (Jones et al. 1991), the metal helping to preserve the fabric.

If the base button was of metal, a shank was already present and could be used for sewing the button to the garment. Bone and wooden buttons, however, required a shank, which was generally made from using the bunched cloth and thread of the fabric wrapping. The cloth, cut in a circular piece, was laid over the button base. The excess cloth on the reverse was then wrapped with thread and could serve as the shank. Cloth buttons of higher quality sometimes used more elaborate stitching on the reverse, creating a web of sorts which was then anchored to the garment where the threads were tied together.

Thread/twist/hair buttons

Thread buttons are mentioned in the descriptions, as are twist, hair, and mohair buttons. These were often referred to as needle-worked buttons by those calling for regulations on the button trade, who lumped within that class thread, silk, mohair, and gimp (e.g. RHO 1699; RFS 1698). Much of the raw materials used to make these buttons were imported from Turkey for manufacture in England. The finished buttons were then imported to Virginia, making them available to local inhabitants. Merchants such as Jacob Faulcon, A. Davenport, Robert Adam, Henry Kellum, and James Smith to name but a few all advertised in the Virginia Gazette during the 1770’s offering a variety of thread, twist, and hair buttons.
The usefulness of such buttons on everyday clothing, however, was questioned by the horn-button makers, who claimed that their product was superior. Not only were "Needle-Work Buttons... so dear" they claimed, but they were "made so bad, that Six Sets of such Buttons, will not last one Labouring Man's Suit" (HBM 1704).

If the price of needle-wrought buttons was dear, it was for no other reason than the labour necessary to produce one. To make a button of this style required no special materials or tools other than fiber and thread. A coil of thread (linen, wool, mohair, silk, etc.) was wrapped around a tapered rod several times, and slipped off. According to Gehret, from here,

Make a buttonhole stitch over this coil and pull the loop snugly on the outside edge; make the stitches close together, about 30 times. Join the first loop made and finish by inserting the needle through several stitches on the back, take a backstitch, and then take the needle through the stitches several more times. Repeat once or twice. The completed button should be very firm [Figure 4g] (Gehret 1976:184).

To attach the button to the garment, it could be sewn directly on, or a thread shank could be added (Gehret 1976:184).

Another type of thread button is also known, which uses a wooden piece for the base. Around this base is wrapped the thread, often in elaborate interwoven patterns. One variety was called a Deathhead button, and appears in the runaway descriptions. Examples of similar buttons have been recovered in the Machault (sunk 1760) (Sullivan 1986:78).

**SLEEVE BUTTONS**

Two runaways had between them at least three pair of sleeve buttons, of either stone, paste, or glass. One description mentions stone sleeve buttons with no further details (Thomas Smith, VG, D&H July 29, 1776). The other was said to wear "in his sleeves either a pair of black, or a pair of oval purple buttons set in yellow" (Robert Robinson, VG, Purdie, June 23, 1775). While these may have been stone, they were more likely glass or paste set into gilt brass.

Although specific use as sleeve buttons are attributed in the descriptions, sleeve buttons are described here rather than with shirts where they would normally be placed in keeping with contextual themes. This is primarily due to the fact that other than some minor design preferences, most sleeve buttons are otherwise indistinguishable from other small buttons (Noël Hume 1961:380). Unless a button pair is found retaining the original link component, or tell-tale wear marks on the inner eye of the shank are noted, made by metal links rubbing against metal eyes, (Noël Hume 1961:380), many sleeve buttons would otherwise not be identifiable as such.

In general, sleeve buttons were constructed using the same methods as other buttons. Archaeologically, the greatest number of sleeve buttons recovered seem to be of "pewter, followed by plain brass, and then brass mounted with glass or crystal. Some of the brass examples were originally thinly plated
with silver or gold" (Noël Hume 1961:383). More precious buttons of solid silver and gold were also used for sleeve buttons, but rarely turn up in excavations. On the other end of the scale, a few examples have been recovered made from lead, then plated with copper and silver (Noël Hume 1961:383). Stones used for insets varied, but were generally in line with those used for jewelry. Glass or paste (Figure 2g) were frequently used in imitation of more precious stones or gems, and unlike those with true stones, are not exceptionally rare in archaeological settings.

It seems that the majority of sleeve buttons in all periods were circular, but other shapes were also present. In the first half of the 18th century, octagonal sleeve buttons were quite popular (Figure 2f), and are fairly common at French and Indian War sites (Noël Hume 1961:381). Although falling out of fashion, a few octagonal cuff links were still being worn to the end of the century. One intact silver octagonal cuff link pair was recovered in a cistern in Philadelphia, in a context of circa 1801-1825 (Cotter et al. 1992:182). Such examples may well have been of mid-century origin, and simply continued in use until their loss.

By the 1770's, along with the usual round buttons, oval buttons (Figure 2f) were becoming quite popular (Noël Hume 1985:89). This shape is found in both solid metal, as well as with glass, paste or stone insets. One merchant, Sarah Pitt, even specifically mentioned her recently imported gilt sleeve buttons were oval (VG, P&D, April 19, 1770 supplement). Most merchants, conversely, identified their sleeve button offerings by material rather than shape, such as Christopher Hughes’ “chrystal, mocho, Scotch pebble, paste and glass sleeve buttons” (VG, Pinkney, May 18, 1775). John Greenhow also advertised such articles in Williamsburg, and apparently also offered un-mounted crystals for sleeve buttons that were meant to be set locally (VG, P&D, December 12, 1771).

Metal sleeve buttons could be plain, but were more often decorated. This could take the form of decoration from the mold, or various engraved or stamped designs. They also commonly feature, along with the usual assortment of decorations, slogans or motifs representing social, political, and personal matters. John Harrower exemplifies this last category. On March 3, 1776 he writes, "This day I recd. a pair of silver slive buttons with my name on them for some burred lace I formerly gave to Brown the Silver Smith" (Harrower 1963:140).
CHAPTER V
SHIRTS

Shirts, as are the majority of clothing items, are constructed from fabric. The fabrics present in the runaway descriptions are numerous. In order to better understand the look and feel of the clothing, familiarity with the fabrics involved is essential. For those unfamiliar with 18th century textiles, an extended glossary appears in Appendix F.

Shirts of many fabrics are well represented among the runaway servant descriptions. A minimum of 187 shirts are mentioned among the 201 individual descriptions (Appendix G). The majority of shirts are described with some form of modifier helping to better identify them, including cloth types (Table 1), color (Table 2), or quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHIRT FABRICS</strong></td>
<td><strong>SHIRT COLORS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrics</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osnaburg</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>14+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/Virginia linen</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tow</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland shirt</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish linen shirts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia sheeting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/Virginia cotton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country tow linen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country spun</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sail duck</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheetinng</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The basic shirt form worn in this period was actually a quite simple garment (Figure 5), made from rectangular pieces of cloth. The main body was normally of a single length of fabric, often with a selvage on both sides, as a result of using the textile as it came off the loom or from the finishers. Surviving examples show this width to average about 30 inches (Gehret 1976), which created a very roomy shirt for most individuals.
To form the body, the cloth was folded lengthwise, and the neck cut out along the fold. The shirt was made quite long, perhaps from 36 to 40 inches from shoulder to hem (Gilgun 1993:85). While the length and width would make the shirt large on most men, Cuthbertson informs us this is preferable, for "less than three yards and a half ought never to be put in one, unless the man for whom it is designed be extremely low and thin, as it is a certainty, that the longer and larger they are made, the greater service may be expected from them" (1768:97). This extra size could also come in handy in an emergency, as Nicholas Cresswell relates: "Got up early this morning and mended my breeches with a piece of my shirt lap" (Cresswell, [Berekeley Co. Virginia, October 14, 1775] 1924:125).

The sides were seamed up, generally with a flat-fold hem (Gehret 1976). The sleeves were rectangles made to create a sleeve diameter of about nine to eleven inches maximum, and as long as required for the wearer. These would be attached to the shoulder with slight gathers along the top section, and gathered in more tightly around the cuff, made from a narrower band of material folded over, about two to three inches when complete, though varied. These were secured by a button, or in some cases, cuff links (sleeve buttons). Two squares of about six or seven inches served as sleeve gussets, and two more of about three or four for neck gussets. Small tail gussets might also be placed at the bottom of the shirt, where a few inches were left unsewn for greater mobility. Additional reinforcing strips could also be added to the shoulder area, as seen in original 18th century shirt patterns (Figure 6).

Finally, the collar was constructed of another rectangle, folded over. It was secured by one or two buttons, typically of thread, bone, wood, or horn (Gilgun 1993). Cuthbertson states the collar should be equipped with buttons, and only so high that it would not fall over the stock more than one inch (1768:97). Below this would be the breast opening of the shirt, perhaps seven to ten inches long. The ends of these were often sewn with additional reinforcements, normally a small piece of inconspicuous cloth. Many preserved examples have fancier reinforcement areas, but this in part explains why they were preserved, and is not entirely representative of the more common variety.

As a finishing touch, ruffles could be added to the sleeves or breast opening. While such treatment is often ascribed to gentlemen and not servants, some of the runaways did in fact have ruffled shirts with them. Cuthbertson calls for ruffles on shirts of common soldiers, commenting on the smart appearance they could provide if properly done. The length of the ruffle he recommends "at the bosom, need not exceed two inches in breadth, and it will be an addition to the look of the sleeves (which otherwise appear quite naked) to ornament their slits, with an half inch ruffle" (1768:97).

Further information on shirt construction may be found in several sources (e.g Gehret 1976; Gilgun 1993; Klinger and Wilder 1967), and detailed photos of original shirts are contained in Gehret (1976). An original 18th century shirt contained in the collections of Colonial Williamsburg conforms to the published descriptions, as do most others 18th century examples found in collections throughout the world.

According to Captain Cuthbertson, properly made shirts were worth "eight pence a piece... nor should
Figure 6
Shirt Pattern, circa 1771
(after M. de Garsault's L' Art de Lingère)

- a - shoulder gussets
- b - sleeve gussets
- c - tail gussets
- d - decorative reinforcement at end of neck opening
- e - sleeve closure
- f - neck opening
- BB - body of shirt
the women be ever suffered to demand a farthing more" (Cuthbertson 1768:97), although prices mentioned in diaries of the period show this fluctuated greatly depending on circumstances, and how badly you appeared to need to buy or sell the shirt. Joseph Plumb Martin relates a story in 1777 concerning such a transaction. While staying in a farmhouse during a foraging expedition in the countryside, "one of the men proposed to the landlady to sell her a shirt for some sauce. She very readily took the shirt, which was worth a dollar at least" (Martin [December 1777] 1962:105). Apparently not feeling they had got their money's worth of sauce from the deal, the soldier later stole the shirt back in retaliation to the land-lady's perceived stinginess.

Unlike most garments which would have been at least partially constructed by a tailor, shirts were often home produced, if not made in the home. Soldier's shirts were often contracted for by the colonel, apparently from local women where the regiment was stationed, unless procured from government contractors and shipped to the colonies. Such establishment garments were frequently inferior, and were of "little use, unless taken to pieces, and made up properly" (Cuthbertson 1768:96), presumably again by contracting the services of local women.

Very few merchant advertisements mention shirts in comparison to other garments, further suggesting the source was often less formal. John Harrower refers to shirts for the slaves being made on the plantation from start to finish (Harrower 1963). Landon Carter likewise mentions the process of home sewing for slave apparel (1665). Harrower also alludes to shirts being made for a friend of his by Molly White, the same neighbor whom he had make stocks (Harrower [October 29, 1775] 1963:123).

Nicholas Cresswell has shirts made, but his are a bit more colorful in nature. Prior to going into the Virginia frontier on an excursion, he had a "Calico shirt made in the Indian fashion, trimmed up with Silver Brooches and Armplates so that I scarcely know myself" (Cresswell [August 21, 1775] 1924:103). None of the shirts appearing in the Virginia Gazette runaway advertisements are quite so distinguished a Cresswell's calico shirt, but they do cover a wide range of more common materials.

The single most common shirt to appear among the runaways was made of osnaburg. Roughly 47 examples have this fabric type named, to which, perhaps, several shirts described as coarse, brown, or brown linen might be added. Although those simply called osnaburg were likely shades of brown, some could conceivably have been bleached, but that would be unlikely for this fabric. In addition, one osnaburg shirt was said to have been dyed purple.

Following osnaburg shirts, there are almost equal numbers of check and white shirts. The check shirts were probably primarily linen, linen-cotton, or cotton checks (refer to Appendix F). One runaway wore a check shirt specified Virginia cotton. Check shirts could come in a variety of colors, but blacks, browns, blues, and reds made up the basic range. The size of the check pattern could vary, but seem to have been in standard increments. Swatch books show linen and cotton checks in sizes ranging from about 1/4 of an inch up to more than two. The larger checks are normally placed under furniture fabrics, however, and shirts probably favored the smaller checks.
The bulk of the white shirts listed do not specify textile or even quality. Four do specify linen, and presumably many of the rest were as well. Imported cottons from India could also have been made into these white garments, but linen would be more likely among the servants for bleached shirts. Two shirts, however, are unmistakably stated as muslin.

Those that did not designate a quality were probably of a common variety, not exceptionally coarse, nor exceptionally fine. Only one white shirt was specifically called coarse. Nicholas Cresswell defined country made "very fine linen" as being "thirteen or fourteen hundred warp," although he didn't believe they were able to "bleach it well" (Cresswell [April 9, 1777] 1924:192). Other evidence suggests fine cloth would be anything above about 50 threads per inch, though many quality imported pieces approached 100. Cresswell's range of threads obviously refers to the entire width of the cloth, which in an average piece would make his fall in at about 50 per inch. Several of the white shirts were described as fine, and a "sundry" lot (though not actually said to be white) were all ruffled, as were three Holland shirts. Another seven unruffled Holland shirts would have been of fine bleached linen, as also would be a grouping of Irish linen shirts.

Around a dozen shirts were described as brown linen. While these may have been of the osnaburg variety, they may also have been a bit finer than that cloth, though not so fine as to warrant bleaching. Four more brown shirts must have appeared very similar, but were made of Russia sheeting, which was apparently a hemp fabric (Holroyd 1783:17). Heavier than Russia sheeting shirts were two Sail duck shirts which also appear in the descriptions.

Among the coarse shirts, besides a group of about seven or more which specified nothing more, were ten shirts of tow. Although only two specified linen tow, the others probably were of flax as well. Finally, the one crocus shirt mentioned was also probably a coarse linen garment, though perhaps tinted a yellowish color (Cunnington et al. 1960).

While a great many osnaburgs and other coarse linens were still being imported (it was found cheaper to do so than produce it at home), some were being made in the colonies. Fourteen shirts were of country or Virginia linen, osnaburg, or tow, and another two were called country made, but what fiber was not stated. At least three country or Virginia shirts were also specified as being of cotton, as possibly were five more of cotton, although they could have been from Manchester or India cottons as well.

Overall, the majority of the shirts worn by the runaway servants were of linen. Most were unbleached, and nearly one quarter were of osnaburg, an admittedly coarse textile. Even so, some runaways possessed shirts of finer qualities, such as Irish and Holland linen, and a few even sported ruffles. While whites and browns were the colors dominant for solid color shirts, at least one was purple. Colors were unfortunately not specified among the many check shirts present, but surviving swatches provide a range of variability within which the shirts would have fallen.
CHAPTER VI
NECKWEAR

Twenty runaway servants are described as having some form of neckwear (Appendix H). Eleven of those had among them twelve handkerchiefs. Five more each wore a "neckcloth", and two of those had more than one. Two more individuals had a total of three neck stocks among them. Finally, two unfortunate souls, both obviously convicts who had given their masters trouble in the past, wore iron collars. That more runaways do not have neckwear listed among their belongings is surprising. This may not reflect a lack of the article so much as omission in the descriptions, for evidence suggests handkerchiefs were nearly ubiquitous among the laboring classes.

Handkerchiefs were a very common item among the working classes of the 18th century. Gehret states that the term handkerchief should correctly only be applied to cloths used for wiping, and not those "worn about the neck" (1976:205). While this may hold true using today’s language, using 18th century language this is simply false. While period dictionaries do define handkerchief as a cloth for wiping the face, some add "or cover the neck" (Sheridan 1780). The use and context of the word in the runaway descriptions makes it clear that the term handkerchief was colloquially used for a neckcloth, and the former term appears over twice as often as does the latter.

Eighteenth-century depictions of indentured servants are quite rare, but numerous visual sources exist of sailors. A handkerchief tied about the neck seems to be almost a required accoutrement, and sailor’s are rarely represented without one (Figure 7). This is further supported by diaries which often mention handkerchiefs. Jacob Nagle was angry to find his captain had stolen his. Ashore after being wrecked off the coast of Eastern Virginia he wrote: "I saw a young woman with my black silk handkerchief on hur neck. I asked where she got that handkerchief. She very politely informed me that the capt of our sloop had made her a present of it" (Nagle [1780] 1988:31). A captured American sailor, incarcerated in England, recorded in his diary that even ashore they were all equipped with handkerchiefs. On February 20, 1778 “each man in prison had a check linen handkerchief sent to him, which was given us by the donation” (Herbert 1968:97). We can assume that those servants who we know did have handkerchiefs probably wore them in the same manner as did sailors and other laborers, tied about their necks (Figure 7).

Sheridan says handkerchiefs are normally of silk or linen. Both silk and linen appear frequently in descriptions of handkerchiefs. Of the runaway servants, nine of the twelve handkerchiefs mentioned were made of silk. Five of those were black, and one "sutty coloured". Another was red and white, though if striped, checked, mixed, or even printed is not stated. Two more are not ascribed any color.

Another three handkerchiefs are not specified as to their cloth. Two are checks, and one was country made blue stripe. Checks were a very popular handkerchief in linen, and these examples may well have been of that material. The same holds true for the striped example, although striped cotton, as John
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Sailors and a Gardener
Harrower relates, is a possibility as well. Harrower records his acquisition of as many as four cotton handkerchiefs in his period as a servant in Virginia. The first mention is while he was still on board the ship Snow, bound for America. There Harrower "bought one Cotton napkin for three biscuits and a silk napkin for five Biscuits, both napkins half wore" (Harrower [March 1, 1774] 1963:23). Napkins are defined as a handkerchief by Sheridan (1780), but also by he and Spence as cloths to wipe the hands. That one of Harrower's was silk seems to preclude that use though.

While in Virginia, Harrower obtained at least three more handkerchiefs of cotton. On February 25, 1776, he writes he was given a gift of "a New Cotton Handkierchiff worth 2/ of [Mr. Frazer's] Mother's spinning & weaving & hemmed for me by his sister" (1963:138). Harrower then has two more woven for him of striped cotton by John McDearman, who at the same time made him cloth for waistcoats (Harrower [June 14, 1776] 1963:155).

Besides the five biscuits Harrower bartered for his silk handkerchief, he paid cash for some as well. In 1775 he spent five shillings for a black silk one, (Harrower [May 2, 1775] 1963:128), and later that month he acquired two more of unspecified material for a total price of three shillings.

How much Harrower paid Mr. McDearman for warping his "6 Yds. stript Cotton" he did not write down. He does, however, say those six yards would make him two waistcoats as well as two handkerchiefs. The size of a typical handkerchief varied. Gehret places the average at 25 to 30 inches (1976:154). Beth Gilgun places it at "about a yard square-more or less" (1993:81). The exact size would primarily a function of how far down one wanted the cloth to hang, how much one wanted to spend on it, or how much cloth was left over from some purchase or custom weaving such as Harrower's. Judging from the length of those depicted in engravings and painting on sailor's, 30 inches square seems quite reasonable.

To wear the cloth, one would normally fold it and tie it about the neck, letting the loose ends hang down the breast. To save on fabric, there was also a half-handkerchief, which was a triangle (Earle 1971). The half-handkerchief was about the equivalent size of a full one when folded diagonally. When worn these would be less bulky, but hang about the same distance down the neck.

Although most handkerchiefs of the working classes were probably solid colors, checks, or stripes, finer examples could boast intricate printed or woven patterns or hand embroidery. Some could also be hemmed with a another piece around the border, but most of the servants were likely only stitch-hemmed, such as the gift John Harrower received.

Besides handkerchiefs, five runaways wore neckcloths. While this could refer to a handkerchief, it is possibly a reference to a form of cravat, which Spence (1775) defines as "a neckcloth". The "Neckcloath" is not very usefully defined by Sheridan as "that which men wear on their neck" (1780).

A typical neckcloth, or cravat (Figure 8a), was usually made of fine white linen or cotton muslin. The only example with a specified textile in the runaway descriptions is muslin, although linen is implied for another. The remaining three are presumably all white, but their fabric remains unknown. According to
8a
Neckcloth and Ruffles
(George Washington, engraving after Peale)

8b
Stock
(Daniel Morgan, engraving by Prud'homme after Trumball)

8c
Tied Stock

8d
Buckled Stock

8e
Clasped Stock
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Neckwear
Gilgun, the cravat

is usually about 60 inches long and at least four inches wide. The gentleman finds the middle of the cravat and places it at the front of his neck over the shirt collar. He may pleat the fabric nicely to make the cravat less bulky, then the ends are wrapped around the neck and brought back to the front where they are looped one over the other. The two ends hang down over or under the waistcoat and can even be pulled through a waistcoat buttonhole (Gilgun 1993:81).

Another form of neckwear mentioned in the runaway descriptions is the neck stock. The stock was a very abbreviated form of neckcloth, only large enough to circumvent the neck. Two runaways had stocks mentioned, one with two white ones, and the other an unspecified color, but held in place with brass buckles. White was a popular color for neck stocks, with black being the other choice in general use (Figure 8b). Cloth types could vary, but fine linen and muslin would seem the most reasonable choice for the servants. Velvet, velvetet, and silk were also used for finer quality stocks, though these would typically be black rather than white. Many, if not most, cloth stocks were pleated.

Sturdier stocks could also be had, made from light leather, or even black horse hair, which are what Cuthbertson recommended for British soldiers (1768:81). Furthermore, he added they should be edged with scarlet cloth, and the "ends for the clasps to fit in, are best [made] of leather" (Cuthbertson 1768:81).

While stocks could be attached with tie strings (Figure 8c), Cuthbertson implies the military variety usually had buckles or clasps (Figures 8d-8e). An example of probable military stock-clasps excavated on the island of St. Eustatius, in the Dutch West Indies, were cut from flat brass, then slightly curved and having soldered on studs for attachment to the leather tab on the stock (Figure 9a). Cuthbertson says of these clasps "it will be more convenient, to have the studs for fixing the stock to the clasps, on the inside, rather than the outside, as they are otherwise perpetually catching" (Cuthbertson 1768:101).

Rather than clasps, civilian stocks often employed buckles, which were rounded to avoid injury (Figures 9b-9c). The shape of a stock buckle is quite distinctive, typically incorporating three or four studs for use in attachment to the leather tabs. A pronged tongue allows the opposite end to be secured.

No style is mentioned for the stock buckles of George Newton (VG, Pinkney, June 1, 1775), but they were said to be made of brass. Stock buckles, as shoe buckles, came in a wide variety of metals. The most common kind from archaeological contexts seem to be the brass (copper-alloy) variety as mentioned in the runaway advertisement. Other metals could include pinchbeck, pewter, silver, and buckles plated with silver or tin. Stock buckles were also advertised for sale in the Virginia Gazette sporting paste or stone insets.

That the indentured servant John Harrower wore stocks is unmistakable. Numerous entries in his journal refer to them, including information showing some were attached by buckles. One muslin stock, with "a pretty pinchback stocke Buckle" he traded for on the Snow "for four pence and three biscuits" (Harrower [March 8, 1774] 1963:24). He was also given a "broke Sett Stock buckle" from his master, which he later took into Fredericksburg to get repaired at a cost of five shillings (Harrower [April 16, 1775, June 24, 1775] 1963:92, 100).
9a
Stock Clasp
Cu-alloy with soldered Cu-alloy studs
St. Eustatius, West Indies, c. 1770-1782

9b
Stock Buckle, Stud Attachment
Silver
English, 18th Century

9c
Stock Buckle, Hooked Attachment
Cu-alloy
Unprovenanced

Figure 9
Stock Clasps and Buckles
Harrower also tells of having stocks "for winter wear" made for him of linen he had purchased in town (Harrower [November 11, 1775] 1963:125). To this purpose he left the material and a stock to use as a pattern with Miss Molly White (Harrower [December 3, 1775] 1963:128). Harrower's notation that the stocks were for winter wear may be no more than saying he needed to replenish his supply before the cold set in. On the other hand, it may imply that he wore stocks more often in winter than summer. Stocks would surely have been uncomfortable in the heat of a Virginia summer, but welcome in the cold of winter.

The final style of neckwear described in the runaway descriptions was one which would have been very uncomfortable no matter what the season. Two servants, both running from the same masters, wore iron collars. Solomon Burnham and William George ran with Samuel Chapman from Dorsey's Forge, Maryland in September of 1774. Although Samuel Dorsey and Edward Norwood, who placed the advertisement, did not say so, both men were almost certainly convicts who had ran before. Convicts supplied much of the labour force to colonial iron forges, and also would be the only ones other than slaves who would normally be subjected to iron collars. Depictions of slaves in similar devices suggest they were simple thin bands of iron, probably secured by a rivet. Wealthy slave owners, however, were known to provide their chattel with silver collars (Baumgarten 1988:33).
CHAPTER VII
WAISTCOATS

The waistcoat was an essential part of dress for most men in the 18th century. Not only were they required apparel for the fashionable, but they were also commonly worn daily by the working classes. To be seen without one on was to be seen in a state of undress. Philip Vickers Fithian shows this in his shock on Christmas morning, 1773, "Nelson, the Boy who makes my Fire, blacks my shoes, does errands &c. was early in my Room, dress only in his shirt and Breeches!" (Fithian 1943:53). While waistcoats would not always be practical for a labouring servant, this seems to have had little effect on their presence among the latter groups' wardrobe. Out of 201 runaway descriptions, a total of 101 waistcoats were described, and that number is exclusive of jackets (Appendix I).

The terms waistcoat and jacket were frequently interchangeable at this period. The numbers of waistcoats and jackets listed here should be seen as fluid. In some cases the categorical choice was clear, for instance a "sleeved waistcoat" was classed under jackets, or conversely, a "jacket without sleeves" is placed into waistcoats. Others could be differentiated by both terms appearing in a single description, suggesting one had sleeves and the other did not. For the majority though, the garment was placed in its category according to the original term used to describe it. Waistcoats are here defined as sleeveless while jackets are those with sleeves, a definition which was not so rigid in the 18th century. Some waistcoats were even fitted with removable sleeves, further blending the terms. Sleeves, however, were generally unfashionable on waistcoats by the 1770's (Cunnington and Cunnington 1957:03), and so generally when the term waistcoat was used in the ads it is taken as a sleeveless version.

After placing each garment into its respective group, it was discovered that 62 runaways wore a waistcoat with no jacket. Another 69 had a jacket and no waistcoat, and 18 wore both a waistcoat and a jacket. Fifty-two servants had neither garment listed in their description. Again, while these statistics represent the number of terms, not all of the jackets may have had sleeves just as not all of the waistcoats may have been without them. The 18 servants who wore both, however, can fairly safely be said to have had sleeved and sleeveless garments.

While specific styles varied with each tailor, the basic waistcoat of the 1770's was constructed with a skirt, beginning at about the waistline and extending several inches further (Figure 10). The length of skirt shortened over time, and by the 1770's would typically fall to about the crotch or slightly beyond.

Waistcoats of a decade or so earlier might extend as far down as mid-thigh. In 1768 Cuthbertson directed that waistcoats "be made to button low upon the waistband of the breeches, the skirts to fall back, and to be about nine inches in length, from the lower button-hole" (1768:88). Furthermore, he suggested a waistcoat worn for dress only should last two years, and then could be worn for one more year as common dress (Cuthbertson 1768:89).
By far the most common style was single-breasted. The top button was at the neckline. Most necklines were collarless, but in the latter years of the 1770's small standing collars were occasionally found. The bottom button almost always fell at the point of the waistline where the skirts flared out. The number of buttons on the waistcoat front could vary, but most use between nine and thirteen, with eleven or twelve being most common. In the 1760's the fashion was to wear the waistcoat with only a few of the lower buttons buttoned, but in the 1770's front buttons were normally all used (Cunnington and Cunningham 1957:205), unless a few at the top were left open for ruffles or a neckcloth.

John Harrower purchased waistcoat buttons at least twice, suggesting how many buttons he would have on his waistcoats. His first purchase for an even dozen silver plated buttons (Harrower [December 10, 1774] 1963:77). Assuming he used none on the pockets, twelve would be consistent with the number found on most surviving waistcoats and extant patterns. A few days later Harrower records buying "1½ Dozn. Mother of Pearle buttons for my white morsyled Vest" ([December 26, 1774] 1963:79).

This larger number of shell buttons could be the result of two factors. The first is that these buttons may have been small, and therefore required more. The second is that for this waistcoat Harrower may have planned to have pockets with buttoned flaps. While we may conjecture, we will never know for certain. In addition, of four instances of Harrower buying and selling of buttons, three came in groups of whole or half dozens, suggesting a common number for a card of new buttons, in which case he may have had to purchase buttons by half dozens or dozens. A fourth button purchase, however, of large coat buttons, was for 15.

The skirts of the common waistcoat were vented, normally one in the center back and two on each side (Figure 10). If the waistcoat had pocket flaps, their tops were commonly in line with the bottom button of the front closure, at the waist. Some pocket flaps were functional, others only ornamental, having no real pocket under them. Yet others had may have had pockets with no flap, but only a slit, probably bound, not unlike many small pockets found on breeches bands. This seems to have been unusual at this time, finding more favor in the 1780's and 1790's. The style of the flap could vary, but most surviving examples are scalloped, although a number are in the shape of a parallelogram.

While most waistcoats of the 1770's were single-breasted, double-breasted versions were also in use. Double-breasted waistcoats were in fashion as recent as 1770, so it is not unreasonable to think a runaway servant might have acquired one of these older styles (Figure 11). A new double-breasted style was also in existence, one which would gain prominence in the 1780's and dominate the 1790's (Figure 12).

Two runaway servants, both from Scotland, wore double-breasted waistcoats. Each man was of an age which would have put them in adulthood in the late 1760's, when they may have acquired the then fashionable garments. William Armstrong's (age 37) waistcoat was entirely of Virginia cloth, in and out, and could be a result of the homespun movement of the late 60's (VG, Purdie, July 28, 1775). Robert Robinson's (age 28) was of either light coreded jeans or fustian, although whether domestically woven or imported is not mentioned (VG, Purdie, June 23, 1775). While both men were old enough to have been ingrained with the
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Double-Breasted Waistcoat
(worn under a frock, after an English print of 1770)
Figure 12
British Naval Officer, circa 1780's
fashions of the 60's, and both of the same ethnicity, neither factor may have been involved in their choice of waistcoat. One or both may have worn newer styled double-breasted waistcoats obtained purely out of personal taste or opportunity.

Waistcoats, regardless of the number of rows of buttons, could be made out of many fabrics. Often a waistcoat would represent the finest fabric the wearer owned. When worn with a coat only the fronts showed, so expensive fabrics might be used for the two front pieces and cheaper fabric in the back. Thus, for economy, one could wear a garment that looked very expensive, yet due to the comparatively small amount of expensive fabric used, would not be such a great investment as a coat or breeches of quality cloth would entail. Lesser quality waistcoats were often made of the same fabric throughout.

Most waistcoats were lined with less expensive fabrics than the outer cloth. Common lining material encountered on surviving garments include linens, shalloon, cotton and cotton mixes (typically with linen and wool), persian, and various thin wools. Many of the waistcoats dated between about 1760 and 1775 in the Victoria and Albert Museum seem to favour cotton/linen mixes for their lining (Halls 1973). Though normal, waistcoats did not always have lining, such as that worn by John Harrower’s summer “vest Coat... made of white cotton without any lyning” (Harrower [August 7, 1774] 1963:57).

Of the 101 waistcoats appearing in the servant descriptions, only 33 do not specify the fabric (Table 3). Sixteen are described as cloth, the largest single named category, and these are generally taken to mean wool. The next largest group is domestic cloth (Virginia cloth, country cloth, or homespun cloth) at seven examples. Another five are duffill, followed by lesser numbers of various fabrics. While fine fabrics are included in the group, so are many coarse ones.

Of the 33 examples that listed no fabric, most were described by color. In fact, 87% of the waistcoats were described with a color (Table 4). Blue was the most popular, perhaps due to the availability and inexpensive cost of indigo. Seventeen waistcoats were of that color. Not significantly fewer were twelve examples of striped waistcoats. Stripes were not only popular with landsmen, but sailors especially seem to have fancied such waistcoats. Other colors well represented in the group include red, black, and white.
### TABLE 3
**WAISTCOAT FABRICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia/country/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homespun cloth</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffil</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fustian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 spec. cotton/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linen mix)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcloth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velvet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath coating</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osnaburg</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarn</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linsey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(linen-wool)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nankeen (cotton)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flannel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jump</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damask</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieze</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagathy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearskin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton/silk mix</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corded cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kersey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duroy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4
**WAISTCOAT COLORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nankeen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and red</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claret</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snuff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VIII
JACKETS

As previously mentioned, the term jacket could be applied to both sleeved and un-sleeved garments. A sleeveless jacket is synonymous with a waistcoat. The sleeved jacket, however, could be a sleeved waistcoat, a short coat-like jacket without a skirt, or a short coat-like jacket with skirts.

The sleeved waistcoat was, like the sleeveless version, meant to be worn under a coat, not in place of it (Figure 13). There was no significant difference between the body of the sleeved and un-sleeved version. Sleeves, as on other jackets and coats of the 18th century, were customarily cut with an elbow bend. While this method may have allowed for the fabric hang desired in a sleeve at the time, it also meant that sleeves made from striped material would not follow the pattern. The ends of the sleeves had no cuffs, but were rather simply typically straight hems or vented. The cuffs of these underjackets were normally quite narrow to allow them to be worn under the coat.

When the term jacket was used to signify an outer garment, it could refer to a form of jacket without skirts, as worn by a sailor seen in a British cartoon of 1774 (Figure 14). This style of jacket was often employed by the military, most notably as a work jacket for marines, pioneers, or sappers and miners. Many other laborers wore them as well, including those in the civilian population. Not only did this jacket lack skirts, but also vents on the rear or side. Most were single-breasted, using somewhere between nine and twelve buttons.

Buttons for a skirtless jacket could be of the large size typically used on coats, or the smaller sizes usually found on waistcoats. The sleeves could also use buttons on functional cuffs (Figure 14). Other versions had only simple vents or a plain hemmed sleeve terminal. While turned back cuffs or collars can be added to this type of jacket, few contemporary depictions of the style being worn by non-military people appear to have them. Essentially, this form of jacket was made to conserve material, and serve a functional purpose as a work garment.

The more common form of outer jacket was that with skirts. Numerous 18th century images depict this garment, and it was especially favored among sailors and laborers (Figure 7). The line between a short coat and a skirted jacket is very blurred. In the runaway descriptions, if the term short coat was used, the garment is classed under coats, but otherwise the division is rather arbitrary. As with waistcoats and jackets, there may be considerable overlap between skirted jackets and short coats.

The skirted jacket was made along the same lines as many forms of less fashionable coats, but with short skirts (Figure 15). The skirt of the jacket might only reach as far as those of waistcoats, or a few inches beyond. An exceptionally long jacket might reach to mid-thigh, but would probably be more often called a short coat. If the skirted jacket had pockets, they would follow the same styles as for coats or coatees (see coats).
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Sleeved Waistcoat
(based on an English original of circa 1770-1775)
Figure 14

British Cartoon of circa 1774
Figure 15
Skirted Jacket
With few exceptions, the neckline of the jacket did not have a collar. While this was also true for many coat styles, this feature may have been another that helped separate the jacket from the coat, although the latter garment could be made without a collar as well. In place of a collar, most contemporary sources show the wearer of a jacket with a handkerchief around his neck.

The majority of jackets were single-breasted. Double-breasted jackets were also made (Figure 16), but only two examples are mentioned in the runaway descriptions. While buttons for both front styles could use cloth coverings, the jacket generally utilized uncovered buttons of metal, wood, or horn. The Defence produced a large quantity of cast white metal buttons which may have been domestically produced (Smith 1987:200), and possibly served on sailors’ jackets. The Machault produced a number of leather buttons (Davis 1982) and Copeland (1977:8) states these were occasionally found on sailors’ jackets. For the front closure, most buttons would be coat size, but the cuffs could use smaller sizes as well.

While some jackets would be made with nothing more than a hemmed cuff, with perhaps a vent as the skirtless version, most skirted jackets seem to have had buttoned slash cuffs. The number of buttons could vary, but three to four apportion most often. The slash cuff could be secured with a simple closure, or fitted with a flap. In either case, contemporary depictions of people actually wearing the jacket usually show the sleeves left unbuttoned.

Fabrics used for jackets were a mixed lot. A total of 101 jackets were described in the advertisements (Appendix J). Sixty-six were identified by fabric (Table 5). Cloth (presumably wool) was the most often mentioned fabric with ten entries. Virginia and country cloth followed as a close second, with eight jackets represented. These represent the same two most favored fabrics for waistcoats. Below Virginia cloth, garments made of bear skin, broadcloth, duffil, and Holland all had at least four occurrences, and fewer still were made of a variety of linens, wools, cottons, and mixes. The jackets tended to have fewer fine fabrics represented than waistcoats, and those few that were present, such as the birdeye, were probably jackets of the sleeved waistcoat variety.

Blue was the most common color found among jackets, with almost twice as many samples as the next most popular shade. Twenty one jackets were blue, while another 11 were white. Not significantly fewer were brown (10), red (9), striped (8), and green (7). Other colors were present in fewer numbers (Table 6).

Of the 201 runaway descriptions, 69 individuals wore the jacket alone, with no waistcoat or coat. Eighteen had both the jacket and waistcoat. Of the 69 with only a jacket, it cannot be said with certainty that these were all outer jackets, but it seems likely given that they had no coats. Running in only a waistcoat or an under-jacket might have been necessitated by circumstance on occasion, but given that most servants probably premeditated the escape to some degree, it would be highly unusual to leave behind one’s outer garments. Thus, using this assumption, the 69 jackets are assumed to be outer garments, but the remainder may be outer or under jackets.
16a
Sailor's jacket with lappels unfastened and buttons removed based on a print by W. Humphrey, London, 1781

16b
Double-breasted jacket without lappels based on 18th Century prints
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cloth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearskin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcloth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Striped</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kersey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osnaburg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieze</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fustian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brownish-white</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linsey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Buff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdeyed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peppered</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casimirs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton, twilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drab, white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flannel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaid, white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plush</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagacity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanskin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh plains</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fabric listed</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IX
COATS

Perhaps the most conspicuous article of clothing a runaway could wear would be his coat. This garment was usually the most recognizable item he wore, for it was the dominant piece of the wardrobe. Among the 201 runaway descriptions, 143 coats were described (Appendix K). A total of 72 runaways had no coat, but most of those had a jacket, hunting shirt or frock, or surtout in the coat’s place. Ten had a waistcoat described as the only outer garment, and fifteen were not described with any coat, waistcoat, jacket, or other form of outer-upper garment.

For those servants who wore coats, several varieties were available to them, and indeed several were described as being worn. The majority of the descriptions simply used the word coat. This probably implied that the garment was typical of the area and time, and not any specific or distinctive style. That being the case, the coats worn by the runaway servants probably fell into one of a few basic coat types of the 1770’s.

The average coat was cut to fit rather long. The skirts of the common coat usually hung, by the mid 1770’s, somewhere between mid-thigh and knee level. A few years before, Cuthbertson recommended the ideal length as just enough to show “two of the lower Buttons of the Breeches knee, exclusive of that upon the Band” (1768:83). More fashionable coats would be cut to curve back, exposing the lower portion of the body, and allowing the waistcoat and breeches to be readily seen (Figure 17). Coats cut in this manner fit the body closely, but were not intended to be buttoned, though retained the buttons regardless. Many coats were fitted with small wire hooks and eyes or “Cloth Loops, with a small button and hole to them... just above the pit of the stomach” (Cuthbertson 1768:84). This would hold the coat together, but still allow exposure of the waistcoat. Waistcoats, therefore, which were worn with such coats, tended to be finer than would be required on more straight cut fronts.

When high fashion was not as important, the coat front could be cut with little or no curve, making the garment capable of actually being fastened closed (Figure 18). This style of coat was often referred to as a frock, and was generally more loosely cut than the curved front version (Figures 11, 19). The frock would normally be fitted with a collar, but coats rarely had them. A few coats were cut somewhere in between, having slightly curved front skirts yet not so much as to preclude fastening it, or restricting the body so much as a formal coat.

In general, the first coat described was favored by the genteel classes, although frocks were also popular in relaxed settings. Being free from the requirements of physical labour, they could afford to wear fashionable coats on a daily basis that restricted movement. This is not to say the servants did not have these coats, for descriptions show some were in fashionable attire, but on average, most servants probably wore the informal styles, enabling them to retain their coat while still performing the duties of their station in life.

Regardless of which cut the coat followed, certain features could be found. The majority of civilian
Figure 18
Frock Coat, circa 1770-1775
(based on an English original in the DeWitt Wallace Gallery)
Figure 19
Frock Coat
(James Otis of Boston in an engraving by Chappel)
coats were single-breasted, with buttons from the neck to about the waistline. A few coats of older style might have the buttons lower, but even if a servant acquired such an old coat, it would probably have been altered to fit more into current fashions. Double-breasted coats were more of a military style, but civilians wore them on occasion. They could be either a simple double-breasted buttoning system (Figure 20), or the more martial style with facings and lapels (Figure 21).

Most coats tended to favour cloth covered buttons. In the runaway descriptions, when buttons were not mentioned, it may be for the reason that were unremarkable, being made of the same cloth as the coat. Others would have simply omitted button information, but many made a point to describe buttons when they were of metal or otherwise distinctive, such as deathhead or basket buttons. Coats meant to be worn by men engaged in labour might be more likely to use durable buttons of metal than otherwise, but unless the buttons were described, little more can be said other than offering the range of possibilities.

The skirts of coats and frocks typically had a vent in the center of the back, from the waistline or lower to the bottom of the hem. It could be either pleated or with an overlap (Cunnington and Cunningham 1957:186), or simply butted up against each other (Baumgarten, personal communication). A non-functional button might be sewn on at the top of the pleat. For fancier dress, lace and trim would be added along the edges, and up the rear vent. More practical garments usually omitted such embellishments. On the sides were normally found two pleats or pleated vents. The pleat was generally sewn in place. Buttons were often sewn at the pleat terminal, though were decorative rather than functional, for the pleat was secured by the thread, not the button.

Most coats had pockets on each side, but not always. As coat skirts became smaller, coat pockets were sometimes seen as a fashion liability, for placing anything in them ruined the sleek lines of the coat. Thus, many coats of those who cared about such things had faux pockets, or at least a slit through which one could access real pockets beneath the skirts (Cuthbertson 1768:84). The pocket flaps could come in several shapes, but scalloped edges were most common. Buttons could be omitted from the pocket, but many had them sewn on just below, serving only decorative purposes. Others placed buttons on the flap itself, which held it down by their weight, and some coats also used functional buttons on the pockets. While most pockets were horizontally placed, a few coats placed them vertically, as found on coatees.

The cut of the sleeves of coats bent at the elbows, as also made on jackets. The sleeve end was most often fitted with a cuff, although work frocks frequently had a slash cuff, sometimes covered with flaps, or with simple vents or hemmed ends. Turn back cuffs could be made without buttons, with functional buttons, or with non-functional, decorative buttons. The cuff size changed significantly over time, but by the 1770's cuffs were generally small and close to the sleeve. Functional cuffs with a slash sleeve similar in appearance to those on shirts were also made, and an original linen and wool frock of circa 1770, on display at the Yorktown Victory Center, exhibits similar treatment.

Coats typically had no collar, or were fitted with a small standing collar. The height of the standing
collar at this period was generally between one and one and a half inches (Cunnington and Cunnington 1957:186). Frock coats could have larger collars, but rather than standing, were falling. The size of the falling collar enlarged over time, but in the 1770's rarely exceed about four inches at their maximum width, which would be at the back center. Others were cut more uniformly around, and measured no more than a few inches. One extant garment at Colonial Williamsburg has a sewn down collar (1953-59) which was quite narrow, around one and a half inches in width.

Besides the coat and frock, other variations existed which are described in the runaway advertisements. The short coat, which overlaps with skirted jackets, was cut on along the same lines as longer coats, but with skirts falling somewhere between the level of the crotch and mid-thigh (Figure 22). Similar to the short coat was the coatee (Figure 23). A coatee was a short coat styled after a military fashion, and generally characterized by having vertical pocket flaps. When actually worn by soldier’s they most often had facings, or turned back lapels as the regimental coat, but in civilian wear this could be omitted. In most other respects short coats or coatees were made like coats and jackets. Many authors suggest short coats were popular with the working classes, but comparatively few are specifically described in the runaway descriptions.

Most coats had linings. The lining material varied, but was usually a less expensive fabric than used for the coat body. Occasionally coats are found using several materials for lining, the more expensive where it might show, and the less expensive where it was unlikely to be seen, such as the sleeves or center back. One coat at Colonial Williamsburg (1953-59), the same which had the sewn down collar, used a nice glazed shalloon along the sides, and a coarse linen in the center back. The coat itself is of a relatively inexpensive red wool broadcloth, with cloth covered buttons, and said to have been worn during the Revolution by a man from Massachusetts.

Other coats were made without lining. This was especially true in hot climates such as Virginia. John Harrower mentions on at least two occasions having coats with no lining. In a letter to his wife he described himself “Dressed in short cloath Coat... made of white cotton without any lining” (Harrower [August 7, 1774] 1963:57). In another letter to her in December, he writes that he has “laid aside my [white cotton] summer dress, and put on a suite of new Claret Coulerd Duffle neatly mounted but no lyning in the Coat only faced in the breasts” (Harrower [December 6, 1774] 1963:72).

Stephen Hawtrey, a student at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, explained the reason for omitting linings in a letter to his brother: “your Cloth suit unlined may do for the Month of May, but after that time you must wear the thinnest Stuffs that can be made without lining... [and] You must carry with you a Stock of Linnen Waistcoats made very large and loose, that they mayn’t stick to your hide when you perspire” (letter of March 26, 1765 in the William and Mary Archives, quoted in Baumgarten 1986:13).

Many of the runaways did in fact wear coats that were made of thinner and cooler material such as Holland, cotton, or cotton and linen mixed. A greater number had coats of more substantial fabrics. The most frequently mentioned fabrics were cloth and broadcloth, both wools. Together they represented 37 of the 99
coats with named fabric. Following this was Virginia or country cloth, with 11 mentions, though that fabric could incorporate wool, linen, cotton, or even hemp fibers. Lesser numbers of many other fabrics appear, covering over 25 varieties (Table 7).

A full 129 of the 143 coats had a color given to them in the runaway's description. As with jackets, blue comes in first as the color of choice, with 37 examples. Brown follows in second place with 24 garments. Light colors are next, with a combined total of 33 coats among light, white and gray. Dark and bright colors were also represented in varying amounts, as also were stripes (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcloth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieze</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearskin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Claret</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duroy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casimir</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Snuff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearnought</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Striped</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-thicks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kersey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Copperas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagathy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yellow/</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nankeen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fustian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cotton-linen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osnabrug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro Cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickset</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welch Cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unspecified 44

TOTAL 143
CHAPTER X
FROCKS AND HUNTING SHIRTS

Although few in number, some runaway servants wore frocks or hunting shirts. Sheridan defines frock as "A dress, a coat for children; a kind of close coat for men" (1780). Spence is less specific, simply calling it "a kind of garment" (1775). Regardless, it is clear from other sources that the term could mean both a more casual style of coat and a large pull-over work shirt.

One garment called a frock in the descriptions is definitely a coat. Joseph Lloyd had with him a "German Osnabrug Frock" and a "Frock of blue Fearnought with plain white Metal Buttons" (VG, P&D, January 6, 1774). The fact that the blue frock had metal buttons, and was made of fearnought cloth, both point to this as a coat. The German osnaburg frock, however, poses interpretive problems. The use of the word frock for both garments might suggest the two were similar. On the other hand, a frock made of osnaburg with no buttons described, when its companion piece did, might argue for it being a shirt rather a coat, for he took care to note both color and button type on the one, but not the other. The same problem of identification holds true for three more runaways having frocks (Appendix L). Charles Giddins wore a dark brown broadcloth coat and carried a fustian frock (VG, Purdie, June 2, 1775). Thomas Gils wore a ragged frock and trowsers (VG, Rind, March 10, 1774). Finally, John Young left wearing a linsey frock, and carrying of rifle (VG, D&H, March 25, 1775).

For Giddins, the fact that he wore a coat makes the frock seem more likely to be a shirt. While fustian could be used for coats, it was also a common material for frock shirts. Gils’ ownership of a frock shirt rather than a coat is more conjectural, for little is said of his apparel. Young, however, had a frock of linsey, a common frock shirt material. He also ran from a frontier county, and carried a rifle and some deer and elk hides. Combined these point to the frontier styled loose frock shirt, rather a frock coat.

The basic frock shirt was essentially a large version of a shirt (Figure 24). Frocks were common wearing apparel among the labouring classes and the military of America and Europe for many centuries. They were worn over more valuable garments to protect them. For this reason they were usually made from coarse, cheaper materials, perhaps even old sail canvas such as Samuel Kelly may have employed. In 1784 he complained of his sore shoulders because he had to carry wood back to the ship, and "nothing on [his shoulders] but a shirt or canvas frock" (Kelly 1925:102).

Graphic depictions of frocks, combined with written descriptions, suggest they extended about mid-thigh to mid-calf. They often had some pleating in the sleeves, more so at the cuffs than shoulder. The front had a slit, which could often be closed with a loop and button. Unlike hunting shirts, these work frocks did not have fringe, though a frayed hem could appear that way. Most civilian work frocks were made of undyed material, although on occasion might use colors or patterns. Military frocks worn as a uniform, and not just for work details, were commonly dyed.
24a
Common work frock

24c
Work frock as worn in the English countryside, woodcut by Thomas Bewick

Figure 24
Frock Shirts

24b
Frock with shoulder cape
Hunting shirts came in two basic styles. The first was essentially a form of frock. It is not known whether the terms frock and hunting shirt were frequently interchanged, but it may be that hunting shirts were a more distinctive garment. This probably came in the form of some fringe material along the lower hem (Figure 25) and perhaps sleeve, or the addition of a cape, or a few layers of capes, again, possibly ornamented with fringe (Figure 24b).

As with the frock, the length of a hunting shirt could vary. Most depictions seem to suggest mid-thigh as the most common length. In Virginia, a surviving orderly book for the 6th Regiment specifies the officers to provide themselves with "Hunting Shirts, short and fringed" while the soldiers were to have them "short and plain" (Goodwin 1962:11). While this in itself does not tell very much about the shirts, (even if they are open or pull-overs), the directions for other members of the unit do offer some hints. The hunting shirts for sergeants were to have "small white cuffs", while those of drummers "to be with dark cuffs" (Goodwin 1962:11). Cuffs might suggest that these hunting shirts were in fact forms of frocks.

To further support the concept of many Virginia hunting shirts as pull-overs are references to militia units appearing in the Virginia Gazette. Numerous mentions of the local troops appearing around Williamsburg after Lord Dunmore's removing the gun powder from the public magazine, and culminating with the battle at Great Bridge, refer to them as "shirtmen." The rebels, we are told by the Public Advertiser (London, March 13, 1776), "are called Shirtsman from their Uniforms, being a long Shirt down to their Heels, with a Leaden Medal at their Breasts, in the Shape of an old English Shield, on which is inscribed Liberty or Death" (Naval Documents of the American Revolution [NDAR] Vol 3:622).

While the Public Advertiser has the motto written on a medal, the slogan it refers to is normally conceived as having been written directly on the cloth. Several American units are mentioned bearing this motto. The Williamsburg Independent Company, made up of youths (Henry Nicholson was apparently the captain at age 14), were said in a disposition of 1833 to have worn the motto Liberty or Death upon their hunting shirts (Copeland 1977:140; Zlatch 1970). The Culpeper Minute Battalion likewise wore this slogan, and it also appears on their flag (Sanchez-Saavedra 1978:16). Another unit, Lenoir's Rangers, had the saying written across their black tow shirts (Gilgun 1993:105).

Added to these slogan references concerning troops opposing the Crown, we also have evidence that some Loyalist troops did the same. Probably in response to seeing the Virginia troops wearing the slogan Liberty or Death on their shirts, we are informed that Dunmore's black regiment, raised primarily from runaway slaves, wore Liberty to Slaves across their own shirts (VG, D&H, December 2, 1775:3). While possible with the leaden medal mentioned in the Public Advertiser, this would be difficult to accomplish on an open garment.

While evidence suggests many hunting shirts were closed-fronted, contemporary depictions show many were open fronted. Open fronted shirts seem to have always included some fringe, although one drawing by a German during the Revolution, clearly shows ruffles rather than fringe on the neck, shoulder seam, mid-
arm, and cuff of the garment (reproduced in Katcher 1981:136).

These open fronted shirts seem to be primarily a military style. Another drawing of two open fronted hunting shirts made by the same artist as the ruffled example, shows two capes, both fringed and secured at the neck with a button, fringe in two rows down the open front and lower hem, and four bands of fringe spaced equally apart from a few inches behind the sleeve end to the upper shoulder (reproduced in Katcher 1981:48).

These shirts, represented in Figure 26, are attributed to American Light Infantry.

Rifle companies are normally associated with open front hunting shirts. Perhaps the most well known are those of Daniel Morgan’s Virginia riflemen. Morgan (Figure 8b) has been verbally described and visually depicted in what has now become the archetypal definition of a hunting shirt. Sometime after the Revolution, Simeon Alexander described Morgan’s Regiment in his pension application. They wore, he recalled a,

short frock made of pepper-and-salt colored cotton cloth like a common working frock worn by our country people, except that it was short and open before, to be tied with strings, pantaloons of the same fabric and color, and some kind of cap, but I do not now remember its form. This was their summer dress (Alexander quoted in Dann 1977:106).

Alexander’s testimony tells us several things, although we should use caution, for he recalled the event many years later. First, he uses the term frock, as discussed above, to mean a similar garment to a hunting shirt, but apparently not “open before.” Secondly, he describes how the hunting shirts were fastened, with a tie, probably a simple cloth belt made from the same material as the shirt itself. Finally, he specifically denoted the fabric as cotton. While in more northerly colonies this would be unusual, in Virginia and the south, it may have been a reasonable fabric choice (Katcher 1981:169).

A surviving hunting shirt closely conforming to that as depicted for Morgan’s Riflemen, though of white linen, was worn by Abraham Duryea, a member of the Dutchess County, New York militia. The shirt is attributed to use in 1776. While the shirt is not in exceptional condition, it is well enough intact to offer detailed construction information. A reconstructed version and descriptions of the shirt show it was made in the same general technique as body shirts, but the front opening was cut the entire length. Rectangular sleeves, with square gusset attachments, were sewn into the shoulders. The upper arm had 31 pleats, whereas the lower arm, sectioned by a row of fringe, had 53. Fringe also decorated the front opening, body, cuffs, and shoulder cape. The collar was held fast with a cloth covered button, using a wood base, and secured with a cord. The garment uses linen with 48 threads per inch on the warp, and 40 per inch on the weft (Klinger 1963; 1967).

The Duryea hunting shirt may be considerably more extravagant than would be the majority of hunting shirts in Virginia. While in reality most were probably not as elaborate, some may have followed this lead. Excessive fringe, however, was in fact against specifications for certain Virginia regiments, though we do know soldiers’ used some fringe. This information comes from deserter descriptions, store issue records, and direct observations.

Quite a number of deserters from Virginia regiments appear in the Virginia Gazette. Among those wearing hunting shirts, several are singled out as having red fringe, and belonging to the 6th Regiment, the
Figure 26
Open Front Hunting Shirt
(after an engraving by a German officer serving in America)
same unit which specified the men's shirts were to be plain (Goodwin 1962:11). Store records for the 6th Regiment show at least two companies received osnaburg for their hunting shirts (Goodwin 1962:74). Subsequent deserter descriptions from this regiment and others in Virginia show many of the hunting shirts were dyed dark colors. Another source, written by John Durang, describes a Virginia regiment in green dyed shirts. To this they added yellow fringe (cited in Katcher 1981:169).

Store records for many Virginia regiments frequently mention cloth given out for hunting shirts. Most allotments suggest linen to be the more common material. The 1st Virginia regiment also received wool for use as capes to the shirts (Gallup 1991:34), although it is unclear if these were capes in the modern sense of the word, or collars, which was another 18th century meaning for that term.

Beside the military, hunting shirts are frequently associated with frontier areas. Nicholas Cresswell comments on hunting shirts several times during his travels into the Virginia frontier in 1775. Describing the appearance of his companions, he wrote "I believe there is but two pair of Breeches in the company, one belonging to Mr. Tilling and the other to myself. The rest wear breechclouts, leggings and hunting shirts, which have never been washed only by the rain since they were made" (Cresswell [June 10, 1775] 1924:83-84). Later that summer, Cresswell was informed by his partner, Mr. Anderson, "the Indians are not well pleased at anyone going into their Country dressed in a Hunting shirt" (Cresswell [August 21, 1775] 1924:103).

Hunting shirts appeared in only nine of the runaway advertisements, or less than 1% of the servants involved (Appendix L). Of that number, six apparently wore the shirt in place of a coat, but the remaining three had a coat as well as the hunting shirt. Information concerning the composition of the servant's hunting shirts are mentioned for five garments. Two are linen, one is flax and tow, one is tow, and one is filled with wool. With the possible exception of the wool filled specimen, all five use flax fibers. It is likely the wool fill utilized a flax warp as well. While it cannot be stated what fabric the remaining shirts used, linen or linen mixes (linen and cotton or linen and wool) are likely candidates.

Color is ascribed to six of the garments. Of those with no fabric described, we are told that one is white, another brown, and the third trimmed in green, but no mention of the body color. Of the two linen shirts, one is brown and one dyed yellow. The last shirt with a color mentioned was that of flax and tow, and it was white. The style of the shirts, open or pull-over, are not mentioned in any description.

Hunting shirts appear to have been most popular with the military and in frontier areas. A breakdown of runaways with hunting shirts shows a proclivity to be from the westerly counties. Two came from Augusta, one from Rockingham, one from Botetourt, one from Culpeper, one from Spotsylvania, two from Loudoun, and finally one from Richmond, but sighted with the shirt on in Williamsburg after having "enlisted in a company at York Town" (VG, Purdie, November 17, 1775).
CHAPTER XI
BREECHES

Breeches were worn by a majority of the runaways. Most would have been sewn up by professional or semi-professional tailors. At least two of the runaways were specialists in breeches making. One was a leather breeches maker, Josiah Bailey, who ran from Fredericksburg (VG, Pinkney, September 21, 1775). He wore leather breeches, presumably of his own handiwork. The other breeches' maker was a Hollander by the name of John Charles Kittler. Kittler also wore leather breeches, hinting that he too may have plied that trade, but that he was skilled in cloth cutting and sewing is also stated, for his notice read "breeches maker by trade, but may pass for a tailor" (VG, D&H, June 8, 1776).

Tailors, as previously discussed, were readily available in most areas, and their services were often used, even by indentured servants, as John Harrower's activities have shown. In most cases then, the breeches worn by the servants described in the Virginia Gazette can be assumed to have been sewn up by people who did it for a living. Because tailors would have learned their trade from sources ultimately stemming from Europe, it is reasonably safe to use European derived breeches and patterns to understand what those of the servants would have looked like. Although changes in fashion and geographical preferences would vary some, most breeches of the period involved in this study would fall within a known range of variance.

The cut of breeches changed very little from the late 1760's through the 1770's. There were variations, mostly in closure styles, but the fundamental shape remained fairly constant. The front closure underwent the most change in this period, encompassing at least three major varieties. Up to mid-century, the most common closure on the breeches fronts was a vertical closure, secured by buttons (Figure 27). The number of buttons used could vary, but three appears to be common. Anywhere from two to four buttons normally secured the waistband in front, and ties at the rear vent allowed for adjustment.

Throughout the 1750's and 1760's, waistcoats were generally long and covered much of area between the crotch and waistline. Because the breeches closure did not show, there was little need to take great care in its lines, and this system did not offend the fashionable eye. Many prints of Hogarth show this type of closure, perhaps most explicitly in After (1736), as the gentleman pulls his breeches back on (Shesgreen 1973:Plate 38).

Cunninngton et al. (1960:80) state that the fly-front, a flap covering the button row up the breeches, was not in use until the early 19th century. Cunninngton and Cunninngton cite from the Purefoy Letters a passage apparently directed to a tailor, specifying that the flap not be made on a pair of breeches. Written in 1736, the quote reads "Breeches no flap at the codpiece [front opening] but only buttons and button-holes" (1957:69). While this states the pair of breeches in question was to have no flap, that it specifies this suggests a flap was an option. Paintings and engravings from the period often depict breeches with no visible buttons at this juncture, though without further research little more can be said.
Although this style would have been mostly out of fashion by the beginning of the period under consideration, it is entirely possible some were still being worn. This could be from an old pair remaining in wearable condition, although cloth breeches were not normally expected to last more than about one year (Cuthbertson 1768:90). There is, however, ample evidence that serviceable clothes were given or sold after a death, and it would not be unthinkable for a young servant to have acquired clothing from an elderly man’s estate, and therefore somewhat behind the times in fashion. Likewise, instances of new clothing being made by using older garment’s for a pattern could result it time lag among breeches styles.

Although some of the runaways may have worn breeches with a buttoned front, most would have had a fall front. The fall front was made with a flap, held up by a button on either side. This style of closure offered an uninterrupted look on the front pelvic area, which would be complimentary to the rising waistcoat line. Cuthbertson recommended this system, for it “appears always tight and smooth, and is to be preferred to any other” (1768:87). As the bottom hem of the waistcoat grew shorter, more of the breeches were exposed, and so the fall front solved the problem of unsightly attachment junctures.

The fall front, the norm by the 1770’s, came in two basic styles, the whole fall and the small fall. The whole fall featured a wide flap that extended the entire width of the front of the breeches, from side seam to side seam (Figure 28a). It was secured by two buttons on either corner of the flap, and additionally by being held in the center to the lower waistband button. The small fall (Figure 28b) had a much narrower flap, frequently edged either side by an attached band. The flap is secured by buttons on each corner, and occasionally could add a third center anchor button. The waistband of fall fronts were secured with buttons, usually between two and four. Cuthbertson recommends three large buttons on a broad waistband (1768:86).

The rear vent of the breeches was either left open and tied (Figure 28a), or had a gusset and ties (Figures 27, 28b). Most of the ties utilized a rounded cord (Baumgarten, personal communication). The gusset on extant breeches examined for this study were left raw along the top edge, though cut in scalloped or toothed edges, which is curious considering the same breeches often had their inner seams carefully turned under and sewn, or even covered by additional strips of cloth. This seam protection is quite common in breeches meant for hard wear. About half of the breeches studied by Bryant (1988) in English collections had a strap and buckle for adjusting the back slit, but none of the samples personally examined for this study had used that system, which apparently grew in popularity only after the 1770’s.

Bryant’s study of 78 extant breeches in England suggests that the whole front was not as popular as the small front among those in the sample (1988:30). Unfortunately, whether the sample is biased to any particular styles or dates cannot be accurately ascertained, so this predilection towards small fronts on the surviving examples cannot be said with certainty to be entirely representative of breeches preference as a whole. It may be that the whole front is an earlier or less fashionable style, and therefore less represented in the extant garments. That the vertical buttoned front and the fall fronts overlapped is shown by tailoring plates of the period. Diderot, for example, in The Tailor II, has both varieties pictured side by side (Diderot 1771)
Figure 27
Buttoned Front Breeches, 1736
(as depicted in Hogarth's After)
28a
Whole fall breeches

28b
Small fall breeches

Figure 28
Fall Front Breeches
Regardless of the front opening style, all breeches varieties shared other features. Side pockets were common. On front closure breeches the pocket flaps were separate pieces, such as those depicted on a pair by Hogarth (Figure 27). Fall front breeches usually used integral pocket flaps, looking much like another fall flap behind the actual flap. Not all breeches had their auxiliary pockets, but did usually have a small pocket on the waistband, most often found on the right side. Cuthbertson writes "one cross pocket of a moderate depth, is all a Soldier need desire in his breeches, as it will answer every purpose he can want" (1768:87). Cloth breeches without some form of pocket, however, are very rare (Baumgarten, personal communication).

Because breeches fit the knee area quite snugly, slits were required along the legs to allow the feet to pass through. These were secured by buttons along the knee. Cuthbertson stated that four buttons (exclusive of the knee band) were the preferred number, for "a greater number looks too crowded" (1768:86). Of the large group of English breeches studied by Bryant, there were anywhere from three to seven knee buttons in use (Bryant 1988:31), although 89% used four to five (Bryant 1988:31). Preserved breeches examined in Virginia collections fell into this average, ranging from four to six, depending on the size of buttons used.

Knee buttons, as also those used on the flaps and waistbands, were most often wood or metal covered with the same fabric as the breeches. One pair examined used a combination of covered and uncovered buttons, all except those on front flap being covered in the same fabric as the garment. Sturdy working breeches could use covered or uncovered buttons.

If buttons were not cloth covered, many favored plain flat white metal. Most breeches used larger sized buttons on the waistband and flap, and small buttons on the knees, but several surviving breeches used small buttons for all closures. When that was the case, more buttons were used, and spaced closer together. One example of such a small buttoning scheme is seen on the Virginia cotton Taswell breeches (1991-563) preserved by Colonial Williamsburg, which use very thin metal buttons covered with cloth.

While the buttons down the leg at the knee closure are universal to all breeches of the period, there were variations in how the knee band itself was secured tight around the leg. Three basic techniques were in general use, buttons, buckles, and ties. The knee band itself was usually of the same material of the breeches, although some finer breeches were fitted with a more decorative knee band. At least one servant is known to have worn breeches with a contrasting fabric kneeband, nankeen breeches with yellow ferreting for the band (John White, VG, Rind, July 4, 1774). Some applied kneebands were also decorated with embroidery, but this technique is not expected on breeches of most servants, and is only encountered for the most part on breeches owned by those accustomed to such luxuries on their clothing.

If the knee band were buttoned, the accompanying strap overlapped far enough around the leg to allow it to be secured (Figure 29a). Cuthbertson called for using a button rather than buckles at the knee band, for not only were buckles more expensive, but buttons were less likely to damage the fabric (1768:86). A pair
of breeches at Colonial Williamsburg (G1981-183), said to have been worn by John Blair, does use this button technique to fasten the knee band. This garment, circa 1750-1770, is of unlined silk, and was tailored either in Virginia or England (Baumgarten 1986:55).

While Blair’s breeches may have been more convenient with his buttoned knee bands, most of the breeches examined in the Virginia collections had buckle strap attachments. While no breeches which were personally examined for this study retained the original knee buckles, the strap attachments are unmistakable. Bryant states that for the English collections, the width of the buckle strap varied "from five-eighths to one-and-one-quarter inches" (1988:31). The interiors of archaeologically recovered knee buckles could easily be measured to check for conformity to these dimensions. Those specimens that were examined for this study fell within that range.

The strap to which the buckle was attached (Figure 29b) most often had a button hole type opening on one side, through which the specially shaped buckle flange hooked (Figure 30). This allowed for a single pair of buckles to be easily interchanged with other breeches, or removed and stored in a secure place. Others methods of buckle attachment, such as studs through a leather tab, could have been employed, but surviving buckles and breeches show the former method by far the most common.

Knee buckles from mid-century through the 1760's were usually square or rectangular, with rounded corners (Figure 30a). By the 1770's, the same time that oval sleeve buttons came into fashion, not only was the squared buckle still in use, but oval buckles as well. These could be either rounded (Figure 30b), or pointed (Figure 30c), such as a silver pair owned by John Chiton (circa 1776) now in the Yorktown Victory Center, (Yorktown, Virginia).

Many merchant advertisements in the Virginia Gazette offer knee buckles for sale in the 1770's. As with shoe buckles, knee buckles could come in many metals, including silver, copper-alloys, pinchbeck, pewter, and plated, as well as inset with stone or paste. Though knee buckles frequently turn up in the papers and other documents, they are rather infrequently found in the ground in comparison to other buckles.

Although knee buckles have pronged tongues, suggestive of piercing the knee band strap to hold it secure, extant garments with buckle bands seldom show puncture marks. Bryant suggests this is a function of how the buckle and strap was worn. Rather than pierce the cloth with the prong, it may be that most men wore their breeches with the strap extension "looped around the buckle edge with the end of the extension facing outward" (Bryant 1988:36).

While some paintings from the period suggest this may have in fact been a method employed (Bryant 1988), many others clearly show the buckle frame in full, with the strap entirely through it (see Figure 19). Cuthbertson also implies the prongs were used. In calling for buttons rather than buckles, he explains "Buckles to the knee-bands of a Soldiers breeches are very improper... because their tongues are perpetually wearing out the straps" (1768:86). An original pair of leather breeches with the steel buckles still in place (Neumann and Kravice 1977:54) do in fact pierce the strap.
30a
Square knee buckle, c. 1750-1770

30b
Oval knee buckle, c. 1770-1780

30c
Pointed oval knee buckle, c. 1775

Figure 30
Breeches Knee Buckles
Even so, most surviving fabric breeches, as Bryant noted, do not have obvious punctures on the straps. It should be recalled that most preserved garments are those of the upper classes, and so finer fabrics are present than the runaway servants would have worn. This may have a bearing on how the straps were cared for and used. That on the preserved garments leather straps are more often pierced than cloth may reflect differences in the strength of the two materials, and the behavioral patterns associated with those properties.

The third form of securing the knee band was tying. Two basic systems were commonly used, bands or ribbons, and laces through eyelets. Laced ties through eyelets seem to be very infrequently employed. The breeches Bryant examined did contain one example (1988:22), but none of those examined in Virginia for this study were seen to have that system. The more common method of tying was with a band of cloth, either integral to the knee band or fitted through a slot sewn into the knee band (Figure 29c). Contemporary engravings and paintings show this method with regularity for all classes. Tom Nero, for example, a villain in Hogarth's *Cruelty in Perfection*, wears tied knee bands on his breeches (Shesgreen 1973: plate 79, *The Four Stages of Cruelty* series). In contrast to Nero's social position is Sir John Pole, who clearly displays his ties in a painting by Thomas Hudson, created about 1755 (Tate Gallery 1987:200). Ribbon ties were especially favored by macaronis, and gradually replaced buckles for the entire population by the end of the century (Cunnington and Cunningham 1957:213).

The fit and wearing of breeches did change some over time. Earlier in the century, breeches were looser, tightening on the body towards the end of the century as fashion changed. Cuthbertson demanded that breeches "must be made to fit smooth and tight upon the thighs" for soldiers (1768:86). Paintings of the upper classes do in fact show this trend, but engravings of working classes seem to often have a more relaxed fit, especially a baggy posterior and along the legs. Indeed, labouring men would be more comfortable with slightly looser breeches to accommodate their more strenuous activity (Copeland 1977; Gilgun 1993; Hesson 1979:52). In addition, many men are shown leaving the knee buttons unbuttoned, especially in Hogarth. This may be a symbolic gesture more than reality, for those with undone knee buttons tend to be the ones emphasizing lower characters, but on the other hand, it would free movement of the leg if appearances were not of high concern.

An amusing anecdote provided by Mittelberger from the 1750's shows that concern for appearances was not always high on some people's minds. According to Mittelberger, a preacher by the name of Alexander claimed that during his sermon he could make those in front of him cry, while those behind him would laugh. Wagers were placed, and the preacher stationed himself in the midst of the assemblage, and began to preach... When he saw that his listeners had become so moved that they began to cry, he put his hands behind him, pulled his coat-tails apart, and revealed through a pair of badly torn breeches his bare behind, which he scratched with one hand during this demonstration. At those behind him could not help roaring with laughter, and so he won his bet (Mittelberger [1750-1754] 1960:45).
Considerably more modest than this was Nicholas Cresswell. At a tavern in Berkeley County, Virginia, Cresswell penned "Two Young ladies lodged there... gazed at me as if I was a wild man of the Woods." His overall rough appearance, and "ragged breeches caused me to spend a disagreeable evening" (Cresswell [October 13, 1775] 1924:125). The next morning he cleaned himself up as best he could, and "mended my breeches with a piece of my shirt lap" (Cresswell [October 14, 1775] 1924:125).

While Cresswell does not say exactly where his breeches were torn, those of the preacher were pretty specific in their area of disrepair. To slow wear on breeches a "strap of cloth [ought to] be stitched on firmly between the thighs, which can readily be renewed, when worn out, and will contribute much to them doing greater service" (Cuthbertson 1768:86). While this may have been good advice for those who worked hard in their breeches, at least one preacher may have lost a bet had he followed that practice.

Among the runaway servant descriptions there are at least 161 pairs of breeches described (Appendix M). One hundred and forty list the material they are made from (Table 9). Of that number, 94 are made from fabric, covering about 29 different kinds of cloth. Another 46 are leather or buckskin, and the remaining 21 are not specified, though most of those are mentioned by at least their color, and were probably fabric (Table 10).

Of fabric breeches, there is no one textile that clearly dominates. The largest group is "cloth", with 13 mentions. While cloth can usually be assumed to be a wool (Appendix F), it could also have been used to imply fabric rather than leather, so this number must be viewed with some reservations.

The second most frequently mentioned textile for breeches was drill, with nine appearances. Third came Nankeen, a cotton cloth, with seven garments represented. Virginial/Country cloth and duffil tied with six for fourth, followed by lesser numbers of a variety of other textiles. While most modern researchers say the overall trend for servants' breeches should be sturdy, cheap cloth, those of the runaways are a varied lot, ranging from coarse cheap Negro cotton to silk, casimir, velvet, and plush.

One pair of breeches examined at Colonial Williamsburg, probably worn as servant livery, were also of plush (541036). Interestingly, the plush was not cut so that the pile went in the same direction on the front and rear leg pieces, which is quite visible to the eye. Rather they seem to have been cut to use the least material.

Three pairs of breeches were said to be knit (or net), plus four more were made of stocking material, which was probably the equivalent to knit. The knit technique is quite different from sewing up breeches out of woven cloth, and more akin to making stockings on a loom. The resulting material is quite similar in texture, having a flexible knitted structure, which could also be woven ribbed, as in stockings. That knit breeches material was made on a loom is exemplified by a passage appearing in The Virginia Almanack for the Year 1776 (Dixon and Hunter). A notice concerning a stocking manufactory mentions that
### TABLE 9
**BREECHES FABRICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nankeen</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffil</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia/Country</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plush</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearskin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everlasting/Lasting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fustian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knit/net</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duroy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-Thicks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kersey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osnabrug</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcloth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casimir</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearnought</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linsey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro Cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk stocking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagathy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsted shag</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velvet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather/Buckskin</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10
**BREECHES COLORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nankeen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snuff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they also had a "number of frames for weaving hose, breeches, patterns, etc. either in cotton, thread, or worsted." In most respects these breeches probably looked similar to cloth breeches, though they would have fit tightly against the skin.

While the nature of knit breeches would make a full lining impractical, most breeches were lined. The lining material could vary, even within a single garment, but linen was a popular choice. The fall occasionally was lined with finer quality fabrics than the remainder of the garment. Many breeches were also left unlined, as Harrower relates in a letter to his wife describing his summer clothes. She would no longer recognize him he felt, for he now wore a "short cloth Coat, vest Coat, and britches all made of white cotton without any lyning" (Harrower [August 7, 1774] 1963:57).

Leather breeches (Figure 31) were also frequently lined, especially along the waistband and fall. Interior seams were also commonly covered with a strip. Leather breeches could be sewn using the pattern normally applied to cloth breeches, but were also sewn using a special pattern suited to using a hide more economically (see Diderot 1978:344). The result was a pair of breeches with a single seam up each leg. On occasion, cloth breeches were also sewn using the single seam pattern, such as knit breeches.

Leather breeches were a very common item of apparel among the runaway servants, and indeed all classes of the Virginia population, from runaway slaves to Lord Botetourt, the Royal Governour. Such breeches were "a basic item of utilitarian clothing which men in colonial America had occasion to own" (Kidwell and Christman 1974:31). Within the Virginia Gazette descriptions, at least 46 pairs of buckskin or leather breeches are mentioned.

The vast majority of leather breeches were sewn by professional leather breeches makers, such as James Potter, who practiced the trade on Shoemaker-Row in London (Figure 32). While ready-made garments were only occasionally brought in from abroad, leather breeches, as with sailor's clothing, were frequent items to be imported, and were widely available throughout the colonial world. The majority of leather breeches in Virginia probably came from English shops, but numbers were also imported from the other American colonies to supplement those made more locally. The market for leather breeches was always secure enough to allow speculative stocking, and a variety of sizes would be kept on hand. While the quality of the breeches would vary depending on the leather used and the craftsmanship invested, most would be reasonably well made. Even so, how they fit the individual would vary. Being pre-made, most laborers wore what was available rather than having them fitted to individual measurements, as would wealthier customers.

Leather breeches generally have the same looks as other breeches, and are made with all the same variations of openings. While most leather breeches examined over the course of research for this study were equipped with knee buckles or button closures, tied examples also survive. A pair of breeches pictured in Gehret (1976:272-274), preserved by the Chester County Historical Society, use leather ties at the knee band. The pair also has leather covered buttons, a feature very common to most specimens. Uncovered metal buttons were also used, and when so employed, tend to be plain, undecorated buttons of a copper-alloy or white metal.
Figure 31
Leather Breeches
James Potter,
Leather-Breeches Maker.

At the Sign of the Boot and Breeches,
within Three Doors of Aldgate, on
the Left Hand Side of the Way, in
Shoemaker-Row.

Makes and Selleth all Sorts of
Leather-Breeches, by Wholesale and Retail, at Reasonable Rates.
Likewise Buck and Doe Skins and all Sorts of Leather for Breeches.

Printed at the Old Katherine-Wheel without Bishopsgate.

Figure 32
Leather Breeches Maker Tradecard
For more strength, these buttons were often attached with thongs passing through the shanks rather than thread.

A pair of leather breeches with a slave association use such thonging for the knee buttons. They are preserved at Old Sturbridge Village, Massachusetts. As on the previous pair, these also use leather covered metal buttons on the wide fall front, waistband, and knees, but the knee band was secured with buckles (now missing) (Baumgarten 1988:53). The rear slit is made as on cloth breeches, laced but having no gusset. Most leather breeches, however, have the button holes bound rather than sewn. In most other respects, the leather versions have the same appearance of fabric breeches, including the small pockets on the waistband.

Though most leather breeches were imported, they were made in Virginia as well. Two runaways, previously mentioned, were described as breeches makers, one of whom, Josiah Bailey, was specifically said to make those of leather. Nicholas Cresswell may well have employed Bailey or someone like him. Preparing for a trip into the Virginia frontier, Cresswell records in his diary that he "Bought a Buckskin to make breeches" (Cresswell [June 14, 1775] 1924:86). While he does not detail the process, he obviously took the leather to a local leather breeches maker. He did the same a few years later for a British friend being held as a POW in Virginia, writing that "Mr. Neilson has given him leather to make himself a pair of breeches and I will get them made" (Cresswell [February 1, 1777] 1924:183).

While most leather breeches would be left natural, buff white or tan, they could also be dyed. The most common color for breeches that were not left in their natural state was black, but other shades could be produced as well. None of the leather breeches mentioned in the runaway descriptions give specific colors, so it is probable they were all in natural shades, unless darkened by soiling. A few leather breeches were in fact described as very dirty.

The cloth breeches of the Virginia servants were made using a vast array of colors and shades. Roughly 78% of the total number of fabric breeches described for the runaways had a color mentioned. Black was the most popular, with 18 garments represented. This was followed by white at 16, but among this shade might be added seven more called light, and another one called buff. Blue had 12 examples, and brown and Nankeen, a yellow, both had eight. Several brighter colors also appeared, including red and purple, as well as two breeches that were striped, but unfortunately, the colors are not mentioned.
CHAPTER XII
DRAWERS

Three runaways in the Virginia Gazette wore drawers (Appendix M). While drawers are often interpreted as undergarments (Baumgarten 1992:12; Cunningham et al. 1960:66-67; Lemire 1991:180), the term sometimes also refers to an outer garment. Sheridan (1780) defined drawers as undergarments, but in 1775 Spence called them simply "a kind of breeches." Apparently the use of the term for an outer garment was more common in the earlier part of the century. William Hugh Grove, for example, repeatedly uses drawers in reference to outer garments in his Virginia journal of 1732. There, he wrote, "the Negroes at the Better publick houses must not Wait on You Unless in Clean shirts and Drawers and feet Washed" (Grove [1732] 1977:22). Again he records "In summertime even the gentry goe Many in White Holland Wast Coat & drawers and a thin Cap on their heads and Thread Stockings" (Grove [1732] 1977:30). Finally, in detailing clothes given to slaves by their masters, he lists brown linen shirts, drawers, and shoes, but no other mention of outer garments.

The drawers described in the Virginia Gazette runaway descriptions can be assigned to outer garments with near certainty due to the fact that in all cases they are the only lower garment described. Had any other clothing such as breeches or trousers been noted, their place as outer garments could be questioned. Short of the runaways going about in under-garments and nothing more, these drawers can be classed as breeches.

The first pair of drawers mentioned belonged to James Watson (VG, P&D, March 24, 1774). Watson ran not while serving a master, but before he had been situated in Virginia, while still on board the ship that brought him, the Justitia. The only clothes Watson was described as having were his drawers, of blue worsted, and a green jacket. The second runaway wearing drawers is William Row. Row's coat and waistcoat were woven of "cotton and linen almost white", while his shirt, leggings, and drawers were of "coarse country linen" (VG, Purdie, August 16, 1776). That Row also wore leggings may suggest his drawers were more akin to breeches than trousers. The third runaway in drawers was William Robertson. He had on linen drawers, as well as an old felt hat, an old shirt of country linen, an old sagathy coat, an old plush jacket, white yarn stockings, and a pair of old pumps half worn, with pinchbeck buckles (VG, Purdie, August 15, 1777). Again, as the drawers are the only form of lower garment noted in the otherwise thorough list, it is obvious they are outer-drawers.

While Baumgarten (1992) notes that drawers, when used to denote breeches, are often lightweight fabrics, the examples in the runaway descriptions do not appear significantly different from other breeches' fabrics. While worsted can be woven thin, it is generally not a lightweight fabric. Both linen drawers could have been lightweight, although again these fabrics also commonly appear for normal trousers and breeches. The use of the term drawers in this context probably represents no more than the describer's word choice.
CHAPTER XIII
TROUSERS

No intact trousers are currently known to survive in America for the period concerned here (Baumgarten, personal communication). In addition, no tailor’s patterns were located for trousers of the 18th century during the course of research for this study. Nevertheless, information can be still gathered from other sources.

Trousers were not popular among the fashionable of Virginia in the mid 1770’s. According to Kidwell and Christman, wearing trousers was often considered “a badge of the lower orders” (1974:21). Gottlieb Mittelberger, in mid 18th century Pennsylvania, however, seemed to find them fairly common. Noting the dress of the inhabitants during the summer, he wrote “Everyone wears long trousers that reach down to the shoes; such trousers are very wide and made of fine stiffened linen” (1960:89).

While other sources suggest that trousers were not as universally adopted as Mittelberger makes it sound, he does imply that they were worn by more than just the lowest class. While many of the middle classes would have avoided trousers for social reasons, we do know that they were frequently seen on soldiers and sailors, as well as laborers in cities and the countryside. Trousers commonly appear among the apparel of runaway servants described in the Virginia Gazette, totalling 84 pairs among the 201 descriptions.

Most trousers were constructed similar to breeches for the upper section, although they probably rarely had pockets. While fall front trousers are often shown in contemporary images (Figure 12, Figure 33), many trousers were also made using the front buttoning system found on older breeches (Figure 34), even when they had gone out of fashion for the latter garment. Some trousers were made to fit loosely, adapted to a vigorous work environment, while others fit the leg fairly snugly, much as breeches. The major difference between breeches and trousers was not width so much as length.

When Mittelberger described the trousers he saw, he mentioned they went down as far as the shoes. Another German, J.F. Wasmus, made the same comment. While a POW in America he noted the “long linen trousers which reached down to their shoes” (Wasmus [1777] 1990:72). John Harrower remarked on the length of his trousers in 1774. On March 8 of that year, Harrower, bound for Virginia on the Snow, purchased a pair for the sum of “seven Biscuits” (1963:24). Nearly a month later, he informs us, “I have wore no Brichtes nor stockins since we got into the trade winds, only a pair of long trousers down to my buckles. And this day having put on a shorter pair untill my longest pair was wash’d, I got both my Ancles burned by the sun, it so verrry hot here” (Harrower [April 6, 1774] 1963:30). Harrower’s bad luck could have been avoided had he worn stockings, but these seem to have been optional for those wearing trousers. Wasmus also remarked he saw no stockings worn with the trousers he saw ([1777] 1990:72). Some contemporary prints though, clearly show sailors wearing stockings under their trousers (Figure 35).

Trousers could be found in lengths ranging anywhere from just below the knees to about where
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Harrower's longest pair stopped, at his buckles. There seems to have been no hard rule as to the desired length for civilians and sailors, although in the military longer trousers would be most often seen. Trousers extending over the top of the shoe are primarily a style of later decades, and not the 1770's (Copeland 1977:7).

Sailors are often depicted in some form of trousers, and at least one runaway is said to have had one or two pair of sailor's trousers (William Johnston, VG, D&H, January 21, 1775). While many sailors favored the straight-legged variety, those specifically called sailor's trousers were probably the very wide form called petticoat trousers or breeches (Figure 36).

Still others had trousers similar to Sherryvallies, which functioned, as did petticoat trousers, as overalls, covering the clothes underneath. These, as shown by a surviving pair originally owned by Thomas Jefferson, had buttons going all the way down the outer leg seam from the waistband to the knee band (Baumgarten 1993:102). Jefferson's Sherryvallies were breeches' length, but a Swiss runaway servant by the name of John Eton Dugrect had trousers described as having buttons going down the leg (VG, Purdie, July 21, 1775). As he had several pairs of breeches, he likely wore them as overalls, as did Jefferson.

Trousers of all kinds were found in plain and patterned fabrics, with stripes being especially favored if solid colors were not used. As the runaway servant descriptions reveal, trousers could also be found in checked cloth. Of the 84 trousers listed in the advertisements (Appendix N), only 18 possibly mention color or pattern (Table 11). Seven are said to be brown, six striped (one of which was a black and white cotton), two check, and one each presumed to be blue, red, and white. The last three trousers are assigned their colors based on wording in the advertisement, and the association of the trousers with other clothing. The white pair, for instance, are of negro cotton, and while the description does not say white for the trousers, it did specify white for the negro cotton waistcoat and jacket which accompanied them (Henry Reed, VG, Rind, August 18, 1774). The blue and red trousers are similarly grouped with other color-specified clothing. The remaining 66 make no mention of this attribute, but, going by the fabrics employed, it can be assumed they were undyed, and primarily unbleached fabrics. Most would probably have been shades of brown, but the three Holland linen pairs have a good chance of being bleached white.

While 66 trousers made no mention of color, 67 did make note of the fabric employed (Table 12). Of that number, 31 were specified as osnaburg, making up the largest textile class for this garment by far. The next fabric in popularity was linen, three specifying domestically made. Tow, essentially a coarser variety of the previous two, was represented with eight pairs. The remaining trousers were mostly other forms of linen, along with a few types of woolens and cotton. One of the cotton trousers was negro cotton, which in Virginia at this time, could still mean a wool, as well as a coarse cotton, or even a mix of the two. The other pair was not yet made up, but was a piece of cloth for trousers, of black and white striped cotton, and associated with several other cotton garments.

Although trousers were not as popular with those of the more genteel persuasion, and were generally constructed of coarser fabrics, this did not mean they were necessarily crudely made, or even home sewn.
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While trousers are likely to have been made more domestically than breeches, many were made by tailors. Nicholas Cresswell lets us know this in no uncertain terms, for he felt the tailor who made his was a price gouger. Writing from on board the Edward, in New York harbour, Cresswell said “I have got two pair of drill trousers made here, the stuff cost 1/2 and the rogue of a tailor has charged me 18/ for making them. I am very confident that I could have had them made in England for half a Crown” ([June 2, 1777] 1924:230).

Where most of the servants obtained their trousers is unknown. The fact that several runaways who served the same master wore identically described clothes, however, suggests they were commonly supplied. That one servant took cloth for trousers not yet sewn up suggests this as well, for the master would most likely provide the material, and the clothes would be tailored afterwards.

Some servants may have obtained trousers that were ready-made. George Newton, for instance, a "stout" convict farmer, was said to wear trousers that were "rather too small for him" (VG, Pinkney, June 1, 1775). While this may have been from obtaining them used, or his expansion after having obtained them, it could also have been a function of receiving them in finished form, for some shops did carry the item. The sailor Samuel Kelly exemplifies this, for on board his ship he wrote the master had "laid in a few slops to sell to us, from which each man was supplied with a pair of red baize trousers, so that when we were aloft reefing the sails we appeared like a flock of flamingoes" (Kelly [November 1783] 1924:97).

### Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Osnaburg</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tow</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Linen</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Cloth</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearnought</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER XIV
STOCKINGS

In 1761 Rolt defined stockings as "That part of the clothing of the leg and foot, which immediately covers their nudity.... The modern stockings, whether wove or knit, are a kind of plexus's mashes, intermingled in one another." Because so many of the runaways wore breeches, stockings would have been quite noticeable. One servant, in fact, was especially noted for his lack of stockings, John Ounsted (VG, Purdie, September 27, 1776). Although an exact count of the number of stockings appearing in the runaway ads cannot be given, (several servants ran with an unspecified "several"), there is a minimum number of 106 stockings among the 201 descriptions (Appendix 0). At least 77 of those are identified by material (Table 13), and 81 are ascribed a color (Table 14).

### TABLE 13
STOCKING FABRICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worsted</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thread</td>
<td>19+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarn</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribbed, unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fabric</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County/Virginia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk</td>
<td>1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown fabric</td>
<td>29+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>106+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 14
STOCKING COLORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>6+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed/twisted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marbled</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue &amp; white</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown &amp; white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mottled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spotted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>28+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>81+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the material of the stockings would have a great deal to do with the look of the finished garment, the basic stocking was usually made a little over knee high, and formed to fit snugly against the leg and foot. The toe termination was typically rounded, although some had flat toes as well (Gehret 1976:222). Reinforcements were typical at the heel, to slow wear. Cuthbertson urged that "running [stockings] in the heels will strengthen them exceedingly, therefore every Soldier should learn that piece of economy, as well as to mend his stockings, it being very praise worthy, besides saving him a constant expense" (1768:99).

Due to the heavy wear stockings received, frequent replacement would be necessary. Harrower records obtaining new stockings many times in his diary ([1773-1776] 1963). Cuthbertson called for each soldier to have four pairs on hand at any given moment, "three of which to be of fine yarn, eighteen pence a pair, and the fourth of thread, worth about two shillings four pence, to wear on Sundays, and other particular occasions" (Cuthbertson 1768:99).

Mending was a common pastime for many stocking wearers. Harrower wrote he spent an entire day in December "employed in mending my Stockins" (December 21, 1773] 1963:5). Louisa Wells was a bit more explicit, explaining that during the early years of the Revolution, she "used to darn [her] stockings with the ravellings of another" (Wells [1779] 1968:2). From that, we might assume she spoke of knit stockings rather than the other varieties, of which there were three basic groups.

Stockings were generally made using one of three techniques. They could be knit, as Louisa Wells mentioned, by hand. Rolt explained that "Knit Stockings, are wrought with needles made of polished iron, or brass-wire, which interweaves the threads, and form the mashes the stockings consist of" (1761). He added that

knit stockings are much preferable in durableness and strength to those made in the loom; but the time employed in knitting stockings of any fineness raises their price too much for common wear. The Scotch make the best knit stockings of any people in Europe, and sell them at exorbitant rates; 30s. for a pair of white knit stockings from Aberdeen being a common price, and some amounting to 4£ (Rolt 1761).

Parts of Scotland could actually boast world fame for their knit stockings. John Harrower, from the Shetland Islands, blended well into that sphere. When he left home in search of work he took with him a large quantity of Scottish stockings "to the amount of £3 Str. or thereabout" to sell along the way when he needed cash ([December 6, 1773] 1963:3). According to his diary, his stockings were much more affordable than those Rolt mentioned. His first sale was to "a recruiting Serjant", who bought "3 pair Stockins for 6 [shillings] Str." (Harrower [December 9, 1773] 1963:4). Near Arbroath the following day he made a better deal, getting three shillings for a single pair sold to a merchant. Many other sales and trades follow until he ends up in London, broke, and signs on as a servant bound to Virginia.

A knit stocking could be coarse or fine. The coarse variety was called so for the use of large yarns This would usually result in a stocking with a fabric not unlike that of modern knit mittens, though with perhaps thinner yarn. The density of the stitches would be fairly loose compared to other stockings. Quality
hand knit stockings were also made though, and highly prized, as Rolt mentioned (1761).

The quality, of course, depended upon the skill of the knitter and the yarns available. More skilled knitters might make the stockings with no visible seams, but those made for economy, such as the government contracts, might be knit so that a seam ran up the back, where the tube of the leg came together. Cuthbertson complained that the quality of the government purchased yarn stockings "are generally so ill shaped and coarse, as not to be even fit for wearing under gaiters" (1768:96). He also suggests that yarn stockings should be knit and not woven, for the former were "stronger by many degrees than wove ones" (Cuthbertson 1768:99).

Rolt termed stockings made on a loom "Woven stockings" and said they "are ordinarily very fine; they are manufactured on a frame or machine made of polished iron" (Rolt 1761). The stocking frame, plaa of which are to be found in Diderot, had a long history in England (see Felkin's 1867 History of the Machine-Wrought Hosiery and Lace Manufactures). By the 1770's, the industry had been well developed for several centuries, and had secured a steady market for their product in the American colonies. The looms could weave stockings from many threads, and commonly employed linen, wool, cotton, and silk. Worsted stockings were a frequent product, woven with combed wool (Rolt 1761). Linen stockings were often called thread, while cotton and silk (and silk mixes) were generally called by the fiber names. A large number of these loomed stockings were imported to Virginia, and numerous orders placed to Norton and Sons attest to this fact (Mason 1937).

In discussing the future of commerce between England and America, Holroyd, in 1783, felt confident that the stocking trade would continue: "The great consumption of stockings in the American States is worsted, linen and cotton; that of silk will never bear any proportion; the worsted, linen and cotton have been and most probably will be imported from Great Britain; the silk from different countries" (Holroyd 1783:10-11).

Export figures for stockings going from England to America show Holroyd was not in error. Even with the slowing in trade due to the war, English stockings found their way in large numbers to American wharfs. Statistics compiled by the Commissioners of Customs (1780) show that between 1770 and 1778 over 3.3 million pairs of worsted, 250,000 pairs of woolen, and nearly 66,000 pairs of yarn men's stockings were imported to America.

While large numbers of stockings were obviously being imported from Britain, many were also being made in the colonies, and Virginia itself. Holroyd noted "a considerable amount of coarse worsted stockings is made in America" (1783:11), but finer stockings were being made as well. The most renowned stocking manufacturing center in America was Germantown, Pennsylvania. When visiting in 1760, Andrew Burnaby wrote "The German-town thread stockings are in high estimation; and the year before last, I have been credibly informed, there were manufactured in that town alone above 60,000 dozen pair. Their common retail price is a dollar per pair" (Burnaby 1775:47). At least one servant had a pair of these fine stockings, although they were acquired through theft (James Leighton, VG, Pinkney, November 23, 1775).

Other colonies had their share of stocking weavers as well. Nicholas Cresswell noted one
manufactory in his travels in Frederick Town, Maryland ([December 4, 1775] 1924:133), although its output was apparently fairly limited. Virginia had its share of stocking weavers as well, many of whom advertised in the *Virginia Gazette*, both to employ stocking weavers, and to sell their unwanted looms. A Fredericksburg manufactory, for example, had for sale "four excellent stocking frames, viz one steel one, No. 25, and three Wooden ones, No. 14, 15, and 17" (James Sommerville and George Muir, *VG, D&H*, February 21, 1777). These looms may well have woven the many stockings John Harrower records acquiring in his diary, while a servant near Fredericksburg between 1774 and 1776.

While Rolt defines loomed stockings as woven, that term is also applied to a third form of stocking, one sewn up from cloth. Rather than woven from thread or yarn, the stocking is cut out of a piece of cloth and sewn up, usually from two pieces, one for the body, and one for the sole. Unlike the knit and loomed stockings, these rarely fit well upon the leg, appearing baggy and loose. Made of non-stretching material, not only was it more prone to tearing, but the stocking had to be wide enough the whole length to accept the foot, meaning it would not fit tight at the narrow of the ankle. In addition, garters would be almost a given necessity, for there would be no tightness about the leg to hold the stocking up, short of the grip of the breeches' kneeband. Garters, however, were commonly found on stockings of all materials, not just those sewn from cloth. About the only advantage to stockings of this sort, other than strict economy, was that they could be widened or narrowed more easily by adding cloth at the seam, or taking the seam in.

Of the stockings described in the runaway ads, loomed specimens seem to be most prevalent. Twenty two pairs were of worsted, which was commonly woven on the stocking frames (Rolt 1761). Another group of at least 19 (plus "several others") were thread, again mostly loomed stockings. Sixteen more of yarn may have been largely hand knit. Lesser quantities of ribbed (a knit with ridges), *Virginia* and Country cloth, cotton, and sale were present, along with at least one pair of silk (Table 13).

White was, without rival, the most common color mentioned for the servant's stockings. Seventeen pairs were of that shade. This is precisely what Captain Cuthbertson called for in the military:

White, besides being the most showy, is the readiest colour to be obtained in all places; nor will they be found so difficult to keep clean, as those of a greyish kind (which next to white, are the only coloured stockings, that can decently be admitted for a soldier's wear) because the smallest application of pipe-clay, used for Accoutrements, effectually cleans them, unless they are too far gone in dirt (1768:98-99).

After white, the servant's next most favoured color did not follow the Captain's advice. Blue had nine pairs represented, some of which were light or pale, others presumably a darker indigo color. Gray followed this with a minimum of six examples, and assorted other colors and mixes also had showings of various numbers (Table 14).
CHAPTER XV

LEGGINGS

Leggings were worn by seven runaways (Appendix O). Cresswell describes leggings in Virginia, while preparing for the backcountry. Near Winchester, on April 3, 1775 he declares he "Must wear leggings. These are pieces of coarse woollen cloth wrapped round the leg and tied below the knee with a string to prevent the snakes biting you" (Cresswell 1924:61). The following year he claims "People that travel much in the Woods wear leggings of coarse woollen cloth" (June 4, 1776) 1924:145). Accordingly, at Fort Pitt he "employed an Indian Woman to make me a pair of Mockeysons and Leggings" (Cresswell [August 19, 1775] 1924:102). Samuel Kelly also described leggings. Ashore in Florida he observed "men... lightly clothed with a large piece of coarse blue cloth, wrapped round each leg instead of stockings, and which guard their legs in hunting excursions" (Kelly [1784] 1925:105).

While the leggings described by Kelly and Cresswell were rather crude garments, really nothing more than rectangular pieces of cloth wrapped about the leg and tied, more complex leggings were available. Gaiters were popular among the military for added protection. Cuthbertson describes a serviceable pair of gaiters as made from stout grey linen that has been blacked. The tongue should go over the shoe buckles, fitting smoothly on the foot, and secured by a "double strap of strong leather, to come under the shoe" (Cuthbertson 1768:99). Up the legs, which are to go "just to meet the kneeband of the breeches", should be a row of "small horn or metal buttons without shanks... set on as thick as possible" (Cuthbertson 1768:99). A shorter version was also mentioned, which would "rise... to the swell of the calve, with a small peak at the top of the back seam" (Cuthbertson 1768:100).

Because gaiters were utilitarian, and generally worn until no longer serviceable, few have survived. A woolen gaiter, similar to ones Cuthbertson describes, was recovered from the loft of a farmhouse in Surrey, England (Sloper 1981). Although precise dating of the garment cannot be had, it is assumed to be early 19th century. There was little change in design by then, and the gaiter could well have fit into an 18th century farmer’s wardrobe. The outer body is of wool, with a 60 thread warp and weft and the lining is linen (Sloper 1981:104). One bone button remains, ½ inch in diameter. Nine buttons would have been used on the 13½ inch high gaiter.

Although this sort of leg protection may have been available to the servants, the simpler type described by Cresswell and Kelly is probably what the seven servants with them wore. All probably were simple fabric rectangles, held onto the leg from ankle to knee or thigh by leather, cord, or cloth. While the leggings Cresswell described were of wool, those in the descriptions were varied. Two pairs were cotton, one white. Another pair was coarse country linen, and a fourth of tow. One more pair was linsley, part flax and part wool. The final two pairs do not state a fabric, but one was brown. The other was referred to as wrappers. While it is possible one or both were wool, it is also possible the brown leggings were linen.
CHAPTER XVI
FOOTWEAR

Footwear appears in a large portion of the runaway ads. By far the majority are shoes or pumps, with only one reference to moccasins, and one possible pair of boots. Many descriptions mentioned the actual shoes, while others simply imply shoes through details of the buckles worn upon them. In all, over 101 individual pairs of footwear are identified, although more pairs of shoes are represented than listed here, for a few ads suggested the runaway had multiple pairs, but did not specify the number (Appendix P).

Among those with no word on shoes, some speculation can be offered. A runaway who had stockings described, for example, probably wore shoes, but the describer simply omitted that item if they offered no assistance in the identification of the individual. Stronger examples which suggest such omission behaviour are those ads which are silent on shoes, but describe shoe buckles. Conversely, that type-space was devoted to identify individuals as barefoot suggests that this condition may have been more out of the ordinary than not. Four runaways were specifically said to have been without any shoes.

Sources for shoes vary considerably. The runaway descriptions offer several origins, which can be grossly classed into imported or domestic. English made shoes seem to have enjoyed a favourable esteem among those describing or selling them. Shoes were a frequent import item to Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas, unlike many of the northern colonies who tended to produce more men’s shoes for themselves (Holroyd 1783).

Catherine Rathell of Williamsburg, for example, offered her freshly imported "Didsbury’s best and neatest shoes, pumps, and slippers, with other London made do." (VG, PD, April 13, 1769:3). Didsbury’s products were so well respected that some ordered them exclusively (Mann Page ordering from John Norton, February 15, 1770 in Mason 1937:125-126).

Three years later, Rathell requested from her London supplier additional stock. In January, 1772 she wrote "the gentlemen Now Call frequently for Shoes with long hind Quarters, and that Buckle Low on the foot, so... Send me some of them, if not the most part, as I suppose by the time the[y] Arrive, there will be no Other called for" (Mason 1937:217). She backed up her request with a more specific order asking for "6 Dozn. of Either Didsburys or Carpues best & Neatest Shoes, half of them very stout Wax Leather, the other Dress. Stitched heels &c long hind Quarters from ye largest to the smailest size" (Mason 1937:218).

Didsbury’s reputation as a shoemaker obviously carried weight in the colonies, for not only were his shop’s products advertised to draw customers, but serving under him was also used to advantage. Richard Brooke of Fredericksburg, offered a servant for sale in 1776 who had "worked many years with Mr. Didsbury" (VG, Purdie, June 28, 1776:3). Likewise, a shoe factory in Petersburg promised shoes "equal in Goodness and Workmanship to any imported from London [for] many of the Hands [had] worked with Didsbury and other Capital Tradesmen in that Branch" (John Blaney & Co., VG, D&H, November 18, 1775).
This is not to imply that domestically produced shoes were not as well made as those of Brinoin. The Earl of Sheffield commented that American craftsmen were equal to any in England in the business, and perhaps surpassed those of most other European countries (Holroyd 1783:11). The major drawback to American products was the material, not the skill; "Soles are better made in England, because better tanned. America has not the stock to afford to tan the leather as in England, where it lays three years in the tan pit; in America they leave it only one year (Holroyd 1783:11).

While sole leather may have been inferior, Holroyd conceded that "Upper leathers for shoes are as good in America as in England" (1783:11). Even so, many Virginian shoemakers advertised their use of imported leathers, both from England and the other colonies. The Norfolk manufactory of John Willson assured his potential customers that they could obtain shoes "as neat... as any from London; as I have on Hand London, Philadelphia, and New York Calf Skins, red, green, and blue Morocco Leather, Calimancoes of all colours, and of the best Kinds" (VG, P&D, May 16, 1771:3). In addition the Norfolk factory offered "Negro Shoes", presumably made with lesser quality leather and fewer stitches.

Finally, some shoes were produced at home. Thirteen of the runaways in this study were said to be shoemakers, and many surely were at least occasionally employed at their craft for those around them. Slaves were also trained in the art, and produced shoes for both their fellow chattel and their masters' family. One such man offered for sale was a 24 year old "likely Negro Fellow, who served a considerable Part of his Time at the Shoe Factory at Norfolk" (John Stewart, VG, P&D, October 6, 1774:3). Others offered their services to the general public, such as the man contracted to make new shoes for Louisa Wells during the Revolution: "I found out a Negro Shoe Maker, who said he could make for Ladies. I deny that he could fit them. My shoes had no binding, were lined with French sail-Duck, and the heels were covered with Leather" (Wells [1779] 1968:1).

John Harrower gives us some idea of the place of shoes in a servant's life in his journal. It is also interesting to note that he loans a pair to Lucy Gains, a fellow servant on the plantation, for her to wear while spinning cloth (Harrower [October 23, 1775] 1963:122). In a period of two years, Harrower mentions his shoes at least eight more times. In 1774 he writes that he wore "a pair of new shoes made in Fredericksburgh of English calf leather the price of them 12/6 Curcy" (Harrower [July 18, 1774] 1963:51). He then receives another new pair in December of that year (Harrower [December 4, 1774] 1963:71). Yet another new pair follows in May of 1775, paid for by his master, although apparently he does not wear them until June 11th (Harrower 1963:99). Later that same month Harrower writes "This morning recd. my Shoes from Mr. Anderson [a local shoemaker from whom he bought new shoes in May, 1775] half soled at 3/6" ([June 19, 1775] 1963:100). He receives new shoes twice more before his diary ends, one pair on September 10, 1775, and the other June 18, 1776 (Harrower 1963).

Although only covering a few years, Harrower's journal seems to indicate a fairly regular pattern of shoe renewal, at the rate of two pair per year, one summer and one winter. This seems consistent with other
documents on slaves and servants which suggest such seasonal clothing supplements.

Harrower’s mention of repairs to shoes (June 19, 1775) is also mirrored in other writings, archaeological evidence, and common sense. Shoes were often easily repaired for a fraction of the cost of replacement, and usually just as serviceable: “A shoe after soaking will last almost as long as it did before” (William Davis to Thomas Jefferson 1781, Jefferson 1950:446). Indeed many archaeologically recovered shoes have evidence of replaced heels, insoles, and soles.

Other shoes feature prominent patching, frequently along the sides where the foot caused the leather to wear against the ground. This side damage was especially prone to occur in straight last shoes. As the foot has a natural curve, and the shoe does not, excess friction wears the sides at the contact points. When in motion, the foot would cause the vamp to scrape the ground (Gehret 1976:214), and thus result in a great deal of these repairs on the outer sides of the shoe. For this reason, some 18th century authors recommended alternating the shoe from foot to foot (e.g. Cuthbertson 1768:135; Garsault 1767:25).

Cuthbertson, interested in promoting economy among British soldiers, wrote, “It should be particularly observed, that the Men do not always wear their Shoes, on the same feet, but that they Change them day about, to prevent their running crooked: nor should they be permitted to have their shoe straps pulled towards the toe, like Sailors; but are to be accustomed to tuck the ends of them, under the ring of the buckle” (Cuthbertson 1768:135). This way wear would be slowed on the vamps, and the buckle straps.

Well over 100 complete surviving shoe specimens from Fort Ligonier, Pennsylvania (deposited between September and November, 1758), suggest that some straight last shoes were in fact worn regularly on the same foot and not apparently interchanged (at least towards the end of their use life, which these samples represent). A number of the shoes recovered, all worn and discarded, had assumed "the shape of the foot, and in many cases it is obvious what the shoe had been worn on" (Grimm 1970:128).

In addition to use wear, Grimm noted that in the 1758 deposits there was "no indication of shoes being made in 'rights' or 'lefts'" (1970:130), referred to as crooks. This evidence fits well with an engraving in Garsault (1767: Plate IV), which depicts the sole of a left shoe "worn by a hunter who had shaped shoes made from lasts moulded on the shape of his feet" and is claimed by Swann to be one of "the earliest 18th century examples of rights and lefts known" (1982:24). While this engraving may or may not actually represent the earliest 18th century examples, it is true that straight lasts are the type most commonly encountered among the footwear of the period, and crooks were more expensive than regular shoes. Crooks may have been becoming more widely available, however, for three out of the nineteen shoes recovered from the wreck of the Defence (1779) were of this type, and at least two if not all three were of American manufacture (Smith 1987:200-201).

Among the three crook shoes found on the Defence, all were made with the smooth side of the leather out (Smith 1987:201). This was not the most common method of manufacture. While some of the straight last shoes off the Defence were made smooth-side out, the majority were rough-side out. A group of nearly 500 new shoes, lost in the French Machault in 1760, also follow this technique of rough-side out, straight last
manufacture (Davis 1982; Sullivan 1986).

The rough-side out variety was also the case of the Fort Ligonier specimens. According to Grimm, "almost all uppers... were constructed with the rough (flesh) side of the leather to the outside and the smooth (hair) side of the leather to the inside" (1970:131). These smooth-side in shoes also lacked any trace of lining material (Ayotte 1992:43), which higher quality rough-side in shoes more often (but not always) had.

Grimm also hypothesizes that the rough-side out shoes would eliminate "the need to polish the shoes" (1970:131). While rough-side out might lessen the amount of polishing required, it did not, eliminate the need to touch up the surface. Occasional blackening would be required to maintain the color after wear. Shoe blackening, often called blackball, could be had from several sources, either home made, or purchased. Most contained a mixture of soot (lampblack), tallow (suet) and beeswax. Advertisements in the Virginia Gazette, including John Carter and John Greenhow, both of Williamsburg, attest to shoe blacking's availability in stores (VG, PD, February 25, 1768:2; VG, P&D, April 11, 1771:3). Not all shoes were black; some were left in a natural color. At least one servant is described as wearing "country shoes not blacked" (Walker, VG, D&H, August 12, 1775:3). The remainder, we can surmise, most likely wore blackened shoes.

Details of shoe construction are offered by Grimm (1970), as well as further insights into the same collection by Ayotte (1992). These studies, plus many others on groups of surviving shoes, suggest there is much individual variation. Most of the shoes mentioned in the runaway descriptions do not give great detail. From other sources we know that common shoes were typically found in several varieties, and the runaway's shoes likely covered most of the common styles. Thus, the following is a generalized overview of what might be expected among the shoes worn by runaway servants.

In general, only low quarter shoes (below the ankle) would be meant by the term "shoes" in the advertisements. Anything higher than the ankle would have been deemed a form of boot. Shoes were constructed of "right and left quarter sections, a vamp, inner sole, outer sole, lifts, arch support, side reinforcements... and welts" (Grimm 1970:128) (Figure 37). The components were held together with stitching. Ayotte found the Fort Ligonier shoes to contain an average of four to five stitches per inch "holding the outer sole to the welt" and on "the uppers... from eight to ten stitches per inch" (Ayotte 1992:42). Based on the stitch count from other surviving shoes. Ayotte suggests this about half the number of stitches an average journeyman might use. Although he does not state so, what may be represented here are what so many of the advertisers refer to as coarse shoes, sturdy, yet not constructed as fine as higher quality footwear.

To further reinforce shoes, Cuthbertson recommended small nails in the heels (1768:98). A Swedish traveller to England commented extensively on this practice among the working classes. Pehr Kalm observed in 1748, "The shoes which the labouring man commonly used were strongly armed with iron. Under the heel was set an iron which followed the shape of the heel and somewhat resembled a horseshoe. Round about the soles were nails knocked in quite close beside each other. It was also knocked full of nails under the middle of the sole, far more than under our dalesmen's shoes. Dalecarlars skor, so that they can go with these a long
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time before they are worn out" (Kalm [1770] 1892:244-245). While no heel plates were mentioned for the runaways, this does not preclude their presence. Without further evidence, however, speculation remains that and no more. The runaways did, however, reinforce their shoes through the other method Kalm observed, hobnails.

Samuel Powis wore "small old shoes, with nails in the heels" when he ran in 1774 (VG, Rind. August 4, 1774). Several of the six runaways with Thomas Sharp were said to "have hobnails in their shoes" (VG, Purdie, April 21, 1775), and Thomas Welsh wore shoes nailed all round, both heels and soles (VG, Purdie, June 30, 1775: supplement). Welsh's shoes may also have used the nails partially to help hold the sole on, as well as prolong its life. Several of the Ligonier shoes were found with last minute repair pegs through the former stitching holes of the sole, apparently done only when thread and needles were not available (Ayotte 1992:42). Wooden pegs were commonly used to hold together the leather sole lifts, layered like so many strata (Figure 37). Other varieties featured solid wooden heel lifts, both uncovered, and sheathed in thin leather. Men's heels of both sorts were low, commonly rising little more than an inch.

Of the specimens recovered at Fort Ligonier, with only "two exceptions, the shoes were of wet construction. In wet construction a narrow band of leather is stitched around the base of the upper and the actual sole is sewn to this band or welt" (Ayotte 1992:42). Seams which potentially would rub a wearer's foot were often stitched at an angle so that the thread did not go entirely through the leather (Grimm 1970:131). Other examples had an "L-fold to accomplish the same purpose" and smooth out the seam (Grimm 1970:131).

Toe shapes on men's shoes of this period varied. Early in the century square toes had been the style, but then went to more pointed versions. By mid-century these had mostly been blunted, and by the 1770's sharper toes were returning again (Swann 1982). The majority of the Ligonier shoes were rather round toed (Figure 38a), but also included flat (though not square) (Figure 38b), pointed or semi-pointed (Figure 38c) (Ayotte 1992; Grimm 1970). Other variants existed, but were primarily variations of construction techniques that resulted in similar plan views of the three basic shapes. Grimm termed these "ski-like", which were toes with a small turned-up flap on the front (Figure 38d), and "folded-under" toes which looked when sewn looked like the flat toes with slightly rounded corners (Figure 38e) (Grimm 1970:105, 135).

To secure the shoe on the foot, two methods were in general use. The more common method at this time was the shoe buckle, but tied shoes were also in use. Tied shoes generally had short straps which were fitted with holes for lace (Figure 39). Examples recovered at Fort Ligonier had leather lace, but other archaeologically retrieved examples, as well as some curated specimens, use ties of tape, cord, and common cloth and silk ribbons. Tying one's shoes was generally a sign of lower fashion. At Ranelagh "there were no cropped heads, trousers, or shoe-strings seen... such dresses would not have been admitted" (Henry Angelo, 1770's, quoted in Waugh 1964:105).

Several runaways are described wearing tied shoes, but unfortunately it cannot be said if they were constructed that way, or were modified to tie by necessity. Grimm (1970:134) reported of the Ligonier shoes
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that "one or two holes were occasionally found in the straps", which were apparently of the buckle variety. These, he theorized, were "probably an improvised fastening used when buckles were lost or broken" (Grimm 1970:134). In addition, buckles could tear the straps they were affixed to, and necessitate tying once the straps were gone. Thus, while the tied shoes worn by the servants may have been originally tied, others may possibly have been converted to ties after the loss of a shoe buckle or strap.

For shoes which fastened with buckles, the latchet (the strap to which the buckle is attached) could come in a variety of sizes and cuts. The width of the typical latchet is easily determined by measuring the interior width of surviving shoe buckles. Latchet breadths generally varied between about ¼ and 1¼ inches wide. Those from Ligonier averaged between 1 and 1¼ inches wide (Ayotte 1992:43). While a latchet could not be wider than the interior dimension of the buckle, it could be smaller, but, we are told, the straps of a shoe should be "full large enough to fill the buckle" (Cuthbertson 1768:98).

Latchets recovered in archaeological excavations exhibit considerable variety. Of the 19 shoes recovered from the Defence, at least 12 different styles were identified (Smith 1987:201). At Fort Ligonier, a total of 22 different latchet styles were recorded (Grimm 1970:131-132). The identification of so many types by modern researchers is a very eric view, and the variation classified today may originally have been no more than the result of individual cutting of the leather on any given day. Many of Grimm’s types, both for latchet tips and shoe tongues, are so similar that they could easily have been created by no more forethought than the angle with which one held a knife. Grimm recognized this, and states that among his 22 styles, only three seem to represent basic design elements. Although he does not credit individual variation at initial manufacture, he speculates "most of the others were probably re-cut to extend their use as the shoe became worn" (Grimm 1970:132).

The most common latchet terminal from Fort Ligonier was a simple pointed angle (Figure 38a). Next in number were those cut with an angular flare, which would presumably keep the tip better secured within the buckles when loosened (Figure 38c). The third most numerous variety is probably no more than a variant of the first, a reasonably straight sided strap with a rounded terminal (Figure 38b).

Grimm reported that about 40 latches were "designed for a sew-on strap" (1970:131), that is the buckle strap was an attached piece, not integral to the quarter. Ayotte, however, favors the theory that these represent repairs, necessitated by torn straps from buckle wear, more than original construction methods (1992:42). Many 18th century shoe patterns do suggest that the latchet was normally integral to the quarter, but this would mostly depend upon the shoemaker and the material on hand.

Finally, the tongues of the shoes, whether buckled or tied, are also found to exhibit numerous variants. At Fort Ligonier, a minimum of 25 styles of tongue terminations were identified (Ayotte 1992:42). The most common shape was an angular upward flare, with either a straight or a curved top (Figure 40, top row). Another well represented variant had the sharp corners trimmed. Straight sided tongues were also numerous (Figure 40), as well as few unique styles with variations of almost T-shaped terminals (Figure 40.
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bottom row). The tongue itself generally protruded only a small distance above the top of the buckle, and was tucked under the latches at the sides.

Besides the basic shoes listed in the runaway descriptions, more specific varieties were also mentioned. Within the general category of shoes, fine, coarse, and negro are named. As stated earlier, the distinction between fine and coarse may have in part been related to the stitching, but was also a function of the quality of leather used. Negro shoes, whether imported, made in a local factory, or on the plantation, where probably similar to lower grades of coarse shoes. Whether most were tied or buckles is unknown, but for economy, tied would make better sense.

One runaway, Joseph Higgenson, was thought "to have purchased a pair of new black grain Dogskin shoes" after he ran (VG, D&H, March 25, 1775:3). Shoes of this variety are mentioned in a few shoemaker's advertisements, such as Robert Gilbert's. Gilbert informed the public that his manufactory in Williamsburg could produce "shoes or pumps [of] calf or dogskin; campaign, single, double, or turned channels, slippers, blue or red turkey, cork soles, and galloches." Furthermore, he assures the wary his leathers are of the best quality, for he "imports the whole of his materials from Great Brittain" (VG, P&D, June 30, 1768:3).

Another runaway, a tailor by the name of James Turnbull, was described as wearing a "pair of silver buckles in his shoes of the Macaroni Taste" (VG, P&D, October 13, 1774:3). In 1772 Town and Country Magazine describes such macaroni footwear, "Their shoes are scarce slippers, and their buckles are within an inch of the toe... cut like a butter boat to show the clock of the stockings" (quoted in Swann 1982:28). Caricatures of macaroni's suggest the buckles would be more ornate than the usual, and the shoes perhaps were a form of pumps.

Cunnington and Cunnington (1957:230) state that pumps were "uncommon after 1760", but other evidence does not agree with this assertion. Pumps remained popular among the more fashionable, and perhaps even gained some presence under the fashion influence of the Macaroni. Pumps were made similar to shoes, but lighter, with longer quarters, somewhat like a modern loafer, and slipped on the foot (Figure 41). In 1753, "a pair of smart pumps" were described by "Monsieur à la Mode" as "made up of grained leather, so thin he can't venture to tread on a feather" (quoted in Swann 1982:28). Pumps were constructed without the large latches used to fasten more common shoes. They did, however, usually retain the shoe buckle, sometimes affixed quite low on the shoe (Figure 12). Some pumps were also tied, and an example appears in the runaway ads.

Other varieties in the runaway descriptions include channel and turned pumps. Channel pumps refer to a method of manufacture, specifically how the sole seam was done, but otherwise were probably indistinguishable from other pumps. Turned pumps, also called turnshoes, were sewn inside out, and then flipped, so that the sole seam would be on the inside of the shoe.

In general, in the modern literature, pumps are said to be light shoes, and are usually associated with the more genteel class. Their not infrequent appearance among indentured servants then suggests two
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(Silas Deane, Baron de Kalb, and the Marquis de Lafayette
in an engraving by Chappel)
possibilities. First is that many servants wore these more delicate shoes, regardless of their class or trade. Of the 15 servants wearing pumps, it would not seem too unusual to think of the two shoemakers wearing pumps. It might even seem fitting for the one described as a scholarly man who could pass for a schoolmaster, or the tailor, who would surely be up on fashion. But pumps were also being worn by two carpenters and joiners, two blacksmiths, a few convicts, one of whom tried to get on as a sailor, a gardener or farmer, and a butcher who also was a fair hand at weaving. The other possibility then, is that pumps could also have been made with more sturdy leather, and that most examples we have today simply are the better quality ones. On the other hand, perhaps these men wanted to wear shoes that were not tell-tale signs of a hard laborer, or simply found light slip-on shoes more comfortable on their feet.

One servant, an Irishman by the name of Andrew Kelly, wore footwear that was probably even more comfortable on his feet than pumps, though would have afforded less protection to his soles. He ran wearing buckskin "mockasons" (VG, Purdie, September 20, 1776:2). Although further details are not given, Kelly’s moccasins may have been of a variety common to the American Indian people’s of the Virginia-Maryland Chesapeake or Piedmont areas. Portraits of riflemen and frontiersmen often depict moccasins of what are called the Eastern Woodland pattern. These are made from one piece of leather, sewn together with a seam running up the top center of the foot (Figure 42a).

Another common moccasin type uses three pieces, two uppers and a sole, rather than one (Figure 42b). An example of this variety was recovered in the excavations at Fort Ligonier. The stitching on the sole was such that it did not go through the bottom, thus avoiding problems of wear on the thread. Furthermore, an "ornamental strip of leather 1.25 inches wide is attached to the uppers, framing the opening where the foot is inserted. This section, which can be flipped up, is held in place by lacing that also secures the moccasin to the ankle when tied" (Grimm 1970:108).

Although we tend to think of at least the uppers of moccasins as soft leather, a sailor visiting Florida in 1784 described what appear to be 100% rawhide moccasins. Samuel Kelly described those, worn by hunters, as "made from a new hide in one piece, laced up before, which when dry is very hard" (Kelly 1925:105).

Finally, one runaway was described as wearing either shoes or boots (Robert Walker, VG, P&D, March 24, 1774). Whether this meant he had both pairs, or the advertiser was simply unsure which he wore is unclear. Regardless, boots were typically worn by those travelling by horse (Figure 43), and the wearing of them was often taken as a sign of this (Kalm [1748] 1892). Although boots, as shoes, had considerable variation, the most common variety were knee high or slightly more, with the tops which could be pulled up higher on the leg if added protection were desired (Figure 41). Boots tended to be made of strong leather, and were likely to be rounded, flattened, or slightly square toed.
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42b
Three piece moccasin
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SHOE BUCKLES

With the exception of boots, moccasins, and the occasional tied shoe, most footwear of this period was equipped with a pair of shoe buckles to secure them onto the foot. Archaeologically, these are among the most abundant evidence of footwear, and many thousands of shoe buckles have been recovered from sites in Virginia, as well as the anywhere 18th century Europeans lived. Among the runaway servants, at least 34 pairs of shoe buckles were specifically mentioned (Appendix P).

Shoe buckles have been thoroughly described elsewhere (e.g. Abbitt 1973; Grimm 1970; Stone 1977), and technical description need not be repeated in detail here. These studies, however, provide the basis for the following overview of styles available to Virginia servants in the 1770's. The basic components of a shoe buckle (Figure 44) consist of the frame and the chape. The chape is made up of a pinder (also referred to as a chape at times) and a tongue (also called a fork, prong, or tong). Together, hinged on a pin, they allow the buckle to hold tight to the shoe latches.

Buckles manufactured during the period under consideration here generally had a full frame style pin attachment rather than a recessed form which became more common later in the century (Figure 44). Many of the full-frame variety had the pin-hole formed by slicing the pin terminal area, and then brazing it back on rather than drilling (Abbitt 1973). Pins and chapes of copper-alloy buckles were either of the same metal or iron, but iron buckles would not generally use components of copper-alloys.

Because shoe buckles could easily last a person for a lifetime, especially with the availability of replacement parts, it is likely that many servants were not only fairly current buckles, but also buckles that could be many years, or even decades old. Thus, the selection used for illustration here will cover buckles of the 1770's, but also incorporate older examples, dating back to about mid-century (Figure 45a-45f).

Shoe buckles were generally made from the same metals as were buttons. Noël Hume (1985:86) ranks them in order of value, stating that silver and jewel bedecked buckles were preferred by the gentry, followed by solid silver (though ornamentally cast). Then came copper-alloys such as brass and bronze, though often tinned to resemble silver, and tin-alloys including common pewter. At the bottom of the list Noël Hume places iron buckles, which out of necessity were usually quite plain in design. While Noël Hume does not mention them in his listing, shoe buckles of pinchbeck could also be inserted between the brass and tin alloys. Steel buckles were also made, but more costly than iron. Steel, however, could take a higher polish, and was receptive to engraving, and by no means only confined to the lower classes (Abbitt 1973:30). Lord Botetourt, for example, had listed in his inventory of the bed chamber "2 Sets of New steel Shoe & Knee buckles. 1 p' cut steel Shoe Buckles. [and a] p' of old d'." (CWF 1981:9). Other steel buckles were also listed, including additional shoe and knee buckles elsewhere in the Palace. Interestingly, a few servants also wore steel buckles, according to their descriptions in the Virginia Gazette.

Buckles of all metals, other than iron or steel, also utilized forms of paste or glass settings rather than real jewels or stones. Prior to 1750 buckles with real settings were generally solid backed, but after that date
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they began to use open frames, to prove they were not paste, which, incidentally, is said to have lost much of its sparkle under anything less than normal sunlight (Abbitt 1973:26).

Although everyday buckles could be rather plain (Figures 45b, 45d, 45e), many were also commonly decorated with designs from the mold (Figure 45a), filed (called carved), or even some combination of the two (Figure 45c). Post-casting decoration, through filing was a very common method of embellishment, and can give buckles cast from the same master pattern very different final looks.

Starting in the 2nd quarter of the 18th century, shoe buckle designs began to become quite ornate, following in the rococo tradition. Such buckles are known to have been worn and even made in Virginia after 1730, and prior to 1760 (Noël Hume 1985:86). Through mid-century square frames were most fashionable (Abbitt 1973:26; Cunnington and Cunnington 1957:229), followed by "square, oblong or ovoid", buckles between about 1760 and 1775 (Cunnington and Cunnington 1957:229). Cuthbertson recommended shoe buckles with rounded corners for soldiers, as they were least likely to get caught and cause damage to the shoe or gaiters (1768:101). The average sized men’s shoe buckle at this time, based on measurements taken from buckles with secure archaeological contexts, is about "2 inches to 2 1/2 inches from side to side" (Abbitt 1973:26).

From about 1775 to 1788, buckles grew in size, reaching their peak about 1777 (Cunnington and Cunnington 1957:229). These large buckles were termed Actae buckles, and could reach nearly from sole to sole over the arch of the top of the foot. Such exaggerated buckles were mainly the accoutrement of the macaroni. The more common variety still averaged around two to three inches from end to end. Children’s buckles were also made, presumably in proportionate sizes, which could confuse the unwary in assigning dates to buckles based on size alone. Because shoe buckles, like buttons, were durable, it is likely that any of the above styles of buckles could still be found on shoes in Virginia in the 1770’s. Shoe buckles recovered in excavations in Virginia bear this out.

According to Abbitt, among the buckles found in Virginia, the majority appear to be copper-alloys (1973:30). Examination of several other Virginia collections including shoe buckles supports this assertion. Next in number from the copper-alloys, are iron or steel buckles. Pewter buckles are also to be found, but not in great numbers. This is probably due both to their less frequent use than copper-alloys, and pewter’s propensity to be recycled. Silver frame buckles are not surprisingly rare in archaeological contexts, probably due to the metal’s inherent value, but a few have been excavated in Williamsburg.

Shoe buckles set with paste have also been recovered in Virginia (Figure 45f). Williamsburg sites have produced several, including one from the Anthony Hay site which shows “evidence of having been backed with a red coloring, perhaps to make them resemble rubies” (Abbitt 1973:30). Those mentioned in Abbitt (1973) and examined by the author, were all solid set into copper-alloy (brass) settings, and had solid backs.

Among the runaway servants, it appears that copper-alloy buckles also dominate, but only if plated buckles are included here. Three buckles are specifically termed brass. Another two are said to be yellow
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Silver, steel chape
Williamsburg, VA, mid-1700's style, post 1790 context

45b
Cu-alloy, iron chape
Williamsburg, VA, post 1765 context

45c
Cu-alloy, silver plated.
St. Eustatius, West Indies
mid 18th-century style
(reconstructed view)

45d
Cu-alloy, iron chape
Virginia Beach, VA, late 18th Century

45e
Cu-alloy
Betsev. York River, VA, October 1781
(reconstructed view)

45f
Cu-alloy, paste
James Geddy site, Williamsburg, VA,
post 1780 context
(reconstructed view)
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metal. Seven were Pitchbeck, which was also a yellow metal. The same number of buckles were described as plated, though whether silver or gold was not stated. In all likelihood, they were copper-alloy frames plated in tin to appear as silver. An additional two are more clear in that they are designated as silver plated. This may be a reference to true silver plating rather than tin plating (called common plate), but there is no way to be certain which was the case. In any matter, tin plating was more common.

Just as the two silver plated buckles raise some questions as to actual metal, so do the seven descriptions of silver buckles. While silver was used for buckles, it is not clear if the term referred primarily to metal or appearance. It would not be unthinkable that a servant would be able to acquire silver buckles, but it would seem slightly out of place. On the other hand, perhaps they did invest what cash they had in just a few small, easily portable and re-sellable items. Nevertheless, it is usually safest to interpret silver buckles among the servants as silver plated, or perhaps polished iron or steel. Two runaways were noted as wearing steel buckles on their shoes, and one with a pair made of pewter.

John Harrower came into a parcel of shoe buckles on the road to London, shortly before he entered into his indenture. His dealings with them suggest several things, among them some prices for used buckles. On December 23, 1773 he writes, "Bought 2 pair pinchbeck Buckles at 10d. per pair, 1 pair steel plated with silver at 1/6d. per pair and 1 pair pinchbeck plated with silver at 1/10d. per. Same day sold the steel plated pair at 2/1d. Str. and 1 pair of the pinchbeck at 1/6 Str. to a passanger bound for London" (Harrower 1963:6).

The prices Harrower paid and charged for his buckles are very close to those Catherine Rathell mentions in a letter to her supplier, John Norton of London. Rathell, who bought merchandise both in person and via letters, enclosed an invoice requesting "8 pair of the very best Neat Paste Shoe Buckles from 30/ to 50/ [shillings] a pair [and] 18 pair of Plaided Carved Shoe Buckles" of which she says she purchased "in London last July for 2 1/2 a pr." (Rathell to Norton, December 29, 1771 in Mason 1937:211).

Numerous advertisers in the Virginia Gazette list imported shoe buckles. Christopher Hughes included in his advertisement of March 27, 1775 "silver shoe, knee, stock, and breast buckles, plated shoe, knee and stock buckles, macaroni shoe buckles... chrysal, paste, and foil stone shoe, knee, and stock buckles, [and] chapes and tongs" for buckles which were in need of repair (VG, Pinkney). To supply this assortment, thousands of people in England were employed both full or part time in the trade (ABT 1792), particularly around Birmingham (Cuthbertson 1768:101). Records of the last quarter of the 18th century suggest around 2.5 million pairs of buckles were produced each year (Abbitt 1973:26).

Although most buckles were imported, there were buckle makers in the colonies. According to Mortimer (1766), "The making of common shoe and knee-buckles is an easy business, fit for a lad of slender make, whose friends have little money to spare." Evidence of shoe buckle manufacture has been found in Virginia, such as James Geddy and Sons in Williamsburg, where buckles in various stages of production have been recovered. Several of Geddy's buckles rivaled those made in England, and had they not been found in the shop context, and incomplete, would likely have been attributed to European origin (Noël Hume 1970:24)
CHAPTER XVII
HEADGEAR

HATS

Hats were considered an essential part of dress in Virginia in the 18th century. To be without a hat or head cover was an exception. The runaway servants sought through the Virginia Gazette that had their headgear described, had it so in varying degrees of detail (Appendix Q). Some offer enough information to identify the style with certainty, others only a said to be a hat. Additional information, however, allows conjecture as to what styles the more vaguely described hats would likely encompass.

The most common materials for a hat in this period was either fur or felt. Both varieties were made in a felting process, whereby animal fur or wool fibers were processed into an intermixed material. While the ability of the fibers to adhere to one another was from their own properties, some manufacturers of cheaper hats also used glue to aid the lower quality fibers in remaining together.

Rolt described the best quality hats "and those most valued, [as] being made of the pure hair of an amphibious creature, called castor, or beaver" (1761). Shorter hairs were deemed most desirable for producing fine felts. Not only did it take to felting very well (microscopic barbs on the fur allowed for great strength), but it also had a sheen to it from natural oils in the fur. This was seen as attractive, but also had additional water repellent properties over other furs or wool felts. Hats made using beaver fur were generally called beaver hats, but also castors.

Less expensive grades of hats could be made using lower quality beaver pelts, or, for even more economy, from "the hair, or wool, of several other animals: particularly the hare, coney, and camel" (Rolt 1761). In addition, furs from other semi-aquatic dwellers were sought, for otter, seal, and muskrat pelts had similar properties to beaver (Tunis 1965:46). While beaver fur was often to be found as the material in fine hats, Holroyd suggests "goats hair and rabbits wool" was often to "used in the manufacture of coarse hats" (1783:19). Rabbit fur probably provided the most common alternative source for fur felts.

While most hats made from beaver were called by that name (or castor), few other fur hats seem to have ever been called by the name of the fur’s donor. Three runaways had between them two hats described as “fur” (James Duff, VG, Pinkney, June 15, 1775; William Row and Isaac Singer, VG, Purdie, August 16, 1776). These may refer to felted-fur hats rather than fur-left-on caps, although it cannot be said for certain. Although some hat descriptions did mention of their material (especially differentiating between beaver and felt), most hats were described in merchant records and advertisements by their quality; fine, good, or coarse.

The second major source of material for felted hats was wool fiber. Although the wool of a few other animals could be used, sheep, naturally, were the primary providers. Hats made from felted wool were normally called felt hats. Although felt hats tended to be cheaper in general, exceptionally fine quality felt hats, as made in Britain, could rival any beaver. In discussing sources of materials and possible trade
opportunities, the Earl of Sheffield wrote: "The Americans will be able to manufacture beaver hats for themselves, which they prefer to foreign ones, though they will not by any means keep out rain so well as fine felt hats" (Holroyd 1783:19).

Americans did seem to favour beaver hats when they could obtain them. In the 1750's, one observer commented that in "Philadelphia very large and very fine beaver hats are worn; and no wonder, since Pennsylvania is the home of the beaver. (Mittelberger 1960:89). In Virginia, likewise, "country gentlemen preferred the 'really fine' beaver hats of the local makers to those imported" (Clark 1929:209). Politics, especially the boycotts of the 1760's, plus the availability of beaver pelts in America, meant that a great many of the beaver hats worn by Americans were in fact domestically made.

Considerable hat production took place in the colonies, and by 1774, Philadelphia had no fewer than 43 hatters working in the city (Tunis 1965:46). Hat making was also carried on in Virginia. Although hatmakers published very little in the Virginia Gazette concerning their presence, there were a few. One such piece was an advertisement seeking journeymen hatters, placed from Gloucester county in 1777. Samuel Guthrie informed the reader that potential journeymen "will meet with very great encouragement either in coarse work or fine, by applying to the Subscriber" (VG, Purdie, November 7, 1777). While Guthrie may have sought workers capable of producing fine work, American hats were said to occasionally be "poorer and much dearer than those of England" (Clark 1929:209). At least one runaway servant, William Webster, was named as a hatmaker in his description (VG, Pinkney, November 23, 1775).

Although many beaver hats were made in America, many others were still imported. Between 1774 and 1778, the years involved in this study, well over 200,000 good beaver or castor hats were imported to America from England alone (Commissioners of Customs 1780). Added to that are almost 5,000 more "Carolina hats" (Commissioners of Customs 1780), which were made from inferior beaver pelts, and commonly worn by servants (Cunnington et al. 1960:38).

While English beaver hats may have been more expensive to purchase than American ones, "the high price of wool and of labour in the American States must induce them to import the felt and common hats" (Holroyd 1783:19). The import figures for felt hats supports this view, citing over half a million being imported in a five year period, (1774-1778) and four of those years were during the war (Commissioners of Customs 1780).

Merchant records in the colonies also attest to the fact that many hats were imported. Several store owners advertised hats in the Virginia Gazette, most of which were probably recently arrived from Europe. Matthew Anderson, of Gloucester, for example offered "Men's coarse and fine Hats" to his customers in 1776 (VG, D&H, April 20). Mary Hill also had just received some "mens fine Hats" on the ship Nancy (VG, P&D, October 31, 1771), and to that could be affixed Mary Dickenson's cockades fresh off the Randolph (VG, P&D, April 19, 1770: supplement).

While many merchants imported hats for speculative sales, dealers in Britain also sent them by special
request. Orders processed through Norton and Sons offer some pricing information not often obtained elsewhere. A "plain Hat", for instance, meant to be worn by an "8 year old boy" cost William Nelson six shillings in 1769 (Mason 1937:66). A second hat for the same lad was requested with lace, which would add a few pence to the price, though how much was not recorded. Men's hats were a bit more costly, running from 12s. 6d. for good hat meant for a 19 year old (Mason 1937:357), to 15s. each for four hats ordered by two customers in 1770 (Mason 1937:125, 147). John Robinson, of York County, was willing to pay slightly more for his "fashionable Mans Hatt", which "cost abt 18/ Sterl" (Mason 1937:121 [1770].

John Harrower was saving his money to bring his wife and children to America. Unlike John Robinson, Harrower certainly spent less than 18 shillings when he "went to Town to buy a hatt" in Fredericksburg on May 25, 1776 (Harrower 1963:152). The hat he bought that day was probably a blank, that is not yet styled or shaped. This is made clear by his entry of May 31st: "I sent my Hatt to Town by Jacob to be Dressed Cutt round & trimmed with binding" (Harrower [1776] 1963:153).

Dressing a hat was the process of shaping it into the desired style, and adding any extras that would make it more functional or fashionable. This was often the task of specialists, such as the milliner Margaret Hunter, who advertised "Bonnets and Hats made in the newest Fashion" in a postscript to her general advertisement (VG, P&D, July 9, 1772).

For functional purposes, many hats were fitted with a lining. Quality hats often had the crown fully lined with silk or persian. Less costly hats with full lining might employ more common fabrics. One example in the Colonial Williamsburg's collection (1960-911) features a linen lining, and is attributed to English manufacture of circa 1750-1775. Though made in England, the hat was worn in New Hampshire (Baumgarten 1986:70). A military hat of the Revolution is likewise preserved in Morristown, New Jersey, containing a full lining of brown linen. It is made in two sections, a band around the inner crown and a circular disk in the top (Katcher 1981:195).

Other hats had more economical linings, only partially covering the interior, and sewed around the inner crown base. These could be fitted with a drawstring, to allow for adjustment of the fit. Still other hats may have had bands of cloth or leather sewn in without the adjustment feature. Finally, a great many hats would have had no lining at all. Although this might be expected of the more coarse hats, period paintings of men holding their hats with the interior showing suggest that even better quality hats may not have always been lined. Three runaways had hats with lining specified, one each of red, yellow, and white.

Another feature which some hats had was band or ribbon around the crown, a trait that has continued into the present. Several runaways had these, using such materials as black ribbon, velvet, crape, and a narrow leather strap. Military hats often had a mohair or linen cord tied around their crowns, which could be adjusted and helped to tighten the hat.

Two of the servants also wore hat buckles with their hat bands (Figure 46a). These still occasionally appear in merchant advertisements in the Virginia Gazette, but were apparently not a very common ornament
during this period. No buckles specifically identifiable as hat buckles were encountered in the Virginia collections, but they appear similar in style to other buckles, though smaller and lighter, and not having the chape apparatus.

Hats often had edge binding along the brim (Figure 46a). This was a sewn-on tape or narrow woven band of cloth. Although the dimensions could vary, Neumann and Kravic (1975:136) state the bindings averaged between 1 and 1½ inches wide. Not only would binding make a hat look more fashionable, but it could also serve to protect the edge of the brim. Hat binding materials, including ferret, which was a "kind of tape" (Spence 1775) or "narrow ribband" (Sheridan 1780), could be of several different fibers and even metallic.

Fashionable bindings might be of gold or silver lace. One runaway convict tailor was noted as having silver lace, "with which I imagine he will lace his Hat", wrote Richard Cadeen, though the hat was "not very old, but not very fine" (Thomas Scott, VG, P&D, July 28, 1774). John Harrower also acquired silver lace, each time for 6 pence, although he does not specify if it was to be used on hats or clothes. The matter is rather irrelevant though, for he resold the first piece within two days, and the second within a few hours, and both at a handsome profit (Harrower [December 16-22, 1773] 1963:5-6).

Non-metallic binding was by far the more common. For the fashion minded, silk or velvet might be called for, but good quality binding could also be woven from wool, linen, and cotton (Copeland 1977:202; Chteret 1976:280; Wingate 1979:232). Cuthbertson preferred mohair tape for hat binding, but admitted "linen will answer best" for soldiers, as it can be cleaned with "pipeclay scraped in water" unlike "woolen lace" which "soon gathers dirt, or turns of a yellow hue" (Cuthbertson 1768:94). At least one runaway, Dennis Connolly of lower Rockingham, may have worn a military hat bound with white linen (VG, Purdie, June 5, 1778).

Cuthbertson also recommended "linen-tape about a finger’s breadth" for button loops, which went over the left cock and often tied down a cockade, though could be worn alone as well (1768:94). Hat buttons the loops hooked around are mentioned in several merchant advertisements in the Virginia Gazette, although exactly how these differed from the remainder of their button stock is never stated.

Cockades (Figure 12, Figure 21) were standard on most military hats, but many civilians also sported them, often choosing colors symbolic of their personal political persuasions or various affiliations (Spence 1775). During the Revolution several allusions are made to wearing a red cloth badge of some sort for loyalists, and many may well have done so with a red cockade. While not a cockade as such, one American pensioner did relate an interesting account involving the wearing of a symbol on a hat. Moses Hall, a participant in the Battle of Haw River, North Carolina, had lost his hat. To replace it, he wrote, "I thought I would take the first I found. I first picked one up off the ground by a dead man, but blood being in the crown of it, I threw it down again and took the hat off this large Tory and put it on my head. And, after going some distance, this Robert Luckie... came toward me in great haste and cautioned me that my hat had a Tory sign
on it and take it off. It was a red strap passing over the crown" (pension application quoted in Dann 1977:204).

A runaway servant told a similar tale in Virginia. William Burnett, in his disposition, related he "saw three men with a piece of white paper on their hats in front. He instantly knew them to be Tories and run and dropped his potatoes at the fence, that he might be able to go the faster" ([1780] quoted in Dann 1977:373).

While white paper may have served the Tories well enough, most cockades were made of more durable material. Cuthbertson proclaimed that "hair cockades are strongest, and of course fittest for Soldiers... with the edges as plain as possible, that they may be less liable to retain dust, and thereby be easier cleaned with oil, which nourishes the hair, and always gives them a black and glossy look" (1768:96).

At least three archaeologically recovered cockades, however, from military contexts, are all of silk. One was found in the scuttled Betsey [1781] off Yorktown. Another was lost in the wreck of the Machault in 1760. The third, recovered at Fort Michilimackinac, was more fragmentary and less precisely dated, but of similar style to the Yorktown specimen (Stone 1974). Other cockades are known to have been made of horse hair, silk-like ribbon, linen, mohair, or dimity (Neumann and Kravic 1975:85).

A hat upon which a cockade was attached would have been cocked. Cocking was the more fashionable way to treat the hat brim among mainstream society of this time, although some also preferred to wear the brim down. The latter was very popular among working people, or those who wore their hat for protection from the elements rather than for looks (Figure 7, Figure 46b). In the Virginia countryside wearing hats uncocked was common. This is not as true for the more urban areas, but for those working in the fields, the brim would offer welcome shade from the hot Virginia sun.

In the 1750's this tendency to wear the brim down was noted by a German visitor. Pennsylvanians, he wrote, "during the summer, because the heat is so great, one and all wear their hats with the rim turned down, especially in the country" (Mittelberger 1960:89). The protection notwithstanding, the humidity in some parts of Virginia probably also took its toll on cocking, for a "heavy dew would unroll a wool hat, leaving the edges gaily undulant", as would a good rain (Tunis 1965:47).

To correct such mishapens, if the wearer chose to bother, a hat could be re-dressed. Sometimes this meant no more than a re-steaming and a good brushing. Cheaper hats were sometimes prone to scaling, which required removal on occasion. Cuthbertson warned "It should strongly be insisted on, that the manufacturers of Soldiers Hats, do not use any glue for stiffening them", as that makes a "whitish kind of scab... in less than a month's wear" (1768:94). The glue he refers to was akin to shellac, and would stiffen a hat's brim with only a few coats allowed to soak in and dry. Cuthbertson recommended a mixture of logwood and water be brushed on the hats to keep them dressed. Apparently this concoction was dark, "preserving the colour of the hats" (1768:95).

If the hat's surface needed to be refinished, it could be smoothed with pumice stone (Tunis 1966:48), or otherwise trimmed and touched up. In severe cases, the hat could even be turned, that is flipped inside out
and reblocked, so the less worn interior would be the new exterior. Although we do not know to what extent, at least some of the runaways had their hats re-touched. Ralph Chilingsworth, for example, wore a beaver hat that had "been dressed after being some time wore" when he ran in 1775 (VG. Purdie, December 28, 1775). It is quite probable that several of the servants had undertaken similar rejuvenations of their own hats.

Cocks were generally held in place by one of several methods. In the original blocking, the brim could be set in place and held with no other device. This method would only hold its shape for a short time before having to be re-dressed. Another method seen on many cocked hats, especially among civilian hats, is a hook and eye. David Wardrop, an escaped POW surgeon, advertised for in the Connecticut Gazette on November 8, 1776, wore "a new beaver hat cock’d up with hooks & eye." More common, however, would be a hat cocked up using either thread or cord. Cocks sewn up with thread would usually show no obvious signs of the attachment, but those using cords of material such as linen, mohair, or silk were quite apparent.

Although it seems to not have been generally adopted, Cuthbertson recommended additional strength to the cocked leaves be added "In order to prevent the front cock of the hat from squeezing to a pinch" by use of "a piece of whalebone, of about four inches long... sowed on the inside of that part" (Cuthbertson 1768:93). Those without such a device, it might be assumed, would, in time, show the pinching Cuthbertson describes.

While popularly the standard cocked hat is thought of as a simple three-sided style, there were actually many variations available to the runaway servants. At least one servant wore a macaroni hat. These were described in 1772 as "hats of an inch in the brim, that do not cover but lie upon the head", making the wearer appear "a most ridiculous figure" (Town and Country Magazine quoted in Waugh 1964:107). Normally they were cocked on three sides, and "sometimes trimmed with a feather" (Cunnington and Cunnington 1957:236), as popularized in the song Yankee Doodle.

A more conservative brim would be cut closer to that recommended for the British military. Of those, "four inches and a half are enough for the breadth of the leaves, as any thing above that size, draws the face, unless it be remarkably full and broad" (Figure 47) (Cuthbertson 1768:92-93). An American military hat of the Revolution era in the National Park Service collections has a rear cock of 6½ inches (Katcher 1981:195). Civilian cocked hats mostly fell somewhere around these sizes, though the brim size largely depended on the fashion currently in vogue, and personal tastes.

Among the more popular civilian large-brimmed cocked hats of the mid 1770's were simple cocks of one, two, or all three brims. Many civilians, including some of the runaways, also wore their hats cocked in a military fashion. For British military hats, to assure uniformity among the soldiers, Cuthbertson (1768) went so far as to offer a diagram of a machine for cocking hats.

The Fantail hat (Figure 48a) frequently appears in the runaway servant descriptions. It is described as one with the brim "turned up sharply in front with a high peak from which the brim borders sloped down each side to the base of the back brim. The brim behind, semi-circular (like an open fan) stood up straight at the back of the hat. The flat-topped crown was visible only at the side gaps. This hat was often trimmed with
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a button and a loop on the left side. and if worn by the military, with a feather or cockade” (Cunnington and Cunnington 1957:236).

The Ramillies (Figure 48b) was likewise commonly made with a military appearance, and in fact was popular among many officers. Although none of the servant descriptions specifically mention its use, it was gaining popularity with civilians during the war. The Ramillies is made with the rear cock slightly higher than the sides, and the front sloping slightly lower. The rear cock could measure as much as six or six and a half inches, but also as low as about five.

A much narrower brim was to be found on the round or small hat. Unlike the Ramillies, these hats were frequently described as being worn by the servants, and seem to have been popular with the working classes. It may well have been this style that John Harrower had his hat trimmed into in 1776 (Harrower 1963:163). Typically the brim would be cut down to between two and four inches, and one side cocked up (Figure 48c). Many sailor’s are depicted wearing such headgear, although when not ashore, the brim was often left down.

There could be variation within this style as to how the brim was trimmed as well. Those which had one side cocked permanently often left that leaf wider than the remainder of the brim, such as on an original specimen worn by a Connecticut officer, and now preserved by the Connecticut Historical Society (Neumann and Kravic 1977:137). Others might uniformly trim the brim, and either only slightly roll it on a side, or simply leave it down.

Still others might cock all three sides of their cut-down brim. This style, apparently a habit among many sailor’s ashore, ”made the seamen look as if they carried a triangular apple pastry upon their heads” (The Dress of the British Sailor, National Maritime Museum, London 1957, quoted in Copeland 1973:9). The sailor’s cock, as this was sometimes referred to, was ”an equilateral triangle with the brims joined to the crown” (Cunnington and Cunnington 1957:235). Written and visual sources suggest many sailor’s also painted the low crown with red for additional waterproofing. Such a hat is present on a sailor in Hogarth’s Chairing the Members (1755).

Although the term round and small hat appear to be generally interchangeable terms, there was another form of round hat existing in the 1770’s that was significantly different from that previously described. According to Cunnington and Cunnington (1957:238) this variant of the round hat ”came into fashion in the 1770’s especially for riding,... [and] had a round, flat-topped crown and a flat, uncocked brim. It was usually made of beaver. During the 1770’s the crown was moderately high and the brim large.” Portraits of British gentry, dressed in casual country attire, show this style to have been worn, but it seems to have been more prevalent after the 1770’s. Flat-topped crowns, though, show up regularly on depictions of sailor’s hats in the 1770’s.

While felted-fur and wool-felt hats definitely make up the bulk of headgear described in the runaway advertisements, other forms do appear. Straw hats are mentioned for four runaways. Both George Dormon
and Thomas Orton are described with a generic “straw hat” (VG, Purdie July 25, 1777; VG, D&H, November 13, 1778). Thomas Hall has added to this a “new straw hat bound round” (VG, Purdie, October 11, 1776). Walter Harris’s hat is most fully detailed, being a “straw hat filled in with blue and white wool which hides the straw” (VG, Purdie, April 18, 1777).

Though visual depictions of common men’s straw hats are few (as opposed to many examples of women’s straw hats), those that have survived show they were styled in the same general shape as the common felt hat. A straw hat could be cocked, but usually the brim was left down for functional purposes.

Men’s straw hats were apparently mostly American made. Merchant advertisements mentioning straw hats for men are surprisingly scarce. Chip and cane hats are offered on occasion (e.g. Catherine Rathell, VG, P&D, May 5, 1774), but straw hats as such were not noted in any of the scores of merchant ads examined, nor were they to be found in the compiled index to the Virginia Gazette. The implication is that either common men’s straw hats were not frequently imported, or simply that they were not advertised. It may be that much of the supply was furnished by local crafters.

Kalm describes the small scale straw hat maker in England in the late 1740’s. There, he states, only the straw from wheat was ever used for hat making ([1770] 1892:337). Petitions for patents, earlier in the century, suggest professional plaiters often used imported straw, such as Bermuda or Leghorn (Dony 1942:27). Of the wheat variety, Kalm noted, they were “cut off into pieces 9 inches long, which were bound into small bundles after the tubes had been first cleaned out” (Kalm [1770] 1892:338). He then goes on to describe the process of cleaning and bleaching the straw for greater whiteness using a process of sulphur steam. Finally, he states the prepared bundles would be dipped in water to soften before being plaited into a hat (Kalm [1770] 1892:338).

Although most of these hats were simply interwoven straw, the one runaway having his hat interwoven with wool makes for an interesting variant. No contemporary descriptions of the process were located, but it probably merely involved the interweaving of wool yarn with the straw plaiting, so that none but the yarn showed.

While not actually classified as a straw hat, we do have an account of a reasonable proximity left to us. Jacob Nagle, a sailor wrecked on the shore of Wallop’s Island, Virginia, during the Revolution, wrote: “I had lost all my clothes excepting what I had on: one shirt, one pair of trousers and a light waistcoat and a west indes lime basket for a hat, without shoes” (Nagle [1781] 1988:31).

Another form of headgear using woolen yarns was the common cap. Four references to “wools hats” and one to a worsted cap appear in the runaway ads. While the use of the term “wool hat” might be in reference to felted wool, the worsted cap was certainly of the knit variety.

A excavated specimen of a knit cap has been recovered from the New York waterfront (Neumann and Kravic 1975:138). That example was originally tarred, probably as a result of a seaman’s designs to make his cap waterproof. An almost identical cap may be seen in an engraving of 1773 (Figure 14). Although these
examples are rounded, more conical Monmouth versions were also common.

Finally, two servants are described as wearing raccoon hats. Another two, previously mentioned, wore fur hats, although whether this referred to fur or felted fur cannot be said for certain. Few advertisements of Virginia merchants mention fur hats among their stock. Two ads mentioning similar headgear, both refer to “furred” hats rather than fur hats, which is probably a reference to the surface dressing. Undoubtedly, the majority of true fur were domestically made, and not imported.

Of the two servants who wore raccoon caps, (Thomas Benson, VG, Purdie, June 30, 1775; John Williams, VG, Purdie, August 04, 1775) very little additional details are known. One ad notes that the cap was lined with green persian, hinting at manufacture by a craftsman (persian was commonly used for linings), but otherwise the hat’s appearance is left to conjecture. Copeland (1975:98) suggests many fur hats had ear flaps for added warmth in winter, but others were certainly plain. Whether or not these caps had tails as popular conceptions often attribute them is unknown, but the probability is that many did not. Fur caps of this sort are usually attributed to frontiersmen. The servants wearing them ran from Fincastle and Pittsylvania county.

WIGS

When Gottlieb Mittelberger visited Pennsylvania in the 1750’s, he observed that “Peasants as well as gentlemen wear wigs... All the men have their hair cut quite short during summers, and wear only a cap of fine white linen and over it a hat with the rim not turned up (Mittelberger 1960:89-90). Conversely, an anonymous visitor to Maryland in 1740 commented “‘Tis an odd Sight, that except some of the very elevated sort, few Persons wear Perukes, so that you would imagine they were all sick, or going to bed: Common People wear woolen and Yarn Caps; but the better ones wear white Holland or Cotton: Thus they travel fifty Miles from Home. It may be cooler, for ough’t I know, but, methinks, ‘tis very ridiculous” (quoted in Bullock et al., 1987:13).

By the 1770’s in Virginia the wearing of wigs was in a decline. Advertisements for wigs and wigmakers drop off in the Virginia Gazette by the 1760’s. A few advertisements and other records do attest to their continued presence. In 1771 an auction of the estate of James Long, by his executrix Elizabeth Long, lists “a complete Set of Wig-Making Utensils, and a Variety of Hairs, newly imported” (VG, P&D, June 6). Yet another ad in 1774 seeks a “Sober Man that is well acquainted with Hair Dressing and Wig Making” in Williamsburg, though offers no further information (VG, P&D, March 24). In addition, John Mason, one of the runaways, was said to have been a “peruke maker” (VG, Rind, May 12, 1774).

Other records reveal several wigmakers were still present in the Williamsburg area in the 1760 s and 1770 s (Bullock et al. 1987), although how many carried on a viable business farther from the capitol is unclear. Nevertheless, wigs of many sorts were still being worn with regularity by many individuals in the American colonies. In the runaway descriptions, four out of the nearly two hundred individuals described are
noted as having wigs. Among the four are five wigs and one "false tail" or queue (Appendix Q).

Earlier in the century, and continuing through the period under study, "the wig was an important badge of social rank, particularly among the upper and would-be upper classes (Bullock et al., 1987:13). The prohibitive cost of wigs in earlier decades precluded many of the lower classes from wearing them, but a glut of hair on the market in the mid 18th century greatly reduced the price of a wig. It was speculated shortly thereafter, that the spread of the fashion to the middle and even lower classes was not just a factor of the reduced price, but by an aggressive campaign to expand the market by the industry (Corson 1966). In 1765, the English peruke gild even went so far as to petition the king to require every adult male in Britain to wear a wig. In protest another group quickly submitted a petition from the "wooden leg-makers gild" asking for the same requirement, and His Majesty got the point and denied both petitions (Corson 1966).

An inexpensive wig "might easily cost a journeyman his wages for two to three weeks, while a wealthy planter might pay nearly as much for one 'Grisell Tye Wig' as a servant's board cost for a year" (Bullock et al. 1987:26). By the 1770's, a common peruke could be had for about 1 guinea, and "a journeyman usually treated himself to a new one once a year" (All the Year Round, an 18th century journal, cited in Corson 1966:266). In Williamsburg, about 1770, Edward Charlton sold 60 "brown dress bob wigs at 43 shillings each" (Bullock et al. 1987:24). Indeed, this would be a considerable expenditure for most servants.

Some people obtained their wigs second hand, presumably at a reasonable savings. Ralph Chillingsworth, as an example, wore a "brown wig which is rather too large for him", likely because he bought it used, or received it as a gift (VG. Purdie, December 28, 1775). An auction announced in the Virginia Gazette lists among other items, "Gentlemen's wearing apparel, consisting of several suits of clothes, hats, wigs, stockings... and sundry other items too tedious to mention" (VG. P&D, July 7, 1768). It is also interesting to note that the articles offered were "the property of a Gentleman in Britain", for it is among that class one is more likely to note wigs still being worn.

Owning a wig also incurred maintenance costs. In more urban setting, one would normally pay a yearly fee to a peruke-dresser for routine care and styling. Preserved accounts show that even some servants participated in this activity (Andrew Anderson bills to Col. Thomas Jones, 1741-1743 reproduced in Bullock et al. 1987:27). In Williamsburg the fee for these services could range anywhere from about 1 pound 5 shillings to 4 pounds per year (records of Williamsburg peruke maker Edward Charlton, cited in Bullock et al., 1987). Harrower was to receive 5 pounds for his entire term of indenture. But prohibitive cost need not leave one wigless.

For those only needing the look of fashionable hair, a queue could be purchased. This was simply a long tail of hair which could be attached to the back of the head, creating the appearance of long hair, or if powdered, of a full wig. One runaway servant not only had a wig, but also often went about wearing a queue. John Eton Dugger, from Berne, Switzerland, was a barber by trade, and was "used to travel with
gentlemen." Normally he wore "his own hair with a false tail, and is generally powdered". After he ran, it was believed he had cut his hair and "taken up a wig". Along with his shaving materials, Duguet also carried a powder bag, along with "a prayer book in French, and some old commissions for officers in the Swiss militia by which he will probably try to pass" (VG, Purdie, July 21, 1775). The powder bag would have contained white (or even colored) powder used for dressing both wigs and natural hair, made using a base of flour. Five other runaways were also barbers, but only one other wore a wig, John Saunders, who had both "a curled dark wig, and an old scratch ditto" (VG, Pinkney, March 2, 1775).

If a servant did acquire a wig, it could be made from any of several materials. Human hair was the most desirable, but also the most expensive. Human hair mixed with horse hair might come next, followed by mixes or totally from the hair of horses, goats, sheep, and cattle. At least one wigmaker advertised "For such as love to save their cash, he will have periwig made up of calves tails" for the sons of his regular customers, but apparently only for them, as he found too little profit in it (Corson 1966:270). Even cheaper models could be made entirely without hair of any kind, but using tow or linen fibers (Neumann and Kravic 1975:273).

The styles available to the peruke purchaser of the 18th century were multitudinous. The French Encyclopédie Perruquière of 1764 listed no less than 115 individually named styles (Bullock et al. 1987). Among the more popular wigs of Edward Charlton in the 1770 was the brown dress bob wigs mentioned earlier. The bob wig was made without a queue, ending before the base of the neck. Cunnington et al. (1960:19) say this style was always worn for undress. The bob was similar to Diderot's "short wig", which also had no queue, but curls along the side and back.

The scratch wig, which one runaway possessed, was also a form of bob. "sometimes with one curl, covering only the back part of the head, the natural hair being brushed up over it in front" (Cunnington et al. 1960:190). Though Charlton sold more bobs than any other style, they are not, with their lack of a queue, the form today that is most popularly ascribed to wig wearers of this period.

Closer to the look we are accustomed to would include the bag wig. The bag wig came into fashion in the 1720's, and remained until the end of periukes in the 1790's (Ribeiro 1983). As the name implies, a bag was incorporated into the wig. The bag wig was different from others in that it was not curled all over, but rather the long hair flowed down the back, enclosed in a bag, and left the shoulders fairly free. The size of the bag varied, even covering the entire shoulders, and macarons often took them to extremes. Normally the bag was of black taffeta, and had a rosette attached for decoration.

The tye, or tie, wig was a very common type of the Revolution and earlier. As the name implies, the queue was tied in the rear with a ribbon. Depending upon the year and personal taste, they could have side and top curls, or simply be pulled back and bound. The tye was similar to the Ramillies. It had a single braided queue, and was tied both top and bottom with a ribbon. The front and sides were normally curled in one or more rows. Often, in the British Army, the higher the rank the more curls one had. Military men
often took the braid and doubled it up to keep it out of the way when on active duty. Also popular with the military was the pig, a long braided tail, and the major bob.

The bob came in two kinds, major and minor. It was undivided, and had curls all over, or else was frizzed. It came about in the 1720’s and persisted over time, popular among the professionals and middle classes, as well as the military. The long bob went to the shoulders, and had one or two tails, whereas the short bob only to the base of the neck. The London Chronicle of 1762 refers to the short bob as a ‘prentice’ and says the shortness is “to show the stone [jeweled] stock-buckle, and nicely stroked from the face, to discover seven-eighths of the ears” (quoted in Corson 1966:264). In addition, the Chronicle refers to the long bob as the ‘Citizen’s Sunday Buckle.’

Among the Macaroni Club of the 1770’s, originally those who had been on the Grande Tour, and those who were always at the forefront of fashion, the club or cadogan was a favourite. It was curled in front and on the sides, and had a long tail tied into a club. The frontpiece was often greatly exaggerated by the macaronis to absurd dimensions. In 1772 Town and Country Magazine described them: “They make a most ridiculous figure... with about two pounds of fictitious hair formed into what is called a club [and] with his foretop (which is full six inches high) there is never a chair nor coach in town that can carry him without he stoops” (quoted in Corson 1966:295). The six inches reportedly grew to as much as a yard on the Continent, although such dimensions are often assigned from exaggerations in caricatures.

No matter what wig a man wore, he could wear it in a variety of colors. White or natural were the most common colors, with various shades of brown and black or “flaxen” favoured if not choosing white. Powders could also be colored to change the look of a wig, and could be obtained in shades of white, gray, brown, black, and even blue, yellow, and green (Bullock et al. 1987). The powder was applied with a billows, whilst the wearer covered his face with a cone. Many wigs were left unpowdered.

Of the runaways, one wig was brown, and two were called dark, all three presumably not powdered. The only wig specified as powdered was almost certainly white. Other runaways probably powdered their own hair from time to time, and several are mentioned as wearing their own hair with a few additional details. Because few advertisements mentioned wigs, it is safe to assume the majority of servants no longer wore them, at least in everyday wear. If they had one stored for Sunday dress, they apparently did not take them, or surely more would have appeared in the runaway descriptions.
CHAPTER XVIII
OUTERWEAR

Seventeen of the runaway descriptions mentioned an outer coat of some form (Appendix R). Nine of those called them 'surtouts', five 'great coats', two 'match coats' and one a 'Hussar cloak.' While some of these garments are relatively distinctive, there is enough overlap between a few to make precise classification into separate categories dubious. A surtout and a great coat, for instance, can be placed together as one group. One of the great coats, however, was made from a blanket, and so probably belongs with the match coats. The Hussar cloak was perhaps more distinctive, although some forms of match coats and cloaks may have imitated some of the lines of even that. All of the outer garments could incorporate similar elements, and the more each shares, the less clear the distinctions become.

While there are some very similar traits between the garments, there are also some major distinctions. The surtout (or great coat) is defined by Spence as "a large upper coat" (1775). Sheridan likewise writes it is a "large coat worn over all the rest" (Sheridan 1780). Essentially, the surtout looked like an oversized frock (Figure 49a). It was cut to hang quite loose, as it would be worn over the other clothes. A slit or vent from the center back of the bottom hem to the waistline was common, allowing the wearer to comfortably ride a horse. The length could vary, but most were slightly longer than the everyday coat, ending somewhere between the knees and mid-calf. The longer version became more popular towards the 1780's (Cunnington and Cunnington 1957:222).

The surtout's sleeves were cut large to accommodate the coat's sleeve within it. The cuffs were often large turn backs, and could be with or without buttons. Pockets on the body of the surtout were optional, but if added, the flaps were cut along the same lines as those on coats. On occasion vertical pockets were used, but if so, tended to be placed further back on the surtout body than horizontal pockets (Cunnington and Cunnington 1957:225).

The surtout could be fastened with either buttons and buttonholes, or buttons and loops, as was one ordered by George Washington (Gilgun 1993:112). Buttons tended to be large, and metal was preferred, probably due to its superior strength. The surtout could be "buttoned from neck to hem, to knees or to waist, but [was] usually worn open from the waist down" (Cunnington and Cunnington 1957:77). Generally it was the older models that had buttons down to the bottom hem, as that fashion was popular in the decades preceding the period under investigation.

The majority of surtouts were single-breasted, but double-breasted versions were also made. If double-breasted, the surtout would have had turn back lapels similar to those of a military coat, but probably of the same material as the body. All versions, regardless of the fastening system, could be lined, partially lined, or have no lining at all.

Collars (also called capes) were made large, so that in cold weather they could be turned up to protect
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Surtouts
Woodcuts by Thomas Bewick
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Matchcoat

49c
Cloak
18th century woodcut

Figure 49
Overcoats
the neck and head. Additional shoulder capes could be added for more warmth, and long enough to pull up over the head when required. When worn down they would generally hang no further than the top of the shoulders.

Match coats were cut much simpler than surtopts. The match coat, or blanket coat, was often a homemade affair, but served the same purpose as the surtoot (Figure 49b). It fit loosely over the other clothing, hanging somewhere between the knees and mid-calves, as the surtoot. While buttons could be used, ties were also often employed. The cuffs were generally plain, and overall the coat was devoid of embellishments. While lining could be added, it is not expected for the most part. A simple hood or cape capable of covering the head would be added for additional warmth. While often called a blanket coat, for being made from similar material, any thick napped wool could be used. The portrait used as a model for the reconstruction (Figure 49b) was a British soldier in Canada, who wore one made from a 2½ point trade blanket (Katcher 1981:68). The points are denoted by the tick marks near the lower hem.

Hussar-cloaks were typically "reserved for the army, the learned professions, and for funerals" (Cunnington and Cunningham 1957:225). Cuthbertson backs up this statement, saying they are best suited for guards and troops in winter quarters, for "Hussar-cloaks are more convenient for Centinels, than any other kind, as by throwing back the short Flaps of them, their Hands are quite disengaged to handle their Arms" (1768:102). He further stated that "they must be in length, below the calves of a middle sized man's leg, be very wide and full, and have a large falling cape, to cover the head occasionally: under the cape, the number of the Company each cloak is made for, should be marked in red, large letters" (Cuthbertson 1768:102). One runaway did in fact wear a Hussar-cloak, fitted with plated buttons, and it may well have been somehow acquired from the military. Soldiers often sold clothing to civilians, with or without the authority to do so (Cuthbertson 1768).

Besides the Hussar-cloak, traditional styled cloaks (Figure 49c) were worn among the civilian population, though they were becoming unfashionable after mid-century (Cunnington and Cunningham 1957:78). A surviving cloak of the latter half of the 1700's is preserved at Colonial Williamsburg (G1956-213) (Baumgarten 1986:69). It is of red wool, a popular color for cloaks, especially among Virginian women. "Almost every Lady wears a red Cloak" (Fithian [December 13, 1773] 1943:38).

While cloaks may often have favoured red, blue was a color often mentioned for many of the surtoots and Hussar-cloaks appearing in a variety of records. Cuthbertson favoured it, because "blue is the most lasting color" (1768:102), and indigo was easily obtained. Orders to John Norton in London from Virginians also suggest blue as the preferred color. R.C. Nicholas placed his order for "As much blue bath Coating as will make a large Man a close bodied great Coat with Trim:gs" in September of 1768 (Mason 1937:72). Likewise, James Carter requested he be sent in Williamsburg "4 yards Dble mill'd blue Cloath for a great coat @ about 12/6 pr. yd. 1 yard best Collar Velvet for Do. [and] 1 bag Buttons for Do. (not hair)" (letter to John Norton dated January 1, 1771 in Mason 1937:152). Finally, in the early 1770's, we see a reward offered for "blue
Husar Cloak” which had been “Lost in the Field on the Day of Battle” by a Regulator in North Carolina (Powell et al. 1971:434).

While blue appears frequently in many sources, among the runaways, it only occurred one more time than did brown. Six outer garments were described as blue, whereas five were brown. Another was gray, and the remaining five were unspecified. One of the brown surtouts, worn by Ralph Emanuel, had a cape of red cloth, spotted with a bit of tar (VG, D&H, April 22, 1775). This is not surprising as Emanuel was a convict “used to the sea”, and this may have been tar off of a ship.

While most surtouts would have been wool, it would not be unreasonable to think Emanuel’s brown version was of duck or sail cloth, treated with linseed oil for a water repellent. Such treatment is described in 1765 by William Smith.

Take a quantity of linseed oil and boil it gently till one half is diminished, to which put a small quantity of litharge of gold, and when it is well incorporated with the oil, lay it on with a brush upon the watch-coat, so that it shall be every where equally wet. I suppose the watch coat, hung in a garret, or other covered place, and so suspended by crooked pins and paper threads in the extremities of the sleeves and edges of the collar that one part shall not touch another. In a short time, if the weather is good, it will be dry; when a second mixture of the same kind should be laid on with a brush as before. When the second coat of painting dry, the grease will not come off and the surtout is an effectual preservative from rain (Smith 1765:47n).

If Emanuel’s surtout actually was treated in a manner such as this, the material probably was not wool. While wool was the common fabric for most surtouts, the fact is that none of the surtouts and other outer garments described for the runaways mention the fabric they were made from. The only clue we are given is that another of the brown surtouts had a velvet cape. Even that is not very precise, for whether the observer meant it in the sense of a collar or a true cape is unclear. What is clear is that at least 17 of the 201 runaway servants left prepared for cold or foul weather.
CHAPTER XIX
SERVANT CLOTHING RECONSTRUCTIONS

J.C. Harrington, a pioneer in historical archaeology, wrote, "As a picture is reputed to be worth a thousand words, so the interpretation of the historical scene through the use of objects and archaeological data contributes insight, even though it is often intangible and hard to acknowledge specifically" (Harrington, 1978:7). The following figures (Figures 50-92) are visual interpretations of the clothing worn by runaway servants and convicts as described in the the Virginia Gazette. As evidence for material culture that has not survived, the descriptions offer the most interesting pictures available of servant clothing in day-to-day life. In an attempt to recover a fugitive, masters and overseers, occasionally aided by other servants, verbally portrayed runaways as they were last seen, including items they took. In most cases the clothing they wore daily was intimately known. As Harrower exemplifies, servants often changed their outer clothes by the season, not the day. What each servant wore or took with him was usually easy to describe.

The preceding chapters survey the social context for servant clothing in Virginia. Further details filled out the picture, including technological contexts such as fabrics, colors, and styles. This can now be brought together in visual form, to reconstruct the everyday look of the servant's clothing. The following profiles are compiled from descriptions written between 1774 and 1778. Roughly 25% of the 201 descriptions studied are represented below, covering a broad spectrum of appearances of the runaways.

The clothing assemblages depicted are based on specific individuals. Each is identified by the name of the person represented and the date the advertisement was published. Figures denoted with a single number, mark a pair who ran together, or two views of one runaway. The remainder are primarily arranged in alphabetical order. Appendix S provides a correlating clothing inventory for the runaways, including those not appearing in the reconstructions. Further information about individual figures may be found there, including data on fabric and color which cannot be represented in line drawings. Items not appearing in the appendix are conjectural, but based on similar descriptions.

The major hinderance to this section was omission of information. Some descriptions were very detailed, others were vague, and required increased speculation. A second obstacle was the use of subjective modifiers in the descriptions. Words such as half-worn, worn, and old mean different things to different people. Because those writing the advertisement tended to be of the middle or upper classes, what they saw as worn might be very different from what a servant considered to be worn. Nicholas Cresswell tended to describe his clothes as worn out, yet he wore them to the theatre in New York with high-ranking British officers ([1777] 1924). Obviously his garments were not as ragged as one might be lead to believe. This variability is hard to translate without knowing more about an observer's perspective. Therefore, unless a garment was specifically described as patched or torn, the actual condition of any given garment may have been better or worse than they appear in the drawings.
Figure 50
Bartholomew Archibald, January 6, 1776

Figure 51
William Armstrong, July 28, 1775
Figure 52
Ned Barry, June 7, 1776

Figure 53
James Reeves, June 7, 1776
Figure 54a
George Blackburn, April 29, 1775

Figure 54b
George Peart, April 29, 1775
Figure 55a
Solomon Burnham, December 15, 1774

Figure 55b
Samuel Chapman, December 15, 1774
Figure 56
Patrick Carrick, July 19, 1776

Figure 57
Thomas Cartwright, June 29, 1776
Figure 59
Richard Colloney, September 29, 1774

Figure 60
James Deverix, June 29, 1776
Figure 63
Thomas Goode, August 4, 1774

Figure 64
Thomas Hall, October 11, 1776
Figure 65
Walter Harris, April 18, 1777

Figure 66
Benjamin Hawkins, February 2, 1776
Figure 67
John Hern, November 10, 1774

Figure 68
Daniel Humphreys, November 15, 1776
Figure 73
John Charles Kittler, June 8, 1776

Figure 74
Michael Lane, June 8, 1775
Figure 75
James Leighton, November 23, 1775

Figure 76
John Newton, July 13, 1776
Figure 77a
George Murdy, March 8, 1776

Figure 77b
Christopher Warren, March 8, 1776
Figure 78
John Oelhyser, February 24, 1775

Figure 79
John Ounsted, September 27, 1776
Figure 80a
William Row, August 16, 1776

Figure 80b
Isaac Singer, August 16, 1776
Figure 85a
John Topin, July 26, 1776

Figure 85b
Richard Hawk, July 26, 1776
Figure 86  
Thomas Turkel, December 20, 1776  

Figure 87  
James Turnbull, October 13, 1774
Figure 88
Robert Walker, March 24, 1774

Figure 89
William Webster, November 23, 1775
Figure 92a
Charles White, November 23, 1775

Figure 92b
Charles White, July 6, 1776
CHAPTER XX
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Two main goals motivated this study in material culture. The first goal of this study was to reconstruct, based on evidence supplied by 18th century observers as well as extant artifacts, the look of the day-to-day apparel of runaway indentured servants and convicts. Because this class of material culture has been shown to be of relatively high importance to people of the past, it may tell more about behavior and social interaction than can many other sources. Traditional views of servant clothing employ many stereotypes, and generalize broadly across time and space. Through this study, this is seen as a dangerous thing. The diversity of clothing worn among the servants became readily apparent early on in the study, and they cannot be treated as a homogeneous group. While it is true that many servants wore the coarse, durable fabrics attributed to their class, many wore fine ones as well. The same holds true with color. Blues and browns are common to the runaways, but bright colors, stripes, and checks are present alongside them.

Behavioral patterns became apparent when looking at large numbers of clothing descriptions. As discussed earlier, clothing was considered a reliable sign of a person’s social worth. Character was often judged by clothing, and in a very socially conscious world, outward appearance was of great importance. When looking at the servant clothing, one is struck by mix of quality. It is not uncommon to find a coarse osnaburg shirt being worn under a fashionable waistcoat. The majority of shirts in the study, in fact, were of osnaburg, a coarse fabric. It may be that this less visible garment was chosen for economy rather than fashion, for it could be easily hidden. If covered by a waistcoat and coat, there would be no need to expend precious financial resources on an item not seen by the general populace.

Likewise, attitudes about cleanliness and appearance in Virginia would suggest the servants did their best to keep clean and neat, for social reasons. Harrower can be seen to concern himself with such things, and made many efforts to comply with the expected levels of appearance. In order to be treated with more respect, doubtless most of the indentured servants in Virginia followed Harrower’s example.

Another interesting aspect of the clothing can be seen in apparent master’s issues. Many servants ran with a fellow servant from the same master, and were described with many identical garments. These like items probably represent fabric or clothing procured by the master and given to the servant as part of his yearly allotment. Most times these issued items were of coarser or less expensive material. George Washington’s runaways, for example (Thomas Spears and William Webster), both wore light brown duffil suits with black horn buttons. In addition, each man had check and osnaburg shirts and osnaburg trousers (VG, Pinkney, April 28, 1775). All of the fabrics mentioned in the clothes they had in common between them were durable, inexpensive fabrics. Horn buttons were also inexpensive compared to metal, and together the clothing represents a master’s idea of what a servant should wear, long-lasting, cheap clothes.

The servants, it seems, did not always share the master’s view. A duffil waistcoat such as Spear’s
and Webster's may have been practical for a servant, but Thomas Benson's silk-cotton or Thomas Faston's black velvet ones were not. What we may be seeing is a form of social resistance. The servant, by wearing clothing "too good" for his station in life, is sending the message that the master is not in total control of the servant's life. Many ads, especially for slaves, comment that the clothing actually worn was finer than what they should have had (Meaders 1993). By wearing clothing not indicative of a common laborer, they were going against social expectations. The same holds true for white servants, though perhaps to a lesser degree than applied to slaves.

While procuring better clothing than the master issued may have been a form of resistance to the master's control, it may also have reflected the servant's desire to blend in with his master's class. This in itself can be considered a form of resistance, but it can also be viewed as the opposite, acceptance of the system. The difference is, that while the system may be accepted, the servant may be asserting that he is trying to step up the ladder above his current place in the social hierarchy. By giving an outward appearance of more refined tastes, as suggested by his better quality clothes, he could hope to be accepted as better than his fellow servants in their coarser clothing. We constantly see John Harrower upgrading his apparel, and in doing so he was upgrading how he was seen as a person when in town, away from the master's plantation. While the presence of finer clothes could be no more than chance acquisitions, unless they were described as excessively worn, the regularity with which they appeared suggest resistance and social climbing is in fact what is being expressed.

The mix of clothing fabrics, colors, and styles also tells us about the behavior of servants. In fashionable circles, mean's clothing was generally expected to consist of a matching or complimentary suit of a coat, waistcoat, and breeches. Many servants did have suits (Washington's issue of duffils for example), but many more wore garments which were not part of a suit. Walter Harris provides a striking example. Harris wore spotted velvet breeches, a purple broadcloth waistcoat with gold basket buttons, and a patched, brown broadcloth coat with a scarlet velvet collar. This was topped with a blue and white straw and wool hat (Figure 66). While the quality of Harris's clothes are reasonably high (although the coat is worn), there is no semblance to a matching suit whatsoever. Unlike Thomas Spears, who can be safely said to have worn clothes issued complete, or in fabric, by his master, Harris probably acquired these clothes on his own, in an attempt to express his own individuality. John Harrower's diary shows this ongoing process many times, as his wardrobe is supplied both by issues from the master and through his own devices.

An interesting note is that when a servant can be seen to have procured a garment on his own, it is often of a higher quality than that which master tended to give out. Again, this may be a function of a master-servant relationship. When the master issued clothes, the outward assumption is that durability and price are a function of economy. That is, the master buys the cheapest fabric he can which still satisfies minimum quality standards. While this was probably the prime deciding factor, it should not be overlooked that a master's fabric choice may have also been influenced by social motivations. Selecting lower quality fabrics
not only saved money, but also asserted power and authority over the recipient of the cloth.

Regardless of possible power and social relation issues, the clothing in the runaway descriptions tell us basic information about clothes in Virginia in the 1770's. Most servants seemed to conform to social attitudes about minimal dress. The middle and upper classes were rarely seen without a coat, waistcoat, and breeches. This combination was emulated by a large percentage of the servants, who, despite the rigors of wearing such clothing, seemed to have it with them. If not wearing a coat, they substituted a more practical jacket, but rarely is a servant described without one or the other. If they did have a coat, they rarely were without a waistcoat or jacket to wear under it, and only a handful of runaways left without some garment to wear over their shirt. Once away from those who knew they were servants, runaways do not seem to have been attired significantly different from any free workers in their same community, living under similar economic conditions.

The second goal of this study was to take existing artifacts, experienced only in their present context as isolated objects, and conceptually return them to their systemic or social contexts. In this way they may be better understood as part of a complex whole rather than as artifacts unto themselves. Buttons, for example, are often studied in detail in any number of archaeological reports. Even so, buttons are rarely discussed for what they were, part of a garment, rather than for what they now are, independent artifacts. While technological aspects of the object are important to our classification and description phase of study, it rarely adds great insight to the more important interpretation phase which should, but does not always, follow artifact analysis. Rather than study a button or any other artifact as it relates to an archaeological site, we must remember that its true value lies in what its place was to the people that created the archaeological deposit. While many studies excel at the former phase, most fail miserably at the latter.

Stone (1974), for instance, does an excellent job at technical description of some 426 buckles or buckle components, but totally omits any reference whatsoever to original use. Unless one is conversant in 18th century artifacts, one would never learn that Stone's Class I, Series B, Type 1, Variety a, is in fact an intact shoe buckle. Stone writes such information "is less critical in order of interpretive importance than the determination of either date or nationality of use" (1974:25). While this may be true for sorting out the site's chronology, it is absurd if any attempt to conduct anthropological archaeology at a site is intended. While from Stone's etic perspective date and origin are most important, from the emic perspective of the one who owned the object, the fact that it was a shoe buckle, and quite an ornate one at that, is what really mattered. If we hope to gain significant insight into behavioral aspects of people who inhabited the site, we cannot put etic considerations over emic ones. If we do, we lose the bulk of information the artifact contains that can link the present with the past in a more meaningful way. As Deetz (1994) has shown at Flowerdew Hundred, sometimes this more humanistic approach leads to greater understanding of a site than can a purely scientific approach alone.

This study has attempted to weave together artifacts and documents to visually recreate a segment of
colonial society which has rarely received attention in the fields of archaeology or material culture. Hopefully it can serve not only to shed more light on that population, but also as an impetus to archaeologists to make more use of artifacts for emic inquiry rather than etic. More interpretations that directly relate artifacts back to the people who used them need to be conveyed to the public at large, as well as shared with professional colleagues. Technically oriented field reports are crucial to preserving the information at a site, and to provide reliable contexts upon which to base interpretations, but do not in themselves do justice to the messages contained in what is recovered. More integration with written sources is needed in archaeological investigations, not only from traditional records used by historical archaeologists, but also from non-traditional sources. Diaries are especially useful to gain emic perspectives into material culture, yet seem to be a primarily untapped resource in archaeology for anything but clues to more tangible site elements.

Finally, archaeological findings must be presented to the public unencumbered with the usual masks of jargon found in so many reports. While some may criticize Deetz or Noël Hume for writing too much for the public, and not enough for colleagues, this is the only way that archaeology can fulfill its calling. The general populace must be allowed to appreciate archaeology, and how it connects our past with our present, and perhaps even our future. Historical archaeology not only teaches us about the past, but it also tells us more about ourselves. If we do not reaching out with more concern to the public’s needs and wants, we will be unable to continue under the benevolence of its funding, which is, after all, the source ultimately through which most archaeology exists. Archaeological research must be a cooperative endeavor within the community, and the results must be presented in an interesting manner. Anything short of this is a disservice to history, and a violation of the trust instilled in the professional community as the caretakers of our common heritage.
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APPENDIX A

AGES OF THE RUNAWAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boy/lad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 126
APPENDIX B

LOCATIONS FROM WHERE FUGITIVES RAN OR WHERE JAILED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albemarle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Co.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford Co.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Co.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blandford</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botetourt Co.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon, off Brig Innermay lying at</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway, on Appomattox River</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick Co.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Co.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Co.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpeper</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Co.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinwiddie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax Co.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauquier Co.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fincastle Co.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Co.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericksburg</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goochland Co.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Brier, levels of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire Co.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover Co.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James City Co.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George Co., placer near Falmouth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William courthouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Co.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds Town</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loudoun Co.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex Co., near upper Church</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nansemond Co., at Milner's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neabsco Furnace (John Tayloe's)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kent Co., near Providence Forge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg, Mr. James French's shop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsylvania co.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation of James Pride, esq.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George, at Flower de Hundred</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince William</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince William Courthouse Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raspberry plain, near Leesburg (owner in Loudoun)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Henrico Co.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond (city or county not stated)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Co., Farnham Parish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham, lower end of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotsylvania</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford Co.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Co.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex Courthouse, near</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Co.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorktown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland (general)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, Anne Arundel Co., Herring Bay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, Annapolis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, Baltimore</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, Charles Co.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, Dorsey's Forge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, Frederick Co.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, Hartford Co.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, Prince George's Co.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jails with no residence cited:
Augusta County Jail (actual residence unstated)                                | 3          |
Essex County jail (actual residence unknown)                                   | 1          |
Northumberland Jail (actual residence unknown)                                 | 1          |
York prison, (actual residence unknown)                                        | 1          |

Totally unknown (William Clark)                                               | 1          |
APPENDIX C

TRADES OF THE RUNAWAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Number of Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter/joiner *1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor *1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer/Gardener *2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailor/used to the sea *5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber/Hairdresser</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer *1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver *1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmith *1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter *2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick maker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(both had other trades as well)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocking weaver</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waggoner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasterer *1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay maker *1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist (Painter/drawer)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookbinder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches maker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet maker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver and gilder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditcher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax dresser</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Works worker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather breeches maker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruke maker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropemaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddler and harness maker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (reading) teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waggon-maker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelwright</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currier *1, Farrier 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostler *1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screw maker *1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting man *1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* number of individuals who had a primary trade also tallied.
APPENDIX D

MONTH IN WHICH RUNAWAYS LEFT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Number running</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

BUTTONS

BREECHES BUTTONS
Metal
Metal- light coloured Worsted Shag Breeches
Plain white metal- Brick coloured Duffil breeches
white metal- New light gray breeches of coarse cloth
white metal- new sailor’s jacket and breeches of blue duffil
Twist
Twist- purple broadcloth suit
Horn
black horn- light brown duffil breeches
(2 examples)

COATS BUTTONS
Metal
metal- brown coat (3 examples)
metal- blue broadcloth coat
metal- Devonshire Kersey brown coloured coat
metal- short brown working coat
plain white metal- coarse dark brown cloth coat
plain white metal- blue Fearnought frock
white metal- blue lappled coat
silver basket- dark blue [coat]
plated- dark brown cloth coat
plated- blue Hussar cloak
common plate- short light brown frieze
Postilion’s Coat lappled
yellow- coarse blue coat
yellow- light mixed cloth coat
brass- blue coat
brass- dark coloured cloth coat
gold basket- old claret casimier coat
Cloth/twist/hair
cloth- dark brown coat with buttons of the same
on each side twist- purple broad cloth suit
hair- fine cloth coat of a parson’s gray colour
Deathhead- Newmarket coat of light Bath coating
Horn buttons
black horn- olive coloured coat
black horn- light brown duffil coat
black horn- short pale blue coat, turned, double breasted

JACKET BUTTONS
Metal
metal- blue broadcloth jacket
metal- Drab colored Frieze Jacket
metal- blue cloth jacket with sleeves
plain white metal- coarse dark brown jacket
white metal- New light gray jacket of coarse cloth
white metal- new sailor’s jacket of blue duffil
yellow metal- green cloth jacket
Horn
small black [horn?]- old blue sailor’s jacket
high topped horn- new ash coloured jacket

WAISTCOAT BUTTONS
Metal
pewter- old Virginia Cloth blue twilled jacket,
without sleeves
white metal- blue waistcoat
common flat metal plate- light brown Frieze waistcoat
gold basket- purple broadcloth waistcoat
yellow metal- light mixed cloth waistcoat
Cloth/twist/hair
twist- purple broad cloth suit
Horn
black horn- light brown duffil waistcoat
(2 examples)

SLEEVE BUTTONS
Paste/Stone buttons
stone sleeve buttons
black or purple oval buttons set in yellow
APPENDIX F

TEXTILES

No study of clothing can be undertaken without an understanding of textiles. Fabrics are the base of clothing products, and can reveal insights not only into the makeup of the clothing, but also into social concerns and status, domestic production concerns, trade matters, and a variety of other economic and technological related concerns.

Unfortunately, textiles suffer from very poor survival rates in both archaeological and curated contexts. Although special circumstances can lead to their occasional preservation in an archaeological setting, the reality is that few sites offer sufficient conditions to preserve fabric. While curated specimens fare much better survival, they too are subject to destructive forces. The results have left comparatively few examples of textiles from the 18th century.

Research in Virginia yielded only a few scraps of archaeological recovered cloth. The collections of the Yorktown Victory Center contained fragments of canvas and a silk cockade which can be assigned a terminus ante quem of October, 1781, for they were contained in the Betsy, a British ship scuttled in the retreat attempts of Lord Cornwallis. The archaeological collections at the Colonial Williamsburg offered few additional examples, other than a twilled wool blanket fragment from a well context dating to the 1760's (pictured in Noël Hume 1969:41). Cloth fragments are mentioned in an excavation report of Redoubt 9, on the Yorktown Battlefield (Borresen 1938), which can be dated to late October 1781, but unfortunately these could no longer be located by the NPS curator.

Most textiles located were, not surprisingly, curated rather than archaeologically recovered. The clothing collections of the Dewit-Wallace Gallery at Colonial Williamsburg contained a wide selection of garments and fabrics, although mostly of upper class origin. Some have known Virginia associations, but most do not. The Yorktown Victory Center also has a few period garments, but again, from more wealthy contexts than servants. Colonial National Historic Park has some coarser textiles (tent linings and a bag) associated with George Washington, but despite the upper class association, they were still useful for information on textiles mentioned in the runaway advertisements.

The most useful source of original textiles are 18th century swatch books still in existence. These are collections of cloth samples made by textile manufacturers, or those involved in textile trades or consumption. Unlike clothing, which tends to get preserved more often as the quality goes up, or from whom it came, cloth swatches are often more class neutral. While the swatch books may not always preserve samples from the coarsest cloths, they do preserve samples from cloths frequently mentioned in servant and slave descriptions.

Many swatch books survive covering a wide range of textiles. Several are preserved in the Winterthur Museum, as well as a variety in European archives. Montgomery (1984) includes several photographic reproductions of swatches. A facsimile edition of Barbara Johnson's swatch book has been published, covering a wide range of textiles used by a woman in England over a span of many years (Rothstein 1987). The Bower sample book likewise preserves swatches of the 18th century, (Burbridge 1983), as does the Holker sample book (Montgomery 1977), all of which were used in the course of this research.

Only textiles mentioned in the Virginia Gazette descriptions are discussed. This is not intended as a comprehensive overview of fabrics, but rather an expanded glossary to aid in understanding a component of the material culture being investigated.

Several textiles in the advertisements are ambiguous. Besides dealing with obsolete fabrics, many seem to have been confused with another then, as well as today. The description of John Williams, for instance, states he has on either a beakskin or a beaver coat (VG, Purdie, August 4, 1775). This raises shows that terms employed by the observers were not always definite. Fabrics that were similar in make could easily have been mistakenly called one fabric when it was in fact another.

Much of the following information comes from European sources. Although the servants ran from Virginia or, in a few cases, Maryland, the use of European textile information is easily justified. In most periods the majority of textiles in colonial America were imported. This was the result of both legislation and practicality. It was often more difficult and costly to produce some fabrics than to import them from established textile centers where prices were kept low due to volume. In addition, the equipment needed to produce some fabrics simply was not to be had in the colonies until sometime after the Revolution. Shalloon, for example, required heavy presses which were only available in Europe as late as the 1770's (Baumgarten 1995, personal communication).

Numerous mercantile advertisements in the Virginia Gazette also give impetus to the notion of the importance of imported fabrics. Even during times of open hostility with Great Britain, imports of all kinds are frequently listed as just arrived in the papers. Although domestic cloth manufacture certainly rose during this period, it by no means put an end to importing cloth. What is seen, in the advertisements both for goods and for runaways, is that a wide range of textiles were in use in this period, and those include, but were not limited to, the textiles discussed below.
Bath coating

Bath coating could cover several variations of a long mopped woolen cloth. Montgomery quotes an 1833 book on haberdashery which describes it as "a thick kind of double raised baize... used for women's petticoats, and a winter article; it is also to be had in nearly all colours, and such goods are used for cloaks" (Montgomery 1984:203 quoting Perkins 1833).

Wingate (1979:51) defines Bath coating as a "lightweight, wide fabric with a long nap, bleached or colored." Both definitions fit the ads, for lighter weight cloth as well as heavier may be suggested in three runaway notices containing it. Charles Butler wore a dark coloured Bath coating waistcoat. William Smith had a Newmarket coat of light Bath coating, not bound, but stitched on the edges with Deathhead Buttons on it. Finally, William Wells had a Bath coating coat and waistcoat. A similar set consisting of a Bath Coating Coat and Waistcoat was offered by Yorktown tailor William Davis "complete, for ready Money" at the rate of 3£. 10s. in 1774 (VG, P&D, April 28, 1774). Likewise one could purchase a "Bath Coating Surtout Coat [for] 2£. 18s." (VG, P&D, April 28, 1774:3).

Bearskin

Bearskin was a "rough, sturdy material" (Copeland 1977:199), although it was not the skin of the animal. It was a coarse "thick, heavy, woolen twill... with a shaggy nap on the face" (Wingate 1979:54). Kerridge defines bearskin as a heavy overcoating cloth which employed noils (short hairs removed in the combing process) in the weft, as did similar cloths such as kersseys and fearnoughts (1985:23).

Montgomery (1984:160) notes that several surviving swatches from 1804 are dark brown or black in color, which mirrors two of the Virginia Gazette descriptions; a dark coloured bearskin jacket and breeches (George Allen), and a brown bearskin coat (Thomas King). A third ad suggests dark colors were not the only possibility. John Williams wore a light coloured Newmarket [coat], either bearskin or beaver coating. It may be that bearskin and beaver looked very similar. Other occurrences of bearskin were for a jacket lined with flannel (William Forbes, another lined with plaid (Robert Shaw), and a few more bearskin coats, jackets, waistcoats, and/or breeches.

Beaver coating

Beaver coating was named not for its content, but rather its appearance, like that of a beaver pelt. It consists of a "heavily felled, twilled wool double cloth which resembles kersey" (Wingate 1979:55). The result was a species of velours in which the pile threads were alternately looped and unlooped, but set out of phase, so that the loops (and consequently the tufts) were arranged alternately (instead of in line), causing the foundation cloth to be uniformly covered. As for the foundation, it could be a twill, a five-end satin or a four-end broken twill. Heavy shrinking reduced the fabric to between half and two thirds of its woven size, making the loops into a dense mass that, when cut, resembled beaver fur (Kerridge 1985:65).

Surviving swatches marked as beaver cloth are found in a Yorkshire pattern book dated 1770, several of which are pictured in Montgomery (1984:Plates D-99 and D-100). Colors range from shades of earth-tone reds and browns to light blues and grays.

Only one mention of beaver coating is made in the ads between 1774 and 1778, that of John Williams. Even then, his coat is described as being either bearskin or beaver coating, suggesting the two were similar textiles, or that observer was unsure which fabric the coat actually was.

Birdseye

According to Montgomery, birdseye was "any cloth woven with a small figure resembling a bird's eye" (1984:169). It could be any of several fabric types, including Indian calicoe, silk, and worsted. Kerridge is more specific, defining it as a fabric created with diamond twills having a spot in the center (1985:55-56). It seems likely that the latter description was in use first, and was perhaps later applied to other fabrics having similar patterning.

The single occurrence among the runaways only specified a "green birdseye" jacket (Edward Williams). Birdseye was woven in Virginia by George Washington's weavers in the late 1760's (Washington's accounts in Gibbs 1780).

Broadcloth

Sheridan defined broadcloth as "a fine kind of cloth" (1780). Fine alludes to the weave, the evenness of the threads, and its ability to hold the dye well when wet. An early 19th century description stated broadcloth was known for its "stoutness" and "the fineness and closeness of the weft, the reasonable shortness of the nap, the soft, silky, but not spongy feel, and the goodness of the dye" (Perkins 1833 in Montgomery 1984:177). When finished, the "felted surface... was the distinguishing feature of broadcloth" (Montgomery 1984:273).

Wingate writes the term derived from the fabric being woven wider than 27 inches (1979:82), and Montgomery adds that it was a "carded wool in plain weave" and measured between 54 and 63 inches in width (1984:177).
Broadcloth frequently appeared in merchant advertisements in the *Virginia Gazette* and was listed as the textile for at least 22 garments among the runaways. Broadcloth made up minimally, one complete suit (suggesting coat, waistcoat and breeches), 13 coats, 4 jackets, and 2 waistcoats. Other than the suit, no breeches were singled out as being of broadcloth. Colors varied from light to dark, including named colors of white, gray mixture, blue, purple, reddish, brown, and black.

**Buckskin**

Buckskin is safely interpreted as tanned deer hide when seen in the advertisements. Leather was a common material for breeches, both in the colonies and England. The term can also signify a cloth (Gilgun 1993:29; Montgomery 1984:181; Wingate 1979:87), but apparently not until the 19th century. As a cloth, buckskin is a twilled woolen, made thick and heavy, with a nap, but sheared and fulled to present a smooth face (Wingate 1979:87). No primary source consulted prior to the 19th century mentioned a cloth by this name.

**Canvas (duck, sail duck, sail cloth)**

One reference to canvas appears in the description of John Bailey, who wore "long canvas trousers". Two other entries refer to duck, which is a form of canvas. One is for two sail duck shirts (Thomas Jackson) and the other for a pair of Duck trousers patched on each knee with Osnabrugs (Joseph Snoock).

Canvas was loosely defined as "a kind of stiff coarse cloth" by Spence (1775). He does not define duck, but refers to sail as being made of canvas. In 1780 Sheridan defines canvas as a "kind of cloth woven for several uses," but omits duck, as well as references to canvas for sails or sail duck.

A more useful description for canvas is given in a dictionary on trade, which states it is a "very clear unbleached cloth of hemp or flax woven very regular in little squares." There is coarse, middling, and fine canvas: the finest are generally made of flax, and the others hemp" (Postlethwayt 1774).

Rolt (1761) defines duck or Hollands Duck as a kind of Dutch sail cloth. He adds that "sail-cloth... is a particular sort of cloth, or canvas, made of hemp." Rolt quotes a statute of George II stating that hemp or flax was allowable in the making of sail cloth, but the yarn used "should be well cleansed, even spun, and well twisted" (Rolt 1761).

Although contemporary accounts make little distinction between canvas and duck, Montgomery (1984) differentiates the two. Duck, she defines, is a "strong, thick linen cloth, finer and lighter than canvas" (1984:228). No mention is made if this distinction is time dependent, although her reference to Irish ducks are for the 19th century. She then states that heavier grades of duck were used for "boat sails."

Haven (1934:183) defines "Duck" as, a broad term used to denote a considerable range of firm, heavy fabrics all of 'square' weave. It owes its existence to the fact that prior to the middle of the nineteenth century the United States of America imported its canvas for sail fabrics from abroad. The lighter flax sails, made principally from Russian Flax and imported mostly from England and Scotland bore a stenciled of a raven as a trademark, while the heavier weights bore a stenciled picturing a duck. Eventually the word duck came to be used to denote a heavy fabric, and applied to cotton canvas when this country started the manufacture of such products (Haven 1934:183).

This explanation stands opposed to Montgomery’s suggestion that the term was a reference to the cloth’s ability to shed water due to its weave and finishing (1984:228).

Among current authors there is no general consensus as to what fiber contents canvas or duck usually had.

Original sources suggest either cloth could be of flax or hemp, and the terms were interchanged, perhaps only dependent upon weight or coarse/fine characteristics of the cloth.

A reference to "Sail Duck of all numbers" in the *Boston Gazette* (October 15, 1751) appears in an advertisement along with cloths which are usually associated with clothing. According to Haven, "Numbered Duck" refers to a firmly woven duck free from sizing, made in a great variety of widths and weights... The weights are designated by numbers, starting with No. 2/0 (called Two Naught), weighing 20 oz. to the linear yard, 22" wide, No. 1/0 weighing 19 oz., No. 1 weighing 18 oz., and so on down to No. 12 weighing 7 oz. The weight of No. 1 to No. 12 Duck 22" wide can be determined by subtracting the designating number from 19 (Haven 1934:195).

Although Haven refers to cotton numbered ducks of 1934, a similar principle of numbering as a reference to weight was in use in the eighteenth century.

In the *Virginia Gazette*, when duck was used in conjunction with "sail", it may be safe to assume the reference was in fact to a heavier grade, even though it is used for shirts. Heavy outer shirts were often used among working men (Copeland 1979). A reference in 1784 to a canvas shirt appears in a sailor’s journal, that of Samuel Kelly. When sent to collect wood for his ship, Kelly complained, "Having neither shoes nor stockings this galled my feet severely, as well as my shoulder, having nothing on it but a shirt or canvas frock" (Kelly 1925:102).
Casimir, cassimere

Casimir was patented in 1766 by Francis Yerbury (Kerridge 1985:40). Prior use of the term (besides cassmere) has been suggested (Gehret 1976:278), but no citations offered. McCombs defines casimire as a "thin fine twilled woolen cloth" (1976:139), and Wingate adds it has a "worsted warp and woolen filling in a narrow diagonal twill" (1979:110). Two runaways wore casimir, Richard Roberts and Thomas Hall. Roberts had on a black cassimere coat, jacket, and breeches, whilst Hall wore an old claret cassimere coat. In April of 1774, a new suit of casimire could be had for £2 from William Davis, a tailor in Yorktown (VG, P&D, April 28, 1774:3).

The possibility that casimir, when appearing in the runway ads, is a variant spelling for cashmere, a type of fine goat wool, cannot be overlooked. Circumstantial evidence, however, might point to the appearance of casimire in the Virginia Gazette as denoting the twilled woolen over the more expensive goat hair.

Check

Montgomery defines check as "a fabric made of any fibers in plain weave with colored warp and weft stripes intersecting at right angles to form squares" (1984:197). Surviving examples of check suggest linen and linen-cotton mixes were more common up to about 1775, after which all cotton checks began to rise in manufacture and predominate the industry (Lemire 1991:94).

Early in the 1700's, linen checks prevailed, but by the first quarter of the 18th century, the linen and cotton industries were in fierce competition, vying for the check cloth market. However, the cotton-linen industry began to surpass the pure linen industry by mid century (Lemire 1991). In some markets, "the partial use of cotton in their manufacture made them more popular than pure linen checks in hot climates, where the inhabitants were accustomed to Indian cotton goods..." (Wadsworth and Mann 1931:127).

The growing manufacture and popularity of all cotton checks began by the start of the last quarter of the century. Between 1775 and 1785 at least 25 different check patterns were being woven in all cotton, compared to about 14 patterns in linen (Lemire 1991:94). The cotton-linen mix checks were also still being made, but much less so than had been produced over the last two decades (Lemire 1991:94). Surviving check swatches in the Holker manuscript (circa 1750) are of both linen and cotton (Montgomery 1977:216).

Imports of 100% cotton check from India throughout the 18th century are also well documented (Wadsworth and Mann, 1931), but do not appear to be as common as European and colonial manufactured checks in surviving examples for the period under discussion. Wool-cotton mixes are also known in check, but not as frequent as linen or linen-cotton mixes for clothing.

Colors used to create the check patterns varied, but combinations of blue, brown, and red were quite common. The color scheme of a check could feature one color on a white base, several shades of one color on a white base, or varied colors on a white or, more rarely, a colored base. When a mixed fiber cloth using cotton was woven, the cotton thread frequently provided the colors due to its propensity to accept dyes more readily than flax.

Swatches in the Holker manuscript contain "a variety of blue and white" checks, with "the arrangement of the coloured warp threads... exactly repeated in the weft" (Montgomery 1977:216). The size of the check could vary from quite small, perhaps ¼ of an inch, to quite large, up to 2 or more inches.

The cost of check cloth has been analyzed by Lemire for the mid and later 1700's. In England, at mid-century, one could purchase "yard-wide" check cloth at a low of "13¼ pence per yard" (Lemire 1991:94). By 1764, the price had risen to 14½ pence per yard, and an unspecified "fluctuating price in the 1770's" (Lemire 1991:94). This was followed in the 1780's by a decrease in cost, to around 12 pence per yard, and falling even more as cotton production grew (Lemire 1991:94).

Going by production trends of check cloth in Britain, we might assume many of the checks encountered in the ads were of the cotton-linen variety, as they would fit well within patterns of production documented in England for the time period. The fact remains, however, that all-linen and all-cotton checks were also likely present, but without specific mention in the newspaper descriptions we have no way to determine which fabric was in fact used for any individual check clothing piece.

Within the runway advertisements, check shirts appear with some frequency. Nearly 30 ads specify check shirts, representing a minimum of 35 individual articles. Only one check shirt was identified by fabric, that being a "Virginia cotton" check shirt worn by William Hanan (VG, D&H, May 2, 1777).

Two pairs of check trousers are mentioned, both by men who ran together from Williamsburg, Andrew Mackgill and John Staunton (VG, D&H, July 29, 1775). In addition, a check apron was stolen by a runaway.

Cloth

Although "cloth" could denote "all kinds of stuffs wove or manufactured on the loom, whether their threads are of wool, hemp, or flax", it was "particularly applied to a web, or tissue, of woolen threads interwoven" (Rolt 1761). These threads were conjoined "some whereof, called the warp, [which] are extended in length from one end of
the piece to the other: the rest, called wool, [being] disposed across the first or breadthwise of the piece" (Postlethwayt 1774). In addition, Postlethwayt states, "cloths are of diverse qualities, fine or coarse" (1774).

When the term cloth is found among the runaway advertisements, it may be generally assumed that the fabric described is in fact of wool. Unless the composer of the ad intended this meaning, it would be unlikely he would use the term at all in conjunction with clothing, as it would obviously be made of a cloth of some sort. Therefore, the term cloth in the ads is taken to denote a wool fabric. That does not, however, mean the word was not used to describe non-wools. John Harrower, writing his wife in August of 1774 states he wear a "short cloath Coat, vest Coat, and breeches all made of white cotton without any lining" (Harrower 1963:57). That he says cloth and cotton seems a bit redundant, but shows that caution must be used in assigned textile attributions to the word automatically. Also, that this was a short coat, and it was August, we can be sure the cotton he describes is not cottoned wool, but the plant fiber.

While we usually see cloth as a woolen textile, the term does not imply any specific style of weave. That must be left somewhat open to conjecture. By and large, the absence of a qualifier, such as twilled or worsted, is taken to suggest the cloth was a common or plain weave, possibly finished in a variety of methods, or at least a weave not particularly notable to those who placed the advertisements.

Coating (also see Bath coating)

Coating can signify "any fabric used to make coats" (Wingate 1979:136) and Montgomery further specifies it is usually a "thick woolen with a long nap" (1984:201). Essentially, any heavy warm textile could probably have been referred to as "coating" in the Virginia Gazette ads, but it would be safe to assume most would indeed be a form of woolen fabric.

Only five descriptions use the word coating in the ads of 1774-1778. Of those, four associate it with another word. Three refer to "Bath coating" (see entry), and one with "bearskin or beaver" (see each entry). The one description that uses the word "coating" alone is that for John Sole (VG, D&H, February 24, 1776) who wore a "snuff coloured Coating Coat."

Corduroy

Wingate defines corduroy as a "strong durable fabric with a cotton ground and vertical cut-pile stripes formed by an extra system of filling yarns. The foundation can be either a plain or twill weave" (1979:149). Montgomery's (1984) definitions agree with Wingate's, but all appear to be taken from rather modern sources. Gehret writes that "from the 18th century", corduroy has been known as a thick "corded stuff of cotton with a pile like velvet" (1976:278).

Cotton made corduroys are mentioned as a form of fustian in Lemire (1991:94, 102). Between 1775 and 1785 they were being manufactured in the Manchester area in a variety forms, and classed as fustian (Lemire 1991:Appendix 1). These included such types of corduroys as "Brunswick, Queen, Prince of Wales, and Genoa" (Lemire 1991:94).

The only specific mention of corduroy noted in a wanted person description was not for a runaway, (and thus excluded from further analysis at this time), but rather for a boatswain who hired a horse and did not return it. Alexander Stewart of the Galleys Hero wore, when on his way to Fredericksburg, "drab corduroy breeches mended in the seat with a patch of darker colour" (VG, D&H, July 13, 1776). No indentured servant was listed wearing the fabric as such, although mentions of "corded duryo" (see Duryo) might be the same fabric or at least similar in appearance, as well as some fustians which could fit into this classification.

Cotton

English fabrics woven of 100% cotton were appearing in Lancashire with regularity by the end of the 17th century (Kerridge 1983:125). Among the earliest surviving English all-cotton cloths are some fragments discovered in a house being demolished in 1927 near Bolton, England. The pieces, attributed to Lancashire manufacture, were retrieved from behind a panelled wall with letters and documents pertaining to the cotton wool business dated between 1607 and 1610, and in a context dating to before 1640 (Wadsworth and Mann 1931:112-113).

Dictionaries such as Spence's (1775) defined cotton as "cloth made of cotton" as well as "the down of the fruit of the cotton-tree". In 1761, Richard Rolli's A New Dictionary of Trade and Commerce defined cotton as a sort of wool, or rather flax, encompassing the seed of a tree of the same name... Cotton makes a very considerable article in commerce, being distinguished into cotton in the wool, and spun cotton; the former being used for various purposes... but the latter is more general, furnishing various cloths, muslins, callicoes, dimities, and hangings, besides being frequently joined with silk and flax in the composition of other stuffs... The manufactures of cotton are now become so great an employment for the poor of Great Britain, as to bring additional wealth to the kingdom; where, after being curiously picked and spun, it makes dimities, tapes, stockings, and gloves; besides several things wove fit for use, as waistcoats, petticoats, and drawers.
of different stripes and fineness; with all which Great Britain supplies her plantations, and other foreign markets; nor is it doubted but workmen in England would equal those in the East Indies for callicoes, had they encouragement (Rolt 1761).

Rolt's statements on the spreading presence of cottons by the mid 18th century are complemented by the documented growth in the industry. By at least 1750 there were thirty thousand people in the Manchester and Bolton districts exclusively engaged in the manufacture of cotton goods, and by 1766, it was estimated that over six hundred thousand pounds worth of merchandise were manufactured in this region in a single year (Crawford 1948:101).

Cotton cloth also frequently appeared as a domestic product in the Virginia colonies of the 1700's (Gibbs 1978; McCombs 1976). Numerous entries between 1773 and 1776 in the journal of the indentured servant John Harrower (1963) refer to cotton cloth. In writing his wife in Scotland (December 6, 1774), Harrower says, "There grows here plenty of extream fine Cotton which after being pich clean and ready for the cards is sold at a shilling the pound" (1963:76). Having purchased raw cotton, as well as planted some himself, Harrower then has it spun as he is "determined to have a webb of Cotton Cloath According to my own mind, of which I hope you and my infants shall yet wear apart" (1963:76, letter dated December 6, 1774). In January 1776 he has cotton spun to run eight yards of cloth per pound, for use as a woman's gown and men's waistcoats, and again in April sets out to have more spun for waistcoats. Finally on June 14, 1776 Harrower writes, "Went to Jno. McDearmans & had 6 Yds. stript Cotton warped for 2 Waistcoats and two handkerchiefs, all prepared at my own expence" (1963:155).

When writing his wife, Harrower describes his new clothes as being a "short cloak Coat, vest Coat, and britches all made of white cotton without any lining" (1963:57). A circa 1775 example of a suit similar to that Harrower describes survives (see Kidwell and Christian 1974:33 plate 31), although it has a linen lining.

Yet another diarist also provides evidence for the presence of cotton and cotton fabrics in 1770's Virginia. Colonel Landon Carter, son of the well known Robert "King" Carter, kept a lengthy journal of his plantation activities at Sabine Hall, near Warsaw, Virginia. His first mention of cotton is dated May 9, 1766 when he states he "Planted 2,200 hills of cotton... some with Anguilla seed" (Carter 1965:297). Numerous references to cotton cultivation follow in the continuing years up to his death in 1778. Included in his entries are passages concerning the weaving of his cotton into fabric, as well as estimates as to how much raw cotton he could produce (Carter 1965).

Governor Fauquier of Virginia also made note of the growing use of cotton in Virginia by the close of 1766, when he wrote to the Board of Trades and Plantations in December that,

The planters Wives spin the Cotton of this Country and make a strong coarse Cloth with which they make Gowns & ct. for themselves and their Children and sometimes they come to Town and offer some for sale. Of this Cotton they make Coverlids for Beds which are in pretty general use through the Colony (Fauquier 1983:1409).

By the mid 1700's, cotton and cotton mix clothing was to be found in all segments of British society (Lemire 1991:92). Between 1775 and 1785 Lancashire manufacturers alone had a minimum of 225 cotton textile types in production (Lemire 1991:95, Appendix 1). Despite the popularity of cottons, domestic manufacture in Britain still lagged behind the market demand by the 1770's, even when manufacturing so great a variety of types. In 1776, a merchant wrote, "It will take considerable time before the [cotton] manufacturers will fully supply the demands for the home trade" (from a manuscript in the British Museum, quoted in Edwards 1967:27n).

Cotton fabrics were available in a myriad of weaves and colors. Cottons were frequently woven into a variety of stripes and checks, and were easily dyed. Printing and painting (see Bowman 1992 for a discussion of printed cotton in 18th century Virginia) were also very popular early in the 18th century. Printed cotton cloth became so popular, in fact, as to cause non-cotton cloth manufacturers in England to pressure legislation to be passed regulating printed cotton imports and use (Bowman 1992).

Prints of the 1770's were primarily made from wood blocks. Copper plates were also used for printing cloth at this time, although Gilgun points out the rolling plate process was not patented until 1785 (1993:25). To encourage printing, premiums, or cash rewards, were offered for those who followed certain guidelines in stamping or printing "linens or cottons from wooden Blocks... or from Copper Plates" (Royal Dublin Society [RDS] 1766:20).

When cotton was used to create a textile, it was either spun pure and combined with other threads, spun pure and woven pure, or spun mixed with other fibers into useable a thread. The first method was most common in Great Britain until the early 19th century (when all-cotton cloths gained prominence), with fustians being the most frequent resulting textile. Fustians were, by the 18th century, mixes of cotton and linen (see fustian), although the term encompassed a wider variety of textiles of cotton mixes as well, including cotton and wool and some all cotton cloths (Baumgarten, personal communication; Lemire 1991; Wadsworth and Mann 1931).

The reason for using mixed threads was that prior to the development of more refined techniques and longer plant fibers, the cotton thread available to weavers in England was not customarily strong enough to be used on both the warp and the woof. The strength of the textile, therefore, was provided by using a strong fiber for the weft, and cotton for the wool, or filling. Nonetheless, all cotton fabrics were woven in a variety of manners, as some fibers and weaves were sufficiently sturdy to use for both warp and woof, if only in small pieces to begin with.
In addition to British or British colonial cottons, and certainly more important before the late 1700's, were the cotton industries of India. By the 17th century they were sufficiently developed to supply a great variety and quantity of 100% cotton fabrics to England, where they "appeared to arrive suddenly and to acquire a phenomenal popularity almost overnight" (Lemire 1991:4). By the end of the 17th century, "European [fabrics] were being supplanted by the new Indian textiles" (Lemire 1991:14) to the extent that the woolen industry was in dire fear, and petitioning Parliament for protection. By the early years of the 18th century, in some woolen producing areas of England, people were harassed on the streets if seen in printed cottons, as the threat was felt to cut so deep (Lemire 1991:34-42). The resulting "Calico Campaigns" (Lemire 1991) saw a great deal of unrest and legislation concerning cottons, especially those imported from India.

Although the word calico is frequently employed to describe much of what was being imported from India as well what was being finished in England, the term in fact covered a wide selection of 100% cotton fabrics, not just the printed fabric which is now commonly associated with the word. Thus, calico was likely a term more encompassing of cotton fabrics than is generally attributed. The troubles of the late 17th and early 18th century with cottons did little to slow the trade or dampen the market for the products, and the demand, as well as use, continued to be strong throughout the 18th century (Lemire 1991).

Cotton, however, did not always signify a fabric made from the fibers of the cotton plant alone. By at least the early 1700's the term cotton was occasionally applied to fustians. In his study of the British cotton trade, Michael Edwards says "by then [1750] 'cotton' cloth was a mixture of cotton weft and linen warp" (1967:3).

The use of the term fustian, likewise, was occasionally used to denote fabrics which are woven in 100% cotton. According to Wadsworth and Mann, "In Lancashire, when legislation was desired or when it had to be evaded, it was often convenient... to group the whole cotton industry under the name of 'fustian'" (1931:115). Tangible evidence of this use of the term comes from Johnson's scrap book. She includes a swatch of 100% cotton, clearly labeled in her own hand as brown fustian (Johnson, August 1757, in Rothstein 1987).

Yet another usage for the term cotton was in use. From at least the 16th century, the term cotton could mean a finishing process whereby "wooleens... were napped or 'cottoned' to give a fuzzy appearance resembling the fluffy fibers of the cotton boll" (Baumgarten 1988:62). Although dictionaries of the 17th and 18th centuries primarily define cotton as pertaining to the plant material, there are also mention "frize" or "frieze", which is apparently a reference to this procedure. As late as 1780 Sheridan adds when used as a verb, cotton means "to rise with a nap." Although no 18th century dictionary consulted defined cotton as a form of woolen textile, rather than a process of finishing, usage as a noun to indicate a wool is clear in many documents up to and through the 18th century. Most occurrences, however, which use cotton as a wool, qualify the word with another such as Welch or Kendal.

To confound matters slightly more, the word "wool" was also frequently applied to cotton fibers. George Crompton's childhood memory, for instance, of processing cotton at home refers to the fiber as wool several times (Crawford 1948:100-101), as do numerous other writings. Thus, the word cotton in the 1770's could mean either a cotton or a woolen textile, depending on the context (Baumgarten 1986:66; Baumgarten, personal communication). For the most part, however, cotton appears to be cotton in the runaway descriptions, with exception of references to qualified uses of the term, such as Welch or possibly negro cotton.

Baumgarten states for slave clothing, that the term should "usually" suggests the "woolen fabric" (1988:62). Thus, the negro cotton mentioned in the descriptions could be a cottoned wool, although the possibility remains it was plant derived cotton, as cotton was frequently grown and used by slaves in addition to the imported cloth provided them.

A British officer in Virginia in 1779, however, writes a passage suggesting cotton fabric was commonly used for slave clothing. Thomas Anburey, a captive of the battle of Saratoga, wrote that the "inhabitants of the lower sort, through the scarceness and difficulty of procuring clothing for themselves and their negroes, pay greater attention to [cotton] at present than tobacco ([1779] 1789:423).

When studied in context, the fiber content can often be made clear. In the case of Harrower's cotton suit, for instance, we know it was not cottoned wool, for he later refers to it as "my summer dress" and contrasts it to his winter "suite of new Claret Coulerd Duffle" ([December 6, 1774] 1963:72).

In yet another instance, Harrower provides clear evidence of his use to mean cotton over cottoned, when he records a "present from Mrs. Porter in Fredq. [Fredericksburg] of two pair cotton breeches" ([May 21, 1775] 1963:97). He later notes these breeches were Nankeen, confirming his use of the word cotton to mean just that, as well as stating the breeches were used as summer wear (Harrower [August 28, 1775] 1963:109).

Thus, when encountering the word cotton in the documents, each occurrence must be analyzed individually. Research in Virginia suggests cotton was a common fabric by the beginning of the Revolution for the lower classes, and this seems to hold true for much of the south, whereas its availability spread more widely after the Revolution in New England and the north.
Country cloth, (see also Homespun and Virginia cloth)

Country cloth or country made cloth can be interpreted two ways. It can be synonymous with homespun, or it can imply cloth made in the colonies by professional weavers or manufactories. The term "Virginia cloth" can also be interchangeable with country cloth (see homespun and Virginia cloth).

Twenty runaway ads mention country cloth, representing a minimum of 33 clothing articles, (excluding handkerchiefs, stockings and leggings). The single largest group was linen shirts, of unspecified quality, coarse, and tow varieties. There was also one listed as being of cotton. While only one article mentioned was a waistcoat per se, at least four more were termed jackets, and a fifth specified a sleeved jacket. Three coats were mentioned, along with three pairs of breeches and the same number of trousers. Last of all were a single pair of drawers, and yellow hunting shirt of linen.

The majority of items listing a fabric at all listed linen. Also mentioned were arustian type mix of cotton warp and twilled wool weft, as well as cotton alone. Colors mentioned included lead, white, yellow (including Nankeen), and striped.

Crocus

Rolt (1761), Spence (1775) and Sheridan (1780) all define crocus as saffron, or the flower thereof. Cunnington et al. define it as a meaning in the 18th century "a linen dyed yellow with saffron" (1960:252). Still others define crocus as a very coarse sacking, like gunny or burlap" (Wingate 1979:168), which in the 18th century was likely to be made from flax or hemp. This coarse sort was used for sacking material, as well as for "servants' and slaves' summer clothing, especially in the southern colonies" (Montgomery 1984:209).

Crocus appears three times in the runaway ads of 1774-1778. Two servants (Michael Coster and Francis Matthews, VG, Pinkney, September 21, 1775), running together from the same master, both wore crocus, one for a shirt, the other for trousers. The third reference is also for a pair of crocus trousers, worn by John McCarty (VG, Purdie, September 12, 1777). Baumgarten states that crocus was also a fabric used in the making of slave trousers (1988:62).

Damask

The single occupancy of Damask in the runaway descriptions is that of a waistcoat worn Thomas Smith (VG, D&H, July 29, 1776). Rolt defines damask as:

a sort of silk stuff... having some parts raised above the ground, representing flowers or other figures: but it is properly a sort of mohair and sattin intermixed, in such a manner as that from the not sattin on one side is on the other: the elevation which the sattin makes on one side is the ground on the other: the flowers have a sattin grain, and the ground a grain of taffetas (Rolt 1761).

The result of this type of weave is a two-tone appearance, caused by the way light hits the threads, rather than different shades of thread. Postlethwayt likewise defines damask as "a silk stuff, with a raised pattern, so as that which has the right side of the damask, is that which hath the flowers raised and sattined. Damasks should be of dressed silk, both in warp and in woof" (Postlethwayt 1774). He also explains the presence of an imitation damask, from "France, which they call the cassat damask... but having the woof of hair, coarse silk, thread, wool, or cotton. Some have the warp of silk, and the woof of thread, others are all thread, both warp and woof, and others all wool" (Postlethwayt 1774). Both authors agree that silk and other various thread mixes could be employed, including mentions of "linen damask" (Kerridge 1983:185), so it is impossible to say with certainty the makeup of Smith's waistcoat. We can, however, assume it had raised flowers or some other design over a solid silk/satin-looking ground.

Dimity

Dimity is a "kind of cotton cloth, or fustian, wore full of ridges, like cords, manufactured in the East Indies, and also in several European countries" (Rolt 1761). Spence simply defines it as "a sort of cotton stuff" (1775), and Sheridan states it to be "a fine kind of fustian, or cloth of cotton" (1780).

Surviving examples in Barbara Johnson's scrap book, dated 1764, confirm these definitions. Her sample is 100% cotton and from India. Many cotton dimities made in England, however, often had a linen warp and a cotton weft at this time (Rothstein 1987:204; Wadsworth and Mann 1931:113-114).

Montgomery is more expansive in her definition of dimity, including "any of a number of harness loom patterned fabrics" (1984:218). Kerridge seems to agree, stating dimity to be more of a weave style incorporating a secondary warp, and "having alternating weaves with the one the mirror image of the other" (1985:61).

A modern definition offered by Wingate, defines dimity as "a range of lightweight, sheer cotton fabrics characterized by warp cords made by bunching and weaving two, three, or more warp threads together... It is also made in check effects by weaving two, three or more warp and filling threads as one in plain and fancy basket weaves" (Wingate 1979:189). She also adds that the "original dimity was of wool and silk fabric" (Wingate 1979:189), but does not state when this applied. Unlike many modern dimities. however, out of "a number of other eighteenth-century
examples... none [are] a lightweight fabric" (Rohstein 1987:204).

Most references continue to mention the use of cotton for the fabric when no qualifiers are attached to the term such as "satin" or "silk". Linen was used in twelve surviving "Sutton Dimity" examples dated to 1720 from the Weavers' Company in London, as well as linen and cotton, (as Sheridan wrote) and cotton and silk, being used in some French examples of the 1730's (Montgomery 1984:219).

Yet another group of examples which date to circa 1779 suggest "the term dimity covered a wide variety of cotton cloth from fine bird's-eye... to large flowered patterns... and stripes (Montgomery 1984:219).

Although Copeland states the cloth was "worn by all classes" (1979:201), it makes but a single appearance in the Virginia Gazette ads. A white dimity waistcoat was being worn by Henry Hurst (VG, Rind, July 28, 1774) when he made his departure from Orange County.

Drab

Drab was used both to describe color and a fabric. For the textile, it was defined as "a sort of cloth" by Spence (1775), and expanded by Rolt (1761) who wrote it was "an extraordinary sort of woollen cloth, chiefly worn in winter-time". Its warmth was due to being a "thick, stout, closely woven overcoating, which was heavy and expensive" (Montgomery 1984:224).

Wingate notes the use of the term to denote a more generic "heavy woolen fabric of a drab color; a thick, strong woolen overcoating made in England" (Wingate 1979:198). When referring to the color of drab, McCombs offers that it was usually "of dull yellowish brown" (1976:140). This assertion is supported by Wingate, who refers to drab as "certain cloths of dull brown, yellowish or gray color" (Wingate 1979:198), which fits in well with Montgomery’s "undyed cloth of gray-beige color" (1984:224), when referring to hue over fiber content.

The term drab occurs in 12 runaway advertisements. Of that number, only five can be said to refer to a cloth rather than color, and four of those are deemed Russia drab (see entry). Three advertisements specifically refer to drab as a color rather than the cloth (drab coloured), and the remaining four are rather ambiguous, leaving room for interpretation as meaning color or cloth.

Drill, drizzling

Drill was a term for a heavy linen cloth (Rolt 1761), akin to canvas and duck, with which it is often associated in merchant advertisements and records. Drill was a twill, and Montgomery mentions "a later reference" (no attribution, but after 1660 and presumably before 1833) which described "drill as a three-thread cotton or linen twilled cloth, either in white or colors" (1984:225). She further adds "lightweight drill was called 'jean' or 'middy twill'" (Montgomery 1984:225). Early drills probably used mostly flax or hemp threads, whereas cotton came to be used more later on. Drill was a quite durable fabric, and relatively inexpensive in most cases.

Drill occurs in ten runaway advertisements. Of those, eight use the term Russia drill. The use of the modifier Russia may indicate drill made from hemp rather than flax, but that is conjecture based on Holroyd’s definition of Russia sheeting as hemp (1783:17). While a good deal of Russia drill was imported to America "through England and Holland, from the Baltic" (Holroyd 1783:22), it was probably otherwise little different from British or American products of similar weave and fiber.

Color is mentioned in five of the eight ads containing drill, four specifying white, and one dark. Of the group, there is one coat and waistcoat set, and the remainder are all breeches.

Duck

See canvas.

Duffil, duffel

Duffil is a coarse woolen textile. It was closely woven in a "two-and-two twill, heavily milled, and with the nap raised high and left shaggy" (Kerridge 1985:33). Holroyd classes it under woollens "Worn by Planters" in America, and values it at 3 shillings 8 pence to 5 shillings per yard (1783:9, 2nd edition).

Duffil’s heavy weight made it a warm material, well suited for outer garments, but it appears in the Virginia Gazette for many articles of clothing. It shows up in 13 runaway ads, denoting some six breeches, five waistcoats, four jackets, and four coats.

An interesting side note on two of the runaways wearing this fabric are from whom they ran. On the night of April 19, 1775 Thomas Spears, in "a coat, waistcoat and breeches of light brown duffil, with black horn buttons" and William Webster, in "a duffil waistcoat and breeches (same as Spear's)" ran from none other than George Washington (VG, Pinkney, April 28, 1775). Washington, it is said, kept notes of his servants' attire, for just such an event (Bailyn 1986:351).

In the 17th century, duffils "otherwise called Shags", were made for trade as well as domestic use, and frequently dyed "Red or Blue, which are the Colours that best please the Indians of Virginia and New England" (Robert Plot, 1677, quoted in Montgomery 1984:228). Samples dating to the mid 18th century, preserved in the
London Public Records Office, are in the former mentioned colors, as well as green (Montgomery 1988:228). Swatches from England, circa 1760, preserved in Paris, expand the known preserved swatches to include yellow and a dark gray (see plates D-53 and D-60 in Montgomery 1984). The colors represented in the ads fit well into the documented categories. They include blue, brown, light brown, gray, white, and brick coloured duffels.

Duroy
Duroy was a lightweight "smooth, worsted fabric produced in England during the 18th century" (Wingate 1979:207). Serge duroys were woven in diamond twills, and made in England by at least 1673 (Kerridge 1985:62).

Montgomery notes that in the Moccasi manuscript, (Paris circa 1760), there are "solid colors, two-color stripes, and two-color figures without glaze" (Montgomery 1984:230). These color schemes include shades of blue, brown, olive, and red, as well as relief flowered motifs similar in appearance to damask, but without the sheen of the satin background.

Colors noted in the five runaway ads mentioning duroy include green, pink, brown, pale blue, ash, and "dove coloured". It is interesting to note that all duroy textiles mentioned in the ads included a color description. Two articles mentioned were coats, and a third was of duroy cloth cut out for a coat, but not yet sewn. One waistcoat appeared in this fabric, and two pairs of breeches, one of which was described as "striped corded Duroy" (VG, P&D, November 10, 1774).

In 1774 William Davis of Yorktown advertised a new suit, meaning coat, waistcoat, and breeches, of "Duroy, lined through" for the sum of "4£, 5s."

VG, P&D, April 28, 1774. Duroy’s use for summer wear is also indicated by an order for a "Light Summer Suit made of Duroy" placed by George Washington (Montgomery 1984:230).

Everlasting (lasting)
Everlasting was characterized by being strong, "stout, closely woven worsted stuff, dyed black and other colors" (Montgomery 1984:235). Most everlastings "were finely woven, close set satins or broken twills with double or treble warps and single wefts" (Kerridge 1985:64).

Although everlastings were generally wool, some may have utilized a "wool warp and cotton filling in a satin weave" (Wingate 1979:222). While this assertion is not supplied with a time frame. Lemire claims that by the 1760’s, everlasting was also "a type of sturdy cotton corduroy" (Lemire 1991:101).

A great many surviving samples from the 18th century feature varied geometric shapes woven into the fabric, such as diamonds, squares, rectangles, or crosses in regular patterns. The patterned pieces usually exhibit two-tone color schemes. The three examples from the runaway ads, however, hold to the black dyed fabric, and all three were used for breeches. No patterning or figures are noted for the runaways described.

Fearnought
Fearnought was a heavy, thick woolen, with a shaggy or long piled face. As a kersey, it is closely related to bearkins, using noils in the web (Kerridge 1985:23).

Fearnought was frequently used for seamen’s coats and ready-made jackets, as well as for "heavy surtout coats and thick winter jackets" (Copeland 1977:202; McCombs 1976:140). Fearnought could also be used to designate a garment made such material.

The use of Fearnought in the ads was confined to four runaways. One wore a blue frock, another a short coat, and one each had trousers or breeches made of the fabric. The only description which included a color was the frock, being blue.

Flannel
Although today flannel is associated with an all cotton fabric, in the 18th century flannel was primarily a woolen textile. While most varieties at that time were all wool, some also incorporated a linen or cotton warp (Kerridge 1985:108). Flannel was closely related to baize, but had a smooth surface with a "tight, hardspun warp and a loosely spun weft of carding wool" in a plain or two and two twill (Kerridge 1985:108). In 1761 Holt defined flannel as a kind of slight, loose, woolen stuff, not quilted, but very warm: composed of a wool and warp; being woven on a loom, with two treddles, after the manner of bays... The principle use of flannel is for placing it between two stuffs, instead of flock, or cotton, to make clothing the warmer; but some use it for waistcoats, drawers, shirts, and shifts, and women most commonly for under-petticoats.

Such uses are born out by some contemporary mentions of the fabric. John Harrower wore flannel for a pair of drawers, brought with him to Virginia in 1774 (Harrower 1963:45). Likewise, Landon Carter mentions flannel in 1774 when he states he "used to wear my flannel Waistcoat next [to] my skin to accommodate the very cold weather of winter. This, however, produced Vast itching" (Carter 1965:902). For this reason flannel was usually woven and
finished to "offer the least possible irritation to the skin" (Kerridge 1985:108).

Although most flannels were woven to be a soft textile, coarse flannels were also produced. These frequently went by the name of Welch flannel, and were classed with friezes (Kerridge 1985:109-110). Holroyd states Welch flannel was mostly a product of the Shrewsbury area, and places it as a woolen meant mostly for slave use in America (1783:9, 2nd edition). Landon Carter ordered "10 yards Welch flannel" in 1763, but stated no specific use for which he intended it (Carter 1965:245).

Mrs. Catherine Ratheall of Williamsburg, did specify what she intended to do with flannel she ordered in 1771. She requested of John Norton, in London, "White flannel, the thickest & Best that Can be got for 13 or 14d p yd. N.B. it Must be very White as for Gentlemens Jackets" (Letter dated December 29, 1771 in Mason 1937:212). This was slightly cheaper than Holroyd's 1783 valuation of Welch flannel, which he priced between 16 and 20 pence per yard. Another order for flannel, this time striped, came from the Earl of Dunmore at the capitol in Williamsburg. He requested, in 1773, "30 Yds. Strip'd flannel for Grooms Waistcoats" (Mason 1937:330).

Flannel appears as a lining for a bearskin jacket in the Virginia Gazette, as well as for a waistcoat and a pea jacket. Both the waistcoat and jacket were of a striped flannel, but the color schemes are not offered. In general, flannels could run the usual range of colors for other cloths, as well as stripes and even tartans, but often were sent out from the weaver white to be piece dyed, resulting in solid colors.

Frieze

Frieze was a warm woolen fabric, used mainly for coats. Both Spence (1775), and Sheridan (1780) define the word as a sort of coarse warm cloth. Roll (1761) goes into more detail, explaining that it is in commerce, a kind of woolen cloth, or stuff, for winter wear, being frizzed or nap, on one side; whence in all probability, the name is derived: but frizes, some are crossed, others not crossed; the former being chiefly of English manufacture, the other Irish; and some cloths are only frizzed on the backside, as black cloths; but others on the right side, as coloured and mixed cloths, rameens, bays, and frizes.

The resulting fabric created a "heavy woolen coating with a rough, fuzzy, frizzy face... [which] ranges from 22 to 30 or more ounces per yard" (American Fabrics Magazine [AFM] 1966:618). After the cloth had been frizzed, it was spun so that the face was fairly uniform (Kerridge 1985:19).

A contemporary description of the process used to create finish is given in 1766:

In the Friezing, or Frizing of woolen cloth the hairs of the pile are twisted into each other so as to form little raised naps, or burrs, which are thickly and regularly spread over the surface of the cloth.... Every sort of woolen cloth, may be Frieze'd; but worsted cloths, having no pile, cannot admit of that operation (Duhamel de Monceau 1766:183 translated in Montgomery 1984:243).

Although the primary use for frieze seems to have been for warm clothing, the runaways wearing frieze were not all winter escapes. One ran in November, and another in January, admittedly cold months in Virginia. Two more ran in late March, one in April, two in May, and the last in June, still wearing a "darkish coloured frieze coat" (Dennis M'Donald, V.G. P&D June 16, 1774).

The use of frieze in articles of clothing other than coats is documented in the runaway advertisements. Of eight ads using the term, six specify coats, but two list jackets, and one a waistcoat (worn with a frieze coat as well). Of the clothing articles mentioned, three are described as dark or darkish, two as brown (one specifically as light brown), and one each as drab and "claret coloured".

Holroyd places "Fries" under woolens "Worn by Planters" in America, and gives a price range of 4 shillings to 6 shillings per yard. He furthermore states it was chiefly a product of Yorkshire, England (1783:9, 2nd edition).

Fustian

By the 17th century, fustian came to denote a type of fabric woven of cotton and linen (flax or hemp). Towards the end of the century, this fiber mixture was becoming quite common (Wadsworth and Mann 1931:113). The cotton was employed for the weft, whereas the flax thread provided the stronger warp. The use of the term, however, was even more eminence than simply a fabric of cotton and flax. Fustian was also used to denote a variety of other types, including a cotton and wool mixed fabric, all cotton fabrics, and earlier, an all wool fabric.

Prior to, and continuing into the 17th century, the word fustian could be applied to a worsted (woolen) fabric, which had been in existence before the use of cotton in the weaving. A petition to Parliament of 1621 from London fustian dealers suggests this, when they complain that for the past twenty years "diverse people in this Kingdome... have found out the trade of making other Fustians, made out of a kind of Bombast or Downe... commonly called Cotton Wool; and also of Lynden yarne... and no part of the same Fustians of any Wooll at all" (quoted in Wadsworth and Mann 1931:15).

If not by about 1601, as the petition suggests, at least by 1611 we know the term "fustin" was being used to denote a fabric of "lynden and cotton" as it appears thusly in a Norwich listing of textiles of that date (Moens 1888:78).
248, quoted in Wadsworth and Mann 1931:20).

By the mid 18th century if not somewhat before, the term was applied not only to fabric of mixed fiber content, but also some of 100% cotton. Rolt (1761) flatly put it that "Right fusians should be made entirely of cotton thread, both woof and warp". To confuse the issue even more, "it was often convenient... to group the whole cotton industry under the name of fusian" (Wadsworth and Mann 1931:115). A surviving example labelled as fusian and dated 1757 is in Johnson's scrapbook. It is woven "completely in cotton in a 2/1 twill" (Rothstein 1987:204).

Spence is of little help in defining the word by 1775. He simply states it is "a kind of cloth; bombast" (Spence 1775). Bombast, conversely, he defined as fusian, although in earlier centuries it was applied to the cotton plant. Sheridan (1780) gives a more traditional definition for fusian, calling it "a kind of cloth made of linen and cotton", but this is again confused by Rolt's calling it "a kind of cotton stuff, which seems quilted or whaled on one side, chiefly made for frocks, or outer coats of men and boys, but then went on to say that "there are also a great many made, whose warp is of flax or hemp" (Rolt 1761). To compound matters a bit more, some manufacturers split the cloth between fusian and cotton-linen fabrics, which were essentially the same as plain fusians, but were differentiated in certain legal matters (Wadsworth and Mann 1931:115).

Regardless of the exact fibers employed, we know that fusian could appear in a variety of manners. Rolt (1761) proclaimed that "there are fusians of several kinds, wide, narrow, coarse, fine, with shag or nap, and without it." In that same decade, "many sorts of napped, ribbed, and plain fusians invaded much of the market for men's waistcoats, coats, and frocks" (Lemire 1991:101).

Wadsworth and Mann narrow fusian into two main types, "those with plain and those with a cut and raised surface- a difference depending both on weaving and finishing (1931:113). Quoting a historian of 1783, they list early 18th century fusians being made in "herring-bones, pillows for pockets and outside wear, strong cotton ribs and barasons, broad-raced linen thicksets and tufts, dyed, with white diapers, striped dimities and lining jeans" (Ogden 1783:75 quoted in Wadsworth and Mann 1931:113). Lists of fusians produced in Lancashire from 1775-1785 list even more textiles under fusian (Lemire 1991: Appendix 1).

Besides a variety of weaves, we also know that fusians were block printed and painted, just as cottons from India were. In 1736 a document entitled The CASE of the Importers of Cotton Wool, and the Manufacturers thereof into FUSTIAN, and of the Traders in that Manufacture states that from at least the reign of George 1, "Some Branches of the Fusian Manufacture were printed" ((CIC) 1736:1). This was in response to bans on certain foreign cotton goods, for domestic fusians of cotton and linen would not "be mistaken for Callicoe, which is wholly made of Cotton, nor can it be imitated in the East Indies" due to a lack of flax for linen thread in that area, (CIC) 1736:1).

The above statement suggests that Rolt's 100% cotton fusians came about after the 1730's, but still before the early 19th century as one author mentions for all cotton fusians (Gilgun 1993:28). Nonetheless, when encountering the word fusian in the advertisements, it is probably safest to assume the observer was describing the more common plain cotton woof and linen warp fabric, which formed the backbone of the fusian industry during the period in question.

The word fusian appears in five advertisements in the Virginia Gazette for runaways of 1774-1778. One additional ad mentions clothing of "cotton and linen" in probable reference to fusian. Within those descriptions, nine or ten clothing articles are mentioned. Included in the group are one coat, one frock, three waistcoats, two jackets (one of which was said to be either fusian or jeans), and three pairs of breeches. Colors associated with the clothing are white, "almost white", brown, light, and "dark". The jacket which was said to be either fusian or jeans was further described as "corded".

Half-thicks

Half-thicks was a woolen fabric with a coarse weave, properly classed as a kersey. It utilized shorter wools, which were carded before spinning. By 1606 half-thicks first appear in England, and occasionally were passed off as Devonshire kersey (see kersey), which was better quality than the average kersey (Kerridge 1983:26). It was also sometimes called 'white-wash', and perhaps for this reason Wingate states they are white in color (1979:283).

Surviving examples, as well as written records, however, show they came in an assortment of colors, including blue, green, purple, and red.

Two runaways were wearing half-thicks, both running together from the same master. Each man had a coat and breeches of blue half-thicks, which were likely items issued to them at sometime during their servitude.

Holland

Holland often signified "a fine, white, even, close kind of linen cloth, chiefly used for shirts and sheets: being chiefly wrought in the provinces of Holland" (Rolt 1761). Although several contemporaries specified it was applied to "fine linen made in Holland" (Sheridan 1780), it was also a term used for "all fine, plain weave" linens whether from Holland or not (Montgomery 1977: 217; Montgomery 1984:258-259; Wingate 1979:294). By 1758, for example, "Hollands" were being made in Manchester. England as well (Montgomery 1984:259). Frequently.
However, fine linens woven elsewhere were sent to Haarlem for finishing and bleaching and thus picked up the name as well (Rolt 1761).

While Rolt (1761) specifies Holland to be a white fabric, examples are named in documents show it came in a wide variety of shades, including white, but also natural browns, dyed colors, checks, and stripes. The colors specified in the ads are brown (probably simply unbleached) and stripes, but white is safely assumed in the case of a group of fine stuffs described by their owner, as would most Hollands deemed "fine".

Although Holland is associated with fine linen in most instances, there were also versions woven using cotton in for this period. By 1750, samples of "Cotton Holland". using colored cotton warps to create stripes, are to be seen in the Holker Manuscript (Montgomery 1977:217). Colors mentioned for the stripes of those fabrics include "shades of blue, red and blue, tan, dark red, etc." (Montgomery 1977:217). Hollands of all cotton are also mentioned by at least the 1740's, although speculation exists to push that date back to the 1730's or even 1720's (Wadsworth and Mann 1931:176n). John Robinson of York County, Virginia, likewise ordered "1 ps of strong fashionable cotton holland" in January, 1770, as well as "thread to suite it" from John Norton in London (Mason 1937:121).

Twelve runaways are mentioned in relation to Hollands, representing 21 clothing articles. The most numerous type of Holland clothing mentioned was in fact shirts, as Rolt proclaimed, but only due to a single individual, John Murphey. Murphey stole from John May nine "Holland shirts, two of them ruffled and marked IM, with broad hems on the ruffles; two others plain, marked AC, with the numbers [blank space with numbers omitted from ad] below the marks; the other fine ruffled only at the Bosum, with narrow hems on the ruffles" (VG, D&H, November 4, 1775). Beyond that incident, only one shirt of "fine Holland" was mentioned for the runaways.

Three other clothing groups are represented by three mentions each; striped Holland trousers, Holland jackets (one striped, two not specified), and three brown Holland coats. One other coat of jeans was lined with brown Holland, and one waistcoat of Holland was mentioned in an ad. The articles mentioned as striped may have utilized cotton warps.

Homespun (see also Country cloth and Virginia cloth)

The term homespun denotes cloth woven from yarns or threads which had not been commercially processed or woven. Most were done on a hand loom either by family members, slaves, or servants, or by local people hired for the task. In his journal, John Harrower makes several references to home manufacture. His first experience in Virginia with spinning is told to us through a letter of December 6, 1775, written to his wife:

And I have at this time, a great high Girlie, Carlite as Black as the D-s. A-se spinning some cotton for me for which I must pay her three shilling the pound for spinning it for she must do it on nights or on Sunday for any things I know notwithstanding she's the Millsers wife on the next plantation. But I'm determined to have a web of Cotton Cloath According to my own mind, of which I hope you and my infants shall yet wear apart (Harrower 1963:76).

Although Harrower does not state whether the woman was a slave or not, it can be safely assumed. He does mention two women later that were apparently slaves of Colonel William Daingerfield, Harrower's master. Of them he wrote: "Upon Monday 15 Jan'y, last Ganzera & Patie went to John McDoa. to spin wool & cotton for him & they continued with him until Tuesday 2oth. Inst. being 31 work days in which time they spun 6 lb. of Wool & 8½ lb. Cotton to run nigh five yds. per lb." (February 23, 1776, Harrower 1963:138). Later that year an Irish woman, "Mary Fitzgilly", comes to the plantation "to spin flax" for them (Harrower [October 10, 1775] 1963:121).

John McDearmen figured in several of Harrower's entries. Although apparently an overseer for one of Daingerfield's plantations, he also seems to have been a weaver, for Harrower mentions that he "Warped 21 Yds. cloth for the Nigers" (Harrower [October 30, 1775] 1963:123) and later that he "Went to Jno. McDearmans & had 6 Yds. stript Cotton warped" (Harrower [June 14, 1776] 1963:155).

As Harrower records for the plantation upon which he was a servant, so too does Landon Carter record for his dominion the activities of home-spinning. His first mention appears in 1758, when he estimates his "weaving boy" should be able to weave 8 yards in 13 hours, but complains of his unproductivity when only required to produce seven (Carter 1965:212). Later, when political problems cause cloth to become more hard to come by, Carter seeks a more experienced person to take care of his plantation's homespun needs. On April 26, 1777 Carter writes:

I will give great wages and a comfortable living to a Sober diligent Person capable of teaching the Preparation of flax, hemp, cotton, and wool from the growth, for manufacturing the same, and skilled in all parts of weaving the same into the usual apparel which is made from them with a knowledge to direct making the proper looms. The enormous charge for such necessaries being beyond all conception in any rule of trade (Carter 1965:1101).

In response to his offer, one William Stoughton and his wife offer their services to Carter, to oversee his cloth production from hemp and flax. In August of the same year he records "Stoughton, the flax dresser, returned... He has been busy, breaking, swelling, and heckling... Nassau says not one bit of the lint is wasted and the tow made fit for spinning. It seems they do it by drawing it from between two Cards" (Carter 1965:1128). Using the threads Stoughton could produce for him, Carter states "from the swinged flax called generally tow there was a strong good
thread fit for bags and sacking; The Heckled from that in the first heckle was a good canvass thread, and soon to 3 or 4 fine heckles" (Carter 1965:1118). Then, on August 3rd of the following year, Carter makes mention of his cotton spinner as well (Carter 1965:1139).

Visitors to Virginia also took note of the homespun industry. The Reverend Andrew Burnaby toured Virginia in 1759 (Burnaby 1775). Not especially impressed with what he found, he related, "Their manufactures are very inconsiderable. The make a kind of cotton-cloth, with which they clothe themselves in common, and call it after the name of their country; and some inconsiderable quantities of linen, hose, and other trifling articles" (Burnaby 1775:12-13). The cloth to which Burnaby refers frequently appears in the documents as Virginia cloth.

Although some modern authors suggest homespun was generally a woolen or linen (Gilgun 1993:27; Wingate 1979:295), we do see from contemporary sources in the south, as well as specific research into the subject (Gibbs 1978; McCombs 1976) that a great deal of cotton was also being spun and woven in Virginia in the 1770's. It is likely much of this was woven with either linen or wool fibers, but we also know at least some was woven using only cotton (Harrower 1963).

Most homespun was likely a plain weave, but Harrower mentions hiring a weaver to make jeans (a twilled weave) and numerous surviving examples show weaving patterns were only as limited as their creators experience allowed (Little 1931).

There is also a great deal of evidence concerning the spinning and weaving of very coarse linens, woolen, and cottons or cotton mixes for use by slaves and probably indentured servants. Carter (1965) refers to this, as well as several mentions by Harrower (1963). In October of 1775, Harrower records the process of making linen for the slaves on the plantation, something that had heretofore not been done. On the 16th he writes, "This morning 3 Men went to work to break, swingle and heckle flax and one woman to spin in order to make coarse linen Shirts to the Nigers" (Harrower [October 16, 1775] 1965:121). By the end of October, the linen thread was given over to "John McDearmen" who "Warped 21 Yds. cloth" for Daingerfield's slaves with it (Harrower [October 30, 1775] 1963:123).

The fabric may have been very much like imported osnabrugs.

While homespun cloth is said by numerous sources to have been almost universally produced throughout the colonies in varying quantities, apparently very little was offered for sale. Governor Fauquier of Virginia said "that no merchant would know where to purchase 100 yards of homespun cotton or linen if he had a sale for it" (Clark 1929:209), suggesting that homespun was indeed meant primarily for home use only.

Although numerous references to country cloth and Virginia cloth are made in the advertisements, only four specifically use the term homespun or home made. Although in many cases the latter two textiles could be interchangeable with homespun, they are discussed in separate sections, as they can refer to colonial versus strictly home manufacture. Of the four ads with the term, we have six clothing articles mentioned, and one generic "clothed in homespun woolen and linen (VG, Purdie, April 11, 1777) for a mulatto servant bound until age 31. The six clothing articles specified in the advertisements include a linen shirt, a blue coat, a striped waistcoat, a blue and white striped coat and waistcoat, and white drill breeches.

Iris h linen

Irish linen generally referred to just that, linen from Ireland. Rolt said of the linen industry "of late years Ireland has made such improvements in the linen manufacture, that it is now become the staple commodity of the country" (1761). In fact, in the years 1768 and 1769, linen exports from Dublin exceeded 36 million yards of cloth (Warden 1864:397).

Although the quality of Irish linens varied greatly, as they were mostly the product of a widespread domestic cottage industry, they did seem to enjoy a favorable reputation on the whole. Before export, linens were inspected and stamped with quality ratings (Warden 1864:395).

Five runaways were described as having Irish linen, and all five were shirts. Only two mentioned color, and both were white. In addition, one used the term "fine", but added that the shirt was "much patched". There may have been more Irish linen shirts represented than the five. One description adds "and several others" after mentioning an Irish linen shirt, but the observer simply may have meant other shirts of unspecified fabric.

Jeans (janes)

Jeans was usually classed as a sort of fustian. It was normally made using a mix of cotton and linen, woven in a twill. Montgomery suggests jeans could apply to a form of "lightweight drill" (1984:225). While true, jeans typically have "more threads per inch and a finer twill line than drills" (Wingate 1979:316).

Jeans could also be made using a mix of cotton and lower grade wool, and, on some occasions, of all cotton, even in the 18th century. John Harrower wrote on June 26, 1776, "At 5 pm I went to Mr. Becks & hade a short Coat cut out of cotton cloth wove Jeans. I bought the cotton and paid for spinning it at the rate of 2/6 per lb. and one shilling per Yd. for Weaving (Harrower 1963:156).

Jeans are mentioned for six or seven clothing articles in the runaway ads. Of the group, three are breeches,
two white and one dark. Another three pieces were waistcoats, one of which is listed as being either jeans or fusian. The two jeans waistcoats were white, and the third was a corded, double breasted, light jeans or fusian one. The final clothing article was a coat of unspecified color that had a lining of brown Holland.

Kersey (including Devonshire kersey)

Kersey encompasses a variety of twilled woolen fabrics. Originating in England before the 13th century (Kerridge 1985:5), the manufacture of kersey cloth soon spread all over Europe. By 1761, Rolt notes kersey were being "manufactured in Yorkshire, and exported to Italy, Portugal, Spain and other places".

Kersey cloth derived its name from kersey yarns, which were used in the weaving. Kersey yarns were noted for being thickly spun yarn, often using lower quality carded wool, and thus being a less expensive finished product. The resulting twilled weave was a heavy fabric, which was usually napped and storn (Kerridge 1985:5). It provided good protection from the cold, and was often used for outer garments (Montgomery 1984:272-273).

The use of large yarns is noted by both Spence (1775) and Sheridan (1780) who refer to kersey as a "coarse stuff", apparently in reference to the weave more than anything else. This usage holds true to some of those encountered in the Virginia Gazette. In the runaway advertisements, kersey is used in relation to the weave itself for three of the eight ads mentioning it. Two of those specify Virginia manufacture. Another kersey with a name attached is an example of a coat of Devonshire kersey.

Although in the 18th century most kerseys were a coarser material, Devonshire kerseys were, along with a few other varieties, an exception. Devonshire kerseys were made from about 1505 onwards in the West Country, "utilising the best of the newly improved West Country wools from the east of the Allen and Fowey rivers. These kerseys were well spun, woven and fulled" (Kerridge 1985:23). By the early 17th century, imitations of Devonshire kerseys were being passed off in the market, some of which were also known by the name of half-thicks (Kerridge 1985:26).

Even though wool was by far the most common yarn mentioned in the production of kerseys, other materials could be wrought into a kersey weave. By the 1780's examples are known from Lancashire wove from cotton (Montgomery 1984:273), and two runaways were described as wearing kersey wove Virginia cotton clothing. Wingate also adds that kersey can be made "of all wool or with a cotton warp and woolen weft" (1979:327) which would not be an unlikely combination in colonial Virginia.

Represented in the descriptions are three coats, three jackets, two waistcoats, and two breeches. Colors include black and white for a waistcoat, brown for a coat, white for two jackets, and an unspecified color of breeches patched with red.

Knit/net

Knit can include several variations of cloths. Sheridan specifies that knits are woven "without a loom" (1780), but loomed varieties are also known. Hand knitting was accomplished with needles creating an "interlocking series of loops of one or more yarns" (Wingate 1979:333). Most yarns used in knits would have been worsted, made from combing the longer wools before spinning.

Knit fabrics could also be made on a loom. A notice in The Virginia Almanack for the Year 1776 (Dixon and Hunter) concerning a "stocking manufactory" had a "number of frames for weaving hose, breeches, patterns, etc. either in cotton, thread, or worsted." Obviously the product was very similar to loom woven stockings, and was probably finished by hand off the loom.

One description mentions knit used for a jacket. Three more runaways had knit (net) breeches, all of which were black.

Linen

Malachy Postlethwayt wrote, "What linen is needs no definition, it being so well known" (1774). Unfortunately, that is not always entirely correct. The word linen can be used to envelope a wide assortment of fabrics. The period under consideration, we know the term was applied to fabrics beyond that of spun flax. Sheridan (1780) defines linen as "made of linen" or "resembling linen", as well as "cloth made of hemp or flax". To complicate matters slightly more, Postlethwayt (1774) states of linen "there are a variety of sorts, the chief materials of which are cotton, flax and hemp". Rolt (1761) also lists those three fibers as making up linen, adding that it is "a name given to a sort of texture of interwoven threads*. Wadsworth and Mann (1931:115) also note that in "Lancashire, when legislation was desired or when it had to be evaded, it was often convenient... to call cotton goods linen". When these more generic usages of the word linen came into being is important, for many researchers today seem apt to automatically associate the word linen with flax derived cloth.

Another good example of the uncertainties concerning linen are shown by the Hollands of the mid 18th century discussed earlier, which were made partially or entirely of cotton. While Holland was normally a linen, it was also sometimes cotton (Wadsworth and Mann 1931), but retained its name suggestive of linen. Thus, as with cotton,
linen must be examined in context before assigning a fiber content to the fabric in question. In most cases, flax will remain the probable thread employed, but there will be exceptions.

Once the determination has been made that in a document the word linen applies to the "cloth made of flax" (Spence 1775), there are a variety of forms which can be included. Linen ran the gamut from coarse (osnaburgs, sacking, sail cloth) to fine (Hollands and many Irish linens), not to mention those lying somewhere in between.

Linen itself is a very ancient fabric, dating back at least 4,000 years (Legget 1945; Warden 1864; Wingate 1979). From ancient times down to the early 19th century, flax, (primarily from Linum usitatissimum) along with wool, was the staple cloth of most woven textiles.

Up to the period of the American Revolution, most linen in the colonies was imported. Harrower mentions when observing the spinning of linen in Virginia, that "before this year [1775] there was little or no linen made in the Colony", and that what he had seen on October 16th, was the "first of the kind that was made on the plantation" (Harrower 1963:121).

Landon Carter likewise mentions making linen cloth on the plantation in the 1770's. He hires a couple, William Stoughton and his wife, to oversee his hemp and flax affairs in July 1777 (Carter 1965) (also see homespun).

Even during the Revolution, a great deal of linen and other cloth was still being imported to Virginia. The Dutch were notorious for ignoring trade regulations in the West Indies, and supplying the colonies with all sorts of goods from Europe. St. Eustatius was a prime center for such trade, and visitors of the period commented on the wide variety of items, including cloth and ready made clothing, available for trade to the Americans there (Rodney 1789; Schaw [1775] 1935).

The supplies of linen to both England and the American Colonies were to be found all over Europe, and was "chiefly in the hands of the Russians, Germans, Swiss, Flemings, Hollanders, and French" (Postlethwayt 1774). Russia had tremendously large trade in flax cloth, especially from Lower Russia and the regions of Livonia, Estonia, Narva, and the "new conquests" as well as the city of St. Petersburg (Rolt 1761; Postlethwayt 1774).

Germany was best known for osnaburgs production. A great deal of that textile type shows up in early Virginia records. Holland was well known for fine linens, especially bleached linens from Haerlem, although a great deal of unbleached brown Hollands are found among the runaway descriptions. Due to politics, few linens are mentioned in the British records from France, but it would not be unlikely that they reached the colonies through Dutch open ports in the West Indies.

Closer to the ports of England, linen was being manufactured in Ireland and Scotland (Defoe [1724] 1991; Durie 1799; Warden 1864). In the 1760's, Rolt stated the "linen manufacture in Scotland is very considerable; but of late years Ireland has made such improvements in the linen manufacture, that it is now become the staple commodity of the country" (Rolt 1761). Defoe states that Scotland made "a very great quantity" of linen, "and send it to the plantations" ([1724] 1991:332).

Linens were also woven in England proper, but due to difficulties in cultivation, most were made using imported yarn and thread. Russia supplied considerable quantities of linen yarn to England, as did other continental European countries (Warden 1864).

In general linen, as encountered in the runaway descriptions, was probably a plainly woven fabric. While the weights varied considerably, most would run between fine shirt weights, and heavier weights (light canvas weights) used for trousers and breeches. By far the most common item listed in the ads with the word linen were shirts. There are also several references to linen breeches and trousers, as well as a few drawers, neckcloths, jackets, and a hunting shirt. Linen is also listed as a lining material for two items, a hat and a jacket.

The majority of linens that include a color designation use white or brown. Brown linen was also sometimes apparently an interchangeable term for osnaburgs (Carter 1965:444). References to checks and stripes also could be linen, as these were common patterns, especially when using a cotton weft. Color combinations of blues, reds, browns, and white were typical. Linens were occasionally printed with wood blocks and copper plates, even in the 1760's (RDS 1765; Rolt 1761).

Linsey, linsey-woolsey

Linsey was a cloth "made of linen and wool mixed" (Sheridan 1780). The warp used flax, whereas the weft wool. On occasion, cotton could be used in place of flax (Wingate 1979:355) as well as hemp (Kerridge 1985:10). Harrower (1963:137-138) mentions the spinning of wool and cotton in his entry for February 23, 1776, but is not clear if they are to be woven together or separately. In either case, some varieties of Virginia cloth were known to mix the two (McCombs 1976), and the weaving of linsey in America is known to date to the 17th century (Little 1931:19; Montgomery 1984:279).

Linsey was usually considered a "coarse, loosely woven fabric" (AFM 1980:631). It was frequently woven using lower quality wool, but the result was "a strong, warm, cheap cloth, suited to hats, shirts, waistcoats, petticoats, shifts and all sorts of working clothes" (Kerridge 1985:10).

The name "tartan" was often applied to linsey on the Continent (Kerridge 1985:10), but not in reference to
the tartan now associated with Scottish plaids. Whites and blues were common, as well as linsey being "often highly colored" (AFM 1960:631; Wingate 1979:355). Besides solid colors, linsey is known in stripes and mixed colors such as blue and white or blue and red (Perkins 1833).

Five garments utilize linsey in the runaway descriptions. One wore a white fullled linen jacket and breeches. Another had a striped linsey jacket with blue backs, and two were waistcoats of the cloth, one which was constructed of part cloth as well.

Muslin

Muslin, like linen, is an ancient fabric. Wingate states that it was first woven in "Mosul, Mesopotamia, where it derived its name" (1979:405). Montgomery only acknowledges the later appearance of muslin in India, where she states the "fine cotton textile [was] first made" (1984:304).

Regardless, muslin was certainly a major commodity imported by Britain from India via the East India Company from the 17th century onwards. By the 1690's at least 25 varieties were being imported to England (Montgomery 1984:304). By 1700, imitations of the Indian cloth were being woven in Paisley, Scotland (Wingate 1979:405). In the 1720's it was noted that "A few years ago the India company brought over a fine parcel of fine cotton yarn, which was bought by some weavers of London, with which they made as good muslinage as any made in India of that sort of yame" (Elias Barnes quoted in Wadsworth and Mann 1931:122).

In 1764, Joseph Shaw of Lancashire, a seat of English cotton manufacture, attempted to produce muslins, "but he could not get handspun yarn cheap enough to compete with Indian muslin" and the effort did not progress sufficiently until the 1780's when better spinning techniques were developed (Wadsworth and Mann 1931:176).

By the 1st half of the 18th century, serious attempts at completely domestic production were being attempted in Scotland. Defoe wrote in 1724 that they were there made "so good and so fine, that great quantities of them are sent to England... and many of them are sent to the British plantations" (1991:332). In Glasgow "considerable quantities" of muslin from domestically spun cotton were being made, but chiefly confined to handkerchiefs (Wadsworth and Mann 1931:176), to which Defoe adds aprons as well. Most manufacturers, however, were still tied to imported yarns for muslin weaving, and even then were hard pressed to beat the prices offered from India.

The domestic production of muslin was so low that Rolt defined the cloth as being "brought from the East Indies" (1761), with no mention of home pieces at all. Muslins were common in the export trade, and frequently made their way to the colonies, after appropriate tariffs had been paid to Britain. This formality was often bypassed though, and muslins were "daily smuggled from Holland and France" into Great Britain and her colonies (Rolt 1761).

Rolt (1761), Spence (1775), and Sheridan (1780) all define muslin as a fine cloth made of cotton. Wingate (1979:405) explains that muslins include "a wide range of quality and weight, which varies from lightweight to sheers to heavyweight sheetings, and may be given a great variety of finishes". Montgomery quotes a 17th century traveller as saying those muslins from Calcutta were "made so fine you can hardly feel them in your hand, and the thread, when spun, is scarce discernable" (1984:304), but that is not to say most muslins were so fine. Most were more sturdy grades akin to calico and sheetings, but not so coarse as the utility muslin available today in the United States.

Muslin, as a cotton, was easily dyed, but often supplied in the natural or a bleached state. They were also subject to printing, as well as being woven in stripes and checks (Montgomery 1984:304-306). Defoe comments that those made in Scotland were "generally strip’d" (1724) 1991:332).

Only two runaways are noted as owning muslin apparel. One man had two muslin shirts, marked with his initials I.W. (John White) in black silk (VG, Rind, July 7, 1774). The other had a neckcloth of muslin. Both articles were probably white, although neither description mentioned a color.

Nankeen, Nankin

Nankeen was originally a plain weave cotton cloth imported from China. It was woven from fibers of Gossypium religiosum (Wingate 1979:407-8), which had a natural tint to the cotton, producing a yellowish garment. In the late 18th century, a British Ambassadorial expedition sent to China by King George III took note of the area known for Nankeens as it passed;

The land in this neighborhood [Kiang-nan] was chiefly cultivated with that particular species or variety of the cotton shrub that produces the cloth usually called Nankeens in Europe. The down enveloping the seed, constitutes what, in the language of the trade, is called cotton wool, which is of a white colour in the common plant; but in that growing in the province of Kiang-nan, of which the city of Nan-kin is the capital, the down is of the same yellow tinge which it preserves when spun and woven into cloth. The colour, as well as the superior quality of this substance, in Kiang-nan, was supposed to be owing to the particular nature of the soil; and it is asserted, that the seeds of the nankeen cotton degenerate in both particulars when transplanted to another province, however little different in its climate (Staunton 1799(2):172).

Another source which mentions the unique cotton used for Nankeen comes from a Chinese work. In an 1821 translation of Kuen-Fang-Poo (no date given), the cotton is referred to as "of a dusky yellow colour" and that the
"wool thereof is very fine" (Staunton 1821:252). The un-named Chinese author goes on to state that in China "the cloth made from this species of cotton is not showy or inviting in its appearance, and is mostly worn by students and retired persons" (Staunton 1821:252).

Apparently more popular in the West than in China, Nankeens were reproduced by Europeans. Imitation nankeens "were made in France and dyed yellow to match the natural color of Nankeen cotton" as well as "in both France and England, with stripes" (Wingate 1979:407). By the mid 1700's, a cloth sold as Nankeen was being manufactured "in the Manchester area... made of ordinary cotton dyed yellow" (Montgomery 1984:308). By the 1830's attempts were made at growing Gossypium religiosum (a yellow cotton variety) in India and the United States, but with little success (Baines 1835:31). Staunton (1799) and the Chinese author (Staunton 1821) both agreed the plant only fared well in its native environment and soil.

Montgomery mentions that other cotton cloths exported from Canton, China, were also sometimes called Nankeen (1984:308). Those, she said, could be dyed, and of yellow, white, deep blue, or black (1984:308).

Unfortunately, Montgomery does not mention a time period when this may have occurred. Staunton (1799:215) did observe that "adjoining to the fields of [white] cotton, are others cultivated with indigo, with whose blue dye, the cloths used for the common people are generally coloured throughout the empire", but he also never referred to any cloth other than the natural yellow as Nankeen. While the term Nankeen is used for cotton cloth made in Europe and even Virginia, it is most probable that in this period they were usually in shades of yellow, in imitation of the true nankeen of China.

Rolt (1761) mentions that around mid century "nankeens were sold for 6s 6d per piece" but the price had risen to as "high as 10s 6d and very bad. The smugglers from Amsterdam and Rotterdam deliver them in London at 10s. and a much better commodity".

A total of nine runwayes were described as having nankeen when they left. Eleven clothing articles were divided among the nine, including eight pairs of breeches, two waistcoats, and one coat. The coat and one of the pairs of breeches were worn by a single man, and were said to be "Virginia nankeen" (VG, D&H, July 29, 1776:7). In all likelihood, this referred to a cotton cloth grown and woven in Virginia, and dyed of a yellow tint similar to that of Chinese nankeen, although there were attempts at growing naturally tinted cloths in Virginia as well.

John Harrower mentions receiving two pairs of breeches from Mrs. Porter "having been vary little wore by Mr. Porter" in Fredericksburg (1969:97). Later he says the breeches were nankeen, and he used them for his summer wear (Harrower [April 23, 1776] 1969:148). Cloths were often felt to be better suited to the hot Virginia climate, as Thomas Anburey put it, "The weather being so extremely hot, woolen cloths are insufferable, therefore from necessity, and as is the custom of the country, the officers wear cotton habiliments" ([1779] 1789:426-427).

Negro cotton, negro cloth

The interpretation offered by Baumgarten for negro cotton is a sort of woolen textile (1988:62).

Montgomery avoids mention of fiber content, simply stating it to be a "coarse homespun fabric used for clothing slaves in the West Indies and the southern colonies. Inexpensive grades of cloth were also imported for the same purpose" (1984:309). A later example (circa 1860) labeled "niger cloth" Montgomery cites, is woven of cotton, and "may have developed from the coarser, homespun negro cloth" (1984:309).

Contemporary British sources, such as Rolt (1761), Mortimer (1766), Postlethwayt (1774), Spence (1775), and Sheridan (1780) did not use the term. Wingate, however, offers that negro cloth was a "coarse hemp cloth, often containing cotton, imported from England by the American colonists in the 17th and 18th centuries" (1979:412). She later adds that when American mills made the cloth in the 19th century, sometimes coarse wool was used for filling (Wingate 1979:412).

The evidence for negro cotton as a woolen, however, comes from many sources. Orders placed with a Virginia merchant (Mason 1937) reveal much raw cloth made of wool was ordered for use by slaves, although the term "negro cotton" is not used. James Carter ordered 100 Yds Welch Cotton for Negroes on his invoice of January 1771 (Mason 1937:151). Another planter ordered "Welch Plaines and Osnabrigs" for "Negroes Cloths" in the same year (Mason 1937:156-157). Lord Dummore ordered 150 yards of blue plains and 12 pieces of osnaburg for his slaves in 1773 (Mason 1937:300). It is of interest to note, however, that none of the orders used the term "negro cotton" and all referred to the cottoned woolens they were ordering with modifiers such as Welch, Kendal, or Plains.

Holroyd (1783) likewise places Kendal and Welch under woolens intended for slaves. At the end of the American Revolution, he indicates Kendals had previously sold for 12 to 16 pence per yard, and were primarily the produce of Westmoreland, England (Holroyd 1783:9, 2nd edition). Welch plains and flannels, also grouped under woolens "Principally for slaves", were mostly from Shrewsbury, and could be had at 16 to 20 pence per yard (1783:9, 2nd edition).

Evidence can also be found to support claims of negro cotton as more than just woolens. Landon Carter, for instance, has his daughter "Lucy... lay out about 1,500 pounds tobacco in Blare's store for linen and cotton for [his] people" in 1770 (Carter 1965:443). The specific context, and other passages in his diary, would suggest these were not
woolens.

In numerous entries in his journals, Carter also mentions home spinning of cloth, much of which will be used by slaves. A large portion of this is flax and some cotton, which, when woven up, may well have been deemed in the category of negro cloth. John Harrower also makes numerous mention of weaving cloth of cotton and flax on the plantation for use by the slaves (Harrower 1963). In October: of 1775, for instance, he writes that "John McDearmen Warped 21 Yds. [flax] cloth for the Nigers" (1963:123). What the term "negro cotton" or "negro cloth" may be then is not a designation defining fiber material so much as one denoting use and quality.

The terms negro cotton and negro cloth probably applied to a variety of cloths using a variety of fibers. McCombs (1976) notes that Virginia cloth was woven with cotton, flax, and wool in various blends or alone, and it is likely much of the negro cotton was likewise lumped together under a more generic term. Thus, negro cotton may be a wool or a blend of fibers including cotton, flax, and/or wool, but probably signifies a type or quality of weave as often as any meaning of yarn type. When documents can be found, such as those denoting Welsh cottons were acquired, or that homespun linen and cotton was issued, then more specific designations can be made. When the term appears alone, however, context again will likely provide the best clue as to the exact nature of the fabric. Although before and immediately after the American Revolution negro cotton may be most likely a form of inexpensive imported wool, during that period, the increased reliance on home processed flax and cotton as well as wool should not be overlooked.

Yet another possibility of interpretation for the term negro cotton is offered by Wingate. She states negro cotton was sometimes used to denote cotton grown by Africans and imported (Wingate 1979:412). This may possibly be extended to mean cotton grown by slaves in the colonies for their own use or for sale, as was often allowed as a free time activity. It seems unlikely, however, that usage would be applied in the runaway descriptions unless it was obtained from slaves.

Four runaways wore some form of negro cotton. One wore a white jacket, white waistcoat, and trousers of the material. This suit probably was either undyed wool or cotton, or a mix. A second man had a coat, and a third breeches of negro cotton. The last individual was simply stated as being clothed in negro cotton, with no further description. That may be evidence that the fabric was distinctive enough in quality or appearance, regardless of fiber content, to be generally known by the seeker's fellow Virginians as negro cloth. If the term merely indicated a form of wool cloth alone, it would not likely provide sufficient descriptive power to distinguish it from the many other types of wools of similar coarse quality then available.

Osnaburg, osnabrig, oznabrug, oznabrig

Osnaburg is a common fabric in the Virginia Gazette descriptions, most notably for shirts. It was named after the town in Germany from whence the material is said to have originated, Osnabrück (Montgomery 1984:312; Wingate 1979:428). While Wingate states that the "original cloths (in Germany) often were yarn dyed in blue and white and brown and white stripes, checks and solid colors" (1979:428), Montgomery suggests this as a 19th century occurence, accompanied by a switch to cotton for the fabric (1984:312). McCombs, on the other hand, states that by the mid 1700's, osnaburg could refer to many "roughly-spun and woven cloths, whether cotton, cotton and linen, or cotton and hemp" (1976:24). Most osnaburg seen in the American colonies, however, is generally attributed in the literature to the more common, variety made from unbleached, undyed, naturally brown coarse linen or hemp cloth.

A very large amount of osnaburg was being imported annually into Virginia. Although attempts at domestic production using Virginia hamps were undertaken in the 1760's, Governour Fauquier said, "I believe that Scheme is quite at end on their discovering that they could import them much cheaper than they could make them" (Fauquier 1983:1409-1410).

While much of the cloth was still woven in Germany and on the Continent, Britain also produced a sizeable share which made its way to Virginia. Lucy Carter, Colonel Landon Carter's daughter, for instance, brought home "2 pieces British Osnabrigg" on November 15, 1770 (Carter 1965:524). Most imports came through British ports prior to the Revolution. Merchant records of John Norton & Sons show that many customers ordered and received osnaburgs in Virginia in the 1770's, and that much of it went for clothing of their workers, both slave and servant (Mason 1937).

After hostilities began, much osnaburg was still finding its way to Virginia, both from British sources and foreign traders. Dutch West Indian ports were notorious for supplying such items to the rebellious colonies. In addition, a great deal of the cloth seems to have been manufactured in the colonies by the mid and late 1770's, as evidenced in journals such as Harrower's and Carter's.

Osnaburg was generally a coarse plain weave of linen. Tow (low grade linen) was often incorporated, as was hemp, and later, low quality cotton. Often the fibers were not well cleaned, and the resulting fabric could be quite irritating to the skin until worn and washed many times. Slaves in the 19th century recalled the cloth's harshness.

George White, an aged ex-slave interviewed in the 1930, said of osnaburg that "Dat ole nigger-cloth was juss' like needles when it was new. Never did have to scratch our back. Jus' wiggle yo' shoulders an' yo' back was scratched" (Writers' Program 1940:72). Likewise Booker T. Washington recalled how his older brother would wear new osnaburg shirts for him, to break them in and thus spare the back of his younger sibling (in McCombs 1979:25). This
lack of quality and care in removing stray pieces of straw and flax helped keep most osnaburgs very cheap.

Persian

Only one mention of Persian appears in the descriptions. John Williams ran wearing a "rackoon" hat lined with green Persian (VG, Purdie, August 4, 1775:3). Fittingly, Persian is defined as a "thin plain silk, principally used for linings" (Montgomery 1984:321) in items such as bonnets and hoods, as well as other apparel (Kerridge 1985:130).

Persia produced fine silks, from where the name derived. Most was imported to Europe through Turkey, and hence was occasional classed among Turkey Silks, which were all raw (Chambers 1752). According to Rolt, Persian silk was commonly mixed with cotton, goat, or camel's hair (Rolt 1761). Persian silks, however, did not necessarily come from Persia. Due to the prestige of Persian made silk, British manufacturers commonly named their own versions "Persian" in order to capture the market the imported product had built by using the same name (Montgomery 1984:321).

With both imports arriving and domestic silks being made in England, from where John Williams' hat lining came cannot be determined. It might be noted, however, that "wrought silks, and other manufactures of Persia... are not to be worn in this kingdom", according to acts of George II and William III (Postlethways 1774), although such acts were notoriously hard to enforce or obeyed with diligence. Thus, while true persians were expensive, it is feasible his hat utilized some, just as it is possible it came from a weaver in Britain.

Plaid, Plaiding

When Daniel Defoe travelled through Scotland in the 1720's, he described "plaiding" as "a stuff cross-strip'd with yellow and red, and other mixtures for the plaids or vails, which the ladies in Scotland wear, and which is a habit peculiar to the country" (Defoe 1724:191:332). Rolt said plaid was "a chequered serge manufactured in Scotland" (1761). Sheridan defined plaid as a "striped or variegated cloth, an outer loose garment worn much by the Highlanders of Scotland" (1780). Montgomery calls plaid a "swill or plain woven cloth with a pattern of intersecting stripes in both the warp and weft" (1984:325). In the Holker manuscript, circa 1750, a worsted "Scotch Plaid" is preserved which fits this definition of the term (Montgomery 1984 Plate D-32). Holroyd places Scotch plaiding in with woollens "Principally for slaves", and prices it at 6 to 7 pence per yard (1783:9, 2nd edition).

Although plaid today implies a tartan type design, it also had another meaning in the 18th century. Beyond signifying a tartan looking weave, "plaid" could imply more simply an "inexpensive woolen textile, not necessarily patterned, made in Scotland" (Bauergarten 1988:64).

Indeed, plaid could come in solid colors as well as tartan patterns, as the runway descriptions exemplify. A total of eight garments with plaid of some form are described. Of those, four are lined with (unspecified) plaid, including three jackets and a coat. One additional jacket and a pair of breeches are lined with white plaid. A green waistcoat has plaid sleeves (lined with osnaburg), and one jacket is made entirely of white plaid.

The garments were worn by men coming from four countries. Three were from England, two from Scotland, and one each from Ireland and Virginia. Those from Scotland, where tartans were most common, wore the garments lined with plaid not specified as white. Whether or not they represented a tartan form of plaid cannot be verified, but the plaids not specified as white may have either plain or tartan varieties.

One runway not included in the above discussion was described as wearing a gray jacket with striped plaiding lining. Plaiding is defined by Wingate as an "obsolete English kersey" (1979:460), and may have no relation to plaid at all. On the other hand, the description as "striped" may indicate in this was in fact a tartan type plaid.

Plains, Welsh plains, Welsh cotton

Plains is a term used somewhat generically to refer to a variety of "plainly woven cloth[s], generally of wool" (McCombs 1976:141). Much fabric of this sort was woven in Wales, and it is not uncommon to encounter the term Welsh plains or Welsh cotton. Butterworth (1823), however, states Welsh cotton was a product of Shrewsbury, and could be classed into both friezes and plains. Montgomery specifically defines Welsh cotton as a "loosely woven woolen cloth resembling flannel" (1984:373). Wingate defines Welsh flannel similar to Montgomery's cotton, saying it was a "loosely woven, slightly fulled flannel originally with worsted warp and woolen filling" (1979:667).

The appearance of plains for runways occurs in three ads. One is a lead colored coat and jacket of Welsh plains, another a white Welsh cotton coat with a falling collar and short skirts, and the third a jacket of white plains.

Plush

Plush, which appears very much like a velvet, is fairly thoroughly described by Chambers in his Cyclopædia of 1752;

A kind of stuff having a sort of velvet knap or shag on one side; composed regularly of a wool of a single woolen thread, and a double warp, the one wool, of two threads twisted, the other goats or camels hair; tho' there are also some plusses entirely of worsted, and others composed wholly of hair.
Plush is manufactured like velvet, on a loom with three treadles. Two of these separate and depress the woollen warp, and the third raises the hair-warp; upon which the workman throwing the shuttle passes the woof between the woollen and hair-warp; and, afterwards, laying a brass broach, or needle, under that of the hair, he cuts it thereon with a knife destined for that use, conducting the knife on the broach, which is made a little hollow, all its length; and this gives the surface of the plush an appearance of velvet (Chambers Vol 2, 1752).

Plush is closely related to shag, and defined as such by Sheridan who wrote it was a "kind of villous or shaggy cloth, shag" (1780). Spence likewise called it a "kind of shaggy cloth" (1775). Rolt, as Chambers, noted that plush could be "partly made of wool, and partly of goats hair" or "sometimes of hemp and goat hair" and "sometimes entirely of silk" (Rolt 1761).

The origin of plush was not known for certain when Chambers wrote, but he did offer that "some ascribe the invention... to the English" but that others attributed it to Haerlem, Holland (Chambers 1752). In any case, Chambers stated the "French are the people who make the most of it" (1752), and they did in fact produce a great quantity of plush (Kerridge 1985; Montgomery 1984).

Seven runaways took articles made of plush with them. One was not a clothing article, but a blue plush shot bag. Of the remaining six, five men wore breeches made of the fabric, and one a jacket. Colors mentioned included one pair of blue and one pair of black breeches, and three pairs of red plush breeches. The jacket was described as old, but no color was stated.

Poplin In the 18th century poplin was a fabric made of a silk warp and a worsted weave (Kerridge 1985:85). The silk was manipulated in such a manner that it covered the worsted on the face, and gave it a fine finish. Poplin was woven under that name in "Stepney by 1714 and in Canterbury by 1719" (Kerridge 1985:85), but forms are known from the 17th century in the Norwich area (Kerridge 1985:85). Poplin was usually woven in a plain weave, but so as to create fine cross ribs (Wingate 1979:473). Colors varied widely, frequently employing two colors on a piece (see Montgomery 1984:327 and Plate D-9) which often resulted in a mottled type effect. Spanish poplin was especially known for multi-color effect (Kerridge 1985:85).

The single appearance of poplin for a runaway was that of Thomas Scott, a Scottish convict, who had been a tailor. He stole a "red Poplin waistcoat (cut out but not yet sewn up)" (VG, P&D, July 28, 1774:3).

Rolls, rolled
Rolls is defined by Montgomery as "a cloth traditionally rolled rather than folded" (Montgomery 1984:333). It consisted of coarse linen, and was commonly associated with being brown, suggesting it was unleached (Baumgarten 1988:35; Montgomery 1984:333). Merchants records of John Norton in London also refer to rolls sent to Virginia as sometimes being of hemp. One such record dated October 1773, for Thomas Everard, listed "3 ps. Oznabs. and 2 ps. Hempen Roles" (Mason 1937:354).

In yet another letter, John Robinson of York County informs John Norton in London that "I have observed the Oznabgs and brown Rolls you have sent us to be very bad" (letter dated January 15, 1770, Mason 1937:119). That rolls was similar to oznabgs becomes evident in its placement in ads and invoices of shipments, such as that of Everard's and Robinson's. Numerous entries for rolls place it along with oznabgs and similar coarse cloths.

One mention of rolls appears in Norton's records relating the cloth to servants. In August 1768, George Wythe, of Williamsburg, inquired about "two pieces... of rolls for servants" to Norton in London (Mason 1937:58). Another letter in Norton's correspondences suggests the cloth was considered for summer wear. Rolls received by June were "too late to be sold this season, the Planters being chiefly supply'd before my Goods arrived" (Will Anderson to John Norton, June 20, 1771, Mason 1937:161).

In the Virginia Gazette descriptions, rolls appears for four men, all of whom wore trousers of the cloth. Three ran together, and the trousers and other clothes they wore appear to have been issued by their master. None of the rolls mentioned specified a color, but it seems likely they were of the brown, unleached variety.

Russa drab, Russia drill, Russia linen, Russia sheeting
The term Russia used to modify a fabric occurs several times throughout the Virginia Gazette. While geographic names frequently are used in connection with a textile, they only sporadically indicate actual place of manufacture. They frequently allude to the place of a cloth's invention, major production centers, or even a type of weave. In the case of Russia goods, it seems many references were in fact to the place of manufacture, or at least the origin of the imported yarns used to weave the cloth. A great deal of flax and hemp products were imported to the Americas from the Russian states (Holroyd 1783:22).

Parts of Russia, especially Livonia, Estonia, Narva, and Lower Russia were famous for their flax and hemp by the mid 18th century (Mortimer 1766; Postlethwayt 1774; Rolt 1761). Russian linen, "properly so called"
(Postlethway 1774; Rolt 1761) came from this area. Significant quantities of Russian cloths of linen, hemp, cotton, wool, and mixes were made or processed through St. Petersburg (Rolt 1761; Warden 1864), and ended up in British markets under the name of Russia. Nicholas Cresswell alludes to some of this trade when discussing hemp he had seen in Virginia, commenting that domestic production "would be a means of saving large sums we pay to Russians annually for this article, among ourselves" (Cresswell [April 13, 1775] 1924:198). Nevertheless, the use of the term was probably somewhat more encompassing, and applied to imported fabrics from a number of European sources.

Although documents tell us that Russia was a major producer of flax based cloths, it may also be that a large percentage of cloths modified by Russia were in fact hemp. J.B. Holroyd, the Earl of Sheffield, for example, flatly stated that "Russia sheeting is made of hemp" (1783:17). Unfortunately, he does not discuss that possibility with other Russia cloths.

While it may be that the use of the term could have been to denote fibers or even styles of weave rather than origin for the Russia's encountered in the runaway descriptions, it is not possible to ascertain with certainty which is the case. As specific definitions to the various Russia cloths (other than Russia linen and sheeting) were not to be found, each type should be examined in view of the entry for the fabric type the word is used with.

Twelve runaways wore some form of cloth modified by the word Russia. These cloths include Russia drab, Russia drill, and Russia sheeting. For drill, there are seven pairs of breeches, and one coat and waistcoat mentioned, along with the colors dark and white. For drab there are four pairs of breeches, two of which are white. Russia sheeting makes up four brown shirts, owned by two men who left the same master together. One pair of black breeches may also have been of Russia drab, but the entry was not specific enough to state so with certainty.

Sacking

Sacking was usually applied to cloth used for packing sacks (Sheridan 1780; Spence 1774). It was also used (or reused) for clothing items. Most sacking was unbleached linen, woven from fairly coarse yarns of flax or hemp, and for most purposes can be classed as coarse osnaburg.

The use of sacking for clothing among the lower social strata is documented both among the runaway servants, and for slaves. Sacking was frequently used for patching clothes, and the appropriation of the container was not always approved of by the master. George Washington was informed by Anthony Whitting that several sacks had been purloined by the slaves. To prevent their future use of the material, he suggested that "Coarse Sacking of European Manufacture (which a Negro could not mend his Cloaths with without discovery)" be marked inside and out (correspondence of 1792 quoted in Baumgarten 1988:44).

The sole runaway noted as wearing sacking was Francis Matthews, an Irish convict, who ran from an iron works in Maryland (VC, Pinkerley, September 21, 1775:3). Matthews left wearing a pair of sacking trousers.

While sacking could also be referred to as sack cloth, it was generally finer than "sackcloth", which was a very coarse variety of fabric akin to modern burlap. Sacking came in a variety of coarse and finer weaves, but probably that used in clothing was fine enough for packing produce such as grain, and, as Washington's slaves show, similar to coarse rolls or osnaburghs already being worn.

Sagathy, sagathy, sagathree

Sagathy was "a slight woollen stuff; being a kind of serge, or rateen; sometimes mixed with a little silk" (Chambers 1752; Rolt 1761). The thin wool was woven "in a four-harness twill" weave (Wingate 1979:519). Frequently the warp was white, and the filling colored (Wingate 1979:519), which gave the resulting fabric a mottled appearance.

Both Chambers and Rolt note that the main manufacture center for sagathy was Amiens, France (Chambers 1752; Rolt 1761), but it was also woven "in some parts of England" (Rolt 1761). Kerridge (1985:88) notes such production in at least "Tauton and Tiverton in the mid-eighteenth century", and likely Norwich and London as well.

Five individuals wore sagathy in some form. Two had coats of the cloth, one a jacket, one a waistcoat, and the last a pair of breeches. Colors mentioned were "light" for one coat and the waistcoat. The jacket was blue, and the breeches described as deep blue. Both "light" garments could well have been woven with a white ground, and some other light color for the filling. Preserved deep blue swatches of sagathy dated to 1760 are to be found in the Moccasin manuscript (Montgomery 1984:337).

Serge, German serge

Serge comes in a variety of kinds, denominated either from the different qualities thereof, or from the place where they are wrought. Examples of the latter include serg de Florence, serge de Nimes, and, in the case of the two runaways wearing it, German serge (one coat and one pair of gray breeches).

German serge is defined by Wingate as "a fabric made with a worsted warp and a woolen filling" (1979:264). German serge was a serge which utilized a "worsted warp and a woolen filling" (Wingate 1979:264). A wide range of serges have been produced over the centuries, and a good deal originated in Germanic regions of
Europe, from whence the name probably derived. Nonetheless, in the 18th century, the German serges likely to show up in colonial America were a product of England as well as the continent. At least some manufactory were located in the western part of the country, such as those noted in Devizes by Samuel Fisher in 1767 (Montgomery 1984:344). Other areas well known for serge production may also have produced German weaves, Norwich and East Norfolk, as well as several textile centers on the Continent (Kerridge 1985:6-8).

Spence (1775) and Sheridan (1780) offer little help in a definition of serge in general. Both define it simply as "a kind of cloth". More helpful was Chambers, who wrote that serge could be defined as "a woollen quilted stuff, manufactured on a loom with four treddles, after the manner of rateens; and other stuffs, that have the whale" (Chambers 1752). A "whale" referred to the effect caused in the weaving, which Wingate states to be a "diagonal wave that crosses from the lower left to the upper right of the selvage on the right side of the fabric; made with a two up, two down twill in which two warp yarns pass over one filling yarn, and the next two warp yarns pass under the same filling yarn" (1979:542).

Serge could be made of all worsted yarns, but silk "serges were not uncommon" (Kerridge 1985:7). Some were also woven with a silk warp and woolen weft. Linen warps were also sometimes employed. The warp of a serge was "single and inconspicuous" (Kerridge 1985:7).

Shag

Shag was, as the name suggests, a woolen cloth which had an appearance similar to "rough hair" (Spence 1775), and resembled plush in many aspects, but with a longer pile and not as closely woven (Kerridge 1985:78-79). Shag was a "heavy worsted material with a long nap, related to duffel, coating, and blanket" (Montgomery 1984:345). Rather than merely being related to duffel, Kerridge classes shag as a duffel which had the "nap raised high and left shaggy; it was broadcloth with its shag unshorn" (Kerridge 1985:32).

In addition, a Yorkshire pattern book of circa 1770 has "hair shags" samples which are classed as "close-cropped worsted velvets" (Montgomery 1984:346). Shag made of worsted and hair were woven in Spitalfields by the early 18th century, and yet another form of shag was made using a wool and flax mixture in England (Wingate 1979:546).

Only one runaway wore shag in the advertisements of 1774-1778. Isaac Geding of Williamsburg, ran on Monday, February 12, 1775 wearing "a pair of light coloured Worsted Shag Breeches, with metal buttons" (VG, D&H, March 4, 1775).

Another reference from Williamsburg in the period was also recorded by John Norton in his accounts. The Virginia Governor, Lord Dunmore, ordered in June of 1773 "1 Piece of Green Shag" and 1 Do. Blue do." for his "foot-Men" (Mason 1937:330). Although the Geding's shag breeches were only described as "light", shags are known in a wide range of colors, as well as stripes (Montgomery 1984:346).

Shalloon

Shalloon was principally used for lining material (Baumgarten, personal communication; Kerridge 1985; Montgomery 1984; Wingate 1979). The single occurrence in the study follows this usage, being a white shalloon used to line an old blue coat (VG, D&H, January 7, 1775). Although the example here was white, shalloons in the Yorkshire pattern book of circa 1770 came in a variety of colors (Montgomery 1984:346).

Shalloon was an inexpensive "slight woollen stuff" (Sheridan 1780) of "twilled worsted fabric with a single warp" (Wingate 1979:547). The twill was woven in a "two up, two down" weave (Wingate 1979:547), and used "fine [jersey] yarns" (Kerridge 1985:63). After weaving, the fabric was "often glazed and hot-pressed to a smooth finish" suitable for use as lining material (Kerridge 1985:63). Such well finished shalloon linings can be seen in a coat (1953-59) preserved in the Dewitt-Wallace Gallery in Williamsburg, Virginia.

Shalloons were chiefly products of France and England (Wingate 1979:547). In England, manufacture was centered in the towns of "Newport, Ringwood, Romsey, Alton, Andover, Whitechurch, Basingstoke, Christchurch, Newbury, and Reading throughout most of the eighteenth century" (Kerridge 1985:64). There is no evidence that shalloons were produced in the colonies before the Revolution, due to the technological requirements (Baumgarten 1995, personal communication).

Sheeting

Sheeting was a form of linen (see linen), although could also be woven using hemp. It was generally a plain weave (Wingate 1979:550), and was probably of slightly coarser yarn than normal shirt linen, but perhaps not so coarse as some osnaburgs (see osnaburgs). Holroyd (1783:17) defines Russia sheeting as a product made using hemp rather than flax, while at the same time asserting that Irish sheeting was always of flax.

A total of six garments, all shirts, are described as sheeting. Four are Russia sheeting shirts, and the other two simply described as "sheeting" shirts. Two of the Russia sheeting shirts were not specified as to color, but the four remaining shirts were all said to be brown. The two unspecified Russia sheeting shirts were likely brown as well.
Silk

Silk is a very ancient cloth. In the 18th century Rolt succinctly defined silk as "a very soft, fine, delicate thread; the work of an insect, called bombyx [Bombyx mori], or the silk worm" (1761). Sheridan extends this to the cloth as well, saying "the stuff made of the worms thread", as well as the thread of the "worm that turns afterwards to a butterfly" (1780).

The majority of items described in the running ads of silk are handkerchiefs. Six men had black silk handkerchiefs, two carried red and white ones, one had a "sunny coloured" silk handkerchief, and two more carried unspecified handkerchiefs of silk. In addition, at least two descriptions mentioned stockings of the material.

John Harrower mentioned silk several times in his journal while indentured to Colonel Dairgerfield in Virginia. Among other items, he records buying black silk handkerchiefs, and receiving "two silk Vestscoats... having been very little worn by Mr. Porter" of Fredericksburg (Harrower [May 21, 1775] 1963:97).

Silk cotton

Silk cotton was typically referred to as East India silk. Rolt said of East India silk:

That particularly called so, is not the work of the silk worms, but comes from a plant that produces it, in pods, much like those of the cotton tree. The matter this pod contains is extremely white, fine, and moderately glossy: it spins easily, and is made into a kind of silk, that enters the manufacture of several Indian and Chinese stuffs (Rolt 1761).

The "cotton tree" that Rolt mentioned, was probably a member of the Bombacaceae family, known for producing fibers which are "straight and smooth" (Wingate 1979:558). Unlike Rolt, however, Wingate states the fiber is difficult to spin, due to the "straightness and short fiber" (1979:558).

The single reference to silk cotton in the Virginia Gazette advertisements was for a "red and yellow silk cotton waistcoat" (VG, Purdie, June 30, 1775:2).

Stuff

The term "stuff" was often used, apparently, as a generic term for fabric by many advertisers in the Virginia Gazette. Many also used it in conjunction with a modifier, such as "silk stuff". It also frequently appears in conjunction with descriptions of fabrics of all materials, such as those in the period dictionaries (for example a "type of cotton stuff"). Nonetheless, Rothstein offers that the term was also used on occasion to "exclusively for worsted", as well as "to denote a woollen as opposed to a silk fabric" (1987:205). Even so, in Barbara Johnson’s scrapbook, "Irish stuff" is used to denote a "pure silk" fabric, as well as some printed worsted (Rothstein 1987:205).

Swanskin

Swanskin was an "English fabric made with worsted warp and woolen filling" (Wingate 1979:595). Kertridge defines swanskin baize as a "closely woven twill with lambs' wool wefts" and states it "was sometimes classified as a flannel" (Kertridge 1985:106). Montgomery states swanskin was "a fine woolen cloth of plain weave related to flannel and bay" (Montgomery 1984:354). She also adds that in "the late 18th century, the name swanskin, or swansdown, was also given to a fleecy cotton cloth" (Montgomery 1984:354).

One convict servant, from near Snoden’s Iron Works in Prince George County, Maryland, wore swanskin. Francis Matthews left his master wearing a "short old swanskin jacket" (VG, Pinkney, September 21, 1775:3).

Thickset

Thickset was usually a fusian, made from linen and cotton. Wingate, however, classes thickset as a corduroy (1979:615-616), thereby suggesting more of a cotton content. Although in the 18th century and earlier most thicksets were fusians, samples are known before 1740 of all cotton. They were not always readily available, however, as difficulties in finishing made that type less desirable to produce (Wadsworth and Mann 1931:113). Of two labelled samples in the Holker manuscript (circa 1750), one is a "brown linen/cotton velvet channeled to resemble fine corduroy" and the other "all cotton dyed beige" (Montgomery 1977:218).

The corduroy appearance was achieved by making thicksets as "velvets voided to produce fine cords" (Kertridge 1985:125). One sample made in 1753 in France, noted in Wadsworth and Mann, states the fabric was a copy of English thickset, and "is like a modern corduroy" (1931:114n). Thicksets were also made plain, without the stripes or cords as well (Wadsworth and Mann 1931:174n).

Thicksets were also made with flowered designs. A letter dated March 1738/9, mentions both flowered Thicksets and fine Thicksets which were being finished at Manchester (Wadsworth and Mann 1931:266). Lancashire
was also known for thickset production, as was Southwark for similar textiles (Kerridge 1985:124).

The single runaway who was described with thickset was George Peart, a shoemaker by trade. Peart took with him an "old brown Thickset coat" (VG, D&H, April 29, 1775:4).

Tow

Tow was usually a plain weave, coarse, unbleached linen, made of "flax or hemp dressed" (Spence 1775).

The flax or hemp was prepared by being "beaten and combed into a filamental substance" (Sheridan 1780).

Landon Carter recorded the making of tow in Virginia, when he entered in his journal on July 28, 1777.

"From the swinged flax called generally tow there was a strong good thread fit for bags and sackings; The Heckled from that in the first heckle was a good canvass thread, and soon to 3 or 4 fine heckles" (Carter 1965:1118).

Fourteen runaways had a total of 22 tow clothing items mentioned in their runaway ads. One additional runaway carried a tow sheet and bag. Of the twenty two garments, eleven were shirts, eight trousers, two hunting shirts, and one a pair of leggings.

Velvet

Velvet is a very old textile type, and has changed little over the centuries. It is a "warp pile fabric with short, closely woven cut pile which gives the fabric a rich, soft texture" very much the same as plush (Wingate 1979:652).

Rolt defined velvet in 1761 as

A rich kind of stuff, all silk, covered on the outside with a close, short, fine, soft shag; the other side being very strong close tissue. The nap or shag, called also velveting of this stuff, is formed of part of the threads of the warp, which the worker puts on a long narrow channelled ruler, or needle; and which he afterwards curls, by drawing a steel tool along the channel, to the ends of the warp (Rolt 1761).

Rolt went on to state that the best velvets were made in France, "but the velvet manufacture is now very considerable in England; where also stuffs of this fashion are made to resemble silk" (Rolt 1761). By this Rolt may have been referring to cloth of wool and cotton which could be woven and finished into velvet (Montgomery 1984:370), even though Rolt, as well as Spence (1775) and Sheridan (1780) link velvet most closely with silk.

In the Virginia Gazette, velvet appears for the runaways of 1774-1778 at least eight times. Of those eight occurrences, four were clothing articles made of the fabric, two had velvet supplementing the fabric of a clothing article, and two used it as hat binding material. The four clothing pieces included two black waistcoats (one a stolen "jacket" with leather pockets), a red cape, and a pair of spotted velvet breeches. The two items using velvet as a supplement were a brown surcoat with a velvet cape, and a brown broadcloth coat patched under the arms, with a reddish coloured velvet collar.

Virginia cloth, Virginia cotton, Virginia nankin (See homespun and country cloth also)

Virginia cloth frequently appears in descriptions of runaway servants, slaves, and deserters of the Revolutionary period. The manufacture of domestic cloth was often encouraged by various local patriotic and legislative bodies, especially after enforcement of the Navigation Acts after 1763, and the various tax acts of the 1760's.

Virginia cloth, then, denotes a fabric manufactured in Virginia, to contrast or distinguish it from imported fabric. It is possible, however, that the term was used on some occasions to denote cloth woven in England for the Virginia trade (Wingate 1979:656), but this is by no means suggested in any of the documents used for this study.

Cloth manufacture in Virginia extends well back into the 17th century. By the 1750's, it was certainly known by the term Virginia cloth, for Reverend Burnaby stated that in his travels of 1759, the inhabitants "make a kind of cotton-cloth, with which they clothe themselves in common, and call it after the name of their country" (Burnaby 1775:12-13).

In the 18th century Virginia cloth "was mainly of cotton, or sometimes, west of the mountains, mixed with a little wool or linen" according to McCombs (1976:24). Even in the eastern regions though, cotton was probably commonly woven in mixes with wool and flax or hemp, and known by the same appellation (Baumgarten 1988:68). One coat, for instance, in the Dewitt-Wallace Gallery formerly thought to be all cotton was found, under subsequent examination, to have thread containing wool spun in with the cotton (Baumgarten 1995, personal communication). This addition probably was done to give the thread greater strength.

Cotton, nonetheless, does seem to be prominent among the fibers mentioned in many records for Virginia cloth. John Harrower, for instance, records via a letter of December 6, 1775, that he paid a slave woman to spin cotton for weaving into "a webb of Cotton Cloath According to my own mind, of which I hope you and my infants shall yet wear apart" (Harrower 1963:76).

Yet another entry of Harrower's notes that two slaves of the plantation spun both cotton and wool for "31
work days in which time they spun 6 lb. of Wool & 8½ lb. Cotton to run nigh five yds. per lb." (Harrower [February 23, 1776] 1963:138). Besides wool and cotton, Harrower also mentions the spinning and weaving of flax numerous times, as do the journals of Landon Carter mentioned previously.

Virginia cloth could be left natural, dyed, or woven with different colored threads to produce checks and stripes. Natural dyes were mentioned in the ads, such as Virginia cooperas. Stripes were common in these domestic cloths as well, quite frequently white or natural backgrounds with blue stripes. John Harrower, for instance, records in his journal he "had 6 Yds. stript Cotton warped" by John McDearman (Harrower [June 14, 1776] 1963:155). For the runaways, at least seven entries were described as striped or cross barred, and another filled with a contrasting color (red). One shirt was described as a check, and several were dyed in various solid colors including blue, "copperas" and a shade of "pale lead".

While a great deal of the cloth could be deemed coarse (Wingate 1979:656), surviving examples show that fine weaves were also produced. The weaves employed could be plain, twilled, or any number of other variations, limited only by the fibers available and the skills and tools of the weaver. At least two runaways had kersey wove Virginia cloth, and one more specified as twilled. Records kept by George Washington of his Virginia cloth manufactory include numerous weaves and qualities (reproduced in Gibbs 1978).

Virginia cloth appears in numerous runaway descriptions. At least seventeen specific clothing articles are mentioned, including coats, coatets, jackets, waistcoats, shirts, and breeches. The cloth also appears as lining material on at least three occasions, and one man carried a wallet of the fabric. One more runaway was described as being dressed in Virginia cloth, but no specifics were offered as to his exact apparel.

Welch cotton, Welsh plains see plains.

Wilton

Wilton appears five times in the runaway descriptions. References to the cloth are vague, but it appears likely to have been a worsted woolen cloth made in Wilton, Wiltshire, England (Montgomery 1984:374). Wilton was famed for its production of marble cloth, which is so named for its imitation of the veins of color found in the stone, and "Wiltons" may have been of that cloth (Mann 1971:60). Regardless of the exact appearance, imitations were being made in America by at least 1765, when it was being "copied in homespun by Rhode Island weavers" (Montgomery 1984:374).

Five clothing items are described as being Wilton. These comprise two coats, both said to be light colored, one dark jacket, and two waistcoats, one of which was mixed with red.

Wool

Wool production ranks among the oldest textile industries in the British empire. By the 1770's, wool production was recorded in "every county of the realm" (Jenkins and Ponting 1982:1).

Wool is defined by Spence in 1775 as the "hair of sheep". Likewise, Sheridan (1780), stated wool to be the "fleece of sheep, that which is woven into cloth; any short thick hair". Rolt adds wool, "when washed, shorn, dressed, combed, spun, and wove, makes several kinds of cloths and stuffs, for apparel and furniture" (1761). Indeed, wool is a fiber which could be woven, knitted, or felted and shows up in each of these forms within the confines of the runaway descriptions. Rolt notes that the wool industry "includes the several sorts of Commodities into which wool is wrought; as broad cloths, long and short kerseys, bays, serges, flannel, pernepences, says, stuffs, frise, shag, penningtons, stockings, caps, blankets, rugs, and the like" (1761).

Wool was generally categorized into either long or short fibers, each of which was better suited to a different processing. Long fibers, up to about four inches in length (Lucock 1805:155), were most suitable for combing. These could then be woven into worsteds, although they could also be used in woolens (Rowley 1956). Short fibers were carded, and wrought into woolen textiles. In the era of the runaway advertisements, these categories were often defined by the terms fine and coarse, "and, generally speaking, the shorter the staple (or length of hair) the finer the wool will be" (Mann 1971:255).

Wool yarns, which could be used for knitting or weaving, were offered a premium in Ireland in the mid 1700's. To qualify the spinner had to meet exacting requirements. The guidelines called for "all whites for Warp to be spun to five skains to the Pound, light Medleys to four and a half, and Dark colours to four and a quarter Skains to the Pound, Oil included; and that all whites for Woof be spun to three and a quarter Skains, and all Medleys to three Skains to the Pound, Oil included" (RDS 1766:5). Although most knitted items appearing in the descriptions are stockings, two black knit breeches and one knit jacket also appear.

Weaves employed on wool are numerous, ranging from plain weaves to very involved processes, resulting in the several wool based textiles previously described, not to mention an assortment never appearing in the advertisements. In addition, many textiles were woven with wool and another fiber.

Numerous works trace the developments of the wool industry throughout the period involved in this study.
and for a more comprehensive view, consultation of those sources will offer an abundance of information (c.f. Jenkins and Ponting 1982; Kerridge 1985; Little 1931; Ramsay 1982; Mann 1971).

Woolens, woolens (also see wool and worsteds)

A woolen is defined as one of many textiles made of yarn which has been carded, as opposed to combed, which uses short-staple wool fibers (Kerridge 1985; Montgomery 1984:375; Wingate 1979:677). The use of shorter fibers in woolens, versus the longer wool fibers employed in worsteds, results in a fabric which "often have more crimp and higher felting qualities" in finishing processes (Wingate 1979:677).

Although woolens included a wide variety of cloth types, Broadcloth was "England's traditional fine woolen manufacture" (Montgomery 1984:375). Other textiles which may fall under the category of woolen include, kersey, half thick, some serges, and some plains (Montgomery 1984:376), to name but a few.

Worsteds (also see wool and woolens)

Spence (1775) simply defines worsted as "thread made of wool", and Sheridan (1780) as a "woolen yarn". Although frequently applied to a fabric made from worsted yarn, "worsted was primarily the name not of a cloth, but of a type of yarn" (Kerridge 1985:8). The yarn was spun from long-staple, combed wool. The process of combing the wool removes short fibers, with "the objective... to produce a rather compact yarn by having the fibers parallel" (Wingate 1979:679). It could be spun in various grades, depending upon the quality and fineness of the wools used in the spinning (Kerridge 1985:8).

Worsteds cloths may include many styles of weave, among which can be types of shalloons, serges, sagathies, duroys, damasks, everlasting, bird’s eye, knits, plains, flannel, swanskin, and plush (in Montgomery 1984:376). Designs could be woven into the cloth by any number of methods, as evidenced by the variety of cloth types which used worsted yarns in their weaving.

Worsted most often appears relating to stockings in the descriptions. Three uses of the yarn are noted for other clothing articles though (as well as for hat binding). The apparel mentioned includes a Virginia cloth waistcoat which used a red worsted cross bar, a pair of breeches of worsted shag, and a pair of drawers in blue worsted.
Appendix G

Shirts

Check shirts
check shirt (21)
check shirt, may have some paint on them (3 examples)
new check shirt (2 examples)

Cotton shirts
new white cotton shirt (2 examples)
new cotton shirt (2 examples)
cotton shirt

Country/ Virginia cotton shirts
new check shirt of Virginia Cotton
country made cotton shirt

Virginia cotton shirt

Country/ Virginia linen shirts
coarse country linen shirt (2 examples)
country linen shirt (5 examples)
old country made linen shirt (2 examples)
homemade flax linen shirt

Virginia osnaburg shirt (2 examples)

Country tow shirts
country tow linen shirt (2 examples)

Country spun shirts
country spun shirt (2 examples)

Crocus shirts
crocus shirt

Holland shirts
delicate Holland shirt
Holland shirt, ruffles on bosom and cuffs, marked IM, (2 examples)
plain Holland shirt [white] marked AC, with numbers below marks (2 examples)
fine Holland shirt ruffled only at bosom, narrow hems on ruffles
Holland shirt [white] (4 examples)

Irish linen shirts
white Irish linen shirt (2 examples)
fine Irish Linen [shirt] much patched
Irish linen shirt (2 examples)

Linen shirts
brown linen shirt (6 examples)
old brown linen shirt
white linen shirt (4 examples)
fine linen shirt marked I.K.
fine linen shirts (2+)

Muslin shirts
muslin shirt marked I.W with black silk
(2 examples)

Osnaburg shirts
osnaburg shirt (43 examples)
Oznabrig shirt, almost new
new Osnabrug shirt (2 examples)
Oznabrig shirt, almost new, died a purple colour

Russia sheeting
brown [shirt] of Russia sheeting (4 examples)

Sail duck shirts
sail duck shirt (2 examples)

Sheeting shirts
brown sheeting shirt (2 examples)

Tow shirts
coarse tow shirt (2 examples)
new tow shirt
old tow shirt
tow shirt (4 examples)
tow linen shirt (2 examples)

Unspecified fabrics
brown shirt (3 examples)
coarse shirt (8+ examples)
shirt (5+ examples)
coarse white shirt
good white shirt (2 examples)
white shirt (20+ examples)
white shirt marked A.S.
old white shirt
ruffled shirts (2+)

fine shirt (5+)
APPENDIX H

NECKWEAR

HANDKERchieFS
Check
check handkerchief (2 examples)
Silk
black silk handkerchief (5 examples)
sutty coloured silk handkerchief
silk handkerchief (2 examples)
red and white silk handkerchief
Striped
country made blue striped handkerchief

NECKCLOTHS
neckcloths [white?] (3 examples)
neckcloth [linen?]
Muslin neckcloth

STOCKS
white stocks (2 examples)
stock and brass stock buckles

IRON COLLARS
Iron collar (2 examples)
APPENDIX I

WAISTCOATS

Bath
Bath coating coat and waistcoat
dark coloured Bath coating waistcoat

Bearskin
Bearskin Coat and waistcoat

Broadcloth
brown coloured broadcloth coat and waistcoat,
much worn
purple broad cloth suit with twist buttons
(assumed waistcoat)
purple broadcloth waistcoat, with gold basket
buttons

Cloth
black cloth waistcoat
suit of black cloth clothes
blue cloth waistcoat
old blue cloth jacket without sleeves
light blue cloth coat and waistcoat
green cloth jacket without sleeves
green cloth waistcoat
lead coloured cloth waistcoat
grey cloth waistcoat
light coloured cloth waistcoat
light mixed cloth waistcoat, with yellow metal
buttons
suit of light [cloth] colour
Violet or purple coloured cloth coat and
waistcoat.
red cloth waistcoat (2 examples)
under waistcoat of brown cloth

Corded cotton
white cotton waistcoat, corded

Cotton mixed
red and yellow silk cotton waistcoat

Cotton
raised cotton waistcoat

Cotton and linen
blue and white broad striped cotton and thread
under jacket
cotton and linen almost white

Damask
Damask waistcoat

Dimity
white dimity waistcoat

Drab
gray drab waistcoat

Drill
white Russia Drill coat and waistcoat

Duffil
blue duffil coat and waistcoat
large blue duffil waistcoat
light brown duffil (waistcoat) with black horn
buttons (2 examples)
new white Duffil coat and waistcoat bound

Duroy
pale blue Duroy waistcoat

Flannel
striped flannel waistcoat

Frieze
light brown Frieze waistcoat with common flat
metal plate buttons

Fustian
Brown fustian waistcoat (and breeches) about
half worn

Holland
Holland waistcoat

Kersey
kersey waistcoat

Jeans
white jeans waistcoat (2 examples)
double breasted waistcoat of corded light jeans
or fustian

Jump
blue Jump Jacket without sleeves and very
coarse

Linsey
Linsey woolsey Waistcoat
under jacket, part linsey and part cloth

Nankeen
nankeen waistcoat (2 examples)

Negro cotton
white negro cotton waistcoat

Osnaburg
German Osnabrug Frock and waistcoat
osnabrug waistcoat

Poplin
red Poplin waistcoat (cut out but not yet sewn
up)

Sagathy
light coloured sagathy waistcoat

Velvet
black velvet jacket with leather pockets
black velvet waistcoat
Virginia cloth/homespun
blue and white homespun (coat) and waistcoat
black and white Virginia Cloth Waistcoat
Kersey wove
striped Virginia cloth waistcoat
Virginia cloth under waistcoat, cross barred
with red worsted
striped country made Waistcoat
double-breasted Virginia cloth waistcoat lined
(the fore parts) with Virginia cloth.
old Virginia Cloth blue twilled jacket, with
Pewter Buttons, without sleeves
Wilton
Wilton jacket (without sleeves) mixed with red
wilton [waistcoat]
Yarn
waistcoat filled with red and blue yarn
black yarn waistcoat
Unspecified material
short red waistcoat
red waistcoat (2 examples)
scarlet waistcoat (2 examples)
claret coloured coat and vest
black or blue waistcoat
black waistcoat (2 examples)
blue waistcoat (4 examples)
blue jacket without sleeves
blue gray jacket without sleeves
suit of blue clothes
blue waistcoat with white metal buttons
light blue jacket without sleeves
brown Newmarket (coat and) waistcoat
brown waistcoat
dark brown waistcoat
suit of brown clothes pretty much wore
buff coloured waistcoat
Drab coloured Jacket and Waistcoat
green waistcoat (2 examples)
suit of green clothes almost new
jacket without sleeves, much worn
striped waistcoat with blue and white
striped waistcoat (3 examples)
snuff coloured waistcoat
APPENDIX J

JACKETS

Bearskin
bearskin coat and jacket
Bearskin jacket lined with flannel
Bearskin, lined with plaid (2 examples)
dark coloured bear skin Jacket
dark Bearskin jacket
Birdeyed
green birdeyed [jacket]
Broadcloth
blue broadcloth (coat and) jacket, with metal buttons
blue broadcloth jacket
broadcloth coat and jacket of a reddish Mixture
reddish broadcloth jacket lined with white
Virginia cloth
brown broadcloth jacket
Casimir
black casimir jacket
Cloth
blue cloth jacket with sleeves and metal buttons
dark blue cloth coat and jacket
mixed blue cloth coat and jacket, lined and trimmed with black
blue cloth jacket
brown cloth coat and jacket
brown cloth jacket with sleeves.
cloth jacket
New light gray jacket lined with striped Plaids, coarse cloth with white metal buttons
Green cloth jacket with yellow metal buttons.
reddish turned cloth jacket
Cotton
new green cotton waistcoat with plaid sleeves, lined with Osnabrug
twilled cotton filled in with black yarn
Country/Virginia cloth
country cloth jacket
country cloth jacket, lined with oznabrigs
country cloth jacket, warped cotton filled with wool twilled, all white
white country cloth jacket with sleeves
striped country cloth jacket (3 examples)
striped Virginia cloth jacket
Drab
white drab jacket

Duffil
gray duffil jacket lined with striped Virginia cloth
blue lappelled duffil jacket
darkish coloured Duffil Jacket
Flannel
striped flannel pea jacket
Frieze
dark coloured Frieze Jacket
Drab colored Frieze Jacket, with Metal Buttons
Fustian
jacket of white fustian
jacket of dark fustian
Holland
brown Holland jacket (2 examples)
red Holland Jacket
striped Holland
Kersey
white kersey Jacket
old white kersey jacket
old kersey jacket
Knit
knit [jacket]
Linen
brown linen shirt and jacket
white linen jacket
Linsey
striped linsey jacket with blue backs
white linsey jacket [which were fulled]
Negro cotton
white negro cotton jacket
Osnaburg
osnaburg jacket (3 examples)
Plaid
white plaid jacket
Plains
white plain[s] (?) jacket
Plush
old plush jacket
Sagathy
blue Sagathy jacket, which is fine, but much worn
Sailor’s jackets
old blue sailor’s jacket very short with small
black buttons sewed thick on both sides
sailor’s blue jacket
light coloured Sailor’s Jacket
new sailor’s jacket of blue duffil, with white
metal buttons, and lined with white Plaid
Swanskin
short old swanskin jacket
Welsh plains
Welsh plains
Wilton
dark wilton jacket

Unspecified fabric
new ash coloured jacket with high topped horn
buttons
Parson gray coloured (coat and) jacket much
worn
black coat and jacket
blue outside jacket
blue waistcoat with short sleeves
blue jacket lined with plaid
blue jacket with sleeves
blue jacket (5 examples)
short blue jacket generally worn under his coat
dark brown coat and jacket
brown jacket
brown double breasted jacket with sleeves and a
coat
coarse dark brown jacket with plain white metal
buttons
buff jacket
Drab coloured Jacket
green Jacket (2 examples)
green jacket pretty much worn
greenish coloured coat and jacket, belt round
the bottom
light coloured Halfworn Jacket
short jacket, made without skirts, light colour,
lined with linen
old Red jacket double breasted
red jacket (4 examples)
short striped jacket with sleeves
brownish white (waistcoat) much worn, with
sleeves
APPENDIX K

COATS

Bath
Bath coating coat
Newmarket coat of light Bath coating, not
bound, but stitched on the edges, with
Deathhead Buttons

Bearskin
bearskin coat (2 examples)
bearskin short coat
new bearskin short coat
brown bearskin coat
light coloured Newmarket (coat) either bearskin
or beaver coating

Broadcloth
black coat of superfine broadcloth, half worn,
blue broadcloth coat, with metal buttons
blue narrow broadcloth coat, which has been
turned
broadcloth coat of a reddish Mixture
brown coloured broadcloth coat, much worn
brown broadcloth coat patched under the arms,
with reddish coloured velvet collar and & slash
cuffs
dark brown broadcloth coat
dark Broadcloth Coat much patched
gray mixture Broadcloth coat, trimmed with
black
light coloured broadcloth coat, broke at the
elbows, with very few Buttons on it
light coloured superfine broadcloth coat, which
is too small for him
suit of purple broad cloth with twist buttons.
white broadcloth coat lately turned

Casimir
black casimir coat
old claret casimir coat with a slit down the back
and gold basket buttons

Cloth
short brown cloth coat
brown mixed cloth coat
brown cloth coat
coarse dark brown cloth coat with plain white
metal buttons
dark brown cloth coat with plated buttons
old brown cloth coat
old blue cloth coat tore on the shoulders
dark blue cloth coat
light blue cloth coat (and waistcoat) the coat has
been turned.

Cloth con't
mixed blue cloth coat
old blue cloth coat
dark coloured cloth coat, trimmed with brass
buttons and brown binding
old drab coloured cloth coat
fine cloth coat of a parson's gray colour, with
hair buttons
gray coloured Cloth (coat)
light coloured cloth coat, patched at the elbows
light mixed cloth coat, with yellow metal
buttons
lightish coloured short cloth coat
suit of light (cloth) colour
pepper and salt coloured cloth coat
snuff coloured cloth coat
old black cloth coat
suit of black cloth clothes
Violet or purple coloured cloth coat.

Coating
snuff coloured Coating Coat

Cotton
old brown Cotton Coat

Cotton and linen
cotton and linen almost white (coat)

Drab
dark drab short coat
grey drab coat
old drab coat
kind of drab cloth coat

Drill
white Russia Drill coat

Duffel
new white Duffel coat (and waistcoat) bound
blue duffil coat
cloth of light brown duffil, with black horn
buttons
short brown coloured duffil coat, lined with
plaid

Duroy
green duroy coat
old ash coloured duroy coat
pink coloured Duroy coat-cut out (but not yet
sewn up)

Fearnought
short Fearnought coat
Frock of blue Fearnought with plain white

Metal Buttons
Frieze
brown frieze coat
short light brown frieze Postilion’s Coat
lapelled, common plate buttons
clayred coloured frieze coat
dark coloured Frieze coat
darkish coloured frieze coat
good frieze coat
light coloured Frieze coat

Half-thicks
blue half-thicks coat (2 examples)

Holland
brown Holland short coat
brown Holland coat (2 examples)

Jeans/janes
half worn Janes [light colored coat] lined with
brown Holland

Kersey
Devonshire Kersey brown coloured coat, with
metal buttons, and pieced in the sides
old brown kersey coat

Negro cotton
negro cotton coat

Osnaburg
long osnabrug coat

Sagathy
light coloured Sagathy coat
old sagathy coat

Serge
new German Serge coat

Thickset
old brown Thickset coat

Virginia cloth/country cloth
striped Virginia cloth Jack coat
Virginia Copperas striped coatee
blue and white homespun coat
Virginia cloth of cotton, filled with red
Virginia cotton kersey wove coat, died of a pale
lead Colour
lead coloured coat of the country manufactory
Virginia cloth coat of a coperas colour
Virginia Nankin coat
country cloth coat, warped cotton filled with
wool twilled, all white
white coat of country made cloth,
blue home made cloth coat

Welsh cotton
white Welsh cotton coat with a falling collar and
short skins

Wilton
light coloured wilton coat
lightish coloured Wilton coat

Unspecified fabric
old green Coat
olive coloured coat, pretty much worn, with
black horn buttons
green coat turned up with blue
greenish coloured coat
suit of green, almost new
black coat
light blue coat
blue coat with brass buttons
blue lapeled coat with white metal buttons.
blue coat
blue coat much worn
coarse blue coat with yellow buttons
dark blue coat (2 examples)
dark blue with silver basket buttons
old blue coat lined with white shalloon.
old blue coat
short pale blue coat, turned, double-breasted,
black horn buttons
suit of blue clothes
brick-dust coloured coat
reddish coloured coat
brown coat with metal buttons (3 examples)
brown coat much worn
brown coat
coat [brown?] (4 examples)
dark brown coat
dark brown coat with buttons of the same on
each side
dark brown pretty much wore coat
light brown very short (coat), with buttons at
the sleeves
old brown Coat
old brown coat, the skirts of which not hemmed
short brown working coat, with metal buttons
short brown coat
suit of brown clothes pretty much wore, & has
some rents on back of the coat
brown Newmarket coat
dark gray coat (2 examples)
led coloured coat
Parson-gray coloured coat much worn
light coloured coat
thin whitish coat
claret coloured coat
APPENDIX L

FROCKS AND HUNTING SHIRTS

FROCKS:
Fustian
fustian frock
Linsey
linsey frock
Osnaburg
German Osnabrug Frock
Unspecified fabric
ragged frock

HUNTING SHIRTS
Flax and tow
white hunting shirt of flax and tow
Linen
yellow dyed country linen hunting shirt
brown linen hunting shirt
Mixed with wool
hunting shirt filled with wool
Tow
tow hunting shirt
Unspecified fabric
brown hunting shirt
white hunting shirt
hunting shirt trimmed green
hunting shirt
APPENDIX M

BREECHES AND DRAWERS

BREECHES
Bearskin
bearskin
dark Bearskin breeches (2 examples)
Broadcloth
suit of purple broad cloth with twist buttons
Casimir
black casimir breeches
Cloth
blue cloth breeches
lightish coloured cloth breeches (matched coat)
suit of [cloth] of light colour
light coloured cloth breeches, patched at the knees
light coloured cloth breeches
brown cloth breeches
old brown cloth breeches
coarse cloth breeches
cloth breeches
New light gray breeches, coarse cloth [with white metal buttons?]
nuff coloured cloth breeches
suit of black cloth clothes
black Cloth Breeches
Cotton
breeches of twilled cotton filled in
with black yarn
cotton breeches
Drab
gray drab breeches
Drill
new Drilling Breeches
white drill breeches
Duffil
blue duffil breeches
breeches of blue duffil [with white metal buttons?]
breeches of light brown duffil w/ black horn buttons (2 examples)
duffil breeches
brick coloured Duffil breeches [with plain white metal buttons?]
Duroy
brown striped corded Duroy breeches
Dove coloured Duroy breeches
Everlasting/lastig
black everlasting breeches (2 examples)
black lasting breeches
Fearnought
Fearnought Breeches
Fustian
white fustian breeches (2 examples)
Brown fustian breeches, about half worn
Half-thicks
blue half thicks breeches (2 examples)
Jeans
dark coloured jeans breeches
white jeans breeches (2 examples)
Kersey
breeches that he wore last winter (they are kersey wove)
Kersey breeches patched on the seat with red
Knit/net
black Net Breeches
black knit breeches (2 examples)
Leather/buckskin
buckskin breeches, half worn
buckskin breeches better than half worn
buckskin breeches (8 examples)
buckskin breeches, good
buckskin breeches, half worn
buckskin breeches, new, John Stewart written inside of waistband
buckskin breeches, new (2 examples)
buckskin breeches, old, much worn, very dirty
buckskin breeches, old (2 examples)
buckskin breeches, English, old
leather breeches. old ( 6 examples)
leather breeches (19 examples)
leather breeches, pretty much worn
leather breeches, dirty
Linen
brown linen breeches (2 examples)
linen breeches (3 examples)
Linsey
white linsey breeches, which were fulled.
Nankeen (cotton)
nankeen breeches, with pale yellow ferret in the knees
Nankeen breeches (6 examples)
Negro cotton
negro cotton breeches
Osnaburg
Osnabrug long breeches patched on both thighs
white short Osnabrug breeches
Plush
black plush breeches
blue plush breeches
red plush breeches (3 examples)
Russia drab
Russia drab breeches (2 examples)
white Russia drab breeches
white Russia drab breeches, plain pinchbeck knee buckles
Russia drill
dark Russia Drill Breeches
Russia drill breeches (4 examples)
white Russia drill breeches
white Russia Drill breeches, darned at both knees
Sagathy
deep blue Sagathy breeches
Serge
German Serge breeches of a gray colour
Silk stocking
black silk stocking breeches
Stocking breeches
black stocking breeches (2 examples)
old buff coloured stocking breeches
Velvet
spotted velvet breeches
Virginia cloth/country cloth
blue Virginia Cloth Breeches
Thread Virginia cloth breeches
breeches of coarse country linen
Virginia Nankin breeches
striped country cloth breeches
white Virginia cotton kersey wove breeches
Worsted shag
light coloured Worsted Shag Breeches, with metal buttons
Unspecified fabric
black breeches much patched
black breeches (4 examples)
blue breeches patched with white cloth
blue breeches
light blue breeches
suit of blue clothes
crimson breeches
light coloured breeches (2 examples)
old white Breeches
white breeches (3 examples)
snuff coloured breeches
long Breeches (2 examples)
suit of brown clothes pretty much wore
suit of green cloths (almost new)

DRAWERS
Country linen
Drawers of coarse country linen
Linen
linen drawers
Worsted
blue worsted Drawers
APPENDIX N

TROUSERS

Canvas
long canvas trousers
Cloth
brown cloth trousers
Cotton
black & white striped cotton cloth for a pair of trousers
Country cloth
country spun trousers (2 examples)
Country linen
coarse country linen trousers
country linen shirt and trousers
old country made linen trousers
Crocus
crocus trousers (2 examples)
Duck
very narrow Duck Trousers patched on each knee with new Osnabrugs
Fearnought
Fearnought Trousers
Holland
striped holland trousers (3 examples)
Linen
brown linen trousers (5 examples)
old brown linen trousers
linen trousers
Negro cotton
trousers made of negro cotton, half worn
Osnaburg
Osnabrug trousers (26 examples)
Osnabrug to make a Pair [of trousers]
oznabrug trousers, rather too small for him
new Osnabrug trousers
new Osnabrug trousers
Rolls
roll trousers
rolls trousers (3 examples)
Sacking
sacking trousers
Sailor’s trousers
one or two pair of sailor’s trousers
Tow
tow linen trousers
tow trousers (5 examples)
coarse trousers made of tow
new tow trousers

Unspecified fabric
trousers (4 examples)
trousers (has wooden leg he endeavours to hide with)
trousers that button down the legs
coarse shirt and trousers
long trousers (2 examples)
ragged frock and trousers
blue (jacket and) trousers
check trousers (2 examples)
striped trousers (2 examples)
red (waistcoat and) trousers
APPENDIX O

STOCKINGS AND LEGGINGS

STOCKINGS

Cotton
blue and white cotton stockings (mixed probably)
white cotton stockings (2 examples)

Country/ Virginia
country made stockings
[country made shoes] and stockings
fine mixed blue country stockings
pale blue Virginia Yarn stockings
Virginia knit cotton stockings

German town
light coloured German town stockings
Ribbed
dark ribbed stockings
gray ribbed stockings
old ribbed ditto [stockings]
ribbed stockings (2 examples)
white ribbed stockings

Sale
coarse mixed red sale
sale stockings
Sale Hose
Silk
silk stockings (3 +)

Thread
thread stockings (7 examples)
thread stockings, half worn
brown thread stockings (2 examples)
gray thread stockings
old thread stockings, footed with linen
ribbed thread stockings
white thread stockings (6 + examples)
white thread stockings (1 of which is much finer than the other)

Worsted
worsted stockings (9 examples)
blue worsted stockings
black ribbed worsted stockings
fine worsted stockings
gray worsted stockings
light blue worsted stockings
light ribbed worsted stockings
marbled worsted stockings
mixed worsted stockings
mottled worsted stockings
new worsted hose, mixed brown & white
old worsted stockings

Worsted con't
blue worsted stockings
gray worsted stockings

Wool
white woolen stockings

Yarn
yarn hose
yarn stockings (5 examples)
blue yarn stockings
gray yarn stockings
mixed yarn stockings
new milled yarn stockings
white yarn stockings (6 examples)

Unspecified fabric
stockings (12 examples)
stockings, several pair of (3 examples)
stockings, different colours, several other pairs
black stockings ( 2 examples)
blue stockings
blue hose
dark stockings
pal blue stockings
light marbled stockings
grey stockings, coarse, several pair
spotted stockings
black and white mixed stockings
white and black twisted together, stockings of
white and blue spotted stockings
white stockings

LEGGINGS

Cotton
cotton leggings
white cotton leggings

Country linen
leggins of coarse country linen
Linen
linsey leggins
Tow
tow leggins

Unspecified fabric
brown leggins
wrappers
SHOES
Buckled
fine shoes (1 pair buckles apparently shared with 2 shoes)
new shoes with carved metal buckles
new shoes with buckles
old shoes- pewter buckles
shoes- plated buckles (3 examples)
shoes- two pair of shoe buckles, one silver, the other brass
shoes, little worn- pinchbeck shoe buckles
shoes- buckles
[s]hoes- silver plated buckles
[s]hoes- brass carved shoe buckles
[s]hoes- pinchbeck buckles
[s]hoes- plain pinchbeck shoe buckles
[s]hoes- silver shoe buckles
Coarse
coarse shoes (4 examples)
Coarse buckled
crude shoes- steel buckles
crude shoes- 1 set of buckles apparently shared between 2 pairs
crude shoes with very large silver plated buckles
Coarse tied
crude shoes tied with strings
Country made
country made, almost new
country made shoes (3 examples)
Country Shoes
old shoes, country made
old country shoes
old country shoes not blacked
Country made, buckled
country made- large single rimmed Pinchbeck buckles
country made- yellow buckles
country made- plated buckles
country made- odd yellow metal buckles
country made, half worn- brass buckles
country made, new- silver buckles
Dogskin
new black grain Dogskin shoes
English/London made
English made shoes- Pinchbeck pierced buckles
English made shoes
English shoes that have been soled
strong London made shoes
Macaroni
Macaroni shoes with silver buckles
Nailed
several of them have hobnails in their shoes
shoes nailed all round, both heels and soles
Negro made
old negro made shoes
New
new shoes (3 examples)
Old
old shoes (15 examples)
old shoes half soled
old pair of shoes much worn
Old Shoes cut open at the toes
small old shoes, with nails in the heels
Tied
good shoes tied with strings
shoes half worn tied with strings
shoes with strings (2 examples)
vamp shoes with new quarters and strings in them
Unspecified
shoes (11 examples)

PUMPS
Buckled pumps
old pumps half worn- pinchbeck buckles
old channel pumps- small pinchbeck buckles.
pumps- steel buckles
turned pumps half soled- [double rimmed silver plated buckles?]
turned pumps- plated buckles
turned pumps- perhaps silver buckles
Country made pumps, buckled
country made pumps, plated buckles
Country made pumps
country made pumps
old country made turned pumps
Miscellaneous pumps
pumps
single channel pumps not much wore
stitched pumps, with long quarters
turned pumps
String tied pumps
single channel pumps tied with strings

BOOTS
either Shoes or Boots

MOCCASINS
buckskin moccasons

SHOE BUCKLES
Pewter buckles
old shoes with pewter buckles
Pinchbeck buckles
pinchbeck buckles
English made shoes with Pinchbeck pierced
buckles
stole shoes, little worn with pair of pinchbeck
shoe buckles
pair of old channel pumps, small pinchbeck
buckles
country made shoes with large single rimmed
Pinchbeck buckles
plain pinchbeck shoe buckles (also had knee
buckles of same)
old pumps half worn, and pinchbeck buckles
Plated buckles
shoes with plated buckles
country made pumps, plated buckles
two pr shoes, one fine, the other coarse, plain
plated buckles
plated buckles
plated buckles and country made shoes
turned pumps with plated buckles
shoes with plated shoe buckles
Silver
silver shoe buckle (stolen)
perhaps silver buckles- old shoes, turned
pumps, & Dogskin shoes
double rimmed silver plated buckles, turned
pumps half soled
silver shoe buckles
new country made shoes with silver buckles
silver shoe buckles (1 of 2 pairs for 1 pr. shoes)
pair of silver buckles in his shoes of the
Macaroni Taste

Silver plated
silver plated buckles
coarse shoes with very large silver plated
buckles
Steel buckles
pumps with steel buckles
coarse shoes, steel buckles
Yellow metal buckles
country made shoes with odd yellow metal
buckles
country made shoes with yellow buckles
half worn country made shoes, with brass
buckles
brass carved shoes buckles
brass shoe buckles (1 of 2 pairs for 1 pr. shoes)
Unspecific shoe buckles
shoes and buckles
new shoes with buckles
new shoes with carved metal buckles
APPENDIX Q

HATS AND CAPS

HATS
Beaver/Castor
beaver hat much worn
castor hat
fashionable good beaver hat
half worn castor hat (2 examples)
old beaver hat
beaver hat about half worn
old castor hat
Beaver/Castor, cocked
fantail castor hat
half worn beaver hat cocked three ways
good castor, fan tail'd, cocked in the military
fashion, lined with white linen
Beaver hat that has been dressed after being
some time wore
Coarse
course [hat] bound with ferret
course hat lined with red
course hat about half worn
old coarse hat trimmed round the brim
old coarse hat
Cocked/fashionable
fashionable new cocked hat
hat, one corner is torn off
English made hat cut in the Fashion
good fashionable hat
Fantail hat, with yellow lining
Coarse felt
coarse felt hat
coarse felt hat bound (2 examples)
Cocked felt
felt hat, which he wears cocked
new felt hat usually worn with two cocks up
Felt
felt hat half worn, with a narrow leather strap
for a hat band
felt hat not much the worse for wear.
felt hat [uncocked]
felt hat almost new
felt hat (7 examples)
felt hat, bound
felt hat, with a piece sewed on the crown
good felt hat
new felt hat (2 examples)
narrow brimmed felt hat
new felt hat
new felt hat bound with black ferreting
old felt hat (11 examples)

Fine
half worn fine hat
old fine hat
new fine hat
good hat
fine hat bound with velvet with a band
of the same
fine hat half worn
fine small hat, almost new
fine hat more than half worn
Macaroni
macaroni hat
Round
round sailor's hat
round hat bound with velvet
round white hat
Small
small hat, crown sewed in with brown thread,
cocked two ways
small round bound hat slouched
small brimmed hat
small hat bound round with ferret
small round hat with a black riband and buckle
(2 examples)
small fine hat
small hat, bound round with ferret & black band
around the crown
small round hat bound with black worsted
binding & a small piece of crepe tied round the
crown
Small felt
small felt hat (2 examples)
very deep brimmed felt hat
Straw
straw hat (2 examples)
straw hat filled in w/ blue & white wool which
hides the straw
new straw hat bound round
Misc.
Half worn Hat
hat
hat, not very old, though not very fine, may
have laced with silver
new hat
old hat bound with white
old hat (2 examples)
old hat, without any brim
bound (hat)
CAPS
Wool
black wool hat
new wool hat
new wool hat
wool hat
Worsted
worsted cap

FUR
fur hat
new fur hat

RACCOON
carried raccoon hat
raccoon hat (raccoon) lined with green persian

WIGS
brown wig which is rather too large for him
wig
wears his own hair with a false tail, and is
generally powdered.
curled dark wig
old scratch ditto [wig]
dark cut wig
powder bag (for a wig)
APPENDIX R

OVERCOATS

GREAT COATS
great coat [light blue]
old blue great coat
old great coat
old great coat, with one corner torn off, and the button holes in the pocket flaps made downwards
blanket great coat

HUSSAR CLOAK
blue Hussar cloak, with plated buttons

MATCH COATS
match coat blanket (2 examples)

SURTOUTS
chocolate coloured Surtout coat, with a red cape, a little tarred
brown surtout with a velvet cape
brown surtout coat (2 examples)
old brown surtout coat
gray surtout
old blue surtout coat, which has been turned, faced and trimmed with the same colour
blue surtout coat (2 examples)
APPENDIX S

THE RUNAWAY DESCRIPTIONS

The following runaway descriptions were taken from the Virginia Gazette between 1774 and 1778. While an effort was made to be inclusive of all non-slave runaway servants and convicts in that period, some advertisements may have been missed. At the time of compiling of this information, no available compendium of non-slave ads was available, nor was the Virginia Gazette available in electronic format. In addition, those ads which described no clothing were entirely omitted. Some issues of the Virginia Gazette are also missing from microfilmed copies, although a few originals of these issues are known to exist in archives in Virginia. Only those issues available on microfilm were consulted. The individuals are presented in alphabetical order, with their age in parentheses after their name. Item categories omitted in the following list were not present in the original text. Advertisements are listed by the date used for the description, followed by the publisher, and page and column information.

Ad Date: May 12, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p1c1 sup
Name: Allen, George (25)
Residence: Consigned to Thomas Hodge of Leeds Town, but ran from plantation near Dumfries
Date Ran: April 24, 1774
Seeker: Thomas Montgomerie
Hat: small round Hat with a black Riband and buckle
Jacket: dark coloured bear skin Jacket
Breeches: dark coloured Bear skin Jacket and Breeches
Misc: very lately imported in the Justice ran with brother John Allen

Ad Date: May 12, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p1c1 Sup
Name: Allen, John
Residence: near Dumfries
Date Ran: April 24, 1774
Seeker: Thomas Montgomerie
Hat: small round hat with black riband and buckle
Jacket: dark Bear skin Jacket
Breeches: dark Bear skin breeches
Shoes: Pair of Old Shoes cut open at the toes.
Misc: Clothes (except shoes) said to be same as his brother George, who wore those listed here.
(Probably issued by master). Ran with brother George Allen

Ad Date: January 6, 1776, Dixon and Hunter, p4c3
Name: Archibald, Bartholomew (18)
Nationality: not born in colonies
Trade: servant boy
Residence: Augusta Co., Staunton
Date Ran: December 7, 1775
Seeker: Roger North
Coat: brown double breasted jacket... and a coat
Jacket: brown double breasted jacket with sleeves
Breeches: red plush breeches
Stockings: yarn stockings
Shoes: shoes with plated buckles
Misc: dark curled hair. Also stole a horse
Ad Date: July 28, 1775, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Armstrong, William (37)
Nationality: Scotland
Trade: blacksmith
Residence: Westmoreland
Date Ran: July 9, 1775
Seeker: John Turberville or John A. Washington
Hat: two felt hats, one of which he wears cocked
Neckwear: black silk handkerchief
Shirt: two osnabrug shirts
Waistcoat: two blue, one osnabrug, and one striped Virginia cloth waistcoat. A double-breasted Virginia cloth waistcoat lined (the fore parts) with Virginia cloth.
Trousers: two pair of osnabrug and one pair of striped holland trousers
Stockings: several pair of stockings
Shoes: two pair of shoes
Misc: Ran with German Campion, George Craig, Richard Clean, and William Colton

Ad Date: January 24, 1777, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Bailey, John (boy)
Nationality: Hampton, Virginia
Trade: apprentice at a Millers?
Residence: Milner's, in Nansemond Co.
Date Ran: December 17, 1776
Seeker: Thomas Roberts
Hat: round sailor's hat
Jacket: white drab jacket
Waistcoat: under waistcoat of brown cloth
Trousers: long canvas trousers

Ad Date: September 21, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Bailey, Josiah (25)
Nationality: England
Trade: leather breeches maker by trade
Residence: Fredericksburg
Date Ran: September 10, 1775
Seeker: William Blyth
Shirt: osnabrug shirt
Coat: led coloured coat
Jacket: led coloured coat and jacket of Welsh plains
Breeches: leather breeches
Trousers: osnabrug shirt and trousers
Misc: ran with Thomas Hart

Ad Date: August 18, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Balding, William (22-23)
Nationality: England
Trade: carpenter and joiner
Residence: Plantation of James Pride, esq.
Date Ran: August 14, 1774
Seeker: William Chancey
Shirt: coarse white shirt
Jacket: Osnabrug jacket
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trousers:</th>
<th>Osnabrug trousers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misc:</td>
<td>Ran with Edward Grymes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Date:</th>
<th>June 7, 1776, Purdie, p4c2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Barry, Ned (50-60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>Ireland ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>Augusta County, Staunton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Ran:</td>
<td>May 6, 1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>James Crow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat:</td>
<td>new wool hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat:</td>
<td>white coat of country made cloth, white hunting shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacket:</td>
<td>striped linsey jacket with blue backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockings:</td>
<td>white woolen stockings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Date:</th>
<th>November 24, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Bell, James (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>Yorkshire, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade:</td>
<td>miner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>Charles Co., Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Ran:</td>
<td>before November 7, 1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>Samuel Hanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat:</td>
<td>dark blue coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacket:</td>
<td>brown jacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches:</td>
<td>snuff coloured breeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockings:</td>
<td>stockings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes:</td>
<td>shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc:</td>
<td>Several small bells. Ran with Robert Mills. Imported last September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Date:</th>
<th>July 7, 1774, Rind, p3c2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Belong, Joseph (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>West of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade:</td>
<td>joiner and painter, convict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>Annapolis, Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Ran:</td>
<td>June 11, 1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>George Steuart (Richard Sprigg, John Randall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat:</td>
<td>dark gray coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waistcoat:</td>
<td>Nankeen waistcoat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches:</td>
<td>Nankeen breeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes:</td>
<td>new shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc:</td>
<td>Property of Steuart. Left with Thomas King and Thomas Faston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Date:</th>
<th>September 15, 1775, Purdie, p3c2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Bermish, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade:</td>
<td>sold for a bricklayer but knows nothing of the business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>King William courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Ran:</td>
<td>August 27, 1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>Daniel Lipscomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat:</td>
<td>fantail castor hat, old felt hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirt:</td>
<td>two osnabrug shirts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat:</td>
<td>blue narrow broadcloth coat, which has been turned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacket:</td>
<td>reddish broadcloth jacket lined with white Virginia cloth, one osnabrug jacket</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Breeches: pair of dark coloured jeans breeches
Trousers: osnabrug trousers
Stockings: pair of stockings
Shoes: country made shoes with odd yellow metal buckles

Ad Date: June 30, 1775, Purdie, p2c3 Sup
Name: Benson, Thomas
Nationality: Ireland
Residence: Neck Creek, near Mr. Thompson's Mill (Fincastle)
Date Ran: May 21, 1775
Seeker: Nathaniel Morgan
Hat: carried raccoon hat
Shirt: home made flax linen shirt
Coat: carried blue home made cloth coat
Waistcoat: carried red and yellow silk cotton waistcoat
Breeches: carried buckskin breeches
Trousers: tow linen trousers
Misc: brass mounted smooth bore gun, marked on the sideplate MM1769 and on the barrel W. MORGAN, a shotbag and powder-horn, a canister with 2lbs. of powder, a falling axe, a pocket compass, &c. &c. Likewise stole his indentures. Supposed to have been with Thomas Welsh, another runaway

Ad Date: April 29, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p4c2 Sup
Name: Blackburn, George (22)
Nationality: Durham, England
Trade: pretty well learned, writes a tolerable good Hand
Residence: Surry
Date Ran: April 17, 1775
Seeker: Thomas and Samuel Pretlow
Neckwear: some white shirts and neckcloths
Shirt: some white shirts
Coat: suit of black cloth clothes and ditto of light colour
Waistcoat: suit of black cloth clothes and ditto of light colour
Breeches: suit of black cloth clothes and ditto of light colour
Stockings: several pairs of stockings
Misc: long brown hair generally clubbed. Nice in dressing himself. Ran with George Peart.

Ad Date: January 7, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c2
Name: Booth, Charles (20-21)
Nationality: England
Trade: by trade a joiner
Residence: Stafford Co
Seeker: William Brent
Shirt: brown sheeting shirt, one fine Irish Linen Ditto much patched, and several others.
Coat: Violet or purple coloured cloth coat. An old blue coat lined with white shalloon.
Waistcoat: new green cotton waistcoat with plaid sleeves, lined with Osnabrug. A Violet or purple coloured... waistcoat
Breeches: new buckskin breeches. A pair of old Do. much worn, and very dirty
Stockings: dark ribbed stockings and several other pairs of different colours
Misc: white short curled hair. A silver watch. Ran with David Mathison
Ad Date: November 10, 1774, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Booth, William
Trade: sailor
Residence: Dumfries
Date Ran: October 21, 1774
Seeker: Andrew Leitch
Trousers: has a wooden leg which he endeavours to hide with trousers
Misc: Sundry clothes. Ran with Joseph Fisher and Patrick Creamer

Ad Date: August 4, 1774, Rind, p3c3
Name: Boyce, Thomas (30-40)
Nationality: England
Residence: Fauquier Co., near the courthouse
Seeker: William Settle
Hat: fine hat half worn
Shirt: brown shirt, check shirt
Coat: old brown coat, the skirts of which not hemmed
Trousers: brown linen trousers
Misc: Ran with Thomas Goode

Ad Date: September 1, 1774, Rind, p3c3
Name: Breaton, Thomas (23)
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: indentured servant
Residence: ferry opposite Alexandria, Prince George Co., MD
Date Ran: August 27, 1774
Seeker: John Clifford
Hat: felt hat
Shirt: oznabrig shirt, Irish linen ditto
Coat: light coloured wilton coat
Jacket: blue broadcloth jacket, striped country ditto
Breeches: buckskin breeches
Trousers: oznabrig trousers, striped holland ditto
Shoes: country made pumps, plated buckles
Misc: has made several elopements. Stole sundry clothes (not those described here)

Ad Date: November 24, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c1
Name: Browning, George
Nationality: Bristol, England
Trade: shoemaker, convict
Residence: Prince Edward
Date Ran: before October 27, 1774
Seeker: Christopher Curtis
Coat: old blue coat
Waistcoat: striped waistcoat
Stockings: spotted stockings
Misc: Took his shoemaking tools with him. Walks with a stick do to lameness in his leg

Ad Date: March 10, 1775, Purdie, p4c1
Name: Bruton, John
Trade: servant
Residence: Fauquier
Date Ran: February 25, 1775
Seeker: William Withers
Hat: old fine hat
Shirt: check shirt
Jacket: blue lappelled duffil jacket
Breeches: buckskin breeches
Stockings: cotton leggings
Shoes: coarse shoes tied with strings
Misc: Also took a horse

Ad Date: December 15, 1774, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Burnham, Solomon (26)
Nationality: Yorkshire, England
Trade: professes himself to be a complete farmer
Residence: Dorsey's Forge, Maryland
Date Ran: September 24, 1774
Seeker: Samuel Dorsey and Edward Norwood
Hat: coarse hat about half worn
Neckwear: Iron collar
Shirt: Osnabrug shirt
Waistcoat: blue gray jacket without sleeves
Breeches: leather breeches
Stockings: yarn stockings
Shoes: shoes and buckles
Misc: short black curled hair. Ran with William George and Samuel Chapman

Ad Date: April 28, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Butler, Charles
Nationality: England
Trade: saddler and harness maker
Residence: Richmond, Henrico Co.
Date Ran: April 21, 1774
Seeker: Miles Taylor
Waistcoat: dark coloured Bath coating waistcoat
Breeches: Pair of Russia Drab Breeches, Pair of Black do.
Stockings: white Thread and worsted Stockings
Misc: Ran with Thomas Farrill

Ad Date: June 16, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p6c2 supplement
Name: Butler, Edward alias Robert Donald (27)
Trade: tailor, convict
Residence: Albemarle
Date Ran: June 12, 1774
Seeker: Benjamin Colvard and George Divers
Coat: green duroy coat
Waistcoat: Holland waistcoat
Breeches: black lasting breeches
Misc: Ran with Richard Roberts. Also took 2 horses. (Subsequent ads suggest Roberts may have been taken and given information on Butler)

Ad Date: July 28, 1775, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Campion, German (30)
Nationality: Derbyshire, England
Trade: professes farming
Residence: Westmoreland
Date Ran: July 9, 1775
Seeker: John Turberville or John A. Washington
Hat: worsted cap
Shirt: check and osnabrug shirts
Coat: blue half-thicks coat
Jacket: striped flannel pea jacket
Breeches: blue half-thicks coat and breeches
Trousers: pair of rolls trousers
Stockings: stockings
Shoes: shoes
Misc: Ran with Richard Clean, George Craig, William Armstrong, and William Colton

Ad Date: July 19, 1776, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Carrick, Patrick
Nationality: Ireland
Residence: Suffolk County, on way to Cumberland to join a ship's company
Seeker: Aaron Jeffery
Coat: coarse blue coat with yellow buttons
Breeches: old pair of buckskin breeches
Stockings: black stockings
Misc: context suggests Carrick was being forced into naval service. May not have been indentured

Ad Date: June 29, 1776, Dixon and Hunter, p4c2
Name: Cartwright, Thomas (22)
Nationality: England
Trade: Bricklayer by trade
Residence: Essex courthouse
Date Ran: June 22, 1776
Seeker: William Shedden
Hat: new felt hat usually wore with two cocks up
Shirt: 2 new white cotton shirts
Coat: coarse dark brown cloth coat with plain white metal buttons
Jacket: coarse dark brown jacket with plain white metal buttons
Breeches: brick coloured Duffill breeches (possibly with plain white metal buttons)
Trousers: piece of black & white striped cotton cloth for a pair of trousers
Stockings: blue and white cotton stockings [mixed or stripes]
Shoes: country made shoes with yellow buckles
Misc: took old clothes as well. Fair hair cut short though he sometimes wears it tied behind

Ad Date: August 3, 1775, Pinkey, p3c3
Name: Cave, Rueben
Trade: apprentice
Residence: upper end of Spotsylvania
Date Ran: May 20, 1775
Seeker: Henry Coleman
Hat: an old felt hat
Shirt: coarse shirt
Coat: brown Holland coat
Trousers: coarse shirt and trousers
Shoes: shoes with strings
Misc: Ran with Joseph Ingram. Apparently Cave returned in August or September and helped to revise the ad for Ingram

Ad Date: December 15, 1774, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Chapman, Samuel (28)
Nationality: England
Residence: Dorsey's Forge, Maryland
Date Ran: September 24, 1774
Seeker: Samuel Dorsey and Edward Norwood
Hat: new felt hat
Shirt: Osnabrug shirt, a check Do.
Jacket: cloth jacket (sleeved implied by other servant's clothes in the same ad)
Trousers: Osnabrug trousers
Stockings: two pair of stockings
Shoes: new shoes with buckles
Misc: Ran with Solomon Burnham and William George

Ad Date: December 28, 1775, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Chilingsworth, Ralph
Nationality: England
Trade: plasterer by trade
Residence: Richmond and sighted in Williamsburg
Date Ran: December 3, 1775
Seeker: Richard Adams
Hat: Beaver hat that has been dressed after being some time wore
Shirt: white shirt
Coat: good frieze coat, later seen in Williamsburg in a hunting shirt trimmed green
Waistcoat: red cloth waistcoat
Stockings: worsted stockings
Shoes: strong London made shoes
Misc: brown wig which is rather too large for him. The above servant was lately seen in Williamsburg in a hunting shirt with green trimmings and said he had enlisted in a company at York Town. Very fond of spirituous liquors. Seen selling osnabrugs and purchased a gun

Ad Date: July 6, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Clark, William (19)
Trade: joiner
Date Ran: last Saturday night
Seeker: Stephen Mitchell
Hat: one corner of his hat is torn off
Jacket: blue outside jacket
Waistcoat: scarlet waistcoat
Breeches: crimson breeches

Ad Date: July 28, 1775, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Clean, Richard (30-40)
Nationality: England or Ireland *
Trade: joiner and house carpenter
Residence: Westmoreland
Date Ran: July 9, 1775
Seeker: John Turberville or John A. Washington
Hat: fine hat more than half worn
Shirt: check and osnabrug shirts
Coat: brown coat with metal buttons
Breeches: linen and cloth breeches
Trousers: rolls trousers
Stockings: stockings
Shoes: shoes
Misc: claimed to be English but master believed him to be Irish. Ran with German Campion, George Craig, William Armstrong, and William Colton

Ad Date: July 28, 1775, Purdie, p3c1
Name: Coleman, Thomas (25)
Nationality: London, England
Residence: York prison, no residence stated
Date Ran: July 28, 1775, before
Seeker: gaoler William Mitchell.
Shirt: check shirt
Coat: bearskin short coat
Jacket: blue cloth jacket
Breeches: Russia drill breeches
Trousers: long trousers
Stockings: mixed worsted stockings
Shoes: half worn country made shoes, with brass buckles
Misc: gaoler with John Grymes, but no otherwise known association

Ad Date: September 29, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c3
Name: Colloney, Richard alias James O'Daniel
Nationality: Ireland
Residence: near Port Royal, Caroline Co.
Date Ran: August 28, 1774
Seeker: Robert Rennolds
Hat: old felt hat
Shirt: brown shirt
Jacket: gray duffil jacket lined with striped Virginia cloth
Trousers: osnabrug trousers

Ad Date: July 28, 1775, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Colton, William
Residence: Westmoreland
Date Ran: July 9, 1775
Seeker: John Turberville or John A. Washington
Hat: half worn beaver hat cocked three ways
Shirt: osnabrug shirt
Trousers: osnabrug trousers
Stockings: stockings
Shoes: shoes
Misc: Ran with Richard Clean, George Craig, William Armstrong, and German Campion. Seeker said he knew of no other clothes with Colton than those described
Ad Date: June 5, 1778, Purdie, p3c2
Name: Connolly, Dennis (25)
Trade: convict
Residence: lower end of Rockingham
Date Ran: April 10, 1778
Seeker: Michael Coagar
Hat: old hat bound with white
Shirt: two shirts of country tow linen
Coat: yellow dyed country linen hunting shirt
Stockings: yarn stockings
Shoes: old country made shoes

Ad Date: September 21, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Conroy, Michael (25)
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: pretends to be a shoemaker
Residence: Prince George's Co., Maryland near Snoden's iron works
Seeker: Philip Hall and Isaac Short
Shirt: oznabrig shirt
Jacket: country cloth jacket, lined with oznabrigs
Trousers: crocus trousers
Shoes: old shoes
Misc: Ran with Francis Matthews. Also took a broadax. Great villains and will steal anything that gets in their way

Ad Date: April 11, 1777, Purdie, p2c3
Name: Cook, George (26)
Nationality: American
Trade: servant mulatto
Residence: Culpeper, Virginia
Date Ran: March 16, 1777
Seeker: William Knox
Misc: clothed in homespun woolen and linen. Bound to age 31

Ad Date: March 10, 1774, Rind, p3c2
Name: Coulter, James (25)
Residence: Staunton Gaol
Seeker: Thomas Rhodes (Rhoades) gaoler.
Coat: light coloured coat
Waistcoat: dark brown waistcoat
Breeches: light coloured (coat) and breeches
Stockings: worsted stockings
Misc: Gaoled with Thomas Gils on suspicion of being a runaway

Ad Date: July 28, 1775, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Craig, George (30-40)
Nationality: Scotland
Trade: gardener by profession
Residence: Westmoreland
Date Ran: July 9, 1775
Seeker: John Turberville or John A. Washington
Hat: half worn fine hat
Shirt: check and osnabrug shirts
Coat: brown coat with metal buttons, blue half-thicks coat
Breeches: blue half-thicks (coat) and breeches
Trousers: rolls trousers
Stockings: stockings
Shoes: shoes
Misc: Ran with German Campion, Richard Clean, William Armstrong, and William Colton

Ad Date: November 10, 1774, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Creamer, Patrick (21)
Trade: tailor
Residence: Dumfries
Date Ran: October 21, 1774
Seeker: Andrew Leitch
Coat: bear skin coat
Jacket: bear skin jacket
Breeches: bear skin breeches
Misc: Ran with Joseph Fisher and William Booth

Ad Date: February 10, 1774, Rind, p3c3
Name: Darcy, Thomas (28)
Trade: tanner and currier (suspected runaway)
Residence: Augusta county gaol
Date Ran: December 18, 1773, jailed
Seeker: Thomas Rhoades, Gaoler
Coat: thin whitish coat
Breeches: leather breeches
Shoes: silver plated buckles
Misc: Claimed to be a free man, but he was jailed as a suspected runaway

Ad Date: June 29, 1776, Dixon and Hunter, p4c1
Name: Deverix, James (20)
Nationality: England
Residence: Prince William on Kettle Run
Seeker: William Wyatt
Hat: felt hat
Shirt: osnabrug shirt
Jacket: blue jacket lined with plaid, and took with him a light coloured Half worn Jacket
Trousers: coarse trousers made of tow
Shoes: old shoes half soled
Misc: had letters and marks on his hand and thigh with Indian Ink

Ad Date: July 25, 1777, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Dormon, George (20)
Nationality: London, England
Trade: convict servant
Residence: Loudoun Co.
Date Ran: June 20, 1777
Seeker: Samuel Love, Jr.
Hat: straw hat
Shirt: new tow shirt
Trousers: new tow shirt and trousers
Misc: ran with David Hinds

Ad Date: December 19, 1777, Dixon and Hunter, p3c2
Name: Drewry, Thomas (18)
Nationality: Virginia (?)
Trade: tailor
Residence: Williamsburg
Date Ran: Mid December
Seeker: Archibald Diddep
Coat: dark brown coat with buttons of the same on each side
Waistcoat: blue waistcoat
Breeches: light coloured breeches

Ad Date: February 18, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c2
Name: Drum, Bryon
Nationality: Ireland
Residence: Frederick Co., MD
Date Ran: about February 1, 1775
Seeker: Philip Cassay
Hat: old castor hat
Shirt: Irish linen shirt, two Osnabrug Do.
Coat: broadcloth coat of a reddish Mixture, an old brown Coat
Jacket: broadcloth jacket of a reddish Mixture
Breeches: black breeches much patched
Trousers: Osnabrug trousers
Stockings: old (shoes and) stockings
Shoes: old shoes
Misc: fond of spirituous liquor, and it is probable (being without money) that he will dispose of his clothes to get it

Ad Date: June 15, 1775, Pinkney, p3c2
Name: Duff, James
Nationality: Ireland (?)
Residence: Augusta Co.
Seeker: John Trimble
Hat: new furr hat
Shirt: several fine shirts
Coat: light blue coat, and a great coat of the same
Breeches: brown cloth breeches
Stockings: thread and blue worsted stockings
Shoes: two pair shoes, one fine, the other coarse, pair of plain plated buckles

Ad Date: July 21, 1775, Purdie, p3c2
Name: Dugreec, John Ecton
Nationality: Berne, Switzerland
Trade: barber by trade, used to travel with gentlemen
Residence: Dumfries
Date Ran: June 16, 1775
Seeker: Richard Graham
Shirt: white shirts
Coat: suit of brown clothes pretty much wore, and has some rents on the back of the coat. A suit of green. almost new
Waistcoat: suit of brown clothes pretty much wore, suit of green almost new
Breeches: suit of brown clothes pretty much wore, suit of green almost new, New buckskin breeches
Trousers: trousers that button down the legs
Stockings: some white thread stockings
Misc: wears his own hair with a false tail, and is generally powdered. After he ran said he had cut hair and taken up a wig. A powder bag and some shaving materials, a prayer book in French, and some old commissions for officers in the Swiss militia by which he will probably try to pass. Imported on the Justitia by Capt. Kidd

Ad Date: September 23, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: Dulancy, Richard (25)
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: Carver and gilder by trade
Residence: Berkeley Co.
Date Ran: September 8, 1775
Seeker: Marcus Stephenson
Hat: *English* made hat cut in the Fashion
Shirt: fine shirt
Coat: gray mixture Broadcloth coat, trimmed with black
Breeches: black Net Breeches
Stockings: one pair worsted and one pair thread stockings, half worn
Misc: Ran with John Murray. Also took with them a blue Hussar cloak, with plated buttons

Ad Date: April 22, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: Emanuel, Ralph (22)
Nationality: England
Trade: Convict servant "used to the sea"
Residence: a few miles above Leeds Town, just off the Justitia
Seeker: Andrew Leitch
Hat: small hat, bound round with ferret and black band around the crown
Coat: chocolate coloured Surtout coat, with a red cape, a little tarred
Misc: described as well dressed by seeker. To those used to the Smell of Servants just from a Ship, they will easily be discovered, unless they have procured new Clothes

Ad Date: April 28, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Farrill, Thomas
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: Tanner
Residence: Richmond, Henrico Co.
Date Ran: April 21, 1774
Seeker: Miles Taylor
Shirt: white shirt
Coat: old green Coat
Breeches: old white Breeches
Stockings: old worsted Stockings
Shoes: old shoes
Misc: Ran with Charles Butler

Ad Date: January 31, 1777, Purdie, p3c1
Name: Farthing, Charles
Nationality: England
Trade: convict servant
Residence: Loudoun Co.
Seeker: Abraham Lewis, Joseph Lewis
Hat: good felt hat
Shirt: old tow shirt
Coat: white hunting shirt of flax and tow
Jacket: old kersey jacket
Waistcoat: old blue cloth jacket without sleeves
Breeches: Kersey breeches patched on the seat with red
Stockings: stockings of white and black twisted together pair of shoes half worn tied with strings
Misc: ran with William Hipditch

Ad Date: July 7, 1774, Rind, p3c3
Name: Faston, Thomas
Nationality: Scotland
Trade: joiner
Residence: Annapolis, Maryland
Date Ran: June 11, 1774
Seeker: John Randall (Richard Sprigg, George Steuart)
Hat: new fine hat
Neckwear: sundry white (shirts and) neckclothes
Shirt: sundry white shirts
Coat: suit of purple broad cloth with twist buttons, old brown cloth coat
Waistcoat: purple broad cloth suit with twist buttons, black velvet waistcoat
Breeches: purple broad cloth suit with twist buttons, leather breeches
Trousers: striped holland trousers
Shoes: English shoes that have been soled
Misc: arrived on the Betsey Richmond in February 1774. His dress is uncertain, though it supposed he has on... [items listed]. Property of Randall. Listed with Joseph Belong and Thomas King

Ad Date: November 10, 1774, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Fisher, Joseph
Trade: tailor, convict
Residence: Dumfries
Date Ran: October 21, 1774
Seeker: Andrew Leitch
Coat: blue broadcloth coat, with metal buttons
Jacket: blue broadcloth (coat and) jacket, with metal buttons
Breeches: white fustian breeches
Shoes: pinchbeck buckles
Misc: Ran with William Booth and Patrick Creamer

Ad Date: June 17, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: Flemming, John (27)
Nationality: England
Trade: painter, drawer, and silversmith
Residence: Williamsburg
Date Ran: about June 15, 1775
Seeker: Gavin Hamilton
Coat: brown Holland short coat
Jacket: brown Holland short coat and jacket
Trousers: wears trousers
Misc: ran with George Wassell

Ad Date: August 25, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Fogg, William (23)
Nationality: England
Trade: blacksmith
Residence: Brunswick Co., on Poplar Creek
Seeker: Edward Travis
Neckwear: two white stocks
Shirt: one or two white shirts, two osnabrug shirts
Coat: blue coat
Waistcoat: red waistcoat
Trousers: osnabrug trousers
Stockings: two pair of thread stockings
Shoes: pair of plated buckles
Misc: Went with Moses Willis, a white freeman waggoner. Willis wore old beaver hat, check shirt, old Virginia cloth waistcoat, and osnabrug breeches

Ad Date: June 16, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p2c3
Name: Forbes, William (20)
Trade: silversmith apprentice boy
Residence: Norfolk
Date Ran: June 5, 1774
Seeker: James Murphree
Shirt: white shirt
Jacket: Bearskin jacket lined with flannel
Breeches: white breeches
Stockings: thread stockings
Shoes: English made shoes with Pinchbeck pierced buckles
Misc: Given to drink and likes to imitate the Irish accent when drunk

Ad Date: July 25, 1777, Purdie, p3c1
Name: Fright, Matthew (35-40)
Nationality: England
Trade: indentured servant
Residence: Spotsylvania
Date Ran: July 5, 1777
Seeker: John Holladay
Hat: old felt hat
Shirt: country made cotton shirt
Coat: brown coloured broadcloth coat, much worn
Waistcoat: brown coloured broadcloth coat and waistcoat, much worn
Trousers: linen trousers
Shoes: old shoes

Ad Date: November 17, 1775, Purdie, p1c2 Sup
Name: Fullam, Baker (27)
Trade: good groom, and a waiting man.
Residence: Prince William, near Dumfries
Date Ran: late September 1775
Seeker: Thomas Blackburn
Hat: stole beaver hat about half worn
Shirt: stole white shirt marked A.S.
Coat: blue lappelled coat with white metal buttons. Stole blue sirtout coat
Jacket: blue jacket
Breeches: leather breeches, pretty much worn. Sole black everlasting breeches and nankeen breeches.
Stockings: stole pair thread and pair marbled worsted stockings
Shoes: stole shoes, little worn with pair of pinchbeck shoe buckles
Misc: All items stolen apparently from a tutor (young man) living in the house with him. A 31 years servant, a mulatto. Escaped previously. In Richmond during Convention

Ad Date: November 3, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p4c3
Name: Furbough, William
Residence: Newcastle
Date Ran: July 74
Coat: striped Virginia cloth Jack coat
Misc: Left on condition he would pay off his indenture and never returned to do so

Ad Date: March 4, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c2
Name: Gelding, Isaac
Trade: house carpenter
Residence: Williamsburg, Virginia
Date Ran: February 12, 1775
Seeker: James Southall
Hat: new hat
Shirt: brown linen shirt
Coat: Bearskin Coat
Waistcoat: Bearskin Coat and waistcoat
Breeches: pair of light coloured Worsted Shag Breeches, with metal buttons
Misc: wears short brown hair tied behind. Took with him a broad axe and a hand saw

Ad Date: December 15, 1774, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: George, William (34)
Nationality: England
Trade: carpenter and joiner by trade
Residence: Dorsey's Forge, Maryland
Date Ran: September 24, 1774
Seeker: Samuel Dorsey and Edward Norwood
Hat: small round hat bound with black worsted binding and a small piece crap tied round the crown
Neckwear: had on an Iron collar
Shirt: check shirt, one Osnabrug Ditto
Jacket: light blue jacket without sleeves
Breeches: old leather breeches
Stockings: pair of ribbed, worsted stockings
Shoes: pair of pumps with steel buckles
Misc: light coloured short hair. Ran with Solomon Burnham and Samuel Chapman

Ad Date: June 2, 1775, Purdie, p4c3 Sup
Name: Giddins, Charles (30)
Trade: sawyer by trade
Residence: Warwick Co. Ran on road to Williamsburg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Ran:</th>
<th>E(Saturday last)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>Samuel Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat:</td>
<td>dark brown broadcloth coat, carried a fustian frock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacket:</td>
<td>blue jacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waistcoat:</td>
<td>carried a white jeans waistcoat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches:</td>
<td>leather breeches, carried white jeans breeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockings:</td>
<td>worsted stockings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes:</td>
<td>old negro made shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc:</td>
<td>Took along a horse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Date:</th>
<th>July 12, 1776, Purdie, p3c2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Gill, William (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade:</td>
<td>farmer and gardener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>John Tayloe's Neabsco Furnace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>Thomas Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat:</td>
<td>lightish coloured short cloth coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacket:</td>
<td>short blue jacket generally worn under his coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches:</td>
<td>breeches matched coat and Stole a pair blue duffil breeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc:</td>
<td>sundry other clothes, from his fellow servants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Date:</th>
<th>March 10, 1774, Rind, p3c2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Gils, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>Staunton Gaol (suspicion of being a runaway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>Thomas Rhodes (Rhoades) gaoler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat:</td>
<td>ragged frock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trousers:</td>
<td>(ragged frock) and trousers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc:</td>
<td>Gaoled with James Coulter on suspicion of being a runaway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Date:</th>
<th>August 4, 1774, Rind, p3c3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Goode, Thomas (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>Fauquier Co., near the courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>William Settle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat:</td>
<td>old coarse hat trimmed round the brim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirt:</td>
<td>brown linen shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacket:</td>
<td>short striped jacket with sleeves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trousers:</td>
<td>brown linen trousers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes:</td>
<td>English made shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc:</td>
<td>Ran with Thomas Boyce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Date:</th>
<th>October 27, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Gordon, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade:</td>
<td>dyer, suspected runaway with a discharge they believed forged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>jailed at Isle of Wight. From Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>Micjah Wills, jailor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat:</td>
<td>light coloured Sagathy coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waistcoat:</td>
<td>raised cotton waistcoat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches:</td>
<td>dirty leather breeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockings:</td>
<td>white thread stockings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shoes: plated buckles and country made shoes
Misc: Ran with his wife. Came on the ship Molly to Oxford, Maryland 6 months before he was arrested for "strolling about without an Occupation"

Ad Date: April 21, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Gothard, Joseph
Trade: cooper
Residence: Rocky Mill, Hanover Co.
Date Ran: March 27, 1774
Seeker: John Syme John Chrenshaw
Hat: Half worn Hat
Jacket: Drab colored Frieze Jacket, with Metal Buttons
Breeches: old Leather Breeches
Stockings: Pair of Sale Hose
Shoes: Pair of coarse Shoes
Misc: Ran with Thomas Jackson

Ad Date: March 24, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Granger, Francis (30)
Nationality: North of England
Residence: servant ship Justitia near Leeds Town on the Rappahannock
Date Ran: March 19, 1774
Seeker: Capt Finlay Gray
Jacket: Drab coloured Jacket
Waistcoat: Drab coloured Jacket and Waistcoat
Trousers: Pair of Fearnought Trousers
Misc: Ran with Ralph Lawson, Robert Walker, Robert Wood, James Watson, and Lydia Heathcote

Ad Date: September 22, 1774, Rind, p3c3
Name: Gregory, Samuel alias Nailing (18)
Trade: carpenter (for the past 3 years)
Residence: lying off Byrd Creek, Goochland Co.
Date Ran: July 9, 1774
Seeker: Turner Anderson
Shirt: oznabrig shirt
Trousers: oznabrig trowsers
Misc: Went to Loudoun Co. or a neighboring county it was believed

Ad Date: October 27, 1774, Pinkney, p3c2
Name: Griffin, William
Residence: Schooner Kingston below Four Mile Creek (Warwick County?).
Seeker: Peter Ridley
Shirt: check shirt
Waistcoat: black yarn waistcoat, and a wilton one under it
Trousers: oznabrig trowsers
Misc: Stole a silver shoebuckle and a brooch

Ad Date: August 18, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Grymes, Edward (24)
Nationality: England
Trade: Bricklayer
Residence: Plantation of James Pride, esq.
Date Ran: August 14, 1774
Seeker: William Chancey
Jacket: white plaid jacket
Breeches: blue breeches
Misc: Ran with William Balding

Ad Date: July 28, 1775, Purdie, p3c1
Name: Grymes, John (25)
Nationality: Yorkshire, England
Trade: cooper by trade
Residence: of or near Blandford. committed to prison in York for a runaway
Date Ran: before July 28, 1775
Seeker: Owner Samuel Cox, gaoler William Mitchell
Shirt: check shirt
Coat: new bearskin short coat
Trousers: long trousers
Shoes: country made shoes
Misc: has a bag with a variety of weaving apparel, also a pewter pint measure, a tin funnel, and a cooper’s adze. Jailed with Thomas Coleman, but no otherwise known association

Ad Date: October 11, 1776, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Hall, Thomas (30)
Nationality: England
Trade: shoemaker by trade, convict servant
Residence: Fauquier, near Little Run
Seeker: Murthy Maboy
Hat: old felt hat, new straw hat bound round
Shirt: old country made linen shirt
Coat: old claret casimire coat with a slit down the back and gold basket buttons
Trousers: old country made linen trousers
Shoes: old pair of country made turned pumps
Misc: took a set of shoemaker’s tools. Had ready cash and was felt he might purchase new clothes

Ad Date: May 2, 1777, Dixon and Hunter, p3c2
Name: Hanan, William (25)
Nationality: England
Trade: shoemaker
Residence: Petersburg (Mr. James French’s shop)
Seeker: Elias Barnaby, Archibald Midlimist
Hat: small brimmed hat
Shirt: new check shirt of Virginia Cotton
Coat: old blue cloth coat tore on the shoulders
Jacket: white kersey Jacket
Breeches: old leather breeches
Stockings: Worsted stockings
Shoes: old shoes
Misc: ran with Clowd Morrison

Ad Date: April 18, 1777, Purdie, p2c1 Sup
Name: Harris, Walter (25-30)
Nationality: England
Trade: carpenter
Residence: Northumberland
Date Ran: March 12, 1777
Seeker: Jesse Denney
Hat: straw hat filled in with blue and white wool which hides the straw
Coat: brown broadcloth coat patched under the arms, with a reddish coloured velvet collar to it and slash cuffs
Waistcoat: purple broadcloth waistcoat, with gold basket buttons
Breeches: pair of spotted velvet breeches
Stockings: white yarn stockings, and a pair of silk and worsted do.
Shoes: new shoes

Ad Date: September 21, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Hart, Thomas (23)
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: tailor
Residence: Fredericksburg
Date Ran: September 10, 1775
Seeker: William Blyth
Shirt: oznabrig shirt
Coat: claret coloured coat
Waistcoat: claret coloured coat and vest
Trousers: oznabrig shirt and trousers
Misc: ran with Josiah Bailey

Ad Date: July 26, 1776, Purdie, p4c2
Name: Hawk, Richard (55)
Nationality: England
Trade: convict servant
Residence: Loudoun Co
Date Ran: July 1, 1776
Seeker: Arthur Edwards Thomas Askren
Hat: felt hat half wore, with a narrow leather strap for a hat band
Shirt: country spun shirt
Coat: old brown kersey coat
Jacket: old white kersey jacket
Trousers: country spun trousers
Misc: Ran with John Topin. In country for 9 months

Ad Date: February 2, 1776, Purdie, p4c1
Name: Hawkins, Benjamin
Nationality: England
Residence: Northumberland Jail
Date Ran: Jailed on November 31, 1775
Seeker: (Jailer posted ad)
Hat: old coarse hat
Coat: lead coloured coat of the country manufactory
Jacket: blue jacket
Breeches: buckskin breeches
Stockings: stockings
Shoes: shoes
Misc: arrived in colonies in 1767, former servant, jailed on suspicion of being a runaway servant. Served former time in Dunmore county.

Ad Date: November 10, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p4c3
Name: Hern, John alias Pooling Horne (24)
Nationality: England
Trade: convict
Residence: Bull Run (near Colchester)
Date Ran: September 7, 1774
Seeker: Alexander Henderson
Neckwear: silk handkerchiefs
Shirt: two new Osnabrug and several other shirts
Jacket: old blue sailor's jacket very short with small black buttons sewed thick on both sides.
New light gray jacket lined with striped plaiding, of coarse cloth with white metal buttons
Waistcoat: black waistcoat
Breeches: brown striped corded Dury rare breeches. New light gray breeches of coarse cloth
(assumingly with white metal buttons)
Stockings: light marbled stockings
Shoes: old shoes
Misc: Imported on Taylor to Potomack one or two months earlier. Also took horse and other things.

Ad Date: March 25, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c2
Name: Higgenson, Joseph (Higginson) (21-22)
Nationality: London, England
Trade: jobbing blacksmith by trade, convict. Served time as a screw and/or screwplate maker.
and taught other smithing and brass and silver
Residence: near upper Church, in Middlesex
Date Ran: March 18, 1775
Seeker: Samuel Daniel
Hat: fine small hat, almost new
Neckcloth: Muslin neckcloth
Shirt: fine Holland shirt, an Osnabrug shirt
Coat: Virginia cotton kersey wove coat, died of a pale lead Colour
Waistcoat: Wilton jacket mixed with red without sleeves. A blue Jump Jacket without sleeves and very coarse.
Breeches: Russia drill breeches, a pair of old English Buckskin Ditto. A third ad says he had white breeches the same stuff as his coat and also the leather pair.
Stockings: white cotton, pale blue Virginia Yarn, coarse mixed red sale
Shoes: old shoes, turned pumps, perhaps silver buckles, thought to have purchased a pair of new black grain Dogskin shoes after he ran
Misc: Possibly a stone set brooch. * also used were April 8, (Dixon and Hunter) 1775, and April 7 (Purdie) 1775. Straight hair not long enough to tie behind. Also suspected of having stolen two new cotton shirts.

Ad Date: July 25, 1777, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Hinds, David
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: convict servant, ropemaker, former sailor
Residence: Loudoun Co.
Date Ran: June 20, 1777
Seeker: Samuel Love, Jr.
Hat: felt hat
Shirt: tow shirt
Jacket: country cloth jacket
Breeches: breeches that he wore last winter (they are kersey wove)
Stockings: (old shoes and) stockings
Shoes: old shoes
Misc: Dutch blanket, Ran with George Dorman

Ad Date: January 31, 1777, Purdie, p3c1
Name: Hipitch, William
Nationality: England
Trade: convict servant
Residence: Loudoun Co.
Seeker: Abraham Lewis and Joseph Lewis
Hat: old felt hat
Coat: tow hunting shirt
Waistcoat: under jacket, part linsey and part cloth
Trousers: pair of tow trousers
Stockings: pair of stockings black and white mixed
Shoes: old pair of shoes much worn

Ad Date: February 18, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c2
Name: Horbert, Thomas (30)
Trade: silversmith, convict servant
Residence: Borton's Tract, in Augusta
Seeker: William Alexander
Shirt: brown linen shirt
Coat: old brown Cotton Coat
Breeches: Leather Breeches
Stockings: white cotton leggins

Ad Date: November 15, 1776, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Humphreys, Daniel (26)
Nationality: Wales
Trade: tailor by trade
Residence: Williamsburg, back street south side of the Capitol building
Seeker: Samuel Harris
Hat: fashionable new cocked hat
Coat: brown coat with metal buttons
Jacket: buff jacket
Breeches: black breeches
Misc: long light coloured hair worn clubbed behind. silver watch

Ad Date: February 3, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Hunter, John
Nationality: London, England
Residence: Williamsburg
Seeker: Ekanah Deane
Coat: dark drab short coat

Ad Date: October 13, 1775, Purdie, p3c2
Name: Hunter, John (25)  
Nationality: England  
Trade: a pretty good scholar and may pass for a schoolmaster  
Residence: Sugarloaf Mountain, Frederick Co., Maryland  
Seeker: Francis Thomas  
Hat: coarse hat lined with red  
Shirt: old white shirt  
Coat: blue and white homespun coat  
Waistcoat: blue and white homespun (coat) and waistcoat  
Breeches: white drill breeches  
Stockings: black ribbed worsted stockings  
Shoes: turned pumps with plated buckles  
Misc: Ran with William M'Kinlay

Ad Date: July 28, 1774, Rind, p3c3  
Name: Hurst, Henry  
Trade: convict  
Residence: Orange  
Seeker: Thomas Robins  
Shirt: check shirt, with a brown one over it  
Waistcoat: white dimity waistcoat  
Trousers: oznbrig trowsers

Ad Date: June 17, 1775. Dixon and Hunter, p3c3  
Name: Ingles, Andrew  
Nationality: Scotland  
Trade: baker  
Residence: Alexandria  
Date Ran: before June 5, 1775  
Seeker: James Kirk, Robert Adam, George Purvis  
Hat: half worn castor hat  
Shirt: took Osnabrug and check shirt  
Coat: took match coat blanket  
Jacket: Bearskin jacket lined with plaid, red jacket  
Breeches: took a pair leather breeches  
Trousers: Osnabrug trousers  
Shoes: old shoes  
Misc: Ran with Robert Shaw. took bundle with two match coat blankets, two pair of leather breeches, two Osnabrug shirts, two check shirts, two red jackets. Dressed as Shaw, and had same clothes in bundles. (items listed under clothing category as took with for both runaways)

Ad Date: September 14, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3  
Name: Ingram, Joseph (alias Joseph Waggole) (27)  
Nationality: England  
Trade: understands farming, and can use a scythe well  
Residence: upper end of Sporsylvania  
Date Ran: May 20, 1775  
Seeker: Henry Coleman  
Hat: old felt hat  
Shirt: two Osnabrug shirts (1st ad said 2 brown linen shirts)  
Coat: Devonshire Kersey brown coloured coat, with metal buttons, and pieced in the sides
Trousers: roll trousers
Shoes: shoes with strings
Misc: Ran with Rueben Cave, an apprentice who returned and apparently helped with the 2nd description

Ad Date: June 8, 1775, Pinkney, p4c1
Name: Irwin, Francis (also see Michael Lane)
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: blacksmith by trade, convict servant
Residence: Loudoun
Date Ran: May 14, 1775
Seeker: Samuel Canby
Hat: fine hat bound with velvet with a band of the same, coarse do. bound with ferret (combo*)
Neckwear: one black and one red and white silk handkerchiefs combo*
Shirt: two check, two oznabrig, and some white shirts (issue?) combo*
Coat: light coloured cloth coat, patched at the elbows, half worn janes, ditto lined with brown holland, a gray surtout, and one brown ditto, with a velvet cape combo*
Jacket: sailor's blue jacket, and one knit ditto combo*
Breeches: pair of leather breeches combo*
Trousers: two pairs of oznabrig trousers combo*
Stockings: one pair of gray thread and some worsted stockings combo*
Shoes: pair of stitched pumps, with long quarters, and one pair of new, one pair of old shoes combo*
Misc: * above is a combined list for Irwin and Lane. Ran with Michael Lane. Two motley coloured rugs, one blanket, and a smooth bored gun. Also took two mares

Ad Date: April 21, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Jackson, Thomas (30)
Trade: coachman
Residence: Rocky Mill, Hanover Co.
Date Ran: March 27, 1774
Seeker: John Syme John Chrenshaw
Hat: old hat
Coat: dark Broadcloth Coat much patched
Waistcoat: old Virginia Cloth blue twilled jacket, with Pewter Buttons, without sleeves
Trousers: Pair of very narrow Duck Trousers patched on each knee with new Osnabrugs
Stockings: blue hose
Shoes: Pair of Country Shoes
Misc: Ran with Joseph Gothard

Ad Date: August 21, 1778, Purdie, p3c2
Name: James, Thomas
Nationality: Portugal
Residence: Goochland Co.
Date Ran: June 22, 1778
Seeker: Renne Napier
Hat: black wool hat
Shirt: two Virginia osnabrug shirts
Waistcoat: blue waistcoat with short sleeves
Breeches: pair of half worn buckskin breeches
Trousers: pair of trousers
Misc: All clothes may be stolen and not what he was actually wearing. Hired himself out, may not have been under full indentures

Ad Date: January 21, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c2
Name: Johnston, William (17-18)
Nationality: Williamsburg, VA
Trade: bound to a stay maker in Surry Co. and then to a ship
Residence: Brig Innermay lying at Brandon (near Cabin Point)
Date Ran: December 27, 1774
Seeker: James Belches
Jacket: carried away a new sailor's jacket of blue duffil, with white metal buttons, and lined with white Plaid (cloth not tartan). A green jacket pretty much worn
Waistcoat: blue and white broad striped cotton and thread under jacket
Breeches: (new sailor's jacket) and breeches of blue duffil with white metal buttons and lined with white plaid
Trousers: one or two pair of sailor's trousers
Stockings: (country made shoes) and stockings
Shoes: country made shoes
Misc: bed clothes

Ad Date: May 26, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Jones, John (36)
Nationality: Liverpool, England
Trade: convict servant, shoemaker, former sailor
Residence: Botetourt
Date Ran: May 1, 1774
Seeker: Patrick Lockhart
Shirts: two shirts of Country made Linen
Jacket: light coloured Sailor's Jacket
Breeches: Fearnought Breeches, stole (?) new Pair of Buckskin Breeches with John Stewart wrote on the Inside of the Waistband
Trousers: Pair of trousers. Osnabrug to make another Pair
Misc: Ran with Elizabeth Lewellin, a convict Welsh Woman about 25. (Her clothes were also described)

Ad Date: September 20, 1776, Purdie, p2c3
Name: Kelly, Andrew
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: brick maker by trade
Residence: Alexandria
Date Ran: August 12, 1776
Seeker: James Parsons
Shirt: old brown linen shirt
Coat: short brown coat
Waistcoat: brown waistcoat
Trousers: old brown linen trousers
Shoes: buckskin mockasons
Misc: fond of liquors, inclined to be fat

Ad Date: June 6, 1777, Purdie, p1c2
Name: King, George (40)
Nationality: England
Trade: understands farming, accustomed to the business of a groom
Residence: Winchester
Seeker: Patrick Murray
Shirt: country made linen shirt
Jacket: white country cloth jacket with sleeves
Waistcoat: blue waistcoat with white metal buttons
Breeches: pair of buckskin breeches better than half worn
Stockings: white yarn stockings
Shoes: pair of vamp shoes with new quarters and strings in them

Ad Date: July 7, 1774, Rind, p3c2
Name: King, Thomas (30)
Nationality: England
Trade: bricklayer
Residence: Annapolis, Maryland
Date Ran: June 11, 1774
Seeker: Richard Sprigg (George Steuart, John Randall)
Hat: castor hat
Coat: brown bearskin coat
Waistcoat: blue cloth waistcoat, striped flannel waistcoat
Breeches: blue cloth breeches, black breeches
Stockings: gray yarn stockings
Shoes: country made shoes
Misc: arrived on the Chance in March 1774. Spent many years on board a Man of War. Property of Sprigg, ran with Joseph Belong and Thomas Faston (each had different masters)

Ad Date: June 8, 1776, Dixon and Hunter, p7c1
Name: Kittle, John Charles (23)
Nationality: Holland (Dutch)
Trade: breeches maker by trade but may pass for a tailor
Residence: Suffolk Co
Date Ran: June 4, 1776
Seeker: Casper Herritter
Coat: Virginia Copperas striped coatee
Breeches: leather breeches
Stockings: ribbed stockings
Misc: professes himself a showman, & pretends to all sorts of music, though is not proficient in any. Long yellow hair. Carried other clothes with him

Ad Date: June 8, 1775, Pinkney, p4c1
Name: Lane, Michael
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: convict servant
Residence: Loudoun
Date Ran: May 14, 1775
Seeker: Samuel Canby
Hat: fine hat bound with velvet & band of the same, coarse do. bound with ferret combo*
Neckwear: one black and one red and white silk handkerchiefs combo*
Shirt: two check, two oznabrig, and some white shirts (issue?) combo*
Coat: light coloured cloth coat, patched at the elbows, half worn janes, ditto lined with brown holland, a gray sartout, and one brown ditto, with a velvet cape combo*
Jacket: sailor's blue jacket, and one knit ditto combo*
Breeches: pair of leather breeches combo*
Trousers: two pairs of oznabrig trousers combo*
Stockings: one pair of gray thread and some worsted stockings combo*
Shoes: stitched pumps, with long quarters, and one pair new, one pair old shoes combo*
Misc: * above is a combined list for Irwin and Lane. Ran with Michael Lane. Two motley coloured rugs, one blanket, and a smooth bored gun. Also took two mares

Ad Date: March 24, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Lawson, Ralph (22)
Nationality: London, England
Residence: servant ship Justitia off Leeds Town on the Rappahannock
Date Ran: March 19, 1774
Seeker: Capt Finlay Gray
Jacket: blue jacket
Waistcoat: Linsey woolsey Waistcoat
Misc: Ran with Robert Walker, Francis Granger, James Watson, Robert Wood, and Lydia Heathcote

Ad Date: June 17, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: Lee, William
Trade: cooper
Residence: Alexandria
Date Ran: before June 5, 1775
Seeker: James Kirk, Robert Adam, George Purvis
Misc: The said Lee had a variety of clothes which cannot be described. Also took along a yellow bulldog with cropped ears

Ad Date: November 23, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Leighton, James (20)
Nationality: Cambridgeshire, England
Trade: convict
Residence: Frederick County, Marlborough Iron Works
Date Ran: November 18, 1775
Seeker: Isaac Zane
Hat: small felt hat
Shirt: tow shirt. Also stole a fine shirt
Coat: old ash coloured duroy coat. Stole a dark brown cloth coat with plated buttons
Jacket: brown cloth jacket with sleeves. Also stole a new ash coloured jacket with high topped horn buttons
Waistcoat: Stole a black velvet jacket with leather pockets
Trousers: tow trousers
Stockings: white coton stockings, stole light coloured Germantown stockings
Shoes: good shoes tied with strings
Misc: ran with Charles White and slave Will. Stole a check apron and two fine shifts. Imported last summer

Ad Date: November 17, 1775, Purdie, p1c3
Name: Lewis, Isaac
Nationality: Pennsylvania
Trade: waggon-maker
Residence: committed to Essex County jail as a runaway
Seeker: James Emerson, jailer
Hat: old felt hat
Shirt: osnabrug shirt
Coat: old drab coat
Waistcoat: green waistcoat

Ad Date: January 6, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c3
Name: Lloyd, Joseph (21)
Nationality: England
Trade: house carpenter and joiner
Residence: Morattico, Lancaster Co.
Date Ran: October 1773
Seeker: Rawleigh Downman
Shirt: shirt, a white shirt of Irish linen
Coat: German Osnabrug Frock, a Frock of blue Fearnought with plain white Metal Buttons
Waistcoat: German Osnabrug Frock and waistcoat, a black and white Virginia Cloth Waistcoat Kersey wove
Breeches: two pair of long Breeches, a Pair of black Cloth Breeches

Ad Date: May 26, 1775, Purdie, p4c3 Sup
Name: Luscombe, William (17-18)
Trade: servant
Residence: Staunton
Date Ran: April 22., 1775
Seeker: Robert North
Coat: reddish coloured coat
Waistcoat: blue waistcoat
Breeches: red plush breeches

Ad Date: February 17, 1774, Rind, p3c1
Name: M’Carney, Nicholas (27)
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: shoemaker
Residence: Cumberland Co.
Date Ran: December 9, 1773
Seeker: Zachariah Hendrick
Coat: short brown coloured duffil coat, lined with plaid
Waistcoat: Virginia cloth under waistcoat, cross barred with red worsted
Breeches: old pair of leather breeches

Ad Date: September 12, 1777, Purdie, p3c3
Name: M’Carty, John
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: weaver
Residence: Raspberry plain, near Leesburg (owner in Loudoun)
Date Ran: August 23, 1777
Seeker: Thomas Mason
Shirt: two tow linen shirts
Coat: short brown cloth coat
Jacket: one white linen jacket, a jacket of twilled cotton filled in with black yarn
Waistcoat: green cloth jacket without sleeves
Breeches: breeches of twilled cotton filled in with black yarn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trousers:</th>
<th>crocus trousers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockings:</td>
<td>one pair of white yarn stockings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes:</td>
<td>coarse shoes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Date:</th>
<th>June 16, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>M'Donald, Dennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>Hanover Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Ran:</td>
<td>May 22, 1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>George Norvell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirt:</td>
<td>brown linen shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat:</td>
<td>darkish coloured frieze coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trousers:</td>
<td>brown linen shirt and trousers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockings:</td>
<td>sale stockings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes:</td>
<td>shoes with plated shoe buckles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Date:</th>
<th>October 13, 1775, Purdie, p3c2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>M'Kinlay, William (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>near Sugarloaf Mountain, Frederick Co., Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>Francis Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat:</td>
<td>small hat bound round with ferret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirt:</td>
<td>good white shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat:</td>
<td>brown coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waistcoat:</td>
<td>green cloth waistcoat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches:</td>
<td>white breeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockings:</td>
<td>gray worsted stockings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes:</td>
<td>turned pumps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Date:</th>
<th>October 27, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>M'Lean, James (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Ran:</td>
<td>October 10, 1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>Samuel Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat:</td>
<td>coarse felt hat bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat:</td>
<td>Parson-gray coloured coat (and jacket) much worn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacket:</td>
<td>Parson gray coloured (coat and) jacket much worn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches:</td>
<td>black plush breeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc:</td>
<td>Ran with Patrick M'Quire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Date:</th>
<th>October 27, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>M'Quire, Patrick (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade:</td>
<td>smith and farrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence:</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Ran:</td>
<td>October 10, 1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker:</td>
<td>Samuel Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat:</td>
<td>coarse felt hat bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat:</td>
<td>blue coat much worn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacket:</td>
<td>green jacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches:</td>
<td>blue plush breeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc:</td>
<td>Went with James M'Lean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ad Date: July 29, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p4c2
Name: Mackgill, Andrew (also M'Gill)
Nationality: Scotland
Trade: blacksmith
Residence: Williamsburg
Date Ran: July 16, 1775
Seeker: John Shiphard
Coat: dark blue cloth coat
Jacket: dark blue cloth coat and jacket
Breeches: leather breeches
Trousers: striped trousers, check trousers
Misc: Ran with John Staunton

Ad Date: July 13, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Mason, John (22-23)
Trade: barber
Residence: Williamsburg
Date Ran: July 12, 1775
Seeker: Walter Lenon
Coat: brown Holland coat
Jacket: brown Holland coat and jacket
Breeches: Russia drab breeches
Stockings: Virginia knit cotton stockings

Ad Date: May 12, 1774, Rind, p4c1
Name: Mason, John
Trade: peruke maker
Residence: Norfolk
Date Ran: May 11, 1774
Seeker: David Reynolds
Coat: dark blue coat
Waistcoat: striped waistcoat
Breeches: white breeches
Stockings: pale blue stockings

Ad Date: January 7, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c2
Name: Mathison, David (25)
Nationality: Scotland
Trade: Gardener by trade
Residence: Stafford Co.
Seeker: William Brent
Shirt: one shirt of brown sheeting, several others of fine Linen
Coat: old blue surtout coat, which has been turned, faced and trimmed with the same colour. A mixed blue cloth coat
Jacket: green cloth jacket with yellow metal buttons. A mixed blue cloth coat and jacket, lined and trimmed with black. A striped Virginia cloth jacket
Breeches: pair of red plush breeches. A pair of Nankeen breeches
Stockings: fine mixed blue country stockings
Misc: dark red hair curled behind, and at the sides. Many other clothes that cannot be particularized. Ran with Charles Booth. They took with them a Gun, a Pair of double Blankets, and a spotted Rug, and went away in a Pettauger
Ad Date: September 21, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Matthews, Francis (19-20)
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: convict servant
Residence: Prince George Co., Maryland near Snoden’s iron works
Seeker: Philip Hall and Isaac Short
Shirt: crocus shirt
Jacket: short old swanskin jacket
Trousers: pair of sacking trousers
Misc: Ran with Michael Conroy. They are great villains and will steal anything that is in their way. They took with them a broadax

Ad Date: March 9, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Matthews, Paul
Trade: convict servant
Residence: Culpeper (but jailed in Westmoreland Co.)
Date Ran: jailed February 10, 1775
Seeker: Belonged to John Strother, ad placed by James Muse, gaoler
Shirt: Osnabrug shirt
Misc: He is clothed in negro cotton and an Osnabrug shirt

Ad Date: November 24, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c1
Name: Mills, Robert (22)
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: gardener
Residence: Charles Co., Maryland
Date Ran: before November 7, 1774
Seeker: Samuel Hanson
Hat: hat
Neckwear: silk handkerchief
Shirt: two white shirts, one check shirt
Coat: snuff coloured cloth coat
Jacket: red jacket
Breeches: snuff coloured cloth coat and breeches
Stockings: stockings
Shoes: shoes
Misc: Ran with James Bell. Imported last Sept. by Capt. Joseph Street

Ad Date: September 12, 1777, Dixon and Hunter, p4c1
Name: Moncriess, Henry (30)
Nationality: Scotland
Trade: Iron Works worker
Residence: Marlborough Iron Works
Date Ran: August 22, 1777
Seeker: Isaac Zane
Hat: old felt hat
Shirt: country linen shirt
Trousers: tow trousers
Misc: hard to say what his dress was, as he went off from his work in the Day time

Ad Date: May 2, 1777, Dixon and Hunter, p3c2
Name: Morrison, Clowd
Nationality: Scotland
Trade: shoemaker
Residence: Petersburg (Mr. James French's shop)
Seeker: Elias Barnaby, Archibald Midlimist
Misc: had on green clothes when he went away. Ran with William Hanan

Ad Date: March 8, 1776, Purdie, p4c1
Name: Murdy, George (20)
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: weaver
Residence: Frederick County, MD
Date Ran: April 10, 1775?
Seeker: George Sell
Jacket: had on two striped country cloth jackets
Breeches: pair of striped country cloth breeches
Misc: ran with Christopher Warren. Suspected they may have other clothes with them, or get their own changed

Ad Date: November 4, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: Murphey, John
Nationality: England
Residence: Botetourt Co.
Date Ran: October 13, 1775
Seeker: John May
Coat: white Russia Drill coat
Waistcoat: white Russia Drill coat and waistcoat
Breeches: leather breeches
Misc: took a variety of other clothes along but was wearing the above listed clothes. Carried away (stole): 9 Holland shirts, two of them ruffled and marked IM, with broad hems on the ruffles; two others plain, marked AC, with the numbers (none given) below the marks; the other fine ruffled only at the Bosum, with narrow hems on the ruffles; three pair of stockings, one of gray worsted, one of white thread, and the other of brown thread; a white cotton waistcoat, corded; a country made blue striped handkerchief; white jeans waistcoat and breeches; an old great coat, with one corner torn off, and the button holes in the pocket flaps made downwards; a Fantail hat, with yellow lining, and marked in the crown R. May. 75; a pair of small silver buckles, almost square, stamped TA; also a silver watch with a double case, on the inner of which is engraved Stephen May, London and the same on the edge of the plate, under the case. Also stole a horse, saddle, saddle bags, and portmanteau

Ad Date: September 23, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: Murray, John (21-22)
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: stocking weaver by trade
Residence: Berkeley Co.
Date Ran: September 8, 1775
Seeker: Marcus Stephenson
Hat: felt hat, with a piece sewed on the crown
Shirt: coarse shirt
Coat: lightish coloured Wilton coat
Breeches: Pair of Nankeen breeches
Stockings: pair of thread stockings
Shoes: pair of coarse shoes
Misc: took also a blue Hussar cloak, with plated buttons. Ran with Richard Dulancy

Ad Date: June 1, 1775, Pinkney, p4c1
Name: Newton, George
Nationality: Yorkshire, England
Trade: farmer, convict servant
Residence: Spotsylvania
Date Ran: May 20, 1775
Seeker: James Tott
Hat: felt hat, bound
Neckwear: stock and brass stock buckles
Shirt: two Oznabrig shirts, almost new, one of them died a purple colour, a white linen shirt
Waistcoat: jacket without sleeves, much worn
Trousers: pair of oznabrig trousers, rather too small for him
Stockings: pair of new worsted hose, mixed brown & white, pair of white yarn stockings
Shoes: pair of old country shoes
Misc: imported in the Justice in the Spring. A Dutch blanket. Suspected to have other clothes with him. Also took a negro man named George... Also may have had a second negro come along from a neighbor (John Tayloe) named Tim

Ad Date: July 13, 1776, Dixon and Hunter, p2c2
Name: Newton, John (20)
Nationality: Asiatic India
Trade: barber and hairdresser by trade
Residence: Ran on road to Williamsburg Prince William, near King William Court House
Date Ran: 2nd week of May, 1776
Seeker: William Brown
Hat: beaver hat much worn
Coat: short light brown frieze Postilion's Coat lapelled, common plate buttons
Waistcoat: waistcoat of light brown Frieeze with common flat metal plate buttons
Breeches: leather breeches
Stockings: country made stockings
Shoes: country made shoes with large single rimmed Pinchebeck buckles
Misc: description compiled from Dixon and Hunter and Purdie. Long black hair inclines to curl, tied behind, pinned up at sides. 10 years as servant to Sir Charles Whitworth, 12 months in VA

Ad Date: March 31, 1775, Purdie, p4c1
Name: Norris, Alexander
Trade: house carpenter
Residence: Dumfries
Date Ran: February 9, 1775
Seeker: Reginald Graham
Coat: brown coat much worn
Waistcoat: green waistcoat
Stockings: black stocking breeches

Ad Date: November 17, 1774, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Noughton, Thomas
Nationality: Ireland
| Residence:  | Prince Edward                     |
| Seeker:     | John Thompson jr.                |
| Hat:        | felt hat                         |
| Shirt:      | brown linen shirt                |
| Jacket:     | brown linen shirt and jacket     |
| Breeches:   | duffil breeches                  |
| Shoes:      | bare foot                        |
| Misc:       | Ran with Anthony Wilson          |

Ad Date: June 24, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: O'Brien, John alias James Brenon (about 19)
Nationality: Dublin, Ireland
Trade: tailor
Residence: York Town
Date Ran: about June 22, 1775
Seeker: William Davis
Coat: brown mixed cloth coat
Waistcoat: striped waistcoat
Breeches: Nankeen breeches
Misc: also ran January 17, 1777 (John O'brien) Dixon and Hunter January 24, 1777

| Ad Date:     | January 24, 1777, Dixon and Hunter, p4c2 |
| Name:        | O'Brien, John (O'Brien, alias James Brenon) (21) |
| Nationality: | Dublin, Ireland                          |
| Trade:       | tailor                                    |
| Residence:   | Yorktown                                  |
| Date Ran:    | January 17, 1777 Fri                     |
| Seeker:      | William Davis                            |
| Shirt:       | check shirt                              |
| Coat:        | brown frieze coat                        |
| Waistcoat:   | black or blue waistcoat                  |
| Misc:        | Also ran June 22, 1775                   |

| Ad Date:     | February 24, 1775, Purdie, p3e3         |
| Name:        | Oclyser, John                           |
| Nationality: | Netherlands (Dutch)                     |
| Trade:       | baker                                    |
| Residence:   | King George Co. (placer in Falmouth)    |
| Date Ran:    | January 1, 1775                         |
| Seeker:      | Peter Bowers                            |
| Hat:         | one bound and one macaroni hat          |
| Coat:        | blue coat with brass buttons            |
| Jacket:      | kind of brownish white [waistcoat] much worn, with sleeves |
| Waistcoat:   | one kersey waistcoat, one striped waistcoat with blue and white |
| Breeches:    | pair of black everlasting, pair of black stocking, and pair of negro cotton breeches |
| Stockings:   | two pair of stockings, one black the other blue |
| Shoes:       | pair of brass carved shoesbuckles       |

Ad Date: October 20, 1774, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Ogle, Taomas [spelled thusly in several ads]
Nationality: England or Ireland
Trade: shoemaker
Residence: Fredericksburg
Seeker: Benjamin Johnson
Coat: Virginia cloth coat of cotton, filled with red
Jacket: red jacket
Breeches: leather breeches
Misc: Claimed to be English but by his make he appears to be Irish. Several other clothes

Ad Date: November 13, 1778, Dixon and Hunter, p1c2
Name: Orton, Thomas (30)
Nationality: England
Trade: convict
Residence: Mossy Creek Iron Works, Augusta Co., Virginia
Date Ran: September 30, 1778
Seeker: Henry Miller
Hat: straw hat
Shirt: tow shirt
Jacket: short jacket made without skirts, of a light colour, lined with linen
Trousers: tow trousers
Misc: in common is very dirty

Ad Date: September 27, 1776, Purdie, p6c2
Name: Ounsted, John
Trade: farmer, indentured servant
Residence: James City Co.
Date Ran: the Tuesday before September 22, 1776
Seeker: William Dancer
Coat: dark gray coat
Waistcoat: snuff coloured waistcoat
Breeches: leather breeches
Stockings: had no stockings
Shoes: had no shoes

Ad Date: March 3, 1775, Purdie, p3c3
Name: Parker, William (21)
Nationality: England
Trade: blacksmith, but since in Virginia has acted as a waiting man
Residence: Richmond town
Seeker: Archibald M’Kendrick
Hat: round hat bound with velvet
Shirt: carried away sundry ruffled shirts
Coat: black coat, brown surtout coat
Jacket: black (coat) and jacket
Breeches: pair of buckskin breeches
Stockings: carried away sundry... silk stockings

Ad Date: June 16, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c1
Name: Parrot, Benjamin (32)
Nationality: London, England
Trade: House carpenter
Residence: Prince George at Flower de Hundred
Date Ran: May 23, 1774
Seeker: Joshua Poythress, Jr.
Hat: very deep brimmed felt hat
Shirt: white Irish linen shirt. Took 2 new check shirts
Coat: white broadcloth coat lately turned
Waistcoat: lead coloured cloth waistcoat
Breeches: white Russia Drill breeches, darned at both knees
Trousers: took a pair of new Osnabrug trousers
Stockings: white thread stockings (one of which is much finer than the other)
Shoes: coarse shoes with very large silver plated buckles
Misc: items he took he carried in a Virginia cloth wallet, marked SM. came on the Elizabeth
two months before

Ad Date: April 22, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: Pearce, William (25)
Nationality: London (?), England
Trade: convict servant, used to the sea
Residence: a few miles above Leeds Town, just off the Justitia
Date Ran: April 6 (?) 1775
Seeker: Andrew Leitch
Misc: tolerably well dressed. Ran with Ralph Emanuel

Ad Date: April 29, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p4c2 Sup
Name: Peart, George (22)
Nationality: Durham, England
Trade: shoemaker
Residence: Surry
Date Ran: April 17, 1775
Seeker: Thomas and Samuel Pretlow
Neckwear: white shirt and neckcloth
Shirt: white shirt
Coat: dark coloured Frieze coat. took old brown Thickset coat
Jacket: old Red jacket double breasted
Breeches: pair of light coloured cloth breeches
Stockings: gray ribbed stockings
Shoes: pair of pumps
Misc: light coloured long hair which he wore either hanging down his back or clubbed. Ran
with George Blackburn

Ad Date: July 4, 1777, Purdie, p1c1 Sup
Name: Philips, William (20)
Trade: indentured servant
Residence: Frederick Co. near Winchester
Seeker: Rebekah Smith
Shirt: country linen shirt
Trousers: country linen shirt and trousers

Ad Date: August 4, 1774, Rind, p3c3
Name: Powis, Samuel (40)
Nationality: West of England
Trade: tailor and staymaker
Residence: Baltimore, Maryland
Seeker: Abraham Jarrett
Coat: white Welch cotton coat with a falling collar and short skirts
Jacket: dark wilton jacket
Breeches: linen breeches
Shoes: small old shoes, with nails in the heels
Misc: His other cloaths unknown. Left with Edward Williams

Ad Date: May 12, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p4c3
Name: Puttrell, Thomas
Nationality: Nansemond, Virginia
Trade: Butcher, understands gardening, farming, bricklayer & plasterer
Residence: Westmoreland Co.
Date Ran: April 14, 1774 Wed
Seeker: Richard Lee, Thomas Attwell
Misc: had the common apparel of servants. Ran two times before this one

Ad Date: August 18, 1774, Rind, p3c2
Name: Reed, Henry (22)
Trade: coachmaker
Residence: Herring Bay, Anne Arundel Co., Maryland
Date Ran: before July 7, 1774
Seeker: Isaac Simmons
Hat: old hat
Neckwear: check handkerchief
Shirt: two oznabrig shirts
Jacket: white negro cotton jacket
Waistcoat: white negro cotton waistcoat
Trousers: trousers made of negro cotton, half worn
Shoes: coarse shoes
Misc: probably may change his dress. Went with John White. (See July 7, 1774). Seen August 10, 1774 in Berkeley Co., VA at Earl of Dunmore's Plantation

Ad Date: June 7, 1776, Purdie, p4c2
Name: Reeves, James
Nationality: London, England
Trade: bricklayer by trade
Residence: Augusta County, Cow Pasture
Seeker: Hugh Hicklen
Shirt: two coarse tow shirts
Coat: old blue cloth coat
Breeches: blue breeches patched with white cloth
Stockings: tow leggings
Shoes: no shoes
Misc: took a horse with him also

Ad Date: September 5, 1777, Purdie, p3c1
Name: Rice, William (Rill in first ad) (about 27)
Nationality: Shropshire, England
Trade: convict servant weaver and painter
Residence: Spotsylvania
Date Ran: August 11, 1777
Seeker: Francis Taliaferro
Shirt: cotton shirt
Coat: country cloth coat (and jacket), warped cotton filled with wool twilled, all white. took
hunting shirt with him

Jacket: country cloth coat and jacket, warped cotton filled with wool twilled, all white
Breeches: breeches of coarse country linen
Stockings: brown thread stockings

Ad Date: July 28, 1774, Rind, p3c3
Name: Rivers, Robert
Trade: shoemaker, convict
Residence: Aquia, in Stafford
Date Ran: July 10, 1774
Seeker: James Holloway
Hat: felt hat almost new
Shirt: check shirt
Coat: brown Newmarket coat
Waistcoat: brown Newmarket (coat and) waistcoat
Breeches: cotton breeches
Trousers: brown linen trousers
Shoes: old shoes

Ad Date: February 24, 1775, Purdie, p4c1
Name: Robb, James
Nationality: North of England
Trade: sailor
Residence: Ship Elizabeth, lying at Alexandria
Seeker: Robert Adam & Co.
Coat: suit of blue clothes with a red velvet cape [collar]
Waistcoat: suit of blue clothes
Breeches: suit of blue clothes
Misc: Ran with William Williams (servant) and fellow sailors William Tate, Charles Thompson, and John Field. Also stole a Moses New England built boat. Took chest, bedding, and hammocks

Ad Date: June 16, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p6c2 Sup
Name: Roberts, Richard (17-18)
Trade: convict
Residence: Albemarle
Date Ran: June 12, 1774
Seeker: Benjamin Colvard and George Divers
Coat: black casimir coat
Jacket: black casimir jacket
Breeches: black casimir breeches
Misc: Ran with Edward Butler. Also stole 2 horses. May have returned or been caught by July 21, as an ad of that date mentions Butler but not Roberts, and gives an alias for Butler

Ad Date: August 15, 1777, Purdie, p4c2
Name: Robertson, William (40)
Nationality: England
Trade: shoemaker
Residence: Staunton
Seeker: Jacob Peck
Hat: old felt hat
Shirt: old shirt of country linen
Coat: old sacky coat
Jacket: old plush jacket
Breeches: linen drawers
Stockings: white yarn stockings
Shoes: pair of old pumps half worn, and pinchbeck buckles

Ad Date: June 23, 1775, Purdie, p3c1
Name: Robinson, Robert (28)
Nationality: south Scotland
Trade: joiner and carpenter
Residence: Lancaster Co.
Seeker: Mungo Harvey
Hat: fashionable good beaver hat
Shirt: wears in his sleeves either a pair of black or a pair of oval purple buttons set in yellow
Coat: fine cloth coat of a parson's gray colour, with hair buttons
Waistcoat: double breasted waistcoat of corded light jeans or fustian
Breeches: white Russia drill breeches
Stockings: light blue worsted stockings
Shoes: single channel pumps not much wore
Misc: Purchased three weeks ago at Monday Point on the Potowmac from on board the Friendship, Capt. Parks, from Glasgow. Worked in Edinburgh, Kelso upon Tweed, and Inverness building a church

Ad Date: May 13, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p1c1
Name: Rockett, Francis Ware (14-15)
Trade: tailor by trade
Residence: Manchester
Date Ran: April 24, 1775
Seeker: John Sumpier
Coat: light coloured Freize coat
Misc: his other dress I cannot describe

Ad Date: July 13, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Rollings, William
Trade: worked as a waggoner with the Chesterfield Volunteers
Residence: Chesterfield Co., but near Palace in Williamsburg when ran
Seeker: Francis Smith
Coat: blanket great coat

Ad Date: August 16, 1776, Purdie, p5c1
Name: Row, William (18-19)
Nationality: England
Trade: convict servant
Residence: levels of Green Brier
Seeker: Archer Matthews
Hat: fur hat (one stolen by two servants)
Shirt: coarse country linen
Coat: cotton and linen almost white
Waistcoat: cotton and linen almost white
Breeches: Drawers of coarse country linen
Stockings: leggins of coarse country linen
Misc: also took smooth bore gun of best sort, double breechted with part of the stock broke off
before. Shot bag of blue plush, and a powder horn very much carved with a strap of striped girt. Ran with Isaac Singer

Ad Date: March 2, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Saunders, John (41)
Nationality: Wales
Trade: barber
Residence: Richmond
Seeker: Anthony Geoghegan
Hat: felt hat
Shirt: two white shirts
Coat: new white Duffil coat (and waistcoat bound)
Waistcoat: new white Duffil coat and waistcoat bound. Brown fustian waistcoat (and breeches) about half worn
Breeches: pair of coarse cloth breeches. Brown fustian (waistcoat) and breeches about half worn
Stockings: pair of thread stockings, two pairs of yarn ditto
Shoes: two pairs of shoes
Misc: curled dark wig, and old scratch ditto

Ad Date: July 28, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c3
Name: Scott, Thomas
Nationality: Scotland
Trade: tailor, convict
Residence: Westmoreland
Date Ran: July 10, 1774
Seeker: Richard Caddeen
Hat: not very old, though not very fine (may have laced with silver)
Neckwear: black silk handkerchief about his neck
Shirt: several coarse and fine shirts
Coat: kind of drab cloth coat. Stole a pink coloured Duroy coat, cut out but not yet sewn up. *
Ad 2: a long osnabrug coat
Waistcoat: black cloth waistcoat. Stole red Poplin waistcoat cut out but not yet sewn up. * Ad 2: black waistcoat
Breeches: white short Osnabrug breeches. * Ad 2: pair of Dove coloured Duroy breeches
Stockings: white thread stockings
Shoes: pair of double rimmed silver plated buckles, turned pumps half soled
Misc: says of stolen goods they were only cut-out but I make no doubt of his having got them made up, and wearing of them; also some silver lace, with which I imagine he will lace his Hat. * Ad of October 6, 1774 has him wearing only those items with *. Shoes not detailed in first ad but buckles same in both ads. Not specified if the ad was changed from a sighting or he was caught and ran a second time, as no run date given in second advertisement

Ad Date: March 31, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Sears, William (20)
Trade: House carpenter
Residence: Near Sussex Courthouse
Date Ran: March 20, 1774
Seeker: John Gray
Shirt: Osnabrug shirt
Jacket: darkish coloured Duffil Jacket
Waistcoat: striped country made Waistcoat
Breeches: Pair of blue *Virginia* Cloth Breeches. Pair of Leather Do.
Misc: ran with Isaac Spain and possibly John Sturdivant (although latter not advertised for)

---

**Ad Date:** April 21, 1775, Purdie, p3c2
**Name:** Sharp, Thomas
**Residence:** Hartford Co., Maryland
**Coat:** green coat turned up with blue
**Shoes:** several of them have hobnails in their shoes
**Misc:** ran with six others

---

**Ad Date:** October 6, 1775, Purdie, p3c2
**Name:** Shaw, John (18-19)
**Nationality:** England
**Trade:** convict servant
**Residence:** near Westmoreland courthouse
**Date Ran:** August 21, 1775
**Seeker:** William Marmaduke
**Hat:** felt hat
**Neckwear:** suity coloured silk handkerchief, one checked do.
**Shirt:** good white shirt
**Jacket:** osnabrugs jacket
**Trousers:** osnabrug (jacket) and trousers
**Shoes:** pair of silver shoe buckles

---

**Ad Date:** June 17, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
**Name:** Shaw, Robert
**Nationality:** Scotland
**Trade:** baker
**Residence:** Alexandria
**Date Ran:** before June 5, 1775
**Seeker:** James Kirk, Robert Adam, George Purvis
**Hat:** half worn castor hat
**Shirt:** took Osnabrug and check shirt
**Coat:** took Match Coat blanket
**Jacket:** Bearskin jacket lined with plaid, took red jacket
**Breeches:** took leather breeches
**Trousers:** Osnabrug trousers
**Shoes:** old shoes
**Misc:** Items not specified as taken were carried in a bundle containing two Match Coat blankets. two pair of leather breeches, two Osnabrug shirts, two check shirts, two red jackets. Ran with Andrew Ingles. (Dressed the same)

---

**Ad Date:** February 28, 1777, Purdie, p2c2
**Name:** Sherry, Charles
**Trade:** convict servant, cabinet maker
**Residence:** Dumfries
**Date Ran:** February 7, 1777 Sat
**Seeker:** William Scott
**Coat:** greenish coloured coat
**Jacket:** greenish coloured coat and jacket, with a belt round the bottom of his jacket
**Breeches:** pair of buckskin breeches
Ad Date: August 16, 1776, Purdie, p5c1
Name: Singer, Isaac (25)
Nationality: England
Trade: convict servant
Residence: levels of Green Brier
Seeker: Archer Matthews
Hat: (one fur hat stolen between the two - see William Row)
Shirt: coarse shirt
Breeches: old leather breeches
Stockings: brown leggings
Shoes: old shoes
Misc: also took smooth bore gun of best sort, double breeched with part of the stock broke off before. Shot bag of blue plush, and a powder horn very much carved with a strap of striped girting. Ran with William Row

Ad Date: May 8, 1778, Purdie, p2c1
Name: Smith, John
Nationality: England
Trade: flax dresser, convict
Residence: Culpeper Co.
Seeker: John Williams Jr.
Hat: felt hat
Coat: brown linen hunting shirt
Jacket: white linsey jacket (and breeches, which were fuller)
Breeches: white linsey (jacket and) breeches, which were fuller
Stockings: yarn hose

Ad Date: August 25, 1775, Purdie, p8c2
Name: Smith, Joseph (33)
Nationality: Scotland
Trade: painter by trade
Residence: Fredericksburg
Date Ran: August 7, 1775
Seeker: Col. Fielding Lewis in Fredericksburg or Lund Washington at Mt. Vernon.
Shirt: three check and two white shirts (he commonly worked in his check shirts, therefore it is probable they may have some paint on them)
Coat: dark brown pretty much wore coat, light brown very short, with buttons at the sleeves
Waistcoat: nankeen waistcoat, gray cloth waistcoat
Breeches: two pairs of brown linen breeches, one pair black silk stockings breeches
Stockings: one pair mixed yarn and one pair ribbed thread stockings
Shoes: one old one almost new pair of shoes, country made

Ad Date: July 29, 1776, Dixon and Hunter, p7c1
Name: Smith, Thomas
Nationality: England
Trade: Indentured servant, house carpenter by trade
Residence: New Kent
Date Ran: July 7, 1776
Seeker: J. Armistead
Hat: good hat
Neckwear: Black silk handkerchief
Shirt: stone sleeve buttons
Coat: *Virginia* Nankin coat
Waistcoat: Damask waistcoat
Breeches: *Virginia* Nankin breeches
Stockings: white stockings
Shoes: new country made shoes with silver buckles
Misc: fond of dressing his own brown hair

Ad Date: December 29, 1774, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Smith, William (23)
Nationality: Scotland
Residence: Newcastle
Date Ran: December 10, 1774
Seeker: John Cockburn
Hat: coarse felt hat
Coat: light coloured broadcloth coat, which is broke at the elbows, and with very few Buttons on it, a *Newmarket* coat of light Bath coating, not bound, but stitched on the edges, with *Deathhead Buttons*
Waistcoat: pale blue Duroy waistcoat
Breeches: pair of deep blue Sagathy breeches
Stockings: several pair of stockings, pair of wrappers rather darker than the *Newmarket* coat
Shoes: coarse shoes, steel buckles
Misc: A large spur plated with Silver. He likewise carried off with him a black satin Capuchin, a piece of new *Virginia* cloth, containing eight yards, striped with blue and copperas, and emptied Boulster of Feathers to carry them in. Also stole a horse. Has a discharge from the Earl of Dunmore's clerk

Ad Date: November 16, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Snoock, Joseph
Nationality: England
Trade: labourer
Residence: Georgetown
Date Ran: October 9, 1775
Seeker: Robert More
Hat: small fine hat
Shirt: oznabrig shirt, two sail duck ditto
Coat: dark brown coat
Jacket: blue jacket with sleeves, a dark brown jacket
Waistcoat: blue jacket without sleeves
Breeches: pair of buckskin breeches, half worn
Trousers: pair of trousers
Stockings: pair of dark stockings

Ad Date: February 24, 1776, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: Sole, John (19)
Nationality: England
Trade: indentured servant, shoemaker by trade
Residence: New Kent Co, near Providence [sic] Forge
Date Ran: February 18, 1776
Seeker: John Apperson
Shirt: *Virginia* cotton shirt
Coat: snuff coloured Coating Coat
Waistcoat: large blue duffil waistcoat
Breeches: Thread Virginia cloth breeches
Misc: wore black hair generally tied behind

Ad Date: March 31, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Spain, Isaac (18)
Trade: Apprentice or Journeyman to a House Carpenter (Wm. Sears)
Residence: Near Sussex Courthouse
Date Ran: March 20, 1774
Seeker: John Gray
Shirt: Osnabrug shirt
Jacket: dark coloured Frieze Jacket
Breeches: dark Russia Drill Breeches
Misc: Ran with William Sears (and possibly John Sturdivant, although not advertised for)

Ad Date: April 28, 1775, Pinkney, p2 Suppl
Name: Spears, Thomas (20)
Nationality: Bristol, England
Trade: joiner
Residence: Fairfax Co.
Date Ran: April 19, 1775 night
Seeker: George Washington
Hat: felt hat not much the worse for wear
Shirt: check and Osnabrug shirts
Coat: coat (waistcoat and breeches) of light brown duffil, with black horn buttons
Waistcoat: waistcoat of light brown duffil with black horn buttons. A light colored cloth waistcoat
Breeches: breeches of light brown duffil with black horn buttons. Old leather breeches
Trousers: new Osnabrug trousers
Stockings: pair of new milled yarn stockings, a pair of old ribbed ditto
Misc: Ran with William Webster. Left in a small Yaul

Ad Date: July 29, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p4c2
Name: Staunton, John
Nationality: England
Trade: wheelwright
Residence: Williamsburg
Date Ran: July 16, 1775
Seeker: John Shiphard
Coat: brown cloth coat
Jacket: brown cloth coat and jacket
Trousers: striped trousers, check trousers
Misc: Ran with Andrew McGill (Mackgill)

Ad Date: June 2, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Stuart, John (30-35)
Trade: tailor, but indentured on board a ship
Residence: ship Jenny lying at Broadway
Date Ran: May 12, 1774
Seeker: John Kirkwood
Coat: blue surtout coat
Waistcoat: buff coloured waistcoat
Breeches: black breeches
Misc: believed to be heading for Williamsburg
Ad Date: February 24, 1775, Purdie, p4c1
Name: Tate, William
Trade: sailor
Residence: Ship Elizabeth, lying at Alexandria
Seeker: Robert Adam & Co.
Waistcoat: red waistcoat
Trousers: red waistcoat and trousers
Misc: Ran with William Williams (servant) and fellow sailors James Robb, Charles Thompson, and John Field. Also stole a Moses New England built boat. Took chests, bedding, and hammocks

Ad Date: March 25, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c2
Name: Terelagh, Daniel Conner
Residence: Bedford Co., near Mr. Ross's store.
Date Ran: 1774
Seeker: Miles Barrott
Coat: new German Serge coat
Misc: understands playing on the bagpipes well. Also took a horse

Ad Date: November 24, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c1
Name: Thomson, William (35)
Nationality: England
Trade: Bookbinder
Residence: Botetourt
Seeker: James Alcorn
Hat: new wool hat
Coat: Virginia cloth coat of a coperas colour
Waistcoat: waistcoat filled with red and blue yarn
Breeches: linen breeches
Stockings: blue worsted stockings
Shoes: shoes and two pair of shoe buckles, one silver, the other brass
Misc: old smoothbore gun

Ad Date: May 26, 1775, Purdie, p4c3 Sup
Name: Thrifi, John
Trade: convict servant
Residence: Augusta Co.
Date Ran: February 25, 1775
Seeker: Robert M'Kitrick
Hat: old felt hat
Coat: brown hunting shirt
Waistcoat: light coloured sagathy waistcoat
Breeches: old buckskin breeches
Stockings: white yarn stockings
Shoes: old shoes

Ad Date: November 23, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Tippin or Tipping, Charles
Trade: gardener, and can work a little at the carpenter's business
Residence: Annapolis
Date Ran: November 4, 1775
Seeker: William Reynolds
Shirt: white shirt, two brown of Russia sheeting ditto
Coat: short brown working coat, with metal buttons
Jacket: blue cloth jacket with sleeves and metal buttons
Breeches: good buckskin breeches, a white pair of Russia drab ditto
Misc: May have sundry other clothes. Ran with William Webster in a two mast boat, with some others. Stole oznabrig sheets for sails it was supposed

Ad Date: July 26, 1776, Purdie, p4c3
Name: Tom (last name not given) (14)
Trade: brought up to be a barber
Residence: College Camp, Williamsburg
Date Ran: July 10, 1776
Seeker: George Weedon
Coat: gray drab coat
Waistcoat: gray drab waistcoat
Breeches: gray drab breeches
Misc: also took razors and case with him. Had four years left to serve

Ad Date: July 26, 1776, Purdie, p4c2
Name: Topin, John (55)
Nationality: England
Trade: convict servant
Residence: Loudoun Co.
Date Ran: July 1, 1776
Seeker: Arthur Edwards Thomas Askren
Hat: old beaver hat
Shirt: country spun shirt
Trousers: country spun trousers
Shoes: old shoes
Misc: dark cut wig. Ran with Richard Hawk. In country 9 months

Ad Date: December 20, 1776, Purdie, p2c2
Name: Turkel, Thomas (lad)
Nationality: England
Trade: indentured servant lad on ship
Residence: Sloop Washington at Broadway's on the Appomattox
Date Ran: about November 26, 1776
Seeker: Hillary Moseley
Coat: blue duffil coat
Waistcoat: blue duffil coat and waistcoat
Breeches: leather breeches
Misc: subject to liquors. Sundry other wearing apparel

Ad Date: October 13, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Turnbull, James
Trade: tailor
Residence: Blandford
Date Ran: October 4, 1774
Seeker: Andrew Hamilton
Hat: small round bound hat slouched
Coat: dark blue with silver basket buttons
Waistcoat: scarlet waistcoat
Breeches: light blue breeches
Stockings: fine worsted stockings
Shoes: pair of silver buckles in his shoes of the Macaroni Taste

Ad Date: August 12, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: Walker, first name not given (35-36)
Nationality: England
Trade: carpenter and joiner, convict servant
Residence: Mr. Thomas B Griffin's in Lancaster Co.
Date Ran: July 30, 1775
Seeker: John Worneley (but ran from Mr. Thomas B. Griffin's)
Coat: brick-dust coloured coat
Jacket: blue Sagathy jacket, which is fine, but much worn
Breeches: Russian Drill Breeches, a pair of German Serge breeches of a gray colour, due to a venereal disorder, his breeches were often stained behind
Trousers: two Osnabrug trousers
Stockings: pair of blue yarn stockings, and a white ribbed pair
Shoes: pair of country shoes not blacked

Ad Date: March 24, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Walker, Robert (26)
Nationality: Surry, England
Residence: servant ship Justitia at Leeds Town on Rappahannock
Date Ran: March 19, 1774
Seeker: Capt Finlay Gray
Coat: gray coloured Cloth (coat) and a brown Surtout Coat
Shoes: either Shoes or Boos
Misc: Ran with Ralph Lawson, Francis Granger, Jms Watson, Rbt Wood, and Lydia Heathcote

Ad Date: June 17, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: Walsom, Thomas (27)
Trade: barber by trade, convict servant
Residence: Alexandria
Date Ran: before June 5, 1775
Seeker: James Kirk, Robert Adam, George Purvis
Hat: new felt hat bound with black ferreting
Neckwear: black silk handkerchief
Shirt: two white linen shirts
Coat: old drab coloured cloth coat
Jacket: one red and one striped Holland Jacket
Breeches: pair of new Drilling Breeches, pair of old buff coloured stocking breeches
Stockings: one pair of white and blue spotted stockings

Ad Date: March 8, 1776, Purdie, p4c1
Name: Warren, Christopher (35)
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: weaver
Residence: Frederick County, MD
Date Ran: April 10, 1775?
Seeker: George Sell
Coat: short pale blue coat, that has been turned, double breasted with black horn buttons
Ad Date: June 17, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: Wassell, George (17)
Nationality: England
Trade: shoemaker
Residence: Williamsburg
Date Ran: about June 15, 1775
Seeker: Gavin Hamilton
Jacket: blue jacket
Trousers: blue jacket and trousers
Misc: ran with John Fleming

Ad Date: March 24, 1774, Purdie and Dixon, p3c2
Name: Watson, James (20)
Nationality: Scotland
Residence: servant ship Justitia near Leeds Town on the Rappahannock
Date Ran: March 19, 1774
Seeker: Capt Finlay Gray
Jacket: green Jacket
Breeches: blue worsted Drawers
Misc: Ran with Rbt Walker, Rbt Wood, Francis Granger, Ralph Lawson, and Lydia Heathcote

Ad Date: October 19, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Watson, James (20)
Nationality: Ireland
Residence: Maryland
Date Ran: Surrendered in August 1775
Seeker: James Gordon placed ad, John Wayman of Maryland master
Hat: old hat, without any brim
Shirt: brown linen shirt
Coat: old brown surtoute coat
Trousers: brown linen (shirt) and trousers

Ad Date: April 28, 1775, Pinkney, p2 Suppl
Name: Webster, William (30)
Nationality: Scotland
Trade: brick maker
Residence: Fairfax Co.
Date Ran: April 19, 1775 night
Seeker: George Washington
Shirt: check and Oznabrig shirts
Coat: olive coloured coat, pretty much worn, with black horn buttons
Waistcoat: light brown duffil waistcoat and breeches with black horn buttons
Breeches: light brown duffil breeches with black horn buttons
Trousers: Oznabrig trowsers
Misc: Ran with Thomas Spears, had same brown duffil clothes as him. Left in a Yaul

Ad Date: November 23, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Webster, William (23)
Nationality: England
Trade: hatter by trade
Residence: Annapolis
Date Ran: November 4, 1775
Seeker: William Reynolds
Hat: good castor, fan tail’d, cocked, military fashion, lined with white linen
Shirt: white linen shirt, two Russia sheeting ditto
Coat: light blue cloth coat (and waistcoat) the coat has been turned
Waistcoat: light blue cloth (coat) and waistcoat, a red cloth waistcoat
Breeches: pair of white Russia drab breeches, plain pinchbeck knee buckles
Shoes: plain pinchbeck shoe buckles
Misc: With Charles Tippin or Tipping in a two mast boat with some others. Also took a pair of oznabrig sheets which it is supposed they intend to make sails

Ad Date: June 10, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c3
Name: Wells, William
Nationality: England
Trade: convict servant, attempted to get on as a sailor.
Residence: Farnham Parish, Richmond Co
Date Ran: May 12, 1775
Seeker: Francis Christian
Hat: small hat, crown sewed in with brown thread, cocked two ways
Shirt: check shirt
Coat: Bath coating coat
Waistcoat: Bath coating coat and waistcoat, the waistcoat, changed for a short red one since he ran
Breeches: pair of Osnabrug long breeches, patched on both thighs. Carried a pair of light coloured cloth breeches, patched at the knees
Shoes: pair of single Channel pumps tied with strings
Misc: imported on the Justitia

Ad Date: June 30, 1775, Purdie, p2c3 Sup
Name: Welsh, Thomas (21)
Nationality: Ireland
Residence: within 9 miles from English Ferry on New River, Fincastle
Date Ran: about May 31, 1775
Seeker: Samuel Ingram and Joseph Mears
Hat: wool hat
Coat: hunting shirt filled with wool
Breeches: buckskin breeches
Stockings: linsey leggins
Shoes: shoes nailed all round, both heels and soles
Misc: smooth bore gun. Supposed to be with Thomas Benson

Ad Date: July 6, 1776, Dixon and Hunter, p6c1
Name: White, Charles (used alias Johnson when signing on a ship) (28)
Nationality: Rutlandshire, England
Trade: convict. Stocking weaver by trade
Residence: Frederick Co, Marlborough Iron Works
Date Ran: June 17, 1776
Seeker: Isaac Zane
Hat: narrow brimmed felt hat
Shirt: coarse country linen shirt
Coat: short Fearnought coat
Trousers: coarse country linen trousers
Shoes: old shoes with pewter buckles
Misc: may have been heading to a British Man-of-War. Also stole horse and saddle. Ran at least three times. He he had been caught twice before, once in Fredericksburg where he had signed on a ship, and jailed once in Manchester, Chesterfield Co.

Ad Date: November 23, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: White, Charles (28)
Nationality: Rutlandshire, England
Trade: stocking weaver by trade, convict servant
Residence: Frederick Co, Marlborough Iron Works
Date Ran: November 18, 1775
Seeker: Isaac Zane
Hat: small felt hat
Shirt: tow shirt
Coat: old black cloth coat
Breeches: old brown cloth breeches
Trousers: tow trousers
Stockings: mottled worsted stockings
Shoes: new shoes with carved metal buckles
Misc: Ran with James Leighton and slave Will. Stole, with others, an assortment of clothes. Ran multiple times (see July 6, 1776). Imported last summer

Ad Date: July 7, 1774, Rind, p3c2
Name: White, John
Nationality: Berwick, England
Trade: professes gardening and farming
Residence: Anne Arundel Co., Maryland (probably Herring Bay as Henry Reed)
Date Ran: before July 7, 1774
Seeker: John Kilty
Hat: good fashionable hat
Neckwear: fine linen (shirt) and neckcloth
Shirt: fine linen shirt marked I.K. [stolen]. two muslin ones, marked I.W., with black silk [his own]. 3 coarse shirts, 3 oznabrig ditto
Coat: light mixed cloth coat, with yellow metal buttons
Waistcoat: light mixed cloth waistcoat.. with yellow metal buttons
Breeches: nankeen breeches, with pale yellow ferret in the knees, a pair of black knit breeches
Trousers: three pair of oznabrig trousers
Stockings: old thread stockings, footed with linen and a pair of light ribbed worsted
Shoes: pair of old channel pumps. small pinchbeck buckles
Misc: Ran with Henry Reed, and perhaps at least one more servant in the area. Seen August 18, 1774 in Berkely Co., VA at the plantation of the Earl of Dunmore

Ad Date: November 17, 1774, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Wilison, Anthony (14-15)
Trade: apprentice lad
Residence: Prince Edward
Seeker: John Thompson jr.
Shirt: oznabrig shirt
Coat: negro cotton coat
Breeches: Russia drill breeches
Shoes: bare foot
Ran with Thomas Noughton

---

Ad Date: August 4, 1774, Rind, p3c3
Name: Williams, Edward (30)
Nationality: Wales
Residence: Baltimore, Maryland
Seeker: Abraham Jarrett
Hat: new felt hat
Coat: light coloured superfine broadcloth coat, which is too small for him, a dark coloured cloth coat, trimmed with brass buttons and brown binding
Jacket: brown broadcloth jacket, a green birdseyed ditto
Stockings: several pair of coarse grey stockings
Misc: new bed tick, sundry knives, buckles, buttons & c. Some store goods, unknown, and a silver watch, the winding chain of which is broken. Ran with Samuel Powis

---

Ad Date: August 4, 1775, Purdie, p3c2
Name: Williams, John
Nationality: England
Trade: convict servant, taught a reading school
Residence: Peystonsburg, Pittsylvania co.
Date Ran: June 24, 1775
Seeker: Henry Williams
Hat: raccoon hat lined with green persian
Shirt: two osnabrug shirts
Coat: claret coloured frieze coat, a light coloured Newmarket ditto, bearskin or beaver coating
Breeches: pair of leather breeches
Trousers: pair of osnabrug trousers
Misc: very fond of spirits. Taught a reading school for 5-8 months at the place he resided. Understood Prussian exercises well and might have tried to pass as a British deserter.

---

Ad Date: February 24, 1775, Purdie, p4c1
Name: Williams, William (alias "Alick")
Nationality: Scotland
Trade: baker by trade, indentured servant on a ship
Residence: Ship Elizabeth, lying at Alexandria
Seeker: Robert Adam & Co.
Coat: pepper and salt coloured cloth coat
Breeches: leather breeches
Misc: Had a watch. Ran with sailors James Robb, Charles Thompson, Wm Tate and John Field. Stole a Moses New England built boat.

---

Ad Date: June 15, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Wilmore, William
Nationality: England
Trade: weaver, convict servant
Residence: Pittsylvania
Date Ran: April 10, 1775
Seeker: John Marr
Jacket: reddish turned cloth jacket
Breeches: pair of Nankeen breeches
Misc: ran with an unnamed Irishman

---
Ad Date: January 24, 1777, Purdie, p3c2
Name: Wilson, John (30)
Nationality: England
Trade: waggoneer
Residence: Williamsburg
Date Ran: January 18, 1777
Seeker: Gabriel Maupin
Hat: round white hat
Coat: old blue great coat
Breeches: buckskin breeches
Misc: cotton gambadoes

Ad Date: July 28, 1775, Purdie, p3c1
Name: Wilson, Peter (24)
Nationality: Scotland
Trade: butcher by trade, a good hostler, and a tolerable good weaver
Residence: Hanover
Date Ran: July 19th, 1775
Seeker: John Syme
Hat: new felt hat
Coat: black coat of superfine broadcloth, half worn, old great coat
Jacket: jacket of white fustian, jacket of dark fustian
Breeches: breeches of white fustian
Shoes: country made pumps

Ad Date: March 27, 1778, Purdie, p1c2
Name: Wright, William
Trade: ditcher, convict
Residence: Dinwiddie
Date Ran: March 15, 1778
Seeker: Abraham Smith
Misc: Dressed in Virginia cloth clothes

Ad Date: March 25, 1775, Dixon and Hunter, p3c2
Name: Young, John
Nationality: England
Residence: fourth Fork of the South Branch, Hampshire county
Seeker: Jacob Brake
Coat: linsey frock
Misc: hair clipped on his forehead. Went with two negro men. Took rifle, ammunition, large Buck skin and elk skin dre__ [illegible] and a tow sheet and bag

Ad Date: June 15, 1775, Pinkney, p3c3
Name: Unknown (no name given in advertisement)
Nationality: Ireland
Trade: sailor
Residence: Pittsylvania
Date Ran: April 10, 1775
Seeker: John Marr
Jacket: white plain[s] (?) jacket
Breeches: pair of black knit breeches
Misc: ran with William Wilmore
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