

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

According to the author of ‘The Character of the Beaux’ published in 1696, the ‘Country Beau’ ‘having been bred up in ignorance and from his infancy led a retired country life’ on coming into his estate immediately ‘has an itch to be rambling’. So, ‘having washed his face with milk and water, put on his best leather-breeches, tied at knees with red taffeta, his new blue jacket and his grey coat with buttons no bigger than nutmegs and smugged himself up very handsomely, [he] takes his best nag and gallops up to London’. There he is embraced by the ‘Bully Beaux’ who show him the sights, take him to plays and, at their own expense, refashion his country appearance to ‘teach him a little breeding’. Initially ‘amazed at their civility’, it takes the country beau several weeks to realise they are playing him, cheating him at cards and making him pay for all their entertainments. Now seriously in debt, having been forced to sell his best horse and mortgage his estate, and possibly having contracted the pox, he returns home ‘repenting of his folly and resolving to do penance for his past luxury’.<sup>1</sup>

For the author of ‘The Character of the Beaux’ the rustic and unfashionable clothing of the country gentleman was an outward marker of his lack of city ‘breeding’. As a literary type, he is similar to Sir Mannerly Shallow, the antihero of John Crowne’s play, *The Country Wit*, first performed in 1675. We are told that Shallow, a young baronet from Cumberland with £2000 a year, ‘never had anything but country breeding’ and is obsessed with his dogs and horses. Like the ‘Country Beau’, Shallow arrives in London wearing a ‘fine country-fashioned suit’ and is undone by his inability to understand city ways.<sup>2</sup>

In 1711 ‘Mr Spectator’, the fictional narrator of ‘The Spectator’, described the difference in ‘breeding’ between Town and Country with reference to three separate aspects: manners, conversation and dress. Commenting on manners Spectator observed, ‘If ... we look on the people of mode in the country, we find in them the manners of the last age. They have no sooner fetched themselves up to the fashion of the polite world, but the Town has dropped them ... One may know the man that never conversed in the world by his excess of good breeding. A polite country squire shall make you as many bows in half an hour as would serve a courtier for a week’. Noting a shift in fashionable town conversation from the ‘stiff, formal and precise’ to the coarse and uncivilized he noted that this

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

‘infamous piece of good breeding’ had not yet made its way into the Country but if it did it would ‘come too late for them and they will be thought a parcel of lewd clowns’. Finally, with reference to their dress he observed, ‘the rural beaus are not yet got out of the fashion that took place at the time of the Revolution but ride about the country in red coats and laced hats’.<sup>3</sup>

In these publications London is presented – with some irony – as the location of fashionable civility, politeness and good breeding. ‘Civility’, according to Anna Bryson, was associated with new urban forms of elite social behaviour and its development reflected the growth of gentry residence in the capital (discussed in more detail below). It supposedly replaced ‘courtesy’ which was associated with traditional forms of country lordship, centred on the maintenance of household hierarchies of service and the provision of hospitality. Detached from the stable social hierarchies of the country these new modes of behaviour allowed the urban gentry to maintain their exclusivity in the social melee of the capital.<sup>4</sup> ‘Civility’ was closely related to ‘politeness’ which Philip Carter describes as ‘an explicitly new concept of social refinement’, supposedly emerging in the 1660s but most fully apparent in the eighteenth century. Both were forms of behaviour associated with urban life and in particular the new urban social spaces like coffee houses, play houses, public walks, parks and pleasure gardens.<sup>5</sup> Some contemporary commentators included civility as one of the qualities necessary in order to exercise politeness. However, as Carter points out, ‘civility’ could also be used in a critical way to suggest a superficial, outward, form of social behaviour unconnected to any inner morality – something the ‘Country Beau’ and Sir Mannerly Shallow encounter on their arrival in London.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, in each of the examples given above the underlying narrative is of the superficiality, immorality and excessive materiality of the city: here fashionable clothing and ‘civility’ can be used to mask a lack of true ‘breeding’.

In any case, as Mr Spectator’s comments make clear, it is not that the country gentry lacked ‘breeding’ or were incapable of being ‘polite’; it is simply that their modes of behaviour were different to those of the Town. In this respect, Mr Spectator’s close friend, country gentleman Sir Roger de Coverley (‘a gentleman of Worcestershire of ancient descent, a baronet’), in his unfashionable ‘coat and doublet’, is perhaps less an embodiment of what R. H. Sweet described as

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

‘the rural and unpolished world to which politeness had not yet spread’ as of an old-fashioned and uncomplicated style of courtesy of the type identified by Bryson, characterised by stable and appropriately deferential social relations. Coverley is ‘the best master in the world’ so all his servants and tenants love him and continues the ‘laudable custom’ of his ancestors by keeping open house at Christmas.<sup>7</sup>

### **MEN’S FASHIONS**

The fifty-six year old Sir Roger wears a coat and doublet ‘of the same cut’ as those in fashion in his youth when he was ‘crossed in love by a perverse beautiful widow of the next county to him’. This fashion, he likes to joke, ‘has been in and out twelve times since he first wore it’ which was presumably sometime in the late 1670s or 1680s.<sup>8</sup> In another issue of ‘The Spectator’, Mr Spectator advised his country friends to avoid trying to follow Town fashions because of the impossibility of keeping up with them. Rather than make themselves look ridiculous in outmoded styles, they should remain ‘fixed in one certain habit’ which, at some point would come back into fashion just as a ‘clock that stands still is sure to point right once in twelve hours’.<sup>9</sup> As well as highlighting the London-centric view of the unfashionability of country clothing these comments draw attention to the existence of a well-established and rapidly moving male fashion cycle.

In the history of men’s fashions the key event of the seventeenth century is seen as the adoption of the ‘three-piece suit’, the long-line coat worn over a vest or waistcoat and breeches, supposedly invented by Charles II and first worn by him in October 1666. According to Samuel Pepys, in adopting the new vest it was the King’s intention to set ‘a fashion for clothes, which he will never alter ... to teach the nobility thrift’.<sup>10</sup> The King’s sartorial statement needs to be seen in the context of the panic engendered by the Great Fire of the previous month which was viewed by some as a punishment for the nation’s obsession with the luxury consumption of foreign, particularly French, goods and French fashions.<sup>11</sup> The new, longer-line, suit appears to have been rapidly adopted by the fashionable set.<sup>12</sup> Looking back from the early 1680s on the first years of the three-piece suit the anonymous author of *England’s Vanity* described it as ‘perhaps the most grave and manlike dress that ever England saw’

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

but lamented that ‘it had the unhappiness to be brought in too late, and the hard fate to be sent out again too soon ...’, blaming the English obsession with French fashion for its demise.<sup>13</sup> This view of the early three-piece suit as especially ‘manlike’ is shared by David Kuchta who sees it as representing a ‘new modest masculinity’ but early illustrations of it suggest that there was never anything particularly modest about it. Full-skirted, long-line coats were worn over wide breeches giving their wearers a bottom-heavy appearance; flared coat sleeves might end at the elbows to reveal billowing linen shirt sleeves with wide lace cuffs and both the coat and the breeches could be heavily decorated with ribbons, brocade or braid trim.<sup>14</sup> Over the next twenty-odd years its cut and style of the three-piece suit altered and the accessories worn with it changed but as an ensemble male clothing remained elaborate and showy.

With the accession of William and Mary in 1688 male fashion supposedly changed course again: in Kuchta’s words, ‘the age of luxury and effeminacy was gone’.<sup>15</sup> William was more interested in warfare than fashion although as Aileen Ribeiro has pointed out, his clothing accounts reveal a fondness for lace and flowered muslin.<sup>16</sup> By the 1690s the coat was worn closer to the body in what Kuchta sees as a more masculine style. However, although typically more muted in pattern and colour it could still be highly decorated with metallic braid and large buttons (hence the joke about the ‘Country Beau’ having buttons ‘no bigger than nutmegs’). If the coat was muted the waistcoat in contrast could be flamboyant, made of brightly coloured and patterned fabrics and decorated with braid or fringe. The showiest accessories like shoulder and sleeve knots had gone but other accessories remained important, in particular the cravat and the wig, the latter becoming increasingly full and high crowned by the end of the century.<sup>17</sup> Contemporary writers continued to criticise English extravagance in dress and obsession with French fashion; as the anonymous author of *A Satire against the French* (1691), observed, ‘all the fantastic arts of dress we know/ did first from France that impure fountain, flow’.<sup>18</sup>

The excesses of male fashion in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries are best encapsulated in the figure of the fashion-obsessed young man, the fop. According to Mark Dawson, ‘fops were, first and foremost, fictive creations’ who derived their primary impetus from the theatre

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

and other forms of popular literature. Usually depicted as gentlemen born to landed estates, their natural habitat was the city and in particular its fashionable social spaces like coffee houses, theatres and parks.<sup>19</sup> One of the best-known fictive fops is Sir Novelty Fashion, newly created Lord Foppington, in John Vanbrugh’s *The Relapse* of 1696. The first thing he does on coming into his estate is purchase a baronetcy for £10,000.<sup>20</sup> Wearing a wig that is so long ‘it will serve ... for hat and cloak in all weathers’, a fashionable ‘Steenkirk’ cravat and stockings thickened at the calves to make his legs more shapely, Foppington sets off for Town ‘to make ‘em [i.e. polite society] acquainted with his title’.<sup>21</sup>

The portrayal of Foppington is similar to that of the character of the ‘Nice Affected Beau’ who we encounter in ‘The Character of the Beaux’, published in the same year. As with Foppington the comic depiction of the Beau rests on his elaborate use of accessories including his ‘extravagantly powdered and exactly curled’ wig, his rose-scented handkerchief, his precisely-tied cravat, his beauty patches, his scarlet stockings and his snuff box ‘as big as an alderman’s tobacco box, lined with a bawdy picture’. Their significance rests as much in their skilful deployment as in their possession, so the act of lifting snuff from his snuff box to his nose allows the Beau to show off his slender white fingers and diamond ring. His deportment is not just about these external indicators, however, but his ‘mien and air’, subtle and intangible qualities that were as essential as his fashionable accoutrements.<sup>22</sup> The fop may have been largely a fictive creation but the difference between him and the non-fictive fashionably-dressed man is likely to have been one of degree rather than kind in the sense that he was not necessarily wearing anything that was especially different. Rather, it was his social behaviour, his obsessive interest in fashion, his vanity, indolence and mental vacuity that marked him out from his peers.

## **LONDON, THE GENTRY AND THE FASHION MARKET**

Bryson has associated the emergence of the new concept of ‘civility’ in the seventeenth century with the rapid expansion in the number of London-resident gentry. By the early seventeenth century a distinctive ‘London season’ had developed, coincident with the presence of the royal court and the

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

legal terms, with the peerage and upper gentry coming to London in the autumn and returning to their country estates in early summer. After 1689 the more regular sitting of parliament, most often between November and June, brought additional impetus to the ‘season’.<sup>23</sup> The most fashionable residential area in the late seventeenth century was Covent Garden with its grand town houses facing onto the central square. The predominance of gentry in this district meant that your country neighbours could also be your town neighbours as ‘friends and kin grasped opportunities to lodge in or rent houses near each other’.<sup>24</sup> Of course the season was about more than just business: sociability, entertainment, access to specialist services and shopping all drew the country gentry to London.<sup>25</sup> However, ‘the gentry’ were a large and amorphous social group and participation in the London season was only open to the wealthiest. Members of the middle and lower gentry were less likely to spend significant amounts of time in the capital, limiting their visits to short stays and combining necessary business (such as litigation) with shopping.<sup>26</sup>

London was the undisputed fashion capital of England. Although the Court continued to influence high fashion – as the example of the three-piece suit shows – fashions were also being set by merchants and manufacturers. As Clare Haru Crowston has observed for late seventeenth-century France, ‘the basic styles of men’s and women’s clothing did not alter a great deal from year to year. Fashion consisted not in nuances of cut or style as it does today, but in the colours and motifs of textiles, in accessories, and in the design and placement of decorations, all of which changed from season to season.’<sup>27</sup> By the 1680s the East India Company was trying to anticipate new fashions by having samples of silk fabrics made in India and sent to London and Paris for market testing. Designs that found favour were then mass produced in India and returned to Europe for sale.<sup>28</sup> The significance of fabric pattern to contemporary fashions is shown in the advice offered to Rye merchant, Samuel Jeake, in 1681 by his London-based cousin, James Wightman, through whom Jeake was commissioning a new suit, that ‘flowered silk is little worn but gold and silver striped is much worn’.<sup>29</sup> New silk designs were sold in the mercers’ shops on Paternoster Row which ran north of St Paul’s Cathedral. Here, mercers’ apprentices stood in their shop doorways wearing waistcoats made of the newest ‘gaudy’ silk, ‘invented and designed for a fashion’, enticing their male customers with

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

the promise that it ‘hadn’t been made above these three days’.<sup>30</sup> Nearby, Cheapside remained a centre for luxury and fashionable goods and there were also a number of elite shopping centres selling high-end goods like the Royal Exchange on Cornhill and the New and Exeter Exchanges, both located in the Strand.<sup>31</sup> Fashions could also be set by individuals. As a fictional correspondent to ‘The Spectator’ informed its readers, it was a common expression amongst ‘men of dress’ that ‘Mr such an one has struck a bold stroke’, meaning that ‘he is the first man who has had courage enough to lead up a fashion’.<sup>32</sup>

Although London was the nation’s fashion information hub, dissemination was still primarily through direct observation and by word of mouth rather than through print or other media. By the 1670s French ‘fashion’ plates were circulating in London but their role in disseminating fashion information is unclear.<sup>33</sup> There was no equivalent to France’s monthly fashion periodical, the *Nouveau Mercure Galant*, first published in 1677, and other types of printed material which addressed contemporary fashions were less concerned with informing its readers about what to wear as with satirising its excesses.<sup>34</sup>

Above anything else London was exciting, especially for the young, whereas the country was boring. As Lord Foppington says to Amanda in *The Relapse*, ‘Far Gad’s sake, Madam, how has your ladyship been able to subsist thus long, under the fatigue of a country life?’<sup>35</sup>

### **THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN**

The ‘Country Beau’, Sir Mannerly Shallow and Sir Roger de Coverley are literary stereotypes of the country gentleman, wearing his ‘country-fashioned suit’ and with hopelessly old-fashioned manners. These are comic creations, aimed primarily at a sophisticated and fashion-conscious London audience many of whom would probably have sympathised with Lord Foppington’s views about the tedium of country living. We are told at the start of *The Country Wit* that Shallow has never been to London before and it is no coincidence that he is from Cumberland, geographically as remote from London as it was possible to get without leaving England.<sup>36</sup> Here, fashions were especially outmoded; indeed a fictional correspondent to ‘The Spectator’ advised its London readers that it was ‘worth taking a

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

journey thither’ to see northerners’ attempts at fashion for themselves.<sup>37</sup> Of course, this presentation of the ‘country gentleman’ as sequestered in his country house and entirely cut off from the London scene was a literary construct. The reality, as we have seen, was that many of the gentry were leading urban lives for at least part of the year. And even when resident in the country, the gentry were able to make use of London services, ordering goods by letter or using an intermediary to make purchases on their behalf. We can see how this worked in practice by looking at evidence of the clothing purchases of a small number of country gentlemen, examining how they were sourcing their clothing, what they were wearing and the extent to which they participated in a London-centred fashion culture.

The first examples are the Roberts men of Boarzell and Edward May of Pashley, both in Ticehurst in north-east Sussex. In 1680 the Roberts family consisted of Walter Roberts senior (1635-1690) and his two sons, Walter Roberts junior (1655-1700) and John Roberts (1662-1728). Walter’s wife, Mary (née Busbridge) had died in childbirth in 1666 and he did not remarry.<sup>38</sup> Boarzell was a small estate with a demesne or home farm of approximately 300 acres and a number of outlying tenanted smallholdings.<sup>39</sup>

A member of the middle gentry himself, Walter senior was connected through marriage to several other middle gentry families in eastern Sussex. However, within Ticehurst he was less substantial than the other gentry families, the Mays of Pashley, the Courthopes of Whiligh and the Apsleys of Wardsbrook.<sup>40</sup> Walter senior was connected to London trade through his brother-in-law, Thomas Busbridge, who became a citizen and wax chandler of London in 1676 although his surviving business ledger shows that he dealt almost exclusively in silk.<sup>41</sup> Walter’s younger son, John, was apprenticed to Busbridge in 1677 but seems to have not entered trade himself since he was living at Boarzell again by 1684.<sup>42</sup> The Roberts did not own a London house and there is nothing to suggest that Walter senior spent any significant time in the city.

In 1674 Walter senior became guardian to 10-year old Edward May (1664-1685) of Pashley after the death of May’s elder brother, Thomas.<sup>43</sup> The Mays owned property in London indicating stronger connections with the capital.<sup>44</sup> May continued to live at Pashley with his widowed mother, Ann, who



## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

submitted quarterly bills to Roberts for his board and some household expenditure.<sup>45</sup> The final bill dated October 1684 included the cost of boarding May, his new wife, Elizabeth, and three male servants.<sup>46</sup> In April 1685 May turned 21 and came into his inheritance but he only had a few months to enjoy it, dying in November.<sup>47</sup>

During his minority May's clothing purchases were made on his behalf by Roberts senior and evidence about what he and to a lesser extent the Roberts men were wearing is contained in a series of 'vouchers to account' or suppliers' bills. The most coherent set of bills are those for clothes made by a London tailor or mercer called John Heath which date from 1677 to 1687.<sup>48</sup> As a source, these are not unproblematic. Ten bills survive but whether these are all or the majority that were sent or only a small proportion is unknown. Moreover, in some instances it is difficult to tell for whom the clothes were being made, either because the bill gives no indication or because the top part of the bill where Heath normally recorded the customer's name is missing.

Instructions were evidently sent to Heath by letter. Whilst none of these survive we do have some of Heath's responses to them written at the foot or on the back of his bills, including advice on London fashions. An example of this is on a bill dated 9 December 1680 recording the cost of making a new three-piece suit and supplying accessories for the sixteen-year old May. At the foot of the bill Heath has written,

*Sir, I have here sent you Mr May's coat with a rapier and knot for the rapier. As for the rapier I could not buy one under the price above written [£1 15s]. I have not set a cape to the coat for some wear them and some will not but if he will have it I can get one made if I hear from you and send it down or if you send the coat I'll set one on and return it the same week. I have sent the bills according to your order. With my services to you all I wish you a Merry Christmas and am your obliged servant ...<sup>49</sup>*

On this occasion Heath made May a red 'cloth' (i.e. woollen) suit at a cost of £7 8s 6¼d and supplied with it a scarlet, gold and silver shoulder knot, two cravats, a 'fine' hat, two pairs of worsted stockings, 4¾ yards of scarlet ribbon and a rapier at a cost of £4 18s, a 'fine hair camlet coat'<sup>50</sup> at a

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

cost of £1 15s and a box to send the goods down to Sussex in at a cost of 1s 2s. In all the cost was £14 2s 8¼d.

In early 1682 Heath made May a coat of woollen cloth called *drap de Berry* costing 13s a yard with a ‘hair plush’ for the cape and the cuffs.<sup>51</sup> The coat was accessorized with fashionable ‘frost’ buttons – the same as those used on Samuel Jeake’s new suit in 1681 – and a shoulder knot of a scarlet and silver ribbon.<sup>52</sup> Heath also supplied a broad scarlet hat ribbon, intended to match the shoulder knot. Later the same year Heath made May a complete new suit, with a coat and breeches of fine woollen cloth priced at 15s a yard and a waistcoat made of striped lustring and lemon-coloured sarcenet.<sup>53</sup> The coat and waistcoat were fastened with silver buttons and Heath also supplied matching shoulder, sleeve and sword knots, a white castor hat and a pair of silk stockings. The same bill records the making of a second coat for May, this one of hair camlet priced at 6s the yard with contrasting shag<sup>54</sup> cuffs and cape and fastened with gold and silver buttons. Scrawled at the foot of the bill is a note that £1 1s 8d had been paid to London goldsmith, Moses Sicklemore, for a silver tobacco box engraved with a coat of arms, presumably those of the May family.<sup>55</sup>

The clothes that Heath made for the Roberts men were plainer and cheaper than those made for May. For example in 1677 Heath made the 42-year old Walter senior a new suit made of ‘stuff’<sup>56</sup> priced at 2s a yard. The only showy element was the Persian flowered taffeta which may have been used to front the waistcoat (the part that would have been on show) or to line the coat and no other accessories were supplied.<sup>57</sup> In 1687 Heath made Walter senior another suit made of ‘fine stuff’, priced at 2s 6d the yard. The ‘Florence sarcenet’ at a more costly 6s a yard may once again have been used to front the waistcoat or line the coat (or possibly both) but otherwise the suit was relatively unadorned. As a point of comparison, the coat buttons used on Walter’s suit cost a modest 6d a dozen and those used on the waistcoat 3d a dozen; those used on May’s suit of 1680 cost 3s a dozen and 14d a dozen respectively.<sup>58</sup>

The clothes Heath made for John Roberts – two years older than Edward May – were also relatively plain. In September 1677 he made the 15-year old a new suit of a good-quality woollen cloth costing

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

10s 6d a yard. The small amount of tabby<sup>59</sup> recorded in the bill may have been used to face the cuffs but otherwise the suit was completely plain. It was almost certainly made in anticipation of Roberts’ apprenticeship since he was indentured on 17 October 1677.<sup>60</sup> In 1684 Heath made John – now living at Boarzell again – a fine cloth ‘close coat’ with velvet-faced cuffs, costing £2 16s 1d. With the coat Heath also sent John three cravats bought for him by Heath’s wife costing 10s, but no other accessories were supplied.<sup>61</sup>

It is evident from the bills that Walter senior used Heath’s services more sparingly for his and his sons’ clothes than for those of his ward, Edward May. A number of the bills relating to Walter junior and John are for mourning suits and accessories and it is here that the most money was spent, reflecting the fact that late seventeenth-century funerals were as much expressions of status as they were expressions of loss.<sup>62</sup> For example, in April 1684 Heath supplied the 29-year old Walter with a new suit costing £6 6s 5d consisting of a black cloth coat and breeches and a black silk waistcoat. In addition, Heath supplied a mourning sword and belt, mourning shoes with shoe buckles, black silk stockings, a fine muslin cravat, a mourning hat band and a gold ring, costing a further £3 8s 10d.<sup>63</sup> It seems likely that most of the Roberts men’s clothing was sourced elsewhere, probably locally. We know that in 1672 Walter senior bought cloth, fastenings and trimmings to make a new coat from Ticehurst mercer, Thomas Nash, and between 1662 and 1670 he was also using the services of a tailor or mercer, Edward Butler, who, although unidentified, is likely to have been local.<sup>64</sup>

In the 1690s Walter junior was buying some of his clothes from another London tailor or mercer, Samuel Jones, for whom three bills survive.<sup>65</sup> Items made for Walter included a ‘fashionable riding coat’, a ‘fashionable close coat’ and a ‘fashionable coat, breeches and waistcoat’. The description of the items is relatively limited but does suggest that Walter was keeping up with current trends in male clothing. The fine cloth ‘fashionable close coat’ that Jones made for him, probably in 1693, was trimmed with braid and was to be worn over a new striped cloth waistcoat with silver buttons and silver cuffs.<sup>66</sup> Another ‘fashionable coat’ made in 1694 is described as having ‘broad buttonholes’.<sup>67</sup> As we have seen, male coats tended to be cut closer to the body at this date with decoration provided

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

by metallic braid trim and over-sized metallic buttons rather than the elaborate use of ribbon which we saw with Edward May’s clothes.<sup>68</sup>

The Roberts men and Edward May provide an interesting case study of the different types of clothing worn by men of a middle gentry status living in the same Sussex parish at the same date. Whatever the limitations of the ‘vouchers to account’ there is little doubt that May’s clothing was both more expensive and more fashionable than that worn by the Roberts, reflecting the fact that his family was wealthier and that he would, on turning 21, inherit a sizeable estate. Since May lived with his mother it is probable that when he was younger she chose his clothes for him. However, by the time he was 18 he was evidently ordering them himself. On the back of the bill from John Heath dated 23 September 1682 May has written: ‘Cousin Roberts, I do allow of this within written bill and I desire you to pay and discharge the same to Mr John Heath of London’.<sup>69</sup> The Mays had stronger connections to London than the Roberts whose connections were limited and possibly under exploited. There is, for example, no evidence that Walter senior’s brother-in-law, Thomas Busbridge, was supplying the household with London goods, although we know from his business ledger that he was supplying miscellaneous goods, including cloth and clothing accessories, to some of his other Sussex relatives.<sup>70</sup>

The significance of accessories to male dress has already been described and we have seen a number of accessories bought by Walter Roberts for his sons or Edward May including rapiers or swords, shoe buckles, cravats, hats, hat bands, shoulder, sleeve and sword knots and a tobacco box. The range of accessories worn by men or carried on their person in this period can be further illustrated by looking at some of the purchases recorded in the memorandum book of Richard Stapley (1657-1724). Stapley, of Hickstead Place in Twineham, Sussex, was the son of Anthony Stapley and younger brother to Anthony Stapley (1654-1733) who inherited Hickstead Place together with the manor of Twineham after his father’s death in 1667 and the subsequent death of his older brother, John.<sup>71</sup> Like the Roberts, the Stapleys were a minor gentry family of middle gentry status.<sup>72</sup>

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

Richard Stapley never married but lived with his mother, Jane, at Hickstead Place until her death and subsequently with his brother, Anthony, until his own death in 1724. He died intestate but an inventory of his estate recorded that at the time of his death he had personal possessions worth a modest £42 14s plus £1650 in money tied up in various investments.<sup>73</sup> Stapley’s memorandum book is a printed almanac for the years 1682 to 1687 into which he made notes of financial transactions, including some clothing purchases, and recorded notable local events such as the giant trout that was found in November 1692 or the extensive rain fall of June and July 1697. The entries, which continue until January 1724, do not follow each other in date order and appear to have been squeezed in wherever there was room.<sup>74</sup> Whilst Stapley’s memorandum book provides only limited information about his lifestyle, his entries suggest that he preferred male company to that of women. Possibly he was a little eccentric: he kept a pet fox in a hutch from 1699 until its death in 1711.<sup>75</sup>

The evidence from Stapley’s memorandum book suggests that he seldom ventured out of his locality. There are a couple of references to him being in London but on the whole he seems to have stayed in and around Twineham.<sup>76</sup> Most of his recorded purchases were from local tradesmen. His clothing, as recorded, was relatively modest and supplied by local mercers, James Mathew of Twineham and Richard Smith and James Lintott both of nearby Bolney. In May 1692 Mathew supplied Stapley with a serge coat and breeches, stockings and a new black hat, in July 1692 with a calamanco coat and breeches and a pair of stockings, in August 1692 with two fustian waistcoats and in 1694 with a gown (a loose, informal, wrapping gown, like a modern dressing gown) of purple bays.<sup>77</sup>

However, whilst his clothes seem to have been quite utilitarian his accessories were often fashionable and exotic. Although bought locally, their provenance is likely to have been London. For example in 1694 Stapley bought a cane with an ivory-studded head and ‘a purple and gold string to it’ from James Mathew ‘which cost in London 10s’.<sup>78</sup> Amongst the headwear that Stapley purchased were a black velvet cap ‘turned up with fur’ bought in 1692 from Twineham curate, William Sherward, who had ‘sent to London for it’ and a fashionable Carolina hat (a wide and floppy-brimmed hat) bought in 1701 from Bolney mercer, James Lintott.<sup>79</sup> Other small, decorative, accessories that Stapley records are two tobacco boxes, one of silver and one of tortoise shell, a silver snuff box and two pocket

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

knives, one with a tortoise-shell handle and one with an agate handle.<sup>80</sup> The most extravagant accessory that Stapley bought was a silver-cased watch made by London watchmaker, Benjamin Hill (1617-1670), for which he paid £3 in 1688. The watch, bought locally in Hurstpierpoint and obviously second hand, showed ‘the hour of the day, the day of the month, the months of the year, the age of the moon and the ebbing and flowing of the water and will go 30 hours without winding up’.<sup>81</sup> These small accessories were worn or carried out of view – the watch in a fob pocket at the top of the breeches, the snuff and tobacco boxes in coat pockets, the dagger in a sheath on the left hip – but, as we saw with the London fop, they were nevertheless intended to be displayed. For Stapley, however, leading a relatively isolated life in Twineham, their value may have been in their tactile and aesthetic qualities rather than in their usefulness in helping him to achieve a fashionable appearance.

Finally, we can look at the clothing choices of another country gentleman, but this time a member of the upper gentry, Sir Edward Turnor (c.1646-1721) of Great Hallingbury in Essex. Turnor was the son of Sir Edward Turnor (1616/1617-1676), a judge and speaker of the House of Commons, and his first wife, Sarah, daughter and heir of London merchant and alderman, Gerard Gore. Educated at Cambridge and Middle Temple, one of London’s Inns of Court, Turnor the younger was knighted in 1664 and called to the bar in 1672. A high-Anglican tory, he was active in local politics eventually becoming MP for Orford in Suffolk in 1701.<sup>82</sup> He had a house in St Martin’s Lane, Westminster, in London’s fashionable West End. This must have been quite large since he was paying tax on fifteen hearths in 1678 and 1679.<sup>83</sup> Of all the men discussed in this article he clearly had the strongest links to London. Not only had he received his legal training there but once he became an MP he is likely to have spent extended periods of time in the city whilst parliament was sitting.

A portrait of Turnor by John Michael Wright painted in 1672 when he would have been about 26, perhaps to commemorate his call to the bar, shows him resplendent in an elaborately embroidered red coat which is worn open without a waistcoat to reveal a full linen shirt with lace ruffles. He wears a knot of red ribbons on his right shoulder with additional bunches of red ribbon at his wrists and waistband. His gold-coloured breeches are full in the style of the early 1670s and decorated with vertical lines of red braid. At his neck is a short, tiered lace cravat topped with a loose red-ribbon

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

bow. He wears a heavily embroidered and fringed sword hanger, in his left hand he holds a pair of soft brown leather gloves and on his head is a full, low crowned, blonde wig.<sup>84</sup> This is where the ‘grave and manlike dress’ supposedly introduced by Charles II had come to by the early 1670s: Turnor’s fashionable attire is extravagant, showy and heavily accessorised.

We can find out more about what Turnor was wearing and where he was getting his clothing from a series of clothing bills covering the period from 1678 through to 1714.<sup>85</sup> Like the other clothing accounts used in this article, these are not unproblematic. It has not been possible to identify all his suppliers and the accounts themselves tend to give costs for made-up garments or groups of items which means the costs of individual elements (such as fabrics and buttons) are unknown. Where his suppliers can be identified they are in London. For example, in 1695 he bought a variety of blue woollen cloth (possibly for liveries) from drapers, Edward Smith and John Blofield, whose shop was at the King’s Head on Ludgate Hill and an undated bill records the purchase of a number of items from seamstress, Susannah Pluckett, whose shop was in Westminster Hall.<sup>86</sup> In contrast to the extravagantly-embroidered red silk coat worn in his portrait, these bills suggest that for the most part Turnor wore woollen coats in muted colours. A bill from mercer, James Allen, records the purchase of a number of garments over a period from 1679 to 1681.<sup>87</sup> In December 1679 Allen made Turnor a grey cloth suit lined with ‘Morella’ tabby<sup>88</sup> and altered and ‘new made’ a dark colour tabby waistcoat and in January 1681 he made Turnor a dark cloth suit (coat and breeches) lined with tabby and a tabby waistcoat. Turnor’s waistcoats were often more colourful, however. In May 1680 Allen made him a green waistcoat ‘flowered with gold and silver’, with gold and silver buttons and lined with white taffeta, and the following month he made him a white damask waistcoat with silver buttons lined with ‘Persian’.<sup>89</sup>

A bill from an unnamed supplier covering the period 1691 to 1694 records that during this period Turnor continued to wear woollen coats in muted colours although the ‘cinnamon-coloured’ cloth coat made for him in December 1693 must have been striking. It is not possible to determine the cut of his coats from the bill’s limited description of them. However, the references to ‘broad’ buttonholes edged with gold thread and large buttons suggest a fashionable style of close coat which we have

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

already encountered with Walter Roberts junior.<sup>90</sup> His breeches were made of wool, velvet or silk: in August 1693 he had a pair made out of red calamanco to match a red-striped calamanco waistcoat. His waistcoats remained flamboyant: in November 1692 he had one made of ‘rich brocade’; in July 1693 of a ‘spotted white Persian’. Some are described as having been ‘fringed’, for example in December 1693 Turnor paid 1s 6d for ‘fringing a silver vest with gold and silk to it’ and in March 1694 he paid the same amount for ‘putting gold fringe on a vest striped with gold silk and thread’. This highly-fashionable trim would have been added to the bottom of the waistcoat’s skirt; its opening may also have been part fringed to the waist with buttons closing the top.

The bills record little information about clothing or other accessories: in the late 1670s and early 1680s we would expect Turnor to be wearing shoulder and sleeve knots as we have already seen with Edward May. Presumably these were purchased elsewhere. A bill for a seamstress called Frances Spillett from February 1677 records the purchase of lace and muslin cravats, lace cuffs and ‘ruffs’ or ruffles, all essential accessories for the fashionable man.<sup>91</sup> Another essential item was the sword: we can see the elaborate hilt and guard of Turnor’s sword in Wright’s portrait of him of 1672 and a bill from a ‘sword cutler’ called Robert Marshall from 1703 records the cost of ‘fitting up’ Turnor’s ‘large’ and ‘small’ swords.<sup>92</sup>

### **CONCLUSION**

In the popular literature discussed in this article the ‘Town’ and the ‘Country’ are presented as separate spheres, defined by different modes of conduct and material culture. The reality, of course, was rather different. As Anna Bryson has pointed out, ‘by the end of the seventeenth century the majority of the English elite were socially amphibious, undertaking some part of its education at urban centres and often seasonally alternating residence between London and the counties’.<sup>93</sup> Whilst in London they would have participated in urban forms of sociability, worn fashionable London-made clothing and lived in warm, well-lit and fashionably furnished houses.<sup>94</sup> Sir Edward Turnor, a lawyer and MP, is likely to have spent at least part of his year in London, staying in his house in St Martin’s



## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

Lane, Westminster. His portrait of 1672 shows that in his youth he was following fashion and later clothing accounts suggest that this interest continued into his middle age.

However, even if a gentleman did not have the money or inclination to spend eight months of his year in London he could still participate to some extent in London’s fashion culture. Despite not dressing particularly fashionably himself, Walter Roberts senior evidently valued London-made clothes, as the surviving bills from John Heath show. In contrast, the clothes that John Heath made for Roberts’ ward, Edward May, were highly fashionable, probably chosen for him by his mother when he was younger and then by himself when he reached his late teens. Stapley is perhaps the odd one out here in the sense that he seems to have been content to have his clothes made locally. He did, however, have a penchant for fashionable and exotic accessories, bought on his behalf from London.

The evidence that has been used to reconstruct the clothing culture of the Roberts men, Edward May, Richard Stapley and Sir Edward Turnor has its limitations. We have no way of knowing what proportion of their clothing the surviving bills or the entries in Stapley’s memorandum book represent. Moreover, the bills and memorandum book tell us what these men were wearing but not what influenced their choices. The bills are responding to orders, presumably sent by letter, which do not survive. We therefore cannot tell how closely the finished suits match the customers’ specifications. It is clear that men like John Heath were exercising a high degree of professional judgement about what would be suitable for their clients and this included interpreting London’s volatile fashion culture: as Heath noted at the foot of his bill of 9 December 1680, ‘I have not set a cape to the coat for some wear them and some will not’. His uncertainty about how to respond to his client’s instructions is reflected in the fact that he was willing to alter the coat if necessary.<sup>95</sup> Heath was also acting as a proxy shopper for Walter Roberts, buying accessories on his behalf. On the same bill he records his difficulties in finding a rapier for Edward May at the right price and in 1684 he sent John Roberts three cravats, noting on his bill that these had been bought for Roberts by his wife.<sup>96</sup> Samuel Jones’ bills for Walter Roberts junior repeatedly make use of the word ‘fashionable’: a ‘fashionable riding coat’, a ‘fashionable close coat’, a ‘fashionable coat, breeches and waistcoat’. For

**‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

the Roberts men it was Heath’s and Jones’ metropolitan residence that was the guarantee that the garments they produced would look ‘town’ rather than ‘country’ fashioned.

What emerges most clearly from the disparate evidence discussed in this article is the significance of London as the originator and arbitrator of ‘fashion’. Integral to this was its dominant role in consumer culture, made possible by an extensive and highly-sophisticated retail network. It was these factors that drew in provincial consumers like Walter Roberts and Sir Edward Turnor. For them, London-bought clothing had a cachet that provincial clothing lacked and they were prepared to put up with the inconvenience of having to negotiate purchases by letter or through proxy shoppers. In the provinces their London clothing would have marked them out as men of ‘breeding’ or gentlemen. Whilst it is unlikely that they were able to compete with the high fashion of the London fop they may, on occasion, have been able to ‘strike a bold stroke’ amongst their neighbours by showing off the latest London styles.

**‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY  
GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

---

<sup>1</sup> Anon, ‘The Character of the Beaux in Five Parts ... Written by a Young Gentleman’ (London, 1696), pp. 22-27. A ‘bully’ or ‘hector’ beau is described as ‘one, who having no estate to subsist on, is forced to live by his wits, yet is a man of mode and strives to be soon in every fashion’ (pp.18-19).

<sup>2</sup> John Crowne, *The Country Wit* (London, 1675), pp. 3-4, 72.

<sup>3</sup> ‘The Spectator’, no. 119, 17 July 1711.

<sup>4</sup> Anna Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1998), see in particular pp. 107-150.

<sup>5</sup> Philip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660-1800* (Harlow, 2001).

<sup>6</sup> Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society*, pp. 20-22.

<sup>7</sup> R. H. Sweet, ‘Topographies of Politeness’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 12 (2002), p. 357. ‘The Spectator’, no. 2, 2 March, 1711, no. 106, 2 July 1711, no. 107, 3 July 1711, no. 269, 8 January 1712.

<sup>8</sup> ‘The Spectator’, no. 2, 2 March 1711.

<sup>9</sup> ‘The Spectator’, no. 129, 28 July 1711.

<sup>10</sup> Robert Latham and William Matthews (eds), *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, vol. 7 (London, 1972), p. 315 (8 October 1666).

<sup>11</sup> David Kuchta, *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity, England 1550-1850* (California, 2002), pp. 81-82.

<sup>12</sup> Pepys wore his new coat and vest for the first time on 4 November 1666 (Latham and Matthews, *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, p. 353).

<sup>13</sup> Anon, *England’s Vanity: Or the Voice of God against the Monstrous Sin of Pride in Dress and Apparel* (London, 1683), pp. 124-125.

<sup>14</sup> Kuchta, *The Three-Piece Suit*, p. 87. See illustration of the three-piece suit drawn by the earl of Sandwich in 1666, reproduced in Kuchta, p. 83 also the portrait of Sir Edward Turnor, 1672, reproduced in Aileen Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction: Dress in Art and Literature in Stuart England* (New Haven & London, 2005), p. 233 (and detail p. 235).

<sup>15</sup> Kuchta, *The Three-Piece Suit*, p. 93.

<sup>16</sup> Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, p. 287.

<sup>17</sup> Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, pp. 306-307.

**‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY  
GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

---

- <sup>18</sup> Anon, *A Satire against the French* (London, 1691), p. 6.
- <sup>19</sup> Mark Dawson, *Gentility and the Comic Theatre in Late Stuart London* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 145-163. See also Philip Carter, ‘Men about Town: Representations of Foppery and Masculinity in Early Eighteenth-Century Urban Society’, in Helen Barker & Elaine Chalus (eds), *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities* (Harlow, 1997), pp. 31-57 and Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society*, pp. 124-162.
- <sup>20</sup> Vanbrugh, *The Relapse*, pp. 9-10.
- <sup>21</sup> Vanbrugh, *The Relapse*, pp. 12-13, 26.
- <sup>22</sup> Anon, ‘The Character of the Beaux’, pp. 11-18.
- <sup>23</sup> Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, pp. 130-1; Hannah Greig, *The Beau Monde: Fashionable Society in Georgian London* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 4-8.
- <sup>24</sup> Susan Whyman, *Sociability and Power in Late-Stuart England: The Cultural Worlds of the Verneys 1660-1720* (Oxford, 1999), p. 67.
- <sup>25</sup> Whyman, *Sociability and Power*, p. 58.
- <sup>26</sup> For a discussion of the London shopping habits of a member of the lower gentry see Danae Tankard, ‘Giles Moore’s Clothes: The Clothing of a Sussex Rector 1656-1679’, *Costume*, 49(1) (2015), pp. 32-54.
- <sup>27</sup> Clare Haru Crowston, *Fabricating Women: The Seamstresses of Old Regime France* (Durham & London, 2001), p. 50.
- <sup>28</sup> Woodruff Smith, *Consumption and the Making of Respectability, 1600-1800* (New York & London, 2002), pp. 51-53.
- <sup>29</sup> East Sussex Record Office (ESRO), FRE 5057. For a longer discussion of Jeake’s new suit see Danae Tankard, “‘They tell me they were in fashion last year’: Samuel and Elizabeth Jeake and Clothing Fashions in Late Seventeenth-Century London and Rye”, *Costume*, 50(1) (2016), pp. 20-41. The silk was for the waistcoat; the coat was made out of a woollen cloth.
- <sup>30</sup> ‘The Character of the Beaux’, pp. 27-29.
- <sup>31</sup> Claire Walsh, ‘Social Meaning and Social Space in the Shopping Galleries of Early Modern London’ in John Benson and Laura Ugolini (eds), *A Nation of Shopkeepers: Five Centuries of British Retailing* (London, 2003), pp. 52-79.
- <sup>32</sup> ‘The Spectator’, no. 319 (6 March 1712).

**‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY  
GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

---

<sup>33</sup> Alice Dolan, ‘An Adorned Print: Print Culture, Female Leisure and the Dissemination of Fashion in France and England, around 1660-1779’, *V&A Online Journal*, Issue No. 3 (Spring 2011)

<http://www.vam.ac.uk/content/journals/research-journal/issue-03/an-adorned-print-print-culture.-female-leisure-and-the-dissemination-of-fashion-in-france-and-england.-c.-1660-1779> (accessed 19 May 2015); Elizabeth Davis, ‘“Habit de Qualité”: Seventeenth-Century French Fashion Prints as Sources for Dress History’, *Dress* 40(2) (2014), pp. 117-143.

<sup>34</sup> For ballads satirising contemporary fashion see ‘The Virgin’s Vindication: Or the Conceited Fashionmonger’ (Magdalene College, Cambridge, Pepys 5.432, 1664-1703?); ‘The Young Man’s Advice to Proud Ladies: Or, A Friendly Caution against their Monstrous Dress’ (National Library of Scotland, Crawford 744, 1692).

<sup>35</sup> Vanbrugh, *The Relapse*, pp. 27-28.

<sup>36</sup> Crowne, *Country Wit*, pp. 3-4.

<sup>37</sup> ‘The Spectator’, no. 129 (28 July 1711).

<sup>38</sup> ESRO, DUN 52/26, LIB/500874.

<sup>39</sup> Robert Tittler (ed), *Accounts of the Roberts Family of Boarzell, Sussex c1568-1582*, *Sussex Record Society*, 71 (1977-1979), p. xviii.

<sup>40</sup> L. F. Salzman (ed), *Victoria County History: Sussex*, vol. 9 (London, 1937), pp. 245-255.

<sup>41</sup> ESRO, DUN 37/9.

<sup>42</sup> ESRO, DUN 52/13.

<sup>43</sup> Edward May was baptised on 7 April 1664 and buried on 10 November 1685 (ESRO, LIB/500866, LIB/500874). His brother was buried on 7 April 1674 (LIB/500874). For Thomas May’s will see TNA, Prob 11/344/553. For Edward May’s will see TNA, Prob 11/ 383/199.

<sup>44</sup> In her will of 1694 Ann May refers to ‘my houses in London’ (TNA, Prob 11/420/35).

<sup>45</sup> From 1682 these included the cost of keeping one male servant (see ESRO, DUN 50/6/77-80); by the first half of 1684 May had two male servants (ESRO, DUN 50/6/99).

<sup>46</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/99.

<sup>47</sup> For his will see TNA, Prob 11/383/199.

<sup>48</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/52, 54, 62, 65, 81, 84, 86, 97, 104; DUN 51/15. Heath’s occupation is not given but comparison with similar bills surviving for Sir Edward Turnor (see below) suggest that he was more likely to be a mercer than a tailor. Mercers supplied bespoke and ready-made clothing as well as a range of accessories. In some cases they may have done the tailoring themselves but it is more likely that they employed a tailor to make

**‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY  
GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

---

the clothing for them. Mercers’ bills give no indication of this relationship but we can see it in action in the diary of the Sussex mercer, Thomas Turner. Turner, who kept a shop in East Hoathly, used the services of a local tailor, Charles Diggins, to produce clothing for his customers (D Vaisey (ed), *The Diary of Thomas Turner 1754-1765* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 9, 11, 212, 317, 330).

<sup>49</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/62.

<sup>50</sup> Camlet is like stuff but with the wool mixed with silk, cotton, linen or Angora.

<sup>51</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/84. The top part of this bill with its date is missing. Heath received payment on 28 April 1682. *Drap de Berry* was produced in the French town of Berry. Plush is a long-napped velvet.

<sup>52</sup> ESRO, FRE 5057.

<sup>53</sup> Lustring or lutestring is a lustrous silk taffeta; sarcenet is a thin, soft silk with a slight sheen on it.

<sup>54</sup> A shaggy cloth, generally of worsted.

<sup>55</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/86. The top part of this bill with its date is missing. Heath received payment on 20 June 1682. For Moses Sicklemore’s will of 1695 see TNA, Prob 11/424/331.

<sup>56</sup> Stuff is a type of worsted, distinguished from other woollen cloths by the absence of any nap or pile.

<sup>57</sup> ESRO, DUN, 50/6/52. The bill does not say who the suit was made for and it is my assumption that it was for Walter senior. The total cost of the taffeta was 19s suggesting that only a small amount was used. As we have seen with Jeake, by 1681 flowered silk had become unfashionable.

<sup>58</sup> ESRO, DUN 51/15, DUN 50/6/62.

<sup>59</sup> A silk taffeta.

<sup>60</sup> The bill is dated 27 September 1677 (ESRO, DUN 50/6/54). For the indenture see ESRO, DUN 52/13.

<sup>61</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/104.

<sup>62</sup> For a discussion of mourning clothing see Susan Vincent, *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 61-71.

<sup>63</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/97. There is no record of whose funerals the Roberts men were attending.

<sup>64</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/38. Three of Butler’s bills survive dating from 1666, 1669 and 1670 (ESRO, DUN 50/6/15, 50/6/19, 50/6/20). I have been unable to find out where he was based but the fact that his bills do not include the cost of boxes or carriage suggests that he was probably local.

<sup>65</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/129, 50/7/22, 50/7/26. The first two of these are damaged.

<sup>66</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/129. This bill is damaged so the date is missing but it preceded the subsequent bill of April 1694. The ‘silver cuffs’ were probably some kind of braid trim. They may have been designed to turn back over the coat-sleeve cuffs.

## **‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

---

<sup>67</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/7/26.

<sup>68</sup> For an example of a more-or-less contemporary male outfit see the ‘fashion’ doll, ‘Lord Clapham’ (c1690-1700) in the collection of the V&A. He is wearing a red wool coat with flared skirts and a silk waistcoat. The coat has silver braid trim and large silver buttons (object number T.847-1974).

<sup>69</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/81.

<sup>70</sup> ESRO, DUN 37/9.

<sup>71</sup> Anthony Stapley senior had five sons, the oldest of which was John Stapley. By 1670 three of the sons, including John, were dead leaving Anthony junior and Richard as his principal heirs. He also had two daughters, Ann and Elizabeth. His widow, Jane, retained possession of Hickstead Place until her death (see TNA, C5/632/33 and Prob 11/325/393). See also L. F. Salzman (ed), *A History of the County of Sussex: Volume 7* (London, 1940), pp.186-191.

<sup>72</sup> In 1670 the personal estate of Stapley senior was described as ‘diverse manors, lands and tenements situated in [Sussex]’ together with moveable goods ‘amounting to £500 upwards’ (TNA, C5/632/33).

<sup>73</sup> ESRO, HIC 1106. £900 of this was described as held ‘on good security and interest’; £757 7s ‘on doubtful securities and interests’.

<sup>74</sup> ESRO, HIC 1166. See also E Turner, ‘Extracts from the Diary of Richard Stapley, Gent, of Hickstead Place in Twineham, from 1682 to 1724’, *Sussex Archaeological Collections 2* (1849), pp. 102-119.

<sup>75</sup> ESRO, HIC 1166, p. 173.

<sup>76</sup> He was in London in 1684 because he and his mother were involved in a tithe dispute with the rector of Twineham which was heard in the court of Exchequer (TNA, E134/35AND36CHAS2/HIL6; E134/35CHAS2/EAST 6); he was in London again in 1701 to receive a bequest of £500 from his aunt, Grace Easton (ESRO, HIC 1166, pp. 7).

<sup>77</sup> ESRO, HIC 1166, pp. 15, 47. Serge is a loosely-woven, twilled worsted; calamanco is a type of woollen cloth; fustian is a linen and cotton cloth; bays is a coarse woollen cloth with a long nap.

<sup>78</sup> ESRO, HIC 1166, p. 53. Stapley paid Mathew an additional 10s for the cane so the total cost was £1.

<sup>79</sup> ESRO, HIC 1166, p. 78, 139.

<sup>80</sup> ESRO, HIC 1166, pp. 134, 175, 176.

<sup>81</sup> ESRO, HIC 1166, p. 9.

<sup>82</sup> P. E. Murrell, ‘Turnour, Sir Edward (1642x7-1721)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27889>, accessed 2 October 2015]

**‘BUTTONS NO BIGGER THAN NUTMEGS’: THE CLOTHING OF COUNTRY  
GENTLEMEN, c1660-1715**

---

<sup>83</sup> West Sussex Record Office (WSRO), Shillinglee MS ACC 454, bundle no. 5, part 2 (unnumbered bills).

<sup>84</sup> John Michael Wright, *Sir Edward Turnor*, 1672 (Private Collection, sold through Christie’s in 2007); reproduced in Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction* p. 232 & detail p. 235.

<sup>85</sup> WSRO, Shillinglee MS ACC 454 (unnumbered individual bills).

<sup>86</sup> WSRO, Shillinglee MS ACC 454, bundle no. 5, part 1, bundle no. 2 (unnumbered bills). In addition to housing the Law Courts, Westminster Hall was the location of a number of upmarket shopping stalls selling (amongst other things) seamstresses’ ware.

<sup>87</sup> WSRO, Shillinglee MS ACC 454, bundle no. 1 (unnumbered bill).

<sup>88</sup> Presumably produced in Morella in Spain.

<sup>89</sup> Probably a kind of taffeta.

<sup>90</sup> WSRO, Shillinglee MS ACC 454, bundle no. 1 (unnumbered bill).

<sup>91</sup> WSRO, Shillinglee MS Acc 454, bundle no. 5 (unnumbered bill).

<sup>92</sup> WSRO, Shillinglee MS Acc 454, bundle no. 2 (unnumbered bill).

<sup>93</sup> Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, p. 281.

<sup>94</sup> Whyman, *Sociability and Power*, p. 56.

<sup>95</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/62.

<sup>96</sup> ESRO, DUN 50/6/54.