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Abstract

As the saying goes, “what you see is what you get” and if there ever was a period in history that could use this as its slogan, it would without doubt be the early modern period. Ideally, outer appearances and inner selves were supposed to correspond and the position of the wearer within the social system was supposed to be instantly visible from what they wore. Far from being a private matter solely dependent of the person’s own desires and available means, in a hierarchical society dress was intended to demonstrate the position of the wearer within the social system. Even though dress was only one of the many ways through which people created and maintained an identity in the early modern world, the possibility of reaching a potentially wide audience made one’s costume definitely a better demonstrator of one’s identity, financial means and social standing than what one consumed for his or her meals, for example. Therefore, it became increasingly important to regulate dress carefully by way of issuing sumptuary laws, which enforced the correspondence between signified and signifier. The argument that sumptuary laws were devised and enforced in order to maintain social order has been a given in research concerning the early modern period. The present study will take this idea as its starting point and examine how exactly social order was conceived of by the Tallinn town council, which issued sumptuary legislation. By looking at the example of Tallinn, which was a multi-ethnic environment with a complex social order during the early modern period, this study aims to contribute towards the understanding of the creation of social order within an early modern urban setting.
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1. Introduction

In 1636 the wife of a Tallinn gymnasium teacher Alhard Bondel was threatened to have her clothes openly confiscated because she had shown her face in the church in what was considered foreign clothing.\textsuperscript{1} Since she originated from Tartu (Dorpat at the time), she had received the clothes as part of her dowry. Bondel refused to buy new clothes for her, ignored the repeated summons to appear before the town council, after which he was fined 200 Reichsthaler and placed under house arrest. Curiously enough, the law appears to have been in his favour, as the 1631 clothing regulation stated that if a woman already owned the so-called Dorpat costume she could wear it to avoid unnecessary costs connected to obtaining new clothes.\textsuperscript{2} After three months of resistance and with the possibility of unemployment hanging above his head, Bondel finally gave up the struggle and promised to acquire a new wardrobe for his wife. He did, however, ask for a time extension as it was bound to be very costly.\textsuperscript{3}

In this incident from early modern Tallinn we encounter an unfortunate gymnasium teacher and his frustration over the injustice that was done to him and his family in an issue where from a legal perspective he was supposed to be in the right. In this instance, legal and popular opinions did not match up, as the people found his wife’s costume foreign and unrecognisable, and the town council had to yield to the popular pressure. In a society “where one needed to read and be read”, as French historian Daniel Roche aptly phrases it, “where tiny signs revealed social position and personal intention, it was important not only to be able to confirm that one belonged to an order, more or less noble or more or less wealthy [. . .] but to know how to proclaim one’s singularity or conformity in the publicity of appearances.”\textsuperscript{4} During the early modern period unrecognizable was seen as a serious threat to the social order, because if one could not be instantly recognised by external appearances, then how was everybody else supposed to know who that person was, where he placed on the social order and how he/she stood in relation to the others.

Taking as its starting points these issues of legibility and recognisability as well as the clothing regulations that did not come to Bondel’s aid, this study will examine the social order and how it was imagined by the town council in the complex urban microcosm that was early modern Tallinn. How the town’s inhabitants, including Bondel and his wife, were categorised by the council, who was included and who left out and how the consequent social order was supposed

\textsuperscript{1} Von Hansen 1881, pp. 12-4.
\textsuperscript{2} TLA.190.1.2, p. 397. \textit{Aber die Bereits vorgegangen vndt sich hiebeuor auff dörptsch bekleidet, mögen unkosten zu vermeiden bey der dörptschen geduldet werden.}
\textsuperscript{3} Von Hansen 1894, p. 34; Kukke 1992, p. 41.
\textsuperscript{4} Roche 1996, p. 443.
to be ideally visualised and when and where this process of visualisation was to take place are the core questions this study aims to answer.

1.1. Tallinn during the early modern period

Like in the rest of Europe, the early modern period was one of social and political conflict on the territory of what is now known as Estonia as between 1558 and 1710 Estonian territory was subjected to five different rules. Because of the frequent armed conflicts on the Estonian territory and the general social turmoil that accompanied it, Laidre has termed the period from 1558 to 1661 as Estonia’s Hundred Years’ War. It took roughly a century for old power structures of the Livonian Confederation to dissolve and for the Swedish kingdom to emerge as the sole ruler of the land. It has been suggested that as a consequence of the Livonian War the population had decreased by around 55% and by 1601 at most 135,000 people lived on the Estonian territory. By the end of the century, the population had increased again to approximately 400,000 people.

The Swedish rule, however, did not occur overnight but was a lengthy process. Whereas the northern parts of present-day Estonia, including Tallinn, submitted themselves to the Swedish king in 1561, after the end of the Livonian War in 1583 the geographical territory of Old Livonia was still divided between Sweden, Denmark and Poland. The island of Ösel (Saaremaa) only came under Swedish rule in 1645. Moreover, there were differences in how Sweden conceived its power in the newly-acquired Baltic territory. The northern part of Estonia including Tallinn had submitted itself to Sweden voluntarily with a treaty and therefore King Erik XIV had guaranteed the privileges of Tallinn and the nobility in the counties of Wierland, Jerwen and Harrien in 1561. The rest of Estonia, Livonia and the islands, however, were considered as a conquered territory and therefore it was not seen as necessary to guarantee the privileges of local nobility to the same extent or consider them equal to their northern counterparts.

Even though the privileges and the rights of the lower town were recognised by the Swedish crown repeatedly during the seventeenth century, the history of Tallinn within the Swedish empire is a history of resistance to centralisation. For example, from 1584 onwards Tallinn city

---

5 Laidre 2000, p. 932.
6 Laidre, p. 945, p. 947.
7 Laidre, p. 934.
8 Laidre, p. 939.
9 Talve 2005, p. 121.
10 Brüggemann and Tuchtenhagen 2013, p. 99. Tallinn was divided into lower town, which was governed autonomously from the upper town on the Dome Hill, the seat of the Swedish royal power. For a map of Tallinn see image 1, p. 67. Tallinn’s privileges were acknowledged by the Swedish crown in 1561, 1570, 1594, 1607, 1613, 1646 and 1675.
council had to refer to Stockholm rather than Lübeck as the highest court of appeal, even though the city still adhered to the Lübeck law.\textsuperscript{11} Towards the end of the seventeenth century, conscious efforts were made by the Swedish state to reduce the German cultural, social and economic domination. In 1680, Tallinn town council, which had until then elected all of its councillors independently, had to accept the councilman of justice (\textit{Justizbürgermeister}), which was appointed by the king.\textsuperscript{12} In 1690 \textit{Academia Gustavo-Carolina} was reopened in Tartu with Swedish professors teaching in Swedish and refusing students of German background entry.\textsuperscript{13}

There were also conflicts within the town community. During the whole century, the town council struggled to reassert its independence and pre-eminence, which often led to the guilds contesting and boycotting its decisions.\textsuperscript{14} One good example is sumptuary legislation, where the council’s attempts to impose sharper distinctions between the three guilds and forbid fabrics that had been previously allowed to them were often met by sharp opposition from the artisans’ guilds.\textsuperscript{15} Additionally, the guilds were involved in constant power struggles with each other, with the Great Guild taking itself as the sole representative of the town’s community and the artisans’ guilds being sharply dissatisfied with the revocation of their old privileges and their exclusion from town politics and decision-making processes.\textsuperscript{16}

When it comes to guilds as institutions, a guild in its most general form is the association of people who share some common characteristic and pursue some common purpose. The shared characteristic can be anything: religion, nationality, cultural interests, military service and so forth. However, the most common characteristic is occupation and the majority of medieval and early modern guilds were formed around shared economic activities.\textsuperscript{17} In Tallinn, corporations with mainly religious purpose gradually disappeared after the Reformation and the four the four corporations that this thesis will be concerned with were formed around professional activities. Although the exact founding date for any of the four guilds in Tallinn is not known, it can be ascertained from the dates they were first mentioned that they had been established by the end of

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11} Kodres 2003, p. 161. Lübeck law was granted to the lower city of Tallinn in 1248 by Danish king Erik IV and its legitimacy reaffirmed by every new landlord, including the kings of Sweden, thus recognising the autonomy of Tallinn. According to the law, Tallinn city council retained the legislative, executive and judicial power. The regulations issued by the council complemented the law, however, a number of generally accepted judicial principles and traditions were never written down. The underlying principles of Lübeck law remained unchanged from 1248 until the middle of nineteenth century. See T. Kala, \textit{Lübeck Law and Tallinn}, trans. M. Aru (Tallinn, 1998).
  \item \textsuperscript{12} Kodres 2013, p. 189.
  \item \textsuperscript{13} Rystad 2012, pp. 354-5.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} For a more detailed analysis of how the town council perceived its role within the social order and how they tried to reassert their preeminence see chapter 2.1 “Those who regulate: Tallinn town council during the seventeenth century”.
  \item \textsuperscript{15} For a very good and concise overview of the social conflicts between the town council and the guilds during the seventeenth century see Weinmann 1991, pp. 86-157 and amongst the guilds Gierlich 1991, pp. 57-62.
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Gierlich 1991, pp. 57-62.
  \item \textsuperscript{17} Ogilvie 2011, p. 19.
\end{itemize}
the fourteenth century. It has been suggested that the Great Guild emerged from the older St. Canute’s and St. Olaf’s guilds, when merchants decided to establish a corporation of their own, as a contrast to other members who were mainly artisans. This development emerged concurrently with the increase in the social and economic status and political importance.\textsuperscript{18} The Brotherhood of the Blackheads, which united mainly journeymen and unmarried merchants of either German or local origin, was the last to come into existence roughly around the year 1400.\textsuperscript{19}

In medieval and early modern town life guilds played a significant role. The guild protected the interests of its members, offered social security by taking care of its members and their families when they needed help, but also organising funerals for its members if the need arose. They established altars in churches, furthered the cult of their patron saint, participated in masses and prayers. During certain times of the year guilds also organised celebrations both for the members and for townspeople. This all strengthened the communal feeling and shared values amongst the guilds’ members. What differentiates Tallinn from the rest of Western and Northern Europe is that after the Reformation the guilds were not disbanded forcefully and neither did they die out. Both in Estonia and Latvia the larger guilds were active until 1920 when the four-estate model (nobility, clergy,burghers and peasants) that had been established by the Russian Empire in its Baltic governorates was abolished and the guilds consequently closed down.\textsuperscript{20}

In total, the population of Tallinn during the seventeenth century is estimated to have been between 7000 and 9000 people.\textsuperscript{21} The confusion caused by armed conflicts, changes in power but also migration resulted in a notable ethnic diversity. Even though Estonia gradually came under Swedish rule, in the early modern period up to one third of Tallinn’s population was made up of Germans, who had been the lords of the land for at least two centuries, with two thirds being Estonian, Finnish and Russian.\textsuperscript{22} In professional terms, around 9% of Tallinn’s population were merchants, around 30% were artisans and around 60% were common folk employed in physical labour; of these the majority were Estonians.\textsuperscript{23} This meant that the higher and the lower classes differed from each other not only in their social standing but also in their ethnicity. Whereas the higher classes were predominantly of German origin, Estonians were almost always of lowest

\textsuperscript{18} Leimus et al. 2011, pp. 19-20.
\textsuperscript{19} Kreem and Oolup 1999, p. 12, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{20} Mänd 2005a, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{22} Kodres 2003, p. 152. Based on the study of Heinz von zur Mühlen and Paul Johansen, according to Anu Mänd, Germans made up one third of the city population, Swedes one fifth and Estonians less than half. Although Mänd’s data concerns the first half of the sixteenth century, it makes sense to assume that the number of Swedes would increase rather than decrease with the establishment of Swedish rule in Estonia and thus this discrepancy is doubtless worthy of consideration. See Mänd 2005b, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{23} Talve 2005, p. 129.
According to Teet Veispak, in the seventeenth century Estonians as an ethnic group were unknown in Tallinn, and the term Estonians (Ehsten) was used to denote serfs living in the countryside. Instead, free Estonians, Latvians and Livonians living in towns were referred to as Undeutsch. This was not meant to denote ethnic belonging but rather one’s position on the social ladder and carried a certain negative connotation.24

Thus, early modern Tallinn was a multicultural and multi-ethnic hub with a complex social order, yet Kekke Stadin has pointed out that when early modern society of the Baltic area is studied, towns and urban life have often been overlooked since only a minority of the population lived in towns.25 Thus, how all this influenced social interaction and lived experiences is unclear and disputable. On the one hand, the city is seen by some researchers as a place of opportunities and anonymity where people could be private individuals and create their own identities free from the restrictions of birth and background. On the other hand, some see it as a tightly focused and even claustrophobic local community, fragmented culturally, socially and economically.26 If we want to understand how early modern urban society and social order worked, we need to understand how such multiculturalism worked.

1.2. Early modern sumptuary laws

Apart from a few general articles, no concentrated study of early modern sumptuary laws issued within what is now Estonia has so far been conducted and the only context within which they are mentioned are usually general overviews about the history of Tallinn.27 At the end of the nineteenth century, the topic appears to have been of interest to historians of Baltic German origins and even though the articles mostly summarise the regulations, Eduard Pabst’s contribution is invaluable because he printed the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century regulations with explanations and also provided a translation in High German.28 More recently, Inna Põltsam has published a general overview of clothing culture on the Estonian territory from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries.29 Katrin Kukke’s bachelor’s thesis about the clothing culture and sumptuary laws in early modern Tallinn is undoubtedly the closest to the present study, although

24 Veispak 1990, p. 242, see also Johansen and von zur Mühlen 1973. Tiina Kala, on the other hand has suggested that the term Undeutsch did not necessarily have negative connotations and thus does not have to be interpreted as an attempt to deride the local indigenous population. Rather, suggests Kala, it can be seen as evidence that a gradually emerging local German identity was tied to the German ethnonym and language, which in turn was more clearly in opposition with the local non-German identity. See Kala 2004, p. 13.
25 Stadin 2003, p. 5.
26 Merrit 2001, p. 11.
27 Gierlich 1991, pp. 293-7, Brüggemann and Tuchtenhagen 2013, pp. 77-84.
28 Pabst 1857, passim, von Hansen 1894, passim, Stieda 1887, passim.
29 Põltsam 2002, passim.
here the main purpose is to look at conceptions of social order by way of examining clothing regulations rather than focussing on the clothing culture as such.\textsuperscript{30}

In the wider context, there appears to be a similar trend of dated but still useful studies of local sumptuary legislation.\textsuperscript{31} Even though Liselotte Eisenbart’s \textit{Kleiderordnungen der deutschen Städte zwischen 1350 und 1700: Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Bürgertums} was published more than half a century ago, it has been invaluable for the present study for decoding all different kinds of fabrics and furs encountered in the regulations.\textsuperscript{32} Alan Hunt’s more recent \textit{Governance of the Consuming Passions: History of the Sumptuary Law} is undoubtedly the most ambitious work, spanning from Roman antiquity to the present time and from Europe to Japan and China.\textsuperscript{33} Even though Hunt’s work has its merits, the major problem is that its scope is too broad and thus fails to take into account various geographical, social and historical contexts that influenced sumptuary legislation across space and time. Furthermore, his dependence on English scholarship is a serious limitation, as such Anglo-centricity ignores important recent contributions by Gerhard Jaritz and Neithard Bulst, which examine how social status and clothing interacted in early modern estate society (Ständegesellschaft).

Gerhard Jaritz has discussed prestige and competition in clothing behaviour during the late middle ages and the early modern period and examined various forms of externalisation of social prestige based on clothing styles. Urban society was by no means homogeneous; rather, attempts of normalisation and formation took place by the way of clothing regulations, which concerned individual groups to different extents. In addition to differentiation based on class, distinctions based on wealth and tax payments also played a role.\textsuperscript{34} Neithard Bulst has suggested that while the clothing regulations attempted to lay down class boundaries, at the same time they contributed towards giving an additional incentive to people’s social aspirations. The more refined the social hierarchy of early modern period became and the stronger the various levels within the society made claims on their status through outward appearances, the more complicated and thicker the legislation keeping this order in place got.\textsuperscript{35}

Otherwise, sumptuary legislation has usually been discussed within the wider fields of fashion, consumption and material culture.\textsuperscript{36} This naturally makes sense, as one of the underlying purposes for issuing such legislation was to curtail the consumption of luxury goods, including fine apparel, fabrics and accessories, initially because of religious and moral reasons and later on

\textsuperscript{30} Kukke 1992, passim.
\textsuperscript{31} Newett 1907, passim, Greenfield 1918, passim, Baldwin 1926, passim, Vincent 1935, passim.
\textsuperscript{32} Eisenhart 1962, passim.
\textsuperscript{33} Hunt 1996, passim.
\textsuperscript{34} Jaritz 1993, passim.
\textsuperscript{35} Bulst 1993, passim.
\textsuperscript{36} Vincent 2003, p. 118; Roche 1996, pp. 27-56.
because of economic considerations. However, as Susan Vincent points out, such studies are mostly concerned with the economic and functional importance of dress and treat clothes as commodities and not “as items that in turn shape and “use” their owners, or nuanced as objects in which multiple meanings reside”. In his work about fashion and consumption in eighteenth-century Germany, Daniel Purdy has argued against the prevalent sociological tradition, which claims that decorative consumer goods reflect the relative position of their owner within the class hierarchy. Instead, he sees commodities, and clothes in particular as instruments of power.

1.3. Theoretical approaches to dress and social order

In order to conduct the study of how social order interacted with costume and appearances, some key concepts this study touches upon should be discussed and clarified. The first important but complicated problem is that of identity. Brubaker and Cooper have argued that the term “identity” is too vague to be of any real analytical value for social science and have called its usefulness into question. Instead, they propose processual terms “identification” and “categorisation”, which invite us to specify the agents that do the identifying. Here they distinguish between relational and categorical modes of identification, the first meaning identifying oneself within a relational web, such as a web of kinship, and the second meaning the identification of oneself or others by some categorical attribute, such as class or race. On the other hand, Richard Jenkins argues that identity does matter, because it is “the basic cognitive mechanism that humans use to sort out themselves and their fellows, individually and collectively.”

Whereas individual identity emphasises differentiation, collective identity evokes similarities, no matter how vague, apparently unimportant or illusory. These similarities, however, cannot be recognised without simultaneously evoking differentiation and defining “us” necessarily involves defining “them”. The most important aspect of collective identification for the present enquiry, however, is the differentiation between group identification or collective internal definition and categorisation or collective external definition. Brubaker and Cooper have drawn attention to a key type of external identification, namely “formalised, codified, objectified systems of categorisation

37 Rublack 2010, pp. 266-7.
38 Vincent 2003, p. 3.
40 Brubaker and Cooper 2012, pp. 1-12.
41 Brubaker and Cooper 2012, p. 15.
developed by powerful, authoritative institutions”. What will be the subject of analysis is not how the members of various collectives in early modern Tallinn generated group identities and perceived themselves within various collectives but rather how this was done externally by the town council through “authoritatively applied identification”. According to Jenkins, members of a category need not be aware of their collective identification by others and thus it should be emphasised that how the inhabitants were categorised by Tallinn town council for legislative purposes does not necessarily mean that this corresponded to how they identified themselves within any given collective.

Furthermore, in the case of Tallinn there emerges a distinct urban identity. Discussing early modern cultural transfer in the Baltic Sea region, Janis Kreslins has suggested that as a consequence of the relativisation of north and south in the early modern times there emerges a sense of replicability. “The city is self-contained with well demarcated borders and walls. It is not unequivocally inviting. Concurrently, if we take a step into the self-enclosed unit, we find an intertwined and interlocked world which at any time can be superimposed on any setting whatsoever.” Therefore, there was a set of symbols, recognisable in any given urban setting, and it was possible to move between the various settings without feeling that one had left the network. “The cities developed their identities not primarily in competition with one another, but rather as the opposite of everything for which the wilderness stood.”

Additionally, the study will be concerned with various ways of dividing members of a society, either into groups, categories or classes, all of which share the same problem with identity, namely that they are frustratingly imprecise and seem to say too much and too little at the same time. Richard Jenkins has employed a very useful umbrella term, “collectivity”, and makes a distinction between a group and a category, suggesting that category is a class whose nature and composition is decided externally by the entity who defines the category. It can be defined arbitrarily, according to any criteria. A group, on the other hand, is defined by the nature of the relationship between its members and demands mutual recognition by its members. Thus, categories and the processual nature of categorisation emphasise the external aspect of the defining process and will be of use to the present study, as it is not concerned with how people within the early modern society perceived and identified themselves but rather how they were divided into various collectives or categories to make up the social order by the authorities.

45 Brubaker and Cooper 2012, p. 15.
46 Jenkins 2008, p. 43.
47 Kreslins 2012, p. 23.
Whether consciousness of its existence is a prerequisite for the existence of such collectivities, is a matter of dispute. Jenkins has suggested that external identification processes do not presuppose that the members of a collectivity need to be aware of their identification or even of the collectivity’s existence.\textsuperscript{50} Sarah Maza, on the other hand, uses these terms interchangeably and argues that “classes only exist if they are aware of their own existence, a knowledge which is inseparable from the ability to articulate an identity. The existence of social groups [...] is shaped by language and more specifically narrative: in order for a group to claim a role as actor in society and polity, it must have a story or stories about itself.”\textsuperscript{51} This study will not concern itself with the awareness of the objects of categorisation and will adopt the view proposed by Jenkins, namely that for external categorisation process to work, those who are divided into these categories need not necessarily be aware of it, let alone agree with them.

Even though the traditional image of early modern Europe is often that of a rigid society divided into three estates, Peter Burke has warned that this tripartite image should not appear as more clear or sharp than it actually was in the minds of the contemporaries.\textsuperscript{52} One of the aims of this study is to show that the imagined reality was indeed more complex, and that groups, classes and identities intertwined, overlapped and cancelled each other out. Here I use the term “imagined” in order to make a distinction between the social reality as experienced by the whole urban society and the imagined social order in the collective imaginary of the town council, which, it should be admitted, was undoubtedly influenced by their lived experiences and is also reflected in the sumptuary legislation.

The concept of status, or social status, should also be discussed. Ralph Linton has defined status as “a position in a particular pattern”. “It is thus”, he continues, “quite correct to speak of each individual as having a number of statuses. However, unless the term is qualified in some way, the status of any individual means the sum total of all the statuses which he occupies.”\textsuperscript{53} Status can be either individual, in which case it describes the position of a person within a collectivity or the society, or collective, in which case it describes the position of the whole collectivity within the society. However, the relative nature of status should be underlined, as it represents the position or rank of a person or a collectivity relative to the other persons or collectivities within the society. We know that Germans, Estonians, Swedes and Finns all lived in early modern Tallinn but the high social status of Germans derived from the fact that it was high compared to the lower social status of Swedes and even lower social status of Estonians.

\textsuperscript{50} Jenkins 2008, pp. 104-6. \\
\textsuperscript{51} Maza 2003, p. 6. \\
\textsuperscript{52} Burke 1992, p. 5. \\
\textsuperscript{53} Linton 1936, p. 113.
Linton has also developed the concepts of ascribed status and achieved status. Ascribed status is a social status assigned to a person at birth or assumed involuntarily later “without reference to their innate differences or abilities.” Achieved status, on the other hand, requires special qualities and reflects on the person’s abilities. It is a position that is earned or chosen freely.\textsuperscript{54} Whereas the ascribed status is often connected to a person’s ethnic background and family origins, achieved status is often the reflection of a person’s profession. In early modern Tallinn, a person of Estonian background had a lower ascribed status in relation to a person of German background and because of restrictions connected to their lower ascribed statuses their opportunities to exert control over their achieved statuses were limited. For example, it will be discussed later how men of Estonian background could not join the Great Guild or be elected to the town council. One’s ascribed status was thus intimately linked to one’s achieved status, for example what kinds of professions were available, and consequently financial status, that is how much wealth one was able to accumulate.

Finally the issue of how one should interpret clothing as a means of visualising social order should be addressed. As Daniel Roche has put it, “fashion acted as the symbolic stake in the battle of appearances in a society in which the distribution and diffusion of wealth was changing, permitting a greater or lesser social mobility.”\textsuperscript{55} Clothing regulations were necessary precisely because the social order was challenged and threatened by people who over-dressed and made claims to a higher social status through their external appearances. Consequently, a very common approach amongst historians when writing about appearances is that of semiotics, i.e. that one’s costume can be read as a language of signs and symbols.\textsuperscript{56} Roland Barthes has argued that both language and dress are complete structures, constituted functionally by a network of norms and forms and “dress is in fact nothing more than the signifier of a single main signified.”\textsuperscript{57} Within the early modern context this certainly makes sense to a certain extent, as the hierarchical social order had to be visualised, manifested and made explicit through external appearances. However, Ulinka Rublack has shown how visual communication through appearances was so much more nuanced, representing not only individual or collective identities but also one’s tastes, values, sense of self and how one related to the others and to one’s past.\textsuperscript{58}

Opposition to such a view often comes from anthropologists. Grant McCracken argues that instead of interpreting clothing as language, we should focus on the differences between language and material culture and less on the similarities between them. “Unlike language, which

\textsuperscript{54} Linton 1936, p. 115  
\textsuperscript{55} Roche 1996, p. 57.  
\textsuperscript{57} Barthes 2013, p. 8, p. 13.  
\textsuperscript{58} Rublack 2010, p. 3, pp. 259-61.
establishes signs and the rules for their combination into messages, a system such as clothing gives no generative opportunity, and must therefore specify in advance of any act of communication the messages which the code is capable.”59 Susan Vincent agrees, arguing that any garment or style is only intelligible in relation to other items or styles of dress and its meaning will necessarily change over time.60 Daniel Miller has suggested that clothes are not merely signs and symbols that express what lies beneath or in other words, our true selves. There is no true self that lies deep inside and that is represented by our appearance on the outside. Instead, clothes are what made us think what we are.61 Contrary to what most people now seen as given, the natural look of a person should by no means be a guide to who that person actually is, because only a person who spends time, money, attention and taste to create their look and where their final look is the result of activity and effort, can properly be discovered in their appearance.62

1.4. Sources and thesis outline

Wardrobe and the culture of appearances are integral parts of early modern material culture. The various kinds of sources that form the basis for analysing and interpreting early modern costume as well as tracing historical developments can be divided into three categories: written sources, such as sumptuary legislation, probate inventories, wills and so forth; secondly, iconographic material such as images; thirdly, the preserved items of clothing themselves.63 The empirical basis of this study is sumptuary legislation, specifically clothing regulations issued by Tallinn town council during the seventeenth century. The regulations were issued as follows: the earliest one, which is undated but has been placed somewhere to the turn of the seventeenth century; 1631; 1639; two redactions of the earlier regulations issued in 1641 and arguably 1643 (exact date is unknown); 1665; 1690; 1691; 1696; 1706.64 The language of the sources is mostly early new High German. The length and detail of these regulations varies considerably, ranging from a few pages

59 McCracken 1988, p. 67.
60 Vincent 2003, p. 3.
63 Pullat 2013, p. 164.
64 The majority of the regulations can be found in three collections of the Tallinn City Archives (hereafter TLA): collection 230 Der Revaler Magistrat, inventory 1, no. Bs7 Kleider, Hochzeit-, Kindstauf-, Begräbnis- u.e.m. Ordnungen 1497-1738; collection 190 Archiv der St. Kanutigilde, inventory 1 no. 2 Resolutionen/ u.f von Herrn/istern/ und Könige Lit. A; collection 191 Revaler Kaufmanns- Oder Grosse Gild, inventory 1 no. 19 Armen-Ordnung, Rewidierte Ordnung des allgemeinen Gutes-Kastens. Kasten-Ordnungen, Kleider-Ordnungen. The 1639 regulation has recently been translated into Estonian, see Kala et al. 2014, pp. 190-197. The 1691 regulation can be found in printed form in the collection Archiv für die Geschichte Liv-, Est- und Kurlands, volume 1 (Reval, 1857), pp. 238-241. The 1696 regulation can be found in Estonian Historical Archives, collection 1002 Viljandi magistraat, inventory 1 no. 14 Sammelband von Ordnungen der Städte Riga, Pernau, Reval und andere. Teils Drucksachen und Kopien.
to around twenty. For some regulations the originals have not been preserved and the copies in the archives of the Great Guild and St. Canute’s Guild have been consulted. The structure of the sources is very uneven and varies throughout the century. Although it is possible to discern between the introductory part, the main part and concluding part, both how detailed the regulations are and the various issues they deal with vary greatly. On some occasions the legal provisions of the regulations are numbered, on other occasions (mostly from 1690s onwards), the whole text is a continuous prose.

Whilst sumptuary legislation does not provide a particularly new source material, the present study will approach it from a new viewpoint. The point of departure is the notion that sumptuary legislation regulated appearances in order to create and maintain social order and the purpose of this study will be to examine how this social order was reflected in them. By doing this I will gain insight into how the social order in Tallinn was perceived in its ideal form in the collective imaginary of Tallinn town council and how they thought it should be visualised in people’s everyday practices such as dressing oneself, getting married, being buried and so forth. In this way, the study is part of a larger body of research dealing with the creation of social order and individual and collective identities in peripheral regions of northern Europe. Moreover, by looking at the example of Tallinn during the early modern period, the study aims to contribute towards a more nuanced understanding of social order within an early modern urban setting.

The analytical part of this study consists of three components, which all approach the interaction between sumptuary legislation and social order from different angles. The first chapter will focus on the anatomy of social order and here the purpose is to answer the questions “who is regulating?” and “who is regulated?” It will emerge that there were at least two kinds of authorities who were supposed to enforce the regulations, both official as well as unofficial. The categorisation process or how people were divided into different groups and categories appears smooth only on paper, as the categories were difficult to keep apart and the social reality in early modern Tallinn was vastly more complex than the ideal order appearing in the council’s regulations. The regulations were theoretically supposed to apply to every inhabitant yet the majority of people had been left out of them, which reveals that the imagined and the real often did not match up.

The second chapter will deal with the anatomy of appearances and will focus on appearances and costume, i.e. which materials, items, objects and so forth were actually subject to clothing regulations. This contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how one’s position in the social hierarchy determined what the appropriate sartorial expression of this position was according to the town council’s social ideal. Secondly, through the discussion of identity politics
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it will emerge that during certain periods at least there was a conscious attempt to create a collective and distinct female urban identity through appearances. Finally, in order to provide a counterpoint to the first part of the study the final section of this chapter will analyse how transgressions were dealt with and what kinds of punitive measures were conceived of as appropriate. It will be demonstrated that far from there being a uniform system of punishment there were various ways of dealing with the offenders, that these measures could be applied separately or together depending on the gravity of the offence and that they often corresponded to the social position of the offender.

The final part of the analysis will focus on the spatial and temporal aspects of sumptuary legislation as conceived by the town council. In the first section a specific example of an instance when regulation was considered necessary will be discussed in order to shed light on various problematic issues surrounding such occasions. The second section will discuss various physical spaces that, based on sumptuary laws, were perceived by the town council as being central for social interaction and thus were subject regulation. In the last analytical part emphasis will be on the public nature of social interaction, and the processes of manifestation and (de-)legitimisation of social status during occasions and in physical spaces considered problematic.
2. The anatomy of social order

This chapter will examine the key actors and institutions that made up the complex and nuanced social order in early modern Tallinn. In order to get a complete overview of how the social order and the social hierarchy was envisioned by the town council, it will firstly be analysed how the town council saw itself and its own role within the social hierarchy and how its claim for distinction was legitimised. Additionally, the role of religion as a motivating factor behind regulation will be discussed. The second section will firstly examine who could and could not become a citizen and what it meant to be a citizen or merely an inhabitant of Tallinn. Secondly various social groups of early modern Tallinn will be examined and how they were placed higher or lower based on certain criteria and consequently formed a hierarchical social order. The four analytical categories used to discuss various collectivities are status, ethnicity, gender and age.

2.1. Those who regulate: Tallinn town council during the seventeenth century

The town council was the highest judicial, legislative and executive power in the lower town, which was governed autonomously from the upper town on the Dome Hill, the seat of the Swedish royal power. From the later middle ages onwards the council consisted of four burgomasters and fourteen councillors, who were elected for life, usually from amongst the senior members of the Great Guild. Personal requirements to become a member of the town council included being born to free married parents, that is to say parents who were not serfs, impeccable reputation and ownership of land within the town. Artisans and people who produced their goods through manual skills were not considered competent for holding a position within the council. This issue will be elaborated more in depth in the second section of this chapter, but suffice it to say here that the members of the two artisan guilds and especially anyone of Estonian background had no access to the governing elite of the town.

The town council was divided into various big and small offices (in German *Grosse* and *Kleine Ämtern*). The big offices were of greater importance and dealt with issues such as tax collection, coin minting and so forth, and the small offices were of lesser importance and for example dealt with various issues concerning artisans and artisan guilds. For the present enquiry the most important is the office of *Wetteherr*, made up of two councillors who were in charge of collecting the fines that were meted out as a punishment for violating town legislation. In the regulations they were mentioned at least as many times as the town council itself, which
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undoubtedly attests to their importance in enforcing the law.\textsuperscript{70} The 1706 regulation, which reveals a visible change of attitude, stated that instead of paying a fine the people simply had to pay a certain sum for wearing a certain item and after having obtained a certificate from the *Wetteberren* as proof of payment, they were allowed to wear the item. The certificate was important in order to avoid confusion as to whether the person was allowed to wear a certain item or not.\textsuperscript{71}

In adopting legislation and deciding matters about the town life, the council had to take into account the opinions of the so-called town community (*Gemeinde*), which consisted of representatives of the Great Guild and the two artisans’ guilds.\textsuperscript{72} That they were a vital part in the political decision-making is revealed by the fact that almost all clothing regulations invoke the concept of consensual agreement whereby the town council did not simply impose legislation from above but the result had been reached through debate and discussion. In the 1639 regulation it was confirmed in the beginning that all three guilds had with satisfaction accepted and approved the regulation.\textsuperscript{73} In the regulations from the 1690s the town council expressed that with the approval of honourable citizens of all three guilds they intended to abolish wanton abuses once and for all.\textsuperscript{74} In reality, it was the Great Guild that often represented all three guilds at meetings with the town council and in the seventeenth century went so far as to interpret itself as the only representative of the town community.\textsuperscript{75} However, based on the clothing regulations it appears that the town council at least theoretically intended to leave an impression that the town community actively participated in government and legislation was not simply like a one-way street.

Contrary to what Katrin Kukke has previously suggested in her thesis,\textsuperscript{76} it does not always emerge from the clothing regulations how the town council saw itself in the context of social hierarchy. In only three regulations dating from 1631, 1639 and 1665 the town council was mentioned as part of the hierarchy right at the beginning of the regulation.\textsuperscript{77} It is noteworthy that the wording of the section remained virtually unchanged and therefore should be quoted in full:

Because it cannot be confirmed that the members of the town council behave themselves above their social standing in their attire but it is rather felt that each of them would prefer to dress in a
The previous quote reveals that the councilors viewed themselves at the top of the social hierarchy of the town, so high that the regulations did not even apply to them. Because they would have very much liked to don a simple plain dress, which unfortunately was not possible due to them being members of the council, reformation of their clothing was not necessary. If they were to wear simple and plain habit, however, they would not have been councilors anymore and nobody would have seen them as such, because appropriate costume was part of the office. Moreover, they were above the rest of the community not only in their social position and status but they were also on a higher moral level, where luxury and opulence were no longer a threat. In this way they essentially legitimised their claim for power – since they were so moral and not blinded by luxury or selfish greed, they were suitable to rule Tallinn because they could pass judgement on what was good and bad, what was moral and immoral and what was beneficial to the townspeople at large.

Why was the town council’s position so clearly expressed in written form in three instances but not in the others? It can be speculated that the council’s position and what was allowed and not allowed to them was common knowledge and thus acknowledged generally, especially by people who were of close social standing (such as merchants of the Great Guild) and thus there was no need to assert it in written form. These three instances would seem somewhat anomalous in that case. Another possibility might have been that this eminence might have been a temporary ideal that reflected the ideology of sharp social distinctions during that period and as the seventeenth century came to an end, the clothing regulations were seen increasingly as universal, something that were supposed to apply to the whole town community and where distinctions were very basic.

Most persuasively it can be suggested that during the period from roughly 1630 to 1670 the town council experienced that its power and superiority was being threatened by competing groups, especially by the Great Guild, and thus the councillors felt the need to reassert their pre-eminence at the top of the hierarchy in written form. In the second half of the 1650s there were a number of conflicts between the town council and the three guilds, which were mainly caused by the town council striving for more political independence. Additionally, the artisan guilds were strongly dissatisfied with their exclusion from decision of importance for the town.79 Inna

78 TLA.191.1.19, p. 86v. Weilen nicht zu befinden, das sich jemand innerhalb Rahts ihrer seinen Standt in Kleidung verhalte besonders vielmehr erspüret wird, dass ein Jedweder sich lieber in schlechtern vnd gerinern Habit, kleiden würde, was Er solches nicht der Stadt, dem Raht-Stuhl vnd seinem stande zu Ehren dan vnd van thun musste; Alis hat dieser Standt insoweit destoweiner reformation nütig.
Põltsam has suggested that clothing regulations that aimed at a clear and distinctive separation of the different estates were a reflection of social instability and conflicts within the urban community.\(^{80}\) Therefore it became even more important to not only assert one’s position at the top of social hierarchy but gain a legal basis for it through issuing appropriate legislation.

In the regulations the town council also adopted the position of a father by giving the community paternal advice and encouragement (in German *väterliche Vermahnungen*).\(^{81}\) The latter word can be translated in more than one way to mean either “encouragement” in the more positive sense or “admonition” in a somewhat more negative sense. Although this is somewhat different from the mid-century assertion of the council’s position as top of the urban hierarchy, it can still be viewed within the same framework. By reducing the community to that of errant children and adopting the paternal role, the town council reasserted their right to power and their ability to make decisions that benefitted the whole community. Since the community did not know what was good for them, it was necessary for the council to take care of them. It can thus be argued that power was conceived of as being a burden that the town council bore for the sake of their subjects. The preservation of social order, including the visual display of this order therefore became a matter of social responsibility for the community. As Leif Runefelt has pointed out, sumptuary laws were also a reflection of moral and ethical concerns to preserve the social order, because if one was not instantly recognisable, the social order was immediately threatened.\(^{82}\)

The town council was not the sole authority ideally supposed to oversee the adherence to clothing regulations. The regulations referred to the clergy who were encouraged to relentlessly preach against such pride from the pulpit.\(^{83}\) In other words, punishment was not only meted out through fines but by clergy by the way of preaching against excessive luxury in clothing. The idea of avoiding luxury for moral and above all religious reasons was grounded on the reason that the economic decline of Tallinn was a consequence of God’s anger.\(^{84}\) In his analysis of the Great Northern War, Peter Ericsson has argued that God’s punishment on the community because of unrepentant sinners was fundamental to explaining the war, but also famine, plague and other misfortunes that befell people in the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries.\(^{85}\) Moreover, the preaching was supposed to communicate the message that anyone
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who violated secular laws also set themselves above God. Thus, the invoking of God and religion
in the clothing regulations suggests that not only was opulence and luxury during poor times
contrary to the idea that one was supposed to spend within their means, but it was also
necessary to dress according to one’s position within the social hierarchy. Violating secular
legislation essentially meant violating the God-given order of society and thus incurred divine
punishment in addition to the earthly one.

2.2. Those who are regulated: guilds, households and all the rest

The most general way to divide the inhabitants of early modern Tallinn is the minority who had
citizen rights and the vast majority who did not. Only those who were financially independent,
that is they were not in the service of another man or their father, could become citizens. In
Tallinn, owning property was actually not a prerequisite of becoming a citizen and they could also
live in a rented house. The candidate also had to pay a sum of money called Bürgergeld, which the
non-Germans often could not afford. Even though theoretically one’s ethnic background was
not a factor in becoming a citizen, these conditions made it quite impossible for Estonians and
Finns who did not possess necessary financial means to become citizens and for the most part
were employed in somebody’s service. The new citizen also had to give an oath and swear his
allegiance to the town council and the monarch. The citizens could acquire immoveable property,
take part in the administration and legislation of town issues and claim the protection of city
jurisdiction outside of town.

Becoming a citizen was also a prerequisite for climbing the social ladder, although it has to be
underlined that for the most part this only applied for men of German origin. For example, when
a journeyman went from the Brotherhood of the Blackheads to become a member of the Great
Guild (where he could potentially become an alderman and later even a town councillor) he had
to become a citizen, even though as Anu Mänd has shown, there were a few exceptions to this
rule. This, however, is somewhat controversial since according a sixteenth-century Great Guild
regulation, if a skipper or merchant journeyman with good reputation wanted to become a
member he should be accepted, however, later when he became a citizen he had to provide a
letter of birth that would prove he had been born to free married parents, even though

---

86 Rublack 2010, p. 272.
89 Mänd 2005a, p. 176.
90 Leimus et al. 2011, p. 35.
theoretically there was no requirement of ethnicity to become a citizen. To enter St. Olaf’s Guild as a lower artisan, such as a stonemason or a carpenter, citizenship and thus a letter of honest birth were not necessary and consequently members of Estonian background could be admitted to the guild.

As already mentioned previously, the town community or Gemeinde, which consisted of representatives of the Great Guild and the two artisan guilds, participated in town politics and the town council consulted with them on vital issues concerning the town. Outside of the town council and the Gemeinde there was no institution to express any kind of political intent and therefore the majority of the town’s non-citizen inhabitants were shut off from any kind of governing processes. This biggest group of people were most often employed as lower sort of artisans, daily labourers and servants but it also included unmarried merchant journeymen who belonged to the Brotherhood of the Blackheads, and as non-citizens had a purely representative function. The clergy, teachers, medical staff and higher servants of the town council occupied a special position, as they acquired only partial citizen rights and were exempted from all official taxes and duties, such as the sentry duty, which financially independent citizens as well as non-citizens were not.

In early modern Tallinn the clothing regulations fall roughly into two categories – the earlier ones from the turn of the century, 1631, 1639 and 1665 that regulate only the members of the guilds and their households, that is to say wives, daughters and servants, and the later regulations of 1690, 1691, 1696 and 1706 that have lost this distinction and address people in general. In the 1665 regulation there is only a passing reference to the town council servants who, together with their wives and children, were supposed to dress and conduct themselves like members of St. Olaf’s Guild. Thus, their position in the social hierarchy is likened that of the lower artisans and their families. Nevertheless, according to both the 1665 regulation and Johansen and von zur Mühlen, the regulations issued by the town council applied to everybody, but apart from the above-mentioned categories, various other people such as clergy and teachers, who occupied an in-between position within the town hierarchy, but also the lowest artisans and daily labourers were excluded from the regulations. Whereas legislation concerning costume was relatively clear
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97 Johansen and von zur Mühlen 1973, p. 291. The 1665 regulation explicitly stated that everybody, whether they were citizens, had their business in Tallinn or were in somebody’s employment had to adhere to the regulation. TLA.191.1.19, p. 93r. Alle die Jenigen, welche sich in dieser Stadt befreyen, sie sayndt Mannes oder frawens Persohnen, da sie allbie Bürgerlich wohnhaft seyn, oder ihre Gewerbe vnd Nahrung dieses Ortes haben, sollen sich dieser Ordnung gesonachlich submitiren.
when it came to members of corporations, they say preciously little on how the majority of the inhabitants of Tallinn were expected to dress.

2.2.1. Status

As the seventeenth century progressed, the clothing regulations issued by the town council became more elaborate and started to distinguish between an increasing number of collectivities in the social order. The motivation for this was given in the 1631 regulation, namely so that disorder in clothing would be cleared away and every social class could be recognised and distinguished by their outer appearance. Of course, as already mentioned the term “every social class” is extremely problematic in that the regulations only included members of the three guilds and their households. This envisioned system reached its apex in the regulation of 1665 and the social hierarchy that emerged is as follows: firstly, the town council, which was also included in the regulations of 1631 and 1639 and was placed on the top of social hierarchy; then members of the Great Guild and the Brotherhood of the Blackheads, who were mentioned in all the regulations until 1665; then members of St. Canute’s Guild, who were referred to as distinguished or *vornehme Handwerker* in the regulations of 1631 and 1639; then members of St. Olaf’s Guild, referred to as lower or common artisans (*geringe oder gemeine Handwerker*) in the same regulations; finally servants who were distinguished as a group already in the first clothing regulation. By 1690s this social system, however, had all but disappeared and the only differentiation lay between non-servants and servants.

In reality the hierarchy was much more complex and could even cause resentment amongst the guildsmen. Members of the Brotherhood of the Blackheads were addressed in the first four regulations in the same section as members of the Great Guild. Although they were not citizens of Tallinn and did not participate in town politics, as sons of the members of the Great Guild and merchant journeymen of German origin, they still had a higher social status than either of the artisan guild members who, theoretically at least, could be citizens of Tallinn, and were thus allowed to wear better clothes and more jewellery. Additionally, there were attempts to achieve more social equality which were accompanied by attempts at fashion equality. A case in point were goldsmiths, who belonged to St. Canute’s Guild and contested the decision that
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forbade them to wear velvet and pearls in church, claiming that they worked with the most valuable metals and jewellery in the world on a daily basis and thus had the right to do so. The two artisan guilds emerged as two distinct social groups in the 1631 regulation;\textsuperscript{102} in the earliest regulation they had been either ignored completely or addressed under the same section together with merchants under the term citizens (in German Bürgerschaft).\textsuperscript{103} In the 1640s the goldsmiths attempted to join the Great Guild and even though they were unsuccessful, the privilege of wearing the same clothes as merchants on festive occasions was restored on the grounds that it was an old tradition.\textsuperscript{104} This change, however, was not reflected in the subsequent 1665 regulation.

When it comes to servants it emerges from the clothing regulations that the social status of servants was tightly connected to the length of their professional career. Both the 1691 and 1696 regulations established that a servant had to serve at least three years in one master’s house and acquire a certificate that proved their good and faithful service before they could be hired by another person.\textsuperscript{105} The certificate was tangible proof of their good service and loyalty and raised their status in the eyes of future employers. Sarah Maza has suggested that the most important quality that a servant could demonstrate was that of loyalty to the master. It was not just crucial for the harmony of the household but in general for the whole social order, as the family was just the microcosm of the state, which was itself a family writ large. Without loyalty, family and society would dissolve into chaos.\textsuperscript{106}

This loyalty and faithful service was consequently accompanied by an improvement in the servant’s appearance. According to the 1639 regulation, a male house servant could obtain a new livery made from better material at some point after he had been in service for one, three or more years.\textsuperscript{107} Similarly, after a maidservant had served her master faithfully, she could be allowed to wear a skirt made of Packlacken, which she presumably would not have been allowed before.\textsuperscript{108} The 1665 regulation allowed those who had been in service for more than four years or were soon to resign, to wear somewhat better clothes, although it was not specified what, and evidently it only applied to male house-servants of German ethnicity.\textsuperscript{109} Therefore, the length of one’s service was manifested in their appearance and onlookers could interpret that this person
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had already been in loyal service for a certain period of time, which meant their social status, even if within their own group, had already risen.

2.2.2. Ethnicity

Even though Estonia gradually came under Swedish rule in the seventeenth century, up to one third of Tallinn’s population was made up of Germans, who had been the lords of the land for at least two centuries, with two thirds being Estonian, Finnish and Russian.\(^\text{110}\) In the 1930s Paul Johansen claimed that it would be wrong to see early modern Tallinn as a purely German city dominated by German merchants, German language, German culture and traditions.\(^\text{111}\) On the other hand, Anu Mänd has suggested that as Germans in Estonian and Livonian territories inhabited an alien environment and had achieved their upper-class status largely due to their conquest of the region, their customs “played an essential role in asserting their social and cultural identity and differentiating themselves from and creating an opposition to the natives of the land.” Therefore, it was even more important for them to emphasise their “Germanness” and associate themselves with the German territories than for those Germans living in the central German areas.\(^\text{112}\)

On the basis of their ethnic origin, the people who inhabited Tallinn during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were roughly divided into the categories “German” (Deutsch) and “Non-German” (Undeutsch). It has to be noted though that in official documents from the late medieval and early modern period the term Undeutsch was generally used to denote Estonians, whereas Swedes, Finns and Russians were referred to by their ethnonym.\(^\text{113}\) Teet Veispak has argued that in the seventeenth century Estonians as an ethnic group were unknown in Tallinn and the term Estonians (Ehsten) was used to denote serfs living in the countryside. Instead, free Estonians, Latvians and Livonians living in towns were referred to as Undeutsch. This was not meant to denote ethnic belonging but rather one’s position on the social ladder and thus carried a certain negative connotation. According to Tiina Kala, however, this had not always been the case, as the Danish royal decrees from thirteenth and fourteenth centuries referred to local people as Estonians or Estones and only later did this ethnonym become rare and was replaced with a more general term Non-German or Undeutsch. This term, however, did not necessarily have negative connotations and thus does not have to be interpreted as an attempt to deride the local indigenous population. Rather, suggests Kala, it can be seen as evidence that a local German
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identity was gradually developing and this was tied to the German ethonym and language and this in turn was more clearly in opposition with the local non-German identity.114

Ethnic diversity was accompanied by linguistic diversity. Paul Johansen has described the linguistic situation in Tallinn at the turn of the seventeenth century as follows: the plebeian lower class most likely spoke Estonian, the middle class spoke Swedish and poor Low German, as well as Estonian, and the upper class and the artisans of higher status spoke a cultivated, Hanseatic Low German, which became noticeably infiltrated by loanwords from standard High German.115 In written texts standard German prevailed in the seventeenth century, although Low German remained a spoken variety.116 Tiina Kala has posited that when various ethnic groups and languages coexist within a given social setting, an interlinguistic relationship develops, which is dependent on the speakers’ social position or status within the society.117 As people of German origin were the ethnic group with the highest social status, German language also had the highest status in the society, and Estonian as the language of the lowest ethnic group in the social order also had the lowest status.118 Thus, Tallinn was a multi-ethnic and multilingual environment and social order was not only manifested through appearances but through language in both written and spoken form.

Social segregation based on ethnicity became increasingly evident in the course of the sixteenth century.119 Although the number of Estonians did not decrease but on the contrary, increased in Tallinn, their rights were limited in many areas. For example, an increasing number of Estonians were unable to become full citizens of Tallinn because of financial reasons, because being a citizen did not just mean a rise in one’s social status but also included various financial responsibilities.120 Furthermore, their access to the artisan guilds was seriously limited. St. Canute’s Guild, which united artisans of the better sort, such as goldsmiths, smiths and bakers, attempted to restrict access so that those of Estonian birth would not be able to join.121 Even though there were a number of Estonians who were members of St. Olaf’s Guild, a guild for

115 Johansen and von zur Mühlen 1973, p. 376. About the linguistic mishmash amongst the lower classes in early modern Tallinn see also P. Johansen 1951, pp. 24-25. He brings as an example of the linguistic situation a letter written to the city council by stonemason Johan Grijs written in the late seventeenth century, which contained words in Swedish, Estonian and Low German. Therefore, the situation was not better in written language than it was in spoken language.
116 Saagpakk 2012, p. 381.
118 Here it should be noted that of course, not all people of German origin were merchants and not all merchants were of German origin. Undoubtedly, there were also Germans who worked as artisans or servants but for the point of this study generalisations have been made and the majority of Germans belonged to the higher or middle sections of the society. See also figure 19 in Johansen and von zur Mühlen 1973, p. 125.
119 Margus 1939, p. 87.
121 Margus 1939, pp. 83-104.
lower artisans such as weavers, coopers, saddlemasters and butchers, its position as part in the
decision-making community within the town was increasingly disregarded when more important
issues were decided upon. Finally, in 1698 the two artisan guilds were forced to merge into one
St. Canute’s Guild and people of Estonian birth were banned from entering it. Therefore, the
position of people of Estonian origin was low to start with and during the seventeenth century
their inability to have access to any kind of power and position at the bottom of the society was
consolidated.

Thus, in early modern Tallinn, which was very multiethnic, it was the person’s ethnic origins
that played the most important role in determining their relative ascribed status and consequently,
achieved status. Additionally, ethnicity was one of the contributing factors in assessing whether a
person was considered an honourable or a dishonourable person. Paul Johansen has pointed to a
standardised template of a letter of birth from the end of the sixteenth century, which states that
no person of honest and honourable birth could be born of Jews, Wends, Non-Germans or
Finns. Such letters of birth, for example, were necessary when a man wanted to enter a guild. Therefore, one’s position within the social hierarchy was to a large extent already determined at
birth. The available and connected to one’s ethnicity and even though some maneuvering seems
to have been possible in the late middle ages, as stated previously social climbing was made virtually impossible for men of Estonian background.

The previous section explains why ethnonyms are generally not part of the clothing
regulations. In the 1665 regulation in the section dealing with the wives and daughters of St.
Olaf’s Guild, it was specifically pointed out in the last paragraph that all previous regulations
referred to the wives and daughters of men of German and Swedish birth, whereas the wives and
daughters of guildsmen of Estonian origin had no more freedom in their choice of clothing than
what was enjoyed by the most common servants. Even though it appears to be a small detail, it
placed those guild members who were of Estonian birth lower than their fellow guildsmen of
Swedish and German origin. Therefore, even though ethnicity does not seem to be of great
importance, it was always implied in the regulations when the guilds were discussed. Everybody
was aware that any social climbing was virtually impossible for Estonians and even those who
were able to join St. Olaf’s Guild were placed at the bottom of the hierarchy. Even though from
1690 onwards the regulations lost their guild-based structure, which was in turn divided by
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122 Kala 2004, p. 17.
123 Hartmann 1975, p. 65.
124 Johansen 1934, p. 184.
125 See footnote 27.
126 TLA.191.1.19, p. 91v. Dieses alles soll, dem alten nach, vorstehen seyn von Ampts- und Gilde (Mägde?) genossenen Weiber und Töchter Teutischer und Schwedischer Geburt, die Estländische aber haben in ihrer Tracht keiner mehrern freibkeit, als die gemeine
dienstleute genienien, wie davon im negstfolgenden § mit mehrn Nachricht zu finden.
gender, by implication people of Estonian origin were still at the bottom of the social hierarchy and as seen previously, their situation rather worsened than improved.

2.2.3. Gender

Amanda Vickery, who has researched male and female consumption in early modern England, has come to the conclusion that in the eighteenth-century imagination it was mainly women who were associated with consumerism and overspending even though it was the male head of the household who usually spent money on really lavish items. Inna Pöltsam has suggested that when clothing was concerned, male costume was often more luxurious and thus offered greater opportunities for overspending that women often lacked. As part of the household, women’s economy and expenditure were usually tied to their husband’s economy and any great overspending would have been doubtful. Therefore, the agency that was afforded to women in the popular imagination to act independently of their husbands as consumers is undoubtedly interesting because it does not necessarily reflect the realities of early modern society.

Although Pöltsam’s claim that the clothing regulations issued by Tallinn town council only concerned female clothing is incorrect, at least when it comes to the regulations issued during the seventeenth century, it does hold true that women’s clothing was targeted in a greater detail than male clothing until later in the century. For example, in the clothing regulation that dates from the turn of the century, there are four sections that deal with male clothing, eight sections that deal with merchant wives and daughters (Frauenn und Jungkfrauenn) and three that concern maidservants and wetnurses (Dienstmeghde vnd Ammenn). Such female/male categorisation is also visible in the regulations of 1631, 1639 and 1665, however, it has disappeared from the regulations from 1690 onwards, after which members of corporations and their wives and daughters are generally referred to as Manns Persohnen, Frauen and Jungfern. Finally, the regulation of 1706 abandoned any gender-based differentiation when it came to restrictions on clothing and accessories and the only categories mentioned specifically are female servants. Therefore, the clothing regulations were definitely not there to regulate only female clothing and even though their costume was targeted more in detail in the first half of the century, the latter regulations were definitely not concerned with gender-based regulation.

130 TLA.190.1.2, pp. 387-392.
131 Generale Kleiderordnung von 1691, p. 238.
However, when it comes to how the town council perceived women’s role specifically in the context of consumption and luxury, a contradiction appears. Although women’s clothing was regulated in greater detail in the earlier regulations, their role in consumption was by no means emphasised. The regulations from 1690 onwards, however, viewed women as the primary contributors to fashion and luxury consumption and claimed that they were especially susceptible to sinful opulence (Üppigkeit) and pride (Hoffahrt). According to the 1696 regulation, which was most radical in its moral condemnation of luxury, it was mentioned that more and more women had been dressing up in fancy clothes as if it was a virtue of their gender. Therefore, there emerges a fundamental contradiction whereby women’s clothing was initially regulated in great detail but there was no explanation why this should have been the case. Later on, however, when the town council emphasised the role of women as luxury consumers, the detailed regulations had been omitted from the regulations altogether. It is possible that as the moral and religious concerns behind luxury regulation increased women were rather targeted as a group for what was perceived as immoral behaviour.

When we trace the development of differentiation in the regulations between women of higher and lower status, it becomes evident that their social status and position within the social order were tied to the professional (and therefore financial) status of their husband’s or father’s. In the first regulation the differentiation was quite minimal. Wives and daughters of guildsmen were dealt with separately from maidservants and wet-nurses and the first category as a whole was referred to as Frauen and Jungfräulein. Only in paragraph five a differentiation was made between the womenfolk of the Great Guild, referred to as Burgerfrauen und Döchter, and the womenfolk of the two artisan guilds. Thus, the differentiation is mostly very basic and essentially follows the line of servants/non-servants.

In the 1630s the regulations began to differentiate between the family members of the Great Guild, St. Canute’s Guild and St. Olaf’s Guild. In the 1631 regulation the wives of St. Olaf’s Guild were lumped together into the same category with maidservants under the category “wives of lower artisans and maidservants” and later it was stated that the maidservants could dress exactly like the wives and daughters of lower artisans. Even though later on they were dealt with separately from the maidservants and wet-nurses, the wives and daughters of St. Olaf’s
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137 TLA.190.1.2, p. 402.
Guild were still referred to as *Weiber* and *Töchter*, whereas the wives and daughters of the Great Guild as well as St. Canute’s Guild (*vornehme Handwercker*) were referred to more honourably as *Frauen* and *Jungfern*.\(^{138}\) Such a differentiation is not present in the four regulations published from 1690 onwards and as already mentioned, women were generally referred to as *Frauenzimmer* and *Frauen Volck* and the only distinctive group mentioned in the last regulation were female servants.

As the town council perceived in the middle decades of the seventeenth century, what a woman could wear and consequently which position she occupied within the social hierarchy was undoubtedly connected to her husband’s or father’s professional status and to which corporation they belonged. Only women who were employed as servants, and thus likely to be single, were considered independently.

After 1690 the only differentiation that was made between the womenfolk is essentially those who were servants, referred to as *Dienstmägde* and *Ammen* and non-servants, generally referred to as *Frauenzimmer*.\(^{139}\) The main problem concerning social disorder and confusion that the councillors referred to in the later regulations was that the servant girls and housemaids were dressing themselves arrogantly and even dared to ape the young ladies of the house.\(^{140}\) In this light it is interesting that on the one hand, the concern for social confusion was still present in the regulations, however, the careful categorisation that had reached the apex in 1665 had by that time essentially vanished.

There is another group of women that were placed together with the wives and daughters of merchants and better sort of artisans, namely matrons or *Matronen* and which could possibly seen to denote specific kind of women.\(^{141}\) Linguistically, the term seems to have been used as an honourable term for women in advanced age (in German *betagte Frauen*) who were perhaps also widows and heads of households. It appears that they were allowed to wear certain items that were not allowed to younger women of the same social status. For example, in the 1639 regulation it was clearly specified that they were allowed to wear rings on their fingers according to an old custom, however, this was prohibited to younger women.\(^{142}\) It has been suggested that in early modern Europe women were already seen as past their prime in the second half of their thirties which was considerably earlier than men.\(^{143}\) Even though it was not specified in the regulations where exactly this advanced age began, it can be speculated that perhaps they were

---
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seen as a kind of a counterpart to respectable older men, such as the aforementioned bench of elders, and there was a general unwritten consensus in the society, which allowed them to wear certain better items in order to distinguish themselves.

It can also be that women of older age were specifically mentioned in a number of regulations because they were seen to serve a moral and educational purpose within the early modern society. According to Daniel Roche, “girls must be taught an appropriate appearance for their condition, then to perform those functions which proclaimed the honour of the family, the cleanliness of clothes, the quality of servants’ livery, an abundance of linen. Upkeep was first and foremost the expression and confirmation of status.”

Thus, it was seen as vital that girls and young women received proper education in order to preserve and display their status appropriately. Even though these matrons of the society might have been widowed or past their prime, they possessed a certain higher social status and were expected to set an example to younger women with their costume, which was sober and rational and yet displayed their social status appropriately.

Another expectation that was very likely set on them was also connected to moral concerns about the society. Amanda Vickery has explored the interplay between female mature age and fashionable dress in early modern England and argued that older women became the victims of satire and mockery because they were, metaphorically, mutton dressed as lamb. Ideally, inner bodies and outer appearances were supposed to correspond but by making certain fashion choices women were able to conceal their maturity and consequently caused confusion in the society.

On the other hand, though, they too were expected to keep up with the fashion so the morally acceptable space within which they were able to operate was relatively limited. They had to convey both that they were aware of the current fashions and dress accordingly to display the respectable age and status they had reached, on the other hand they had to set a good example for the younger women by displaying sober and rational dress without indulging in ostentatious display.

The final issue that concerns gender and clothing is how female and male genders were perceived to relate to clothes. Susan Vincent has discussed in detail how in early modern England cross-dressing actors and women who disguised themselves as men were condemned in public debates and the press because they were seen to be morally bankrupt. Such public concern, however, was not reflected in the English clothing regulations. In Tallinn, the situation appears to have been the same. The regulations did not describe the design of the items or how they were

144 Roche 1996, p. 366.
145 Vickery 2013, p. 864.
146 Vincent 2003, ch. 5, passim.
normally worn, but most often merely stated which colour it was and which fabric it was made of. Therefore, we have no information about how certain items that the regulations mentioned, such as shirts, coats, hats or collars, were designed depending on whether they were worn by men or women. In early modern Tallinn, it appears that even though the regulations were concerned with sartorial counterfeiting when it came to social order, such counterfeiting in the context of gender was a non-issue for the town council.

Additionally, the understanding of what kinds of clothes and their patterns and colours were appropriate for both sexes differs markedly from the modern one. Terms such as Rock and Kleid, which in modern German denote items that constitute a part of female dress, appear to have been used also to denote male costume in the seventeenth-century clothing regulations. From the eighteenth-century probate inventories it also emerges that the range of colours and patterns of textiles used to make clothes for men seems to have much wider than we might expect. In addition to the usual black, brown and variations of grey, male clothes appear to have been shimmering, striped, floral, multi-coloured, crimson, pearl-coloured and so forth. Thus, the clothing regulations were not concerned with the “effeminising or masculinising nature of certain modes of dress” and even if such concerns were present in the clothing debates of the period, they must have been markedly different from the present-day ones.

2.2.4. Age

Not only was there a clearly perceived social hierarchy made up of inhabitants of higher and lower status, but there were also clear hierarchies within the groups themselves, which, as we have already seen in the case of women and servants, were often based on age. For example, intra-corporation hierarchy was most often based on the length of one’s membership. Age gave experience and consequently, authority. Younger members of the Great Guild were often elected to positions that demanded physical stamina but also excellent organising skills and only when a man had been a member for ten years, was he able to reach the more important positions such as that of an assessor (bisitter). To be elected for the most prestigious position within the Great Guild, that of the alderman, one had to have been a member for at least twelve years but in reality it was often a few decades. Previous aldermen and assessors who had not been elected to the town council made up the bench of elders (in German Ältestenbank), which actually organised the guild’s activities, decided on various matters such who were suitable alderman
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candidates, and punished those who had violated the guild statutes. On the other hand, not all older members were part of the bench of elders as one had to be elected for this position. It thus transpires that a distinction can be made between biological and so-called administrative age. Even though one’s biological age was a precondition for authority and power, an important factor in climbing the ladder of social hierarchy was that a man’s age was accompanied by experience, or administrative age.

As already discussed above in the section concerning servants, age, experience and personal qualities were preconditions for advancing in life. Thus, such ideas were widespread in the society and practised in everyday life, yet they appear in the clothing regulations rather episodically. In the 1639 clothing regulation it was stated that the members of the Great Guild and Brotherhood of the Blackheads could wear coats made of Gewand or Grobgriin, with collars and lapels of not more expensive fabric than Kaffa, velvet and one-coloured velvet was forbidden on collars and lapels and they could not be too wide. However, the regulation further stated that exceptions could be made to guild aldermen and the aforementioned bench of elders. In the 1665 regulation a distinction was made so that the aldermen and the bench of elders of both the Great Guild and Brotherhood of Blackheads as well as other respectable older citizens of Tallinn could wear clothes made of silk on Sundays and other festive days such as weddings or funerals.

2.3. Conclusions: continuity and change during the seventeenth century

During the seventeenth century the clothing regulations were issued by the town council. The governing process was ideally envisaged not to be like a one-way street but all legislation was supposed to be debated and discussed with the representatives of the town community. Even though the clothing regulations emphasised consensus, in reality there was often disagreement and discontent. Social instability and conflicts between the corporations and the town council led to the council trying to assert its preeminence through establishing themselves in the clothing regulations at the top of the social hierarchy. However, this changed from the 1690s onwards when consensus in regulation was emphasised and the town council instead adopted the role of a paternal advisor with a concern for the moral and religious well-being of the town’s inhabitants.

When it comes to the actual people subject to regulation, there were various ways the town council perceived the town’s inhabitants. The first division ran between the small number of
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citizens and the vast majority of non-citizens and this serves as a background for the rest of the discussion. The analytical categories employed were status, ethnicity, gender and age. The main result is that the social order one encounters in the clothing regulations was intricate and complex. While such categorisation helps to make sense of the social complexities, it is artificial and brings forth numerous points of intersection. For example, just as there were high-status men of German origin who had citizen rights, there were low-status men of Estonian origin who did not have citizen rights. It should be underlined that the category that was mostly overlooked in the regulations was that of ethnicity. The reason behind this was that ethnicity always worked through the other categories, such as a Great Guild member always being German, and as explained earlier, the lack of ethnonyms did not mean that ethnicity was not there. For the contemporaries it was simply obvious.

When it comes to social order, there is a clear linear progression in the clothing regulations. The earlier servant/non-servant differentiation developed into an elaborate social order by the middle decades of the seventeenth century. At the top of the social hierarchy was the town council, followed by members of the Great Guild and their wives and daughters, followed by members of St. Canute’s Guild ditto, followed by members of St. Olaf’s Guild ditto, followed by servants. Such a structure was lost again by 1690 and the most basic differentiation that remained in place during the whole century was essentially between non-servants and servants. As part of the household women and daughters of guild members were also subject to regulation. In the social hierarchy a woman’s place was closely tied to her husband’s or father’s ascribed and achieved statuses. Even though women’s clothing occupied constantly more space until 1690, the regulations were by no means only about and for women.

The exclusivity of the regulations also raises the issue of how people who did not strictly fall into any of the above-mentioned groups, that is to say guild members and members of their households, were supposed to visualise their position in the social order. Arguably, the regulations deal with those categories of people that the town council thought as being part of the social order and thus subject to regulation. On the other hand, it still leaves a wide gap between the imagined social order and the social reality. The majority of people who went about their daily business were also expected to dress in a certain way, yet they were completely excluded from the clothing regulations.
3. The anatomy of appearances

When early modern clothing culture is discussed, the problem of how clothing actually looked like arises. Compared to Western Europe, there is almost no visual evidence from medieval and early modern Tallinn that would supplement other kinds of informative sources, such as clothing regulations, probate inventories, wills and so forth. Among the meagre material that has been preserved we can for example find a bas-relief on a gravestone from 1381, which depicts one Kuningunde Schotelmund. She is wearing a long wavy dress, shoes with pointed toes and a long coat that is fastened around the neck with a square brooch.\(^{155}\) Additionally, a sketchy drawing on a letter dating from 1631 appears to depict male costume of the time (image 2, p. 84). The man is wearing a hat with a feather, a long collar and a tight decorated doublet and breeches. He has drawn his sword and a scabbard is fastened to his waist.\(^{156}\) Thirdly, in the travel account written by the German scholar Adam Olearius there is a picture of three women and a maidservant with Tallinn in the background (image 3, p. 85). Perhaps the most striking detail in the women’s costume is the older woman's extremely high hat decorated with feathers. Her millstone collar is also extremely large and she has a long cape-like coat, which is lined with fur.\(^{157}\) Thus, although the clothing regulations described early modern costume through elaborating on what was and what was not allowed, based on merely written sources it is still difficult to really know how the people’s clothes looked like in early modern Tallinn.

This chapter will start by dealing with individual items of clothing and their relationship to the social position of their wearer. Rather than moving chronologically from the first regulation to the last, for analytical purposes the various kinds of items under discussion have been divided into the following categories: hats, coats, collars, skirts, shoes and stockings. This list is by no means exhaustive as it is unfortunately beyond the scope of this thesis. Furthermore, certain items, for example men’s breeches were not mentioned at all and some, such as aprons, vests and shirts were only mentioned irregularly. One interpretation for this is that the town council regulated items that they perceived as socially problematic and a coat as an outer garment would have been more problematic than the shirt under that coat. In any case, this is not a disadvantage, as a selective analysis will still reveal how the social order was supposed to manifest itself in appearances. The analysis of other items that were not strictly clothing but can nevertheless be found in the regulations will follow. Included in this are fabrics, accessories and transportation. Any chronological developments or disruptions will be observable within these categories.
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\(^{155}\) Von Nottbeck and Neumann 1904, pp. 90–91.

\(^{156}\) See Image 2, p. 84. TLA.230.1.BO_9, p. 242. See also Rublack 2010, pp. 60-1.

A similar obstacle mentioned in the first paragraph arises here: even though it is possible to determine what kinds of items are meant in the regulations, the exact appearance of certain items remains elusive. We might be able to deduce that a *Polnische Schlitzmütze* was a slitted hat of Polish origin/design, but we still have no idea how it looked like. Additionally, what kind of gloves were *Polnische Handschuhe*? Sometimes it is also unclear how certain items were supposed to be worn.

Wearing a diamond on or pearls around the head appears a number of times in the regulations, however, it is unknown whether they were part of some headgear or head decoration or if they were simply worn around the head in rows.\(^\text{158}\) Therefore, as it is not possible to make comparisons between written and visual material, such issues can be problematised but will ultimately go unanswered.

The second section of the chapter will analyse how a specific urban female identity emerges from the three earliest regulations through a distinction in female costume between the so-called Reval costume and foreign clothing, which is later also termed Dorpat costume. The third and the final section will deal with how transgressions were dealt with, that is different kinds of punishment that were meted out to the offenders. Various kinds of punishment could be employed individually or together with another kind of punishment and the harshness was usually dependent on whether it was the offerender’s first time but also on the offender’s social standing.

3.1. “Alle Tothheiten und Plantastereyen die jährlich von neuen Inventiret werden”: costume in the clothing regulations

**Hats**

The most popular material for hats was fur and high hats made of fur were popular amongst both men and women during the whole seventeenth century.\(^\text{159}\) As fur was frequently subject to regulation, the use of fur in hats also explains why this item of clothing appears frequently in the regulations. The earliest regulation stated that both guild members and journeymen had to apply moderation when wearing a sable fur hat, even though evidently wearing it was not forbidden for them.\(^\text{160}\) In 1631 sable fur hats were forbidden to the members of Great Guild, their wives and daughters and Brotherhood of the Blackheads, which by extension meant that nobody else was allowed to wear them either.\(^\text{161}\) In the 1639 regulation they remained forbidden to men, however, they were allowed again to wives and daughters of Great Guild members, as the town council

\(^{158}\) For example both 1691 and 1696 regulations mention this, see *Generale Kleiderordnung von 1691*, p. 239 and EAA.1002.1.14, p. A3r.

\(^{159}\) Kukke 1992, p. 36.

\(^{160}\) TLA.190.1.2, p. 387.

\(^{161}\) TLA.190.1.2, p. 394, p. 401.
admitted that forbidding them was useless, because everybody was wearing them anyway.\footnote{TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 318r, p. 321r.} Wives and daughters of St. Canute’s Guild could also wear hats of fur but for them only pine marten fur was allowed.\footnote{TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 323r.} In the 1665 regulation hats made of sable fur were permitted again to members of the Great Guild and the Brotherhood of the Blackheads but their highest value could not extend 12 to 16 Reichthaler, depending on the person’s social standing.\footnote{TLA.191.1.19, p. 86v. I take the currency to be a Germanified version of riksdaler. In the earliest regulation the currency was mark, in the 1639 and 1665 regulations Reichstaler. In the 1691 regulation the currency was Thlr and concerning the wages of servants, daler kopparmynt (in German Thaler Kupffermüntze). In the 1706 regulation the currency was daler silvermynt.\footnote{TLA.190.1.2, p. 392. \textit{Wande}=Gewand, see also footnote 153.} }

Hats could also be made of fabric. In the earliest regulation, maidservants and wetnurses could only wear hats made of black \textit{Wande}.\footnote{TLA.190.1.2, p. 392. \textit{Wande}=Gewand, see also footnote 153.} Even though velvet remained one of the most exclusive fabrics throughout the century, in the earliest regulation it was stated that wives of guildsmen were allowed hats made of red velvet.\footnote{TLA.190.1.2, p. 391. The wording is extremely unclear here and could also be interpreted so that both guild members and their wives could wear red velvet hats. Since the section actually concerns maidservants and wetnurses, I assumed that only women would be subject to discussion here.} In the 1639 regulation, it was specified that hats made of velvet were forbidden to wives and daughters of members of St. Olaf’s Guild and they could only wear hats made of \textit{Wande}. Arguably, then, if such a hat was forbidden to them it was not forbidden to women higher up on the social scale.\footnote{TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 324r.}

\textbf{Coats}

Coats, termed in the regulations both as \textit{Sube} and \textit{Mantel}, were thick and warm items of clothing, sometimes lined with fur and mostly worn during the winter.\footnote{Russak 2007, p. 93.} Even though the difference between the two remains ultimately unclear, it has been suggested that a \textit{Mantel} was usually made of woollen fabric whereas a \textit{Sube} was usually made of silk.\footnote{Russak 2007, p. 95, Pullat 2013, p. 196.}

In the 1631 regulation, members of the Great Guild and the Brotherhood of Blackheads were allowed to have coats made at most of \textit{Wandt} or woollen \textit{Großgrün} with lapels and collars of no better fabric than \textit{Kaffa}. Velvet was completely forbidden but some exceptions could be made for the bench of elders and other older and more respectable citizens.\footnote{TLA.190.1.2, p. 395. See also footnote 153.} Members of St. Canute’s Guild had to have coats of \textit{Wandt} or at most \textit{Floret} and they could be decorated with only one ribbon. Lower artisans could only have coats of coarser sort of \textit{Wandt} and could have no decorations whatsoever. Male servants could be dressed at most in Russian \textit{Wandt} which could...
not be red, green or blue.\textsuperscript{171} According to the 1639 regulation, members of the Great Guild and the Brotherhood of the Blackheads could not have coats of better material than \textit{Gewand} and woollen \textit{Grobgrün}, the collars and lapels could not be too wide or made of velvet and of not more expensive material than \textit{Kaffa}. However, it was also stated that in some cases exceptions could be made to the bench of elders.\textsuperscript{172} The coats of the artisans of St. Canute’s Guild could have coat lapels made of at most \textit{Florett} or \textit{Kaffa}.\textsuperscript{173} Thus, with the exception of velvet, rather than stating all the various fabrics that were forbidden the regulations set the highest standard a coat could be made of depending on its wearer’s position in the social order.

With the earliest regulation, women were forbidden to wear coats made of silk or coats lined with sable fur. The wives and daughters of the Great Guild members were allowed to wear coats made of woollen fabric with pine marten fur on them. Wives and daughters of members of artisan guilds were only allowed to wear coats with lapels made of squirrel fur.\textsuperscript{174} According to the 1639 regulation women’s coats were not supposed to be of better fabric than silk \textit{Grobgrün} and the coat could be lined with pine marten or lesser sort of sable fur worth not more than 5 \textit{Reichsthaler}. Wives and daughters of artisans were supposed to have coats made of wool or Turkish \textit{Grobgrün} but no velvet and only one ribbon as a decoration were allowed. They could use pine marten fur but no sable fur on the lapels.\textsuperscript{175} Sable fur, which was imported from Russia, was the most expensive fur and consequently was subject to most regulation. Wolf and squirrel fur, on the other hand, were cheaper types of furs.\textsuperscript{176} In 1637 the town council apparently debated whether or not to forbid all sable fur on women’s coats, as it generated unnecessary revenue for Russians importing the furs.\textsuperscript{177} As appears from the 1639 regulation, this has come into effect and sable and pine marten furs have been forbidden on coat lapels and collars.\textsuperscript{178}

The 1691 and 1696 regulations forbade the use of Venetian lace and fabrics with golden or silvery floral or striped patterns for coats, additionally \textit{Mantons} that were edged with lace. \textit{Manteau} or \textit{Manton} was a loose-fitting cape-like coat that fell from the shoulders and could be gathered into ruffles on the back. They were combined with a skirt made from a similar material and usually worn on Sundays and for special occasions.\textsuperscript{179} The coats could not be decorated with any golden or silver fringes, laces or tassels, however, the 1696 regulation allowed women to wear
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black silk coats lined with lace not wider than one hand. In the 1706 regulation, a coat which had golden or silver soutaches more than one finger wide was taxed with 50 d sm. For a coat interwoven with gold or silver, one was taxed as much as the item’s value. Additionally, all kinds of golden and silver fixings on a Manton were taxed with 50 d sm. Additionally, servant girls were not allowed expensive coats with linings. Thus, whereas the earlier regulations were more concerned with fabrics, the later regulations appear to have dedicated more time on various decorations, gold and silver.

**Collars**

As it appears from the engraving in Olearius’ work, ruff or millstone collars (in German Krause) appear to have been in fashion during that period. The earliest regulation states that all citizens and journeymen, their wives and daughters should not wear thick long collars. Here it is again difficult to know what exactly is meant by such a description but perhaps it describes a collar similar to a starched ruff collar. According to the 1639 regulation, collars in general had to be moderate, and both in the 1631 and 1639 regulation the use of lace and other embroideries to decorate collars was forbidden. Additionally, any kind of fur was forbidden to wives and daughters of members of St. Olaf’s Guild. According to von Hansen, the wiring disappeared from the collar in the middle of the seventeenth century and after that the collar fell freely on the shoulders. In the 1665 regulation, only simple collars without lace, embroidery or colourful fur and with moderately decorated edges were allowed for members of the Great Guild and merchant journeymen. Thus, it can be argued that the collars had to be quite simple and without any expensive decorations regardless of where the wearer placed in the social hierarchy.

**Skirts**

Skirts made of silk were forbidden both in the earliest regulation and in the 1631 regulation. According to the 1631 regulation, an exception could be made for the more eminent women on festive days and wedding days who could wear skirts of silk Grobgrün and Assucken. Artisans’
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180 Generale Kleiderordnung von 1691, p. 238.
181 TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 410v. A soutache is narrow flat decorative braid used in the trimming of drapery or clothing. In clothing soutache is often used to conceal a seam. Hinchman 2014, p. 176.
182 TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 411r.
184 TLA.190.1.2, p. 388.
186 TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 324r.
188 Buntwerk referred to all kinds of fur that is not single colour, see Eisenbart 1962, p. 132.
190 TLA.190.1.2, p. 398. Grobgrün – a general term for various kinds of coarse strong-threaded woollen and silk fabrics of lower quality, Eisenbart 1962, p. 125. It has not been possible to identify what kind of fabric Assucken was.
wives and daughters could have skirts of woollen Grobgrün and black Sayen or Wande.\textsuperscript{191} Since the women had been complaining that the Bremen skirt was uncomfortable, the 1639 regulation allowed them to wear their Sunday clothes when going to weddings.\textsuperscript{192} Here it is very difficult to say what a Bremen skirt looked like or what kind of fabric was used to make it. Although women generally did not or were not supposed to wear silk skirts as they were not a part of the Reval costume, when distinguished people wore skirts made of Grobgrün, Schamlotz or Tercionell on Sundays and festive days, it could be allowed to a certain extent.\textsuperscript{193} Even though the regulation is vague about who these distinguished people were supposed to be, they were arguably wives and daughters of the councilmen or merchants. It transpires that silk was considered too luxurious for anybody to wear and only coarser silk fabrics such as silk Grobgrün and Tercionell were allowed to those highest up in the society and even then only on certain occasions. It should also be pointed out that breeches, the so-called male equivalent of the skirt are completely absent from the regulations.

The 1665 regulation stated that wives and daughters of Great Guild members should wear skirts, like other clothing made of woollen fabric and Lacke but not Sharlacke, but golden ribbons and laces were not allowed as decorations.\textsuperscript{194} Additionally, colourful underskirts were forbidden.\textsuperscript{195} It was customary at the time that women wore skirts on top of each other and the underskirt was usually made of a different material.\textsuperscript{196} Wives and daughters of members of St. Canute’s Guild were allowed to wear skirts made of taffeta or Tercionell but only for weddings and other festive days and no trimmings were allowed. On all other days they had to wear a skirt and a jacket made of coarser woollen fabric such as Lacken, Sayen, Türkschen, Grobgrün.\textsuperscript{197} The wives and daughters of members of St. Olaf’s Guild were only allowed to wear skirts made of coarse wool material such as Lacke or Mageir, Say, Bobmuseide, Uberkiker or Rash.\textsuperscript{198} Even though fabrics will be discussed under a separate heading, here also the social hierarchy is visualised through the falling quality of the skirt’s material.

\textsuperscript{191} TLA.190.1.2, p. 399. The term used is eingespengt Sayen, but it has not been possible to identify what that exactly meant within textile context. Sayen – initially a woollen outer garment and then the fabric preferably used for it. Later on becomes a lighter woollen fabric, Eisenbart 1962, p. 128. See also footnote 153.

\textsuperscript{192} TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 320r.


\textsuperscript{194} TLA.191.1.19, p. 89r. Sharlacke – a fine woolen fabric considered luxurious during the Middle Ages. See Eisenbart 1962, p. 128. Lacke – general term for woollen cloth. See ”laken” in Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm.

\textsuperscript{195} TLA.191.1.19, p. 90v.

\textsuperscript{196} Russak 2007, p. 78.


\textsuperscript{198} Mageir – coarse woollen or cotton fabric, Bobmuseide – woven mercerised cotton fabric, Uberkiker – woollen material used for doublets (?), Rasb – light woollen material named after the Dutch town where it was initially produced. See Eisenbart 1962, p. 123, p. 126, p. 127.
Both the 1691 and 1696 regulations forbade colourful skirts edged with golden, silver or white bobbin lace. Furthermore, the use of either Venetian lace or fabric and fabrics with golden or silver floral or striped patterns were forbidden to use for skirts. In the 1706 regulation, all kinds of golden and silver fixings on skirts were taxed with a luxury tax of 50 d sm. Thus, instead of focusing on specific fabrics the later regulations appear to have mostly been concerned with patterns, colours and decorations on the skirts. Like the earlier regulations, they are not very forthcoming when it comes to the actual design of the skirts.

**Footwear: shoes and stockings**

Even though shoes were something that people used daily and nobody walked around barefoot, shoes are mentioned in the regulations irregularly and not with all social groups. The earliest regulation forbade silk stockings to citizens as well as merchant journeymen. Silk stockings were also forbidden in the 1631 regulation as well as frivolous high shoes and boots. Here it is difficult to know what is meant by high, whether a shoe with high heel or whether they were not supposed to be high-topped (extending over the wearer’s ankle). The same kinds of shoes were forbidden as part of women’s Dorpat costume, which will be discussed more in detail below. In the 1639 regulation, embroidered stockings and silky shoe ribbons were not allowed to women. In the 1665 regulation, shoes and slippers with golden braids were forbidden for wives and daughters of Great Guild members, and thus by extension, to all other women too. In the 1691 and 1696 regulations shoes with embroidery and lace as well as lined stockings were forbidden for both genders. In the 1706 regulation, shoes decorated with golden and silver real or fake laces and trimmings were taxed with 10 d sm.

In the earliest regulation, slippers made of Tripp were forbidden to both wives and daughters of citizens as well as servant girls. Eisenbart has argued that slippers or in German Pantoffeln were not only restricted to inside use but women often wore them on the streets and thus they were footwear intended for outside use. In the 1665 regulation maidservants and wetnurses were not allowed to wear cordovan shoes, which here is taken to mean shoes made of cordovan
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200 Generale Kleiderordnung von 1691, p. 239, EAA.1002.1.14, p. A3v. Russak has taken Venetian to mean Venetian cloth whereas Pullat has taken it to mean Venetian lace. Russak 2007, p. 79, Pullat 2013, p. 204.
202 TLA.190.1.2, p. 387.
203 TLA.190.1.2, p. 395.
204 TLA.190.1.2, p. 400.
205 TLA.190.1.2, p. 398.
206 TLA.191.1.19, p. 90v.
leather in a shade of burgundy and named after the city of Cordoba in Spain. This is the only instance when such type of shoes were mentioned in the regulations and it is curious that both these specific kinds of shoes were mentioned in connection with servants.

With the 1631 regulation, spurs with which the young merchant journeymen were trespassing on Tallinn’s cobblestoned streets on a daily basis, were not to be tolerated and golden and silver spurs and knee ribbons were forbidden. Black boots and blue or black blunt spurs, however, were allowed. Men’s shoes and boots were an integral part of a sumptuous costume and therefore it might seem somewhat striking that they were not given more attention in the regulations. As women’s dresses and skirts were often long enough to hide the shoes, they were perhaps considered less important than items that could actually be seen. A similar trend has been noticed in merchants’ probate inventories from the first half of the eighteenth century, namely that compared to other items of clothing shoes are almost absent in them.

### 3.2. Accessories

In addition to clothing, accessories as an integral part of one’s external appearance were also subject to regulation. In the section concerning Reval costume in the 1631 regulation it was stated that the golden necklaces that women wore on their wedding days should not weigh more than 10 to 15 lod, depending on the wearer’s social position. Additionally, unmarried women were not allowed any necklaces or rings whatsoever and their bracelets could only be made of moderately sized corals. The same rule for the weight of the necklaces applied in the 1639 regulation, however, every woman herself was responsible for staying within these limits. Additionally, daughters of better sorts of artisans could wear golden and silver laces and small golden or gilded necklaces on their wedding day. In the section concerning Reval costume, rings were allowed to be worn according to one’s free will, but they were forbidden to young unmarried women. In the 1665 regulation, golden and diamond rings and necklaces that were worn on Sundays and other festive days were allowed to both merchants’ wives and daughters but the weight of the necklace had diminished to 8 lod and every respectable woman had to apply moderation in wearing jewellery. Thus, the distinction between married and unmarried women based on what kind of jewellery they were allowed to wear, had disappeared and being allowed to
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214 TLA.190.1.2, p. 398. 1 lod equals approximately 12,8 grams so a necklace of 15 lod would have weighed an impressive 192 grams.
217 TLA.191.1.19, p. 89v.
both wives and daughters of merchants it was not a sign of married status anymore but rather became a sign of higher social standing.

The 1706 regulation is meticulous in its regulations of all possible kinds of accessories. Silver and golden breast decorations and one golden or silver belt around the body not more than two fingers wide were permitted. Breast decorations or Brustlatsche should not be confused with a vest even though both were made of fabric and seemed to have a similar but not exactly the same design. Excessively decorated gloves were taxed with 5 d sm. For using golden and silver ribbons, ornamental trims, feathers or strings in the Fontange, one was taxed 20 d sm. A coat with colourful fixings, likewise a Fontange with colourful ribbons in order to go to the church with these were similarly taxed with 20 d sm. Fontange was a high decorated headdress, however, some have understood it to be the combination of headdress and hairstyle.\footnote{Eisenbart 1962, p. 152.} For double or triple frills on various kinds of clothing one had to pay 20 to 30 d sm and for golden and silver fixings on the coat, 50 d sm.\footnote{TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 410v.} Expensive neckerchiefs made with Spanish, Venetian or Rhenish needle lace, but also lace aprons, lace nightcaps and lace cuffs that were costlier than specified by the regulation were taxed with as much as the specific item’s value. The only accessory that was allowed to the women was lace cuffs around their wrists not more than three fingers wide.\footnote{TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 410v.}

Furthermore, it was stated that moderately sized pearls without a diamond clasp in up to two rows around the neck, one golden necklace and bracelet and golden earrings with one pearl were permitted. Whoever wanted to wear a real diamond on the hat or head, around the neck, on the breast or in ears, had to pay a hefty sum of 100 d sm annually.\footnote{TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 410v.} The same sum was applicable for wearing expensive pearls around the head or hands, even though in such cases terms such as “expensive” and “moderate” are too vague and relative to identify with certainty what kind of pearls were considered acceptable and what resulted in the so-called “sumptuary tax”.\footnote{TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 410v.} Earrings and breast decorations with fake diamonds were taxed with 50 d sm. This detailed differentiation between fake and real raises the issue that a common person was unlikely to recognise the difference between a real and a fake diamond and thus certain expertise was necessary to determine it. Moreover, it can be debated to what extent it was actually important for one’s public appearance to wear a real diamond if the likelihood of it being recognised as such was small. On the other hand, having a real diamond instead of a fake one might have made the crucial difference for one’s position within a certain category, for example merchants, as they

were more likely to recognise the diamond’s real value. Thus, accessories such as jewellery can also be interpreted as a sign or a symbol, which signified different things to different onlookers.

Accessories were also an essential part of the male costume in seventeenth-century Tallinn. The 1639 regulation stated that no journeyman could wear golden rings before he got engaged to a person of honest birth and wearing the seal ring in the index finger was also forbidden. This was altered in 1665 so that nobody except the members of the Great Guild and merchant journeymen could wear rings with diamonds, rubies or sapphires, but only their seal rings or rings made of inferior gold.\textsuperscript{223} Additionally, in the 1665 regulation a whole long list of accessories was forbidden to members of the Great Guild and merchant journeymen. Even though it was mentioned specifically in the regulation, it went without saying that everything that was forbidden to them was even more forbidden to everyone else.\textsuperscript{224} First, belts embroidered with gold, silver and pearls; other luxurious trimmings with gold, silver and various other threads; all kinds of trimmings in French fashion; golden and silver laces, braids and bows or the same items worked through with golden or silver thread; similarly hat ribbons with gold, silver and pearls.\textsuperscript{225} Better sorts of artisans were allowed to wear only one ribbon as a coat decoration.\textsuperscript{226} This is in line with what has been argued in the previous chapter, namely that the understanding of what kind of appearance was appropriate for women and men and what was considered “masculine” and “feminine” was markedly different from the modern understanding.

One might wonder why the regulations dedicate a significant amount of space to regulate against all sorts of ribbons, trimmings, hooks, belts, jewellery and so forth throughout the whole century. At least two things should be considered here. Amanda Vickery has suggested:

> It was often the trimmings rather than the clothes themselves that drew most of the mockery, which was potentially infuriating to stylish dames because fashion change itself was most easily and inexpensively registered in accoutrements—via ribbons, handkerchiefs, and headgear. Accessories allowed a woman to retrim an old dress for the fraction of the cost of making a new gown.\textsuperscript{227}

This applied also to sleeves (in German \textit{Ermellin}), as one could change them easily without changing the bodice, and it was naturally cheaper.\textsuperscript{228} As clothing was costly during the early modern period, such accessories provided a way of reinventing and renewing one’s wardrobe relatively cheaply. Even such small alterations to one’s costume might have made the crucial difference between shabby and stylish. Additionally, “the more added value any piece of clothing had [. . .] beyond the basic user value, the more exclusive they appeared, and the more status they
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\textsuperscript{228} EAA.1002.1.14, p. A3v, Russak 2007, p. 56.
inferred on their wearer.”

The “use value” of a coat without golden trimmings might have been the same as that of a coat with golden trimmings but the latter’s “status value” was incomparably higher.

3.3. Fabrics

In the earliest clothing regulation, velvet and silk were strictly forbidden for women. Clothing, gloves and muffs made of velvet were also forbidden to guild members and journeymen. The 1631 regulation forbade velvet, *Kaffa* and damask to the members of the Great Guild and merchant journeymen. The same fabrics and additionally satin, *Floret* and other, presumably coarser silk fabrics, were forbidden to the members of St. Canute’s Guild. As already mentioned, if a clothing item or fabric was forbidden to people of highest social standing in the society, it was also forbidden to everyone else. Moreover, as can be seen in the fabrics that were forbidden to the members of St. Canute’s Guild, the lower down one moved on the social scale, the more the number of exclusive or forbidden fabrics increased and the more inferior their quality got. Additionally, rather than being concerned with the exact design of an item, the regulation simply forbade the use of certain materials.

In the 1639 regulation, as a general rule it was stated that for members of the Great Guild and the Brotherhood of the Blackheads, the use of one-coloured but also floral velvet was forbidden. Their clothes could be made of *Kaffa* and on Sundays and festive days they could wear doublets made from damask or satin, which were undoubtedly exclusive fabrics. For members of St. Canute’s Guild all kinds of silk fabrics such as velvet, *Kaffa*, damask, satin and others were completely forbidden. They were allowed to use coarser materials such as *Florett*, *Gewand*, *Grobgrün*, *Türksch* and *Vierdrat*. For coats, they could only use *Wandre*, *Grobgrün*, *Türksch* or *Vierdrat*. For members of St. Olaf’s Guild it was merely stated that they could wear clothes made of simple coarse fabrics with no added decorations. Artisan journeymen were allowed to use the clothes
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229 Alm 2014, p. 16. For the concepts of “use value” and “status value”, see Andersson 2006, p. 24.
230 TLA.190.1.2, p. 388. It has not been possible to identify what kind of fabric *Rödischen* was. Eisenhart has described a fabric called *Rosenzeug*, which was either the colour of red roses or alternatively a fabric decorated with roses, see Eisenhart 1962, p. 127. In *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm* “Rosi” – an expensive silk fabric. However, here neither of these fits the list of other fabrics, as silk would be far too expensive and describing the fabric by its pattern seems unlikely.
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235 TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 320r. *Vierdrat* - low-value stronger woollen material made of fourfold twined filaments, usually weaved as white and then dyed. See Eisenhart 1962, p. 131. For other fabrics, refer to the previous footnotes.
they had with them, however, they had to be respectable.\textsuperscript{236} This can be interpreted to mean that their costume was not supposed to be more luxurious than what was understood to be appropriate for them and that they would be recognisable by the inhabitants of Tallinn as journeymen.

As already revealed by the discussion of individual clothing items, it transpires that the regulations did not usually describe the design of the item precisely, i.e. the item’s length or cut, but usually just mentioned the most expensive fabric an item could or could not be made of. This kind of regulation undoubtedly left room for artistic creativity and individual self-expression that allowed to distinguish oneself from others. Additionally, the various fabrics can be divided into three categories; firstly forbidden materials such as velvet and silk, which were generally forbidden and only allowed for some smaller items, such as hats or lapels, and only occasional exceptions were made for the town’s most distinguished and respectable citizens; secondly, materials of similar value that were allowed, depending on the wearer’s social position; thirdly, fabrics that were encouraged in the sense that they were specifically named in the regulations as fabrics one was allowed wear. A person’s position within the social order determined the quality of the costume he or she wore and in turn, the costume with its fabrics and accessories made that person’s position visible to everyone else.

3.4. Transportation

Whereas various means of transportation had not been an issue during the first half of the seventeenth century, such concerns first appeared in 1665. The carriages could not be golden or silver or overwrought with leather. They had to be quite modestly painted and could only be decorated with inexpensive Lacken. For going to church, only one horse could be harnessed in front of the carriage, the carriage had to be modestly painted and no golden or silver decorations were allowed.\textsuperscript{237} In the 1690 regulation, however, the issue was evidently not touched upon but barely a year later it had become subject to regulation again. Golden and silver decorations on carriages and sledges were forbidden and it was also forbidden to decorate horses with golden harnesses or other decorations. Again, as before, even on Sundays it was forbidden to harness more than one horse in front of the carriage.\textsuperscript{238} The 1706 regulation, which had already abandoned the punitive tone and merely demanded a certain tax for all the items that could be considered luxuries, established an annual tax between 20 and 200 d sm depending on how luxurious the carriage and its decorations were. For a gilded or silver carriage decorated with

\textsuperscript{236} TLA.230.1.Bs7. p. 319v.
\textsuperscript{237} TLA.191.1.19, pp. 92v-93r.
\textsuperscript{238} Generale Kleiderordnung von 1691, p. 239, EAA.1002.1.14, p. A4r.
sculptures, the payment was 50 d sm, but for a gilded carriage or sleigh drawn by two horses, the annual payment was no less than 200 d sm.\textsuperscript{239}

As the 1706 regulation demonstrates, there were various ways how a carriage could be designed and decorated and therefore indicate a person’s wealth and status. Even though Amanda Vickery’s research is focused on the eighteenth century, she indicates that during the early modern period the cost of owning a carriage, horses and other related necessities could often be astronomical.\textsuperscript{240} In addition to having pure status value a carriage also had use value, because it was used as a means of getting from point A to point B. Then again, unless one travelled in the middle of the night, audience was guaranteed, thus making one’s social standing and wealth even more visible as one travelled through the streets of Tallinn. Finally, this concern from the second half of the seventeenth century might also be an indication that by that time various horse-drawn vehicles had become sufficiently widespread and popular amongst the wealthy so that the town council perceived regulation as necessary.

### 3.5. “Foreign clothes will take your heart”: dörttsche tracht, foreign influences and the creation of urban identity

Something that is very peculiar to the clothing regulations from the first half of the seventeenth century is the differentiation between local and foreign costume when it comes to women’s clothing. The earliest regulation stated that women of foreign origin who had married into Tallinn could retain their usual dress to avoid expenses on getting an entirely new costume. It was specified that the fabrics could not be more expensive than Gewandt, Röselachen, Sagen, woollen Schamblott, Turkish and coarser Grohgrün. Additionally, the furs, precious metals and the fabrics their clothes were made of could not be of higher value than what was stipulated for the costume of Tallinn (Revalsche Manier).\textsuperscript{241} Their daughters, on the other hand, were obliged to adopt the costume of Tallinn. It was also stated explicitly that those women who had so far dressed according to the traditional fashion could not adopt the new costume.\textsuperscript{242} Two things should be considered here; firstly, the fact that such regulation only touched upon female clothing and secondly, whilst the financial value of such foreign costume was determined, it still left room for so-called artistic creativity.

\textsuperscript{239} TLA.230.1.Bv7, p. 411r.
\textsuperscript{240} Vickery 2006, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{241} TLA.190.1.2, p. 388.
\textsuperscript{242} TLA.190.1.2, p. 389. Der hat ein Erbar Rhadt geschlosen, den nach diesem tage alle frembde Jungfräuenn, die sich mit unsern Bürgernn in der grossen und andern gelden befreyenn, und unter dieser Stadt Jurisdiction, und bootmessigkeit bleibenn wolenn, Ihrer gewöhnlichen tracht, und kleidung (doch den in zukommen Zeiten, ihm Töchtern auff unsere Renalsche Manier geben sollehen) zwahrgebrachen, und bey derselben bleibenn sollehen.
By 1631, however, foreign costume was not just any kind of unrecognisable clothing but it had been termed Dorpat costume (dörtptsche tracht) and appears to have acquired certain characteristic traits that the town council then tried to forbid.\(^{243}\) Firstly, round hats made of sable fur were forbidden. Knitted stockings, a certain kind of high shoes, shoe ribbons made of silk and shoe-roses, which were most likely some kind of decoration, were also forbidden.\(^{244}\) Rather than having anything to do with the town Dorpat (now Tartu), the term seems to have been a denominator of foreign type of costume. On the basis of available material it is unfortunately impossible to establish how such a term came into existence, from where the wearers of this type of costume originated and whether it continued to be a wider umbrella term that denoted any kind of costume of foreign origin or whether it had specific characteristic features that made it unique.

However, already in the 1639 regulation the town council admitted that even though they would like to see that women only wear Reval costume so that there would be a respectable equality and likeness amongst them, Dorpat costume had become so prevalent that banning this would be accompanied by great difficulties.\(^{245}\) Consequently, certain items that had been forbidden before were now allowed. For example, since the round fur hats were so popular that no other kind was worn it was difficult to forbid them and therefore wearing them was allowed only to wives of the members of Great Guild.\(^{246}\) Additionally, whereas in the 1631 regulation bracelets with average-sized corals were allowed, the 1639 regulation states that bracelets could be according to the wearer’s liking, either with corals or reasonably gilded.\(^{247}\) According to the 1631 regulation, trimmings with pearls were only allowed on Sundays and other festive occasions, but according to the 1639 regulation they could be worn all the time.\(^{248}\)

On the other hand, it should be pointed out that even though the town council attempted to regulate the so-called dörtptsche tracht in order to avoid social confusion and foreign influences, in reality the regulations were not always enough. If we recall the case of Alhard Bondel and his wife, it appears that the reality and the law did not always correspond. Since Bondel’s wife was from Dorpat and her clothes had been a part of her dowry, she should have been allowed to wear them according to the 1631 regulation;\(^{249}\) however, for some reason she was forbidden to wear them and was threatened that the clothes would be confiscated openly. In this case legal opinion and popular opinion did not match up and the town council evidently yielded to the popular
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\(^{247}\) TLA.190.1.2, p. 400, TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 322r.
\(^{249}\) TLA.190.1.2, p. 397.
pressure after the people had been outraged by something in her clothing. Of course, it can be speculated that by that time in 1636 what had been stipulated in the 1631 regulation had already been forgotten.

The differentiation between these two kinds of costume – Reval costume and Dorpat costume – and how they were addressed in the regulations is another interesting issue. Rather than stipulating that everything of foreign origin was automatically to be banned, certain aspects were conceded to the wearers of the Dorpat costume. In 1631 it was only stated about the skirts that they should resemble those worn by local women and could not be of better-quality material than silk Grobgrün. The same applied for golden necklaces that could be worn during holidays but should not be heavier than those worn by Tallinn women. The design, however, was up to the individual. Thus it transpires that instead of being a case of cultural assimilation whereby clothing of foreign origin was banned and local costume homogenised, it emerges from the regulations that it was process of cultural exchange. Even though the town council probably did not like or admit it, certain foreign trends and fashions influenced, were taken over by and adapted to the local fashions.

The regulations themselves reveal the extent to which foreign designs and fabrics influenced the wardrobe of the inhabitants of Tallinn. The regulations mentioned Polish gloves and slitted hats, Venetian lace and French accessories; Turkish Grobgrün appeared frequently, women were not happy with wearing Bremen skirts. From the sixteenth-century probate inventories it emerges that people had Russian shirts and caftans (russischen kaffthan), coats (rusche mantel), fur coats (russche zcuben), hats and so forth. Of course, here the question of what made an item be termed by a geographic location arises. Since more costly furs were usually imported from Russia it makes sense to assume that a Russian fur coat was a coat made of Russian furs. On the other hand, as there are no designs available, perhaps it was also of a specific Russian design. The materials were likely termed by their place of origin, however what made gloves Polish, their design or material, is impossible to know due to lack of sources. The previous discussion underscores that the foreign influences were already present in the sartorial practices of Tallinn’s inhabitants and more generally points to the extent of early modern cultural interaction, transfer and change, which manifested itself in external appearances.

Another issue that is both striking and confusing is the regulatory discrepancies between these two kinds of clothing, which are often difficult to interpret, and other regulatory sections concerning women. Take the issue of the differentiation between the kinds of coats the women
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can wear: in the 1639 regulation in the section concerning Dorpat costume it was stated that women’s coats could be made of damask, silk or Turkish Grobgrün but their collar and cuffs could only be lined with velvet or velour but not with sable or pine marten fur.\(^{254}\) In the preceding section about Reval costume, coats lined with sable fur were allowed as long as they adhered to the Reval costume.\(^{255}\) If a woman of foreign background could not wear a coat lined with fur but a woman from Tallinn could, then such an approach can certainly be seen to encourage sartorial uniformity. Yet, as stated previously, a woman of foreign origin was allowed to retain her old clothing due to high costs. If she already had such a fur-lined coat, then she adhered to a similar dresscode as the local women but according to the regulation was suddenly not allowed to wear it. Who was to know whether a woman of foreign origin had brought her coat with her, in which case it was banned as part of Dorpat costume or whether she bought it in Tallinn, in which case it was entirely legal to own such an item? Finally, as the clothing regulations treated both the issues of Reval and Dorpat costumes but also discussed women’s clothes under categories such as the wives of merchants and the wives of artisans, which was to take preference over the other? This reveals the complexity of sartorial issues but also shows that the town council was dealing with potentially illegible appearances as a problem.

The town council’s motivation for issuing such legislation emerges clearly from the earliest regulation, where they primarily attempted to regulate foreign and unusual or extraordinary costume.\(^{256}\) Arguably, such early modern concept of foreign differs from what we today would understand as foreign based on national, ethnic, linguistic, cultural or some other notion. These notions were undoubtedly crucial to and played a role in forming an understanding of what foreign was but here foreigner meant somebody who was an outsider because his or her external appearance was unrecognisable by the town council’s understanding. Since external appearance and inner identity were supposed to correspond, if one did not recognise the other person by their costume it was also impossible to know how to approach that person or what kind of social relationship was to be formed. According to Gierlich, this concern about foreignness in appearances penetrating local collective identity was not only top-down, but the town’s inhabitants were also concerned with the potential dangerous influence of such clothing.\(^{257}\)

The notion of what it meant to be an outsider is also connected to what it meant to be an insider. In Jenkins’ terms, the outside and the inside are two sides of the same coin, and by defining those who were considered foreign because of their sartorial practices, the town council
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also defined what was local and native to Tallinn. Their aim was to reconcile unity and difference, whereby the costume of every inhabitant of Tallinn was governed by a certain different set of regulations that would place them appropriately within the social hierarchy, and these differences made up a unified whole collective identity. However, the situation was complicated by the fact that the regulations did not necessarily regulate everyone who lived in Tallinn (in the previous chapter it was argued that it was the guild members and their households who were mainly subjects to regulation), yet they were supposed to apply to everyone, whether local or foreign. Based on merely the regulations, then, the majority of the town’s inhabitants can be termed as foreigners but in reality they were clearly a part of the town.

To complicate identification politics even further, from legislation dating from the end of the sixteenth century it appears that those who had been in Tallinn for at least four weeks had to adhere to the local customs and traditions and thus wear a habit that would correspond to such customs. If the clothes were too flashy, the council had the right to deprive these foreigners of their clothes. In Tallinn, therefore, even when people were considered foreigners or outsiders, they were expected to be aware of the local clothing customs, what was considered acceptable and what unacceptable. Such a policy towards foreigners staying in the city temporarily again hints at the attempt of cultural assimilation and the protection of local customs because if the outsiders were made to dress more or less like locals, there would be less in their appearance for locals to yearn after and emulate.

Such instances of cultural and social interaction, which meant a change in external appearances as well as in identity as a result of change of physical location, appear to have been of authentic concern during the early modern period. Daniel Purdy has pointed out that even marriage between people from different cities posed a threat to sartorial order and whether the future wife was allowed to retain her old habit or not was a serious legal matter. Town councils would often consult one another to become familiar with the other’s law and customs. It was important to clarify how the relationship between one’s family and old associations was supposed to relate to one’s new home, its customs and traditions and by extension how one’s old identity was supposed to relate to one’s new identity, as one was tied to one’s old hometown and relationships and the other to one’s new hometown and relationships. As discussed previously, if not the women who had married into Tallinn then at least their daughters were expected to adopt the local habit. Neither were such concerns only characteristic to early modern Tallinn. Ulinka Rublack has discussed the debates about foreign influences in Nuremberg clothing and suggested
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that already the contemporaries understood that clothing was by no means something external to the body, which could be taken off and put back on as one wished. Rather, clothing was seen to “mould a person and materialize identity”\textsuperscript{261} Foreign clothes, as suggested in the subtitle, would take one’s heart and the only way to maintain a healthy body politic within the community was to reject all foreign fashions.

### 3.6. On the wrong side of the law: punishing the offenders

As was discussed in the first chapter, the two town council members also called \textit{Wetteberen} were in charge of implementing the punishments and collecting the fines. The punishment for violating the regulations varied considerably during the century and generally, four kinds of official measures can be distinguished. The most common type of punishment was a fine; secondly confiscation of the item; thirdly imprisonment; fourth, a ban on attending public events such as going to a wedding or the church on Sundays in the forbidden costume.\textsuperscript{262} These measures could either be used in combination or separately. To these can be added the unofficial social policing, which could often result in people taking the law into their own hands. Nonetheless, it has to be emphasised again that these legal provisions represent the so-called ideal punishment and in order to analyse if and to what extent they were actually implemented one would have to look at judicial records.

The most usual punishment was a fine. In many instances the sum of the fine is not specified, as neither the 1631 or 1639 regulation includes the fine sums and the 1665 regulation has only included fine sums for some of the restrictions and otherwise includes a rather obscure statement that the fine is steep and serious.\textsuperscript{263} This can be interpreted in various ways; it might have been up to the councillors to decide on an appropriate amount in every singular case, depending on the financial situation or the social standing of the offender. The 1691 regulation, for example, states that the fine for wearing too sumptuous costume in the church, weddings and other public events ranges from 20 to 200 \textit{Reichsthaler}.\textsuperscript{264} Of course, what constituted ‘too sumptuous’ was relative and as revealed by the discussion in the first section of this chapter, depended on one’s position within the society. Additionally, there might have been standard punishments for each type of offence and it was thought of as unnecessary to repeat them in every regulation. The amount the offender was fined was sometimes also dependent on whether the offender had
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offended once or more than once, as in some cases the regulations state that the fine is doubled on the second offence.\(^{265}\)

The second kind of punishment was imprisonment, even though in the clothing regulations there are only three instances where it was mentioned as a means of punishment. It is initially mentioned in the oldest clothing regulation where it is stated that a man who could not pay a fine of 30 Thaler after his wife of foreign origins had worn more silk, fur, pearls and other jewellery than what is allowed for locals, can be imprisoned instead.\(^{266}\) The second instance dates from the 1665 regulation when it is mentioned as a specific punishment for wetnurses and maids for a long list of offences, such as wearing clothes made out of too fine fabrics.\(^{267}\) In this instance it is not an alternative for non-payment but rather an individual punishment for people of lowest social standing which compared to the punishments the guild members received seems to have been considerably harsher. According to the 1691 regulation, on offending for the third time the forbidden item could either be confiscated or the person arrested.\(^{268}\) Although the unhappy gymnasiu teacher Alhard Bondel was not imprisoned, his wife’s and his non-compliance earned him a house arrest, which can be seen as a more lenient version of imprisonment. Thus, even though imprisonment as a means is seldom mentioned in the regulations, it was definitely there as an option.

The third kind of punishment that appears in the regulations was the confiscation of the forbidden item, which was usually a so-called last resort as a punishment. In the 1665 regulation, for example, it is determined that the punishment for a first-time offence was a fine, on the second time the fine was doubled and the third time the item was confiscated.\(^{269}\) The 1691 regulation is similar but for third-time offenders the punishment could be either imprisonment or confiscation of the item.\(^{270}\) Additionally, there are some instances of very aggressive confiscations by townspeople. Namely, from a supplication letter written to the town council by a certain merchant Herman Luhren in 1635 it emerges that his wife had been attacked by an angry mob on her way out of church. Luhren writes that her wife was insulted and treated as an honourless person and if her friends had not come in between, she would have been left naked. All the while the people were enjoying the show from their windows and front doors.\(^{271}\)

The above-mentioned punitive confiscation is interconnected with unofficial social policing, such as public shaming, outrage and complaints if somebody appeared in a public place with
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unsuitable clothes. Susan Vincent has termed the widespread popular knowledge about fashion styles, fabrics, clothes and their value “dress competence”. “This “dress competence” is matched by the imposition of a system of surveillance, whereby citizens monitored not themselves but each other.” Based on this widespread fashion knowledge, the urban community was outraged or took action against the members of their community who they perceived had overstepped the line of acceptable and unacceptable. If we take again the unfortunate Alhard Bondel and his wife, who was threatened with having her clothes torn off on the street, it should be emphasised that such an incident would not have occurred and people would not have been outraged if they had not recognised that her clothes were different but not only that, that they were perhaps more valuable than what was appropriate for her station. Additionally, there was the added element of public shaming and dishonour when somebody was seized in broad daylight and their items confiscated, as one can only imagine windows opening and curious neighbours enjoying the show. Inna Põltsam has suggested that in the smaller towns clothing regulations were not even necessary, because inter-community policing and surveillance were enough for people to avoid excesses in clothing.

The final type of official punishment mentioned in the regulations was the ban on appearing in public places, such as the church, and taking part in public festivities, such as somebody’s wedding, in the forbidden costume or piece of clothing. In the earliest regulation, for example, it was stated that when a woman had adopted a costume in the foreign fashion, she was forbidden from attending weddings and other festivities. Arguably, this underlines the idea that the offender did not simply wear a forbidden item of clothing at home; she/he did so in public in front of an audience. In a society that was so concerned with legibility, not being able to recognise another person by their external appearance posed an immediate threat to the social order.

The last regulation issued in 1706 reflects a marked change in the town council’s attitude towards the punishment of excessive luxury. Even though it is titled Straff-Ordnung wegen Übermässiger Kleider-Pracht und anderer verspürter Excessen and thus emphasises the aspect of punishment or Straff, it emerges that the town council had started to perceive luxury as not something to be punished but rather as something that can be taxed. The council’s stance is worth quoting in full:

Because we feel that the decrees have been broken by most people, the magnanimous and wise town council not only repeats and confirms the previous regulations but adds to them that the
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Wette-herren will be been given free power to initiate legal proceedings and fine everybody without exception, even if the person is from the same town council. Because time and again one fashion after another is created, especially by womenfolk, and one is not able to ascribe a name to all the follies and fantastic ideas that are annually invented, thus it has occurred that whoever wants to strut in front of the others and reveal their arrogance and foolishness shall have free choice to do so as long as they pay a fine and fill the public purse for such folly.\textsuperscript{275}

Thus, even though the town council condemns luxury on moral grounds, it is something that can be financially useful and thus, rather than actually being a punishment, it can be viewed as a kind of luxury tax on items that were not considered necessities. Additionally, with this statement the town council admitted that because of people’s yearning for constant renewal and change they are not able to keep up with that so even though they repeat and reconfirm the validity of previous legislation, they have to admit that in reality their ability to fight this sort of foolishness is limited. Therefore, anyone who wished to indulge in luxury goods was free to do so as long as they made amends and repentent through paying to the public treasury.

The various sums of fines that have been determined in the regulations do not say a lot about what it actually meant to be fined a certain amount of money. Neithard Bulst has argued that it was mostly people belonging to the upper segments of the society who were held accountable due to their use of too expensive materials and outfits.\textsuperscript{276} Gudrun Andersson, on the other hand, has suggested that it was people of lower social standing, for example a servant girl wearing a red ribbon in her hair, who were most severely punished with astronomical sums when they had transgressed the law.\textsuperscript{277} As is also revealed by the last regulation that replaced the structure of fines with a structure of taxation, the wealthiest people had the most financial means available and thus paying a fine (or later on a tax) would not have been a great deal for them anyway. To a certain extent such a system also reinforced the differences between the wealthy and the poor because the former knew they were able to violate the law without any great damage. “The ordinances provided a framework which sanctioned social distinctions, and within which rule-breaking was itself a sign of social standing.”\textsuperscript{278}
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3.7. Conclusions: continuity and change during the seventeenth century

Whilst reading the clothing regulations one has to acknowledge the sheer variety of fabrics, items of clothing and accessories that people employed to design their appearances in early modern society. The number of different kinds of jewellery, belts, headgear, laces, ribbons, trimmings, ruffs, cuffs and other accessories is simply astonishing. However, the central concerns of the regulations changed significantly over the course of the century. The regulations from the first half of the century were equally concerned with items of clothing as with accessories, but from 1690 onwards the regulation of various accessories, jewellery, decorations and so forth became more important. Additionally, whereas means of transportation had not been of concern initially, from 1665 onwards their increasing popularity meant that they also became subject to regulation. A similar change can be found in the idea of a distinct local female identity, which was articulated only in the first three regulations. As the town council perceived it, the local women were not allowed to adopt foreign fashions and women of foreign origins were supposed to gradually adopt a costume that adhered to the local traditions. Last but not least, the final change that also reflects the change in the layout of the regulations is that whereas up until 1665 men’s and women’s clothing and accessories were dealt with separately, later regulations did not distinguish between genders and merely listed all the forbidden items.

When continuities are discussed, it emerges in the context of sartorial practices and social order that one of the main concerns throughout the whole century remained accessories, which occupied considerable space in the regulations during the whole century. As suggested, they enabled to renew one’s costume and elevate the costume’s status value without having to change the whole outfit. Intimately connected to this are gold and silver, whether they were in the form of accessories, decorations or fabrics sewn through with golden or silver thread, or golden and silver ornamentations used on means of transportation. There were also individual items of clothing, such as collars, which were a concern in almost every regulation and which according to the regulations had to be simple and without decorations, whether they were worn by a member of the Great Guild or St. Olaf’s Guild.

In addition to accessories, the most important aspect of the costume that was supposed to signify and make clear the wearer’s position in the complex social order was not the colour or the design of the item but the fabric it was made of. Various kinds of fur, fur hats, fur coats and fur lapels remained a concern up until the last regulation. Some fabrics, such as velvet and silk, remained exclusive through the century and were only considered acceptable for a very limited circle of people or in very small amounts, such as velvet hats. Based on different kinds of available fabrics mentioned in the regulations, their number appears to be relatively similar both
in the upper and the lower ends of the social hierarchy. However, the lower down one moved on the social scale, the worse the quality of these fabrics became. Finally, Gerhard Jaritz has made a very important point about the social context of costume, as velvet as a material could signify different things depending on the context. When it was worn by a distinguished town councillor, it had a positive connotation and signified legitimacy. However, when worn by a lower artisan, it carried negative connotations of illegitimacy and inappropriateness.

The punishments ranged quite widely over the century and even though a monetary fine remained the most popular type of sentence, the forbidden item could be confiscated or rarely, one could be sent to prison. The punishment often depended on the social status of the offender, as for example an individual punishment for maidservants and wet-nurses could be imprisonment. For the present study the ban to appear in public places in forbidden clothing should be highlighted, as it emphasises the importance of the processes of visualisation, recognition and legitimation. On the other hand, when discussing what kind of influence the sumptuary laws actually had on people, Neithard Bulst has suggested that their effect was rather limited. Most people had to make ends meet and could hardly afford luxurious clothing or elaborate trinkets. Instead, the people addressed in the regulations were those who had come into money and were consequently able to demonstrate it through better clothes. As discussed in the first chapter, even though the clothing regulations were in theory supposed to apply to everybody who lived in Tallinn, only certain categories of people were addressed in them. Thus, based merely on the clothing regulations it can be said that their effect on the inhabitants of Tallinn as a whole remained limited.
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4. Temporality and spatiality of social order

After examining the various kinds of people and how they went about their daily business in the first chapter and subsequently examining their external appearances whilst they were doing so, this chapter will establish the specific seventeenth-century temporal and spatial context. Namely, the first section will analyse specific time periods and specific occasions when regulation of appearances and social interaction was considered necessary. Here emphasis will be placed on the public nature of early modern civic celebrations, whatever their purpose might have been, and the consequent manifestation of one’s identity and status that such occasions allowed. The second section will add a final layer of complexity and look at the various kinds of physical urban spaces that were deemed problematic, and how early modern townspeople related to them, whether it was during aforementioned special occasions or whilst conducting their daily lives.

4.1. Time to live and time to die: occasions for regulation

In the same archival collection with clothing and sumptuary regulations one can also find regulations concerning specific instances and events, such as weddings, christenings and funerals. Additionally, other kinds of sources inform us of occasions whose arrangement was subject to regulation, such as the reception of Swedish monarchs, royal representatives or other foreign envoys, but also for example giving the oath of allegiance. Following Helen Watanabe-O’Kelly’s differentiation between ceremonies and spectacles in her discussion about early modern festivals, the above-mentioned events fall into the first category. Whereas spectacles are mainly intended for entertainment, ceremonies do not just demonstrate power relations in a symbolic fashion but bring power structures into being. In addition to these specific occasions that were not dependent on the time of the year, there were certain holiday periods, for example Easter, which were also subject to regulation.

However, no other occasion is taken up in the clothing regulations in such a detailed manner as marriages. The early modern wedding is the best representative of an occasion that involved social interaction and audience but was at the same time infused with significant religious meaning. In the wedding, the couple laid claim to their and their respective families’ social prestige by displaying wealth – in giving, in dressing and in feasting. Among merchants and patricians, weddings were the most expensive celebration an individual was likely to hold, far exceeding the amounts spent on burial or at the parties in honour of the birth of children. Lyndal
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Roper has also suggested that in the German areas, usually a new set of clothes was made both for the bride and the groom. Roper 1985, p. 74. Because of its dual purpose the wedding was a constant concern for the town council, so much so that during the whole early modern period they issued specific regulations concerning weddings, which determined not only the clothing of the happy couple but numerous other aspects, such as the length, number of guests, the physical location and forms of entertainment. Thus, although the wedding will be discussed within the temporal context, that is to say as specific events that took place at a specific time, as the following discussion will reveal such an occasion was undoubtedly an interaction between the temporal and the spatial. To preserve the event as a whole, spatial aspects have in this instance been subdued to its temporality.

As mentioned previously, separate regulations concerning weddings were issued during the whole early modern period. Yet, there are several instances in the clothing regulations that also touch upon the proper way one was supposed to marry. This is the motivation that lies behind the discussion of weddings as part of the clothing regulations. Whereas the earlier regulations mostly discuss the quality of clothing on the wedding day (and other festive days), the later regulations deal with weddings in more detail, albeit these details seem on initial viewing quite random. This might seem curious, as already mentioned, the town council still issued separate regulations for weddings. However, the issues that were regulated together with clothing might have simply been of actual concern to the council and rather than drafting a whole new regulation, they inserted small details wherever they thought suitable.

Weddings were normally held on Sundays or Mondays during the winter months and if a person wanted to have their wedding at a different time, for example during Lent, permission had to be obtained from the town council. The spatial arrangements appear to have been a matter of choice, as according to the 1696 clothing regulation, everybody was free to choose whether they wanted to hold the wedding party in their house or in guild rooms and whether the wedding was to be a Speisehochzeit or a Zuckerhochzeit. Such a differentiation did not appear in the wedding regulations until 1688. A warm dinner was eaten at the first, while cold snacks, marzipan and candies were offered at the second. The party’s duration was also subject to regulation, as Speisehochzeit was supposed to start at exactly 1 o’clock in the afternoon and end no later than 1 at
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night. Zuckerhochzeit had to start at 6 o’clock in the evening and end at 4 in the morning. The guests were not supposed to follow the happy couple home and no music or dancing was allowed there. The number of guests was limited to 70 guests including all attending personnel when the wedding party was held in the guild rooms or 60 guests when it was held at home. It seems unlikely though that the private homes could actually fit that many people and rather, the potential number of guests one could entertain at home was significantly lower. Therefore, one’s access to a guild house determined to a large extent how big the audience to witness the wedding celebrations was to be.

Of course, having a wedding in one of the guilds meant that one had to pay for renting the guild hall or Gildstube and for example, in the mid-seventeenth century the rent for the Great Guild’s main hall was 4 or 5 Reichsthaler and sometimes even more. On the other hand, not everyone who had money was automatically accepted to hold their wedding in the Great Guild – it was mostly reserved for nobility and merchants. When the alderman of St. Canute’s Guild sought to have the wedding of one of his guildsmen first in the hall of Brotherhood of the Blackheads and later in the Great Guild in the eighteenth century, he was simply refused. Therefore, not everyone was able to celebrate their wedding in one of the guilds and even if they had money to pay, they might still be refused on the grounds that their social position was too low.

During the seventeenth century spatial arrangements of a marriage celebration were an issue of discontent. According to the 1629 wedding regulation, it was determined that the festivities could only take place at home and not in any of the guild halls. Members of the Great Guild, however, did not acknowledge this regulation, as it had been adopted without the approval of the guilds and they saw it as intervening in their privileges (as discussed in the first chapter, the guilds were ideally the town council’s counterpart in government processes and thus, such one-sided decisions did not fare well with the guilds). The guild and the town council finally reached an agreement that a wooden lattice would be installed in the great hall, which would have meant that the allowed number of guests could not be exceeded. Perhaps it is for this reason that in the 1696 clothing regulation the choice between one’s home and a guild hall is available and instead the wedding party’s duration and the number of guests are emphasised.

Another aspect of a wedding celebration that the town council carefully regulated in order to avoid excesses was entertainment during the evening. Unlike the wedding ceremony in the
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church, the following feast with accompanying entertainment is categorised by Watanabe-O’Kelly as a spectacle, as its primary purpose was entertainment. It was emphasised in the 1696 regulation that should the wedding party not start and end at the prescribed time, it was the musicians and organists who were to be held responsible and fined 50 Reichstaler. Additionally, they were not allowed to commence playing during the wedding celebration and would not be paid their salary at all. Compared to how much it cost to rent a guild hall, for example, this seems like an unusually harsh punishment directed not at the couples’ immediate family members but at the people responsible for music and entertainment. In any case, the astronomical fine underlines how seriously the town council took any excessive and inappropriate entertainment and even though they allowed the people to celebrate marriage in the guild hall the celebration itself had to be sober and rational.

When it comes to appropriate appearances during weddings, earlier regulations lay more emphasis on how people who took part in them were supposed to dress. In addition to weddings they also mention other festive occasions (Feiertagen in German), i.e. events or celebrations that were not the ordinary working days (Werckeltagen in German) and were attended by a significant amount of people. In the 1639 regulation in the section concerning Reval costume women were allowed to wear their Sunday clothes when they went to a wedding, since they had been complaining about discomfort of the Bremen skirt. This is somewhat peculiar, since arguably one wore Sunday clothes as the best clothes when attending someone else’s wedding anyway so the permission to wear Sunday clothes seems to imply that they had not been allowed to do that previously. Additionally, more dignified women or vornehme Persohnen could wear skirts made of silk Grobgriin or Tercionell on their wedding days and other festive occasions. Finally, it is emphasised that only and only on their wedding day were they permitted to have a jacket made of Kaffia and a skirt made of lesser sort of taffeta.

According to the 1665 regulation, members of Great Guild and merchant journeymen were allowed to have coats made of silk Grobgriin, taffeta and silk Tercionell on festive occasions but glossy velvet, unshorn velvet, plush, brocade and satin remained strictly forbidden to them, as did coats lined with plush or other similar silk fabrics (on normal days silk was forbidden and they were supposed to wear coats made of woollen fabrics such as Gewandt or Turkish Grobgriin). Their wives and daughters could wear coats made of silk, Grobgriin, Tercionell, velvet, damask or other silk fabrics of similar value (on a daily basis they were supposed to wear coats of woollen

\[295\] EAA.1002.1.14, pp. A4r-B1v.
\[296\] TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 320v.
\[297\] TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 320v.
\[298\] TLA.191.1.19, p. 87.
Grobgrün or Gewand). On wedding days and other festive occasions, they were also allowed to wear colourful but not golden or silver ribbons, which had to be of moderate size and not on the head; at all other times the ribbons had to be black. However, all trimmings, laces and other kinds of decorations were still forbidden. As their social status was lower, wives and daughters of St. Canute’s Guild’s members were allowed to wear coats made of cheaper fabrics such as Lacken and Grobgrün and at the most they could have lapels with Kaffa on festive occasions. Additionally, they could wear jackets made of Kaffa with a skirt made of taffeta or Tercionell for festive occasions (on a daily basis they were supposed to wear jackets made of woollen fabric such as Lacken, Sayen, woollen or Turkish Grobgrün). Accessories were completely forbidden to them. In the case of wives and daughters of St. Olaf’s Guild, it has not been mentioned whether they were allowed any clothes of costlier fabrics on their wedding days.

When it comes to the colour of a wedding costume, it is difficult to make any kind of generalisations based on merely the clothing regulations. According to the 1706 regulation, during the ceremony in the church, the bridegroom had to wear black attire and the bride had to wear a black outer garment (Ober Kleyde). Two possible interpretations can be offered here: either black was considered the appropriate colour for the bridal couple to wear at the wedding ceremony in the church but perhaps more likely, it could also mean that for some reason or other a general mourning period had been proclaimed and this is why black was the obligatory colour even during such a happy occasion as a wedding. It will be discussed below how a clothing regulation could be a direct consequence of a royal persona’s death, however in this case it is not directly evident. Ulinka Rublack has discussed the meaning of colours and concluded that black was often the colour of the upper ranks, symbolising values such as loyalty and constancy. To conclude, more than anything else it was the quality and cost of the fabric rather than the design or colours that appear to have been of most concern to the town council when it came to costume during special occasions.

It emerges from the discussion of appropriate appearances that women were more often subject to regulation than men and the only two occasions men’s attire during festive occasions such as weddings was an issue was in the 1665 regulation and a brief mentioning in the 1706 regulation. As the present enquiry is not concerned with wedding regulations per se and is not analysing them in more detail, it is difficult to make any generalisation as to whether they were noticeably gendered when it came to costume. Perhaps, similarly to the line of argument
developed in the first chapter about women’s proneness to exaggeration in their external appearances, it was thought that even on special occasions men were not as likely to indulge in luxuries so regulation of their festive clothing was simply not necessary.

Another vital episode of social interaction, which took place during occasions such as weddings, christenings and funerals, and which was regulated by the town council was the custom of gift-giving or “the fuel of social intercourse”.\(^{304}\) During the Renaissance period giving gifts was governed by a certain set of rules and norms and especially in Western Europe private gift-giving was frowned upon, because “private could mean secret and secret too often meant lawless.”\(^{305}\) The 1696 regulation specified that at a wedding with only cold snacks no presents were allowed, regardless of whether they were ordinary or very expensive.\(^{306}\) Such regulation is very selective and unfortunately does not provide a better picture of how the gift-giving custom was perceived and to what extent regulated by the town council. Arguably, however, the financial costs of having a *Zuckerhochzeit* were not as high as when one decided to provide a whole dinner with potentially many courses. As it was most likely poorer people who opted for such a wedding, their guests would also have had a similar social position and thus, like in other aspects of the wedding, moderation is the reason why presents were forbidden in this case. Nobody was supposed to give excessively and spend more than he could afford.

Another aspect of the gift-giving process that sheds light on the previously discussed restriction is its spatiality, that is to say the physical context in which gift-giving occurred. According to Leif Runefelt, who has discussed early modern sumptuary legislation in Sweden, if a relation had the means to give a gift without suffering economically from it, giving gifts was allowed under the condition that it happened in private.\(^{307}\) This not only seems to indicate a different trend from that described by Martha Howell but also points to the fact that it was especially the public nature of ostentatious behaviour which the sumptuary legislation aimed to prohibit. Presenting gifts at a wedding took place in front of an audience and thus provided an opportunity for making claims to a position one did not actually occupy through presenting items one could not actually afford.

If we now return to the wedding as a whole with all its various aspects such as the ceremony, the procession to the church, the following party, dinner and gift-giving, it emerges that the wedding was a public affair. Even though the number of guests one was allowed to invite was subject to regulation, it was an interaction acted out in the public and legitimised through the

---

\(^{304}\) Howell 2010, p. 145.

\(^{305}\) Howell 2010, p. 32.


audience being present and witnessing it. The importance of the public nature of a marriage celebration is further underlined by Lyndal Roper:

The public wedding processions to the church and the new home of the couple – ‘going to church and street’ – accompanied to the music of pipe and drum, were perhaps socially more significant. Testimony from the people who had seen the couple’s wedding procession, not a document from the church, was commonly supplied when proof of a marriage’s legitimacy was required.308

Thus, the fact that the marriage and its various components were enacted in the public became almost as important as the fact that the ceremony had actually taken place. It had to be legitimised by an audience for it to become true and official.

Furthermore, marriage was not simply a singular event but it had significant implications for one’s future life. For example, the social career of a merchant was intimately tied to marriage. On marrying he had to quit his membership in the Brotherhood of the Blackheads, which consisted of unmarried merchants and merchant journeymen, and join the Great Guild, which was accompanied by acquiring citizen rights.309 Ideally, then, sexual adulthood through the institution of marriage was supposed to correspond with social, political and financial adulthood.310 As Anu Mänd has shown, sometimes the sequence could be the other way around so that a merchant married first and then joined the Great Guild; whichever way it was, marriage and membership in the Great Guild were intimately connected to each other.311 Such change in status was consequently manifested in one’s external appearance, for example through the permission to wear golden rings in the fingers, which was forbidden to unmarried merchants and journeymen.312 Furthermore, marriage as a social institution was governed by a set of both written and unwritten rules and practices and not following them could have resulted in downward mobility. For example, when a member of the Great Guild married below what was considered his social standing, i.e. when the woman was a servant or belonged to a lower social standing, he was thrown out of the guild.313

In addition to weddings, sadder occasions such as funerals were also subject to regulation, although they do not feature in clothing regulations very frequently. Additionally, sometimes the death of a royal person could be a direct motivation for issuing a clothing regulation. In August 1693 the town council of Riga had issued a regulation in connection with the death of Queen consort Ulrika Eleonora of Sweden, which forbade all luxury in clothing and jewellery and curbed

308 Roper 1985, p. 66.
312 TLA.230.1.Bs7, p. 319r.
313 Leimus et al. 2011, p. 137.
the festivities, such as weddings as a sign of mourning. The 1696 Tallinn clothing regulation makes mention to this, however, the date is given as 29 August instead of 20 August when the regulation was originally issued in Riga. Either they got the date wrong or perhaps a separate regulation was actually issued in Tallinn but if that is the case, it has not been preserved in the archives.

Occasionally the regulations could also be concerned with certain holiday periods of the year. Even though such instances are practically non-existent, both the 1690 and 1691 regulations clearly stated that they were to be enforced by Easter holidays and all abuses of luxury had to be abolished for good. Since the two regulations are pretty identical and issued roughly at the same time with a year between them it can be seen as an attempt to remind the people and enforce restrictions before a specific holiday period that was infused with religious meaning and symbols. A unique document from early eighteenth century issued by the town council specified all the annual holidays and celebrations people were supposed to observe and it emerges that the majority of them were tied to a specific religious context, such as the Annunciation and the celebration of the apostles and the evangelists.

Edward Muir has argued that during the early modern period there was no alternative to the liturgical calendar for time-keeping and it created a framework which all the activities, whether business contracts, university schedules or chores of the agricultural season, followed. Neithard Bulst has discussed the role such religious holidays played for the self-representation of people and suggested, “Without undermining the trustworthiness of the determination to implement the issued regulation, a justification for wearing it [a sumptuous costume] on religious holidays was deduced from the fact that it would serve as a praise to the lord and not as the accentuation of one’s own person, riches or claim for social prestige.” Thus, people were likely to employ these instances of public interaction with a significantly increased audience and the town council, being aware of it, took action to curb such luxurious displays.

---
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4.2. Spaces of social interaction

This section will be concerned with various physical spaces that were perceived by the town council as being central for social interaction and thus were subject to regulation, and will start by mapping out the town itself. In the centre of Tallinn was the town hall (no. 2 on image 1) with adjacent town hall square and the market. The streets were lined by private houses led on to the three main churches, St. Nicholas’ Church (no. 1), Church of the Holy Ghost (no. 3) and St. Olaf’s Church (no. 6). The four guild houses, Great Guild (no. 4), Brotherhood of the Blackheads (no. 5), St. Olaf’s Guild (green dot) and St. Canute’s Guild (red dot) were all situated on Long Street, one of the town’s main arteries. The lower town was separated from the seat of the royal Swedish power on the Dome Hill with its Dome Church (no. 9) and the castle (no. 8) by a gate. The city wall and its numerous fortifications firmly separated the town from surrounding fields and pastures, thus making it into an entity of its own.

These urban spaces can be thought of and divided in various ways. Perhaps most obviously to the modern reader, there were spaces that were public and there were spaces that were private. Public spaces, such as the street, the church and the marketplace had universal access, which was generally only limited by the time of the day. The home, on the other hand, was a space with limited access and can thus be considered as private. However, it has been suggested earlier that private and public space did not exist at all in early modern culture and thus such a division should not be merely accepted as a given.¹²⁰ Early modern street as a physical space was extremely ambiguous, as it joined various private and public spaces to each other but at the same

¹²⁰ Laitinen and Cohen 2009, p. 4.
time could never be entirely separated from them. The streets “always entailed negotiation of public and private”.

Another way of looking at early modern spaces is through the lens of religion. Whereas the church was obviously a religious space, religion was not merely confined to the church and also permeated other spaces such as the home but also the town hall, as the discussion about the town council and their religious and moral considerations has revealed. Alternatively, spaces can be divided into gendered and non-gendered spaces. Whilst the church, the street and the town hall square were non-gendered in that every person regardless of their gender had access to the space, the guild can be thought of as a gendered space, as its members were men and access for women was restricted to certain occasions, such as weddings. Gendering of a space, however, could also depend on how the space was used, as will be discussed later in the section.

There are, however, less obvious ways of looking at different spaces. One example is simply the space’s purpose. The purpose of the church was religious observance, the purpose of the town hall was governmental and the purpose of the street was to travel from one place to another. But again, all of these places also served many other purposes, one of them being social interaction, which has been one of the focal points of this study. Another less obvious way of looking at a physical space within the early modern context is through the concept of necessity. To bring an example, the church was not only a religious space but it was also a universally necessary space in that everybody was expected to go to church on Sundays. The street was necessary in that it served as a way to get from one physical space to another. On the other hand, the town hall might have been of necessity to the councillors as a space where they worked but it was not universally necessary to every inhabitant of Tallinn. To conclude, there are many ways how one can conceptualise and analyse early modern urban space in order to make our understanding more nuanced.

Firstly, the church as both a public and a religious space will be examined, because out of all the various public venues where social interaction took place it emerges as the most eminent in clothing regulations. According to Susan Vincent:

[Among the many possible sites of social engagement one of the most potent was at church. It was in this place that the whole community [. . .] gathered and observed one another. The overt order of the day may have been worship, but equally important was the social agenda underlying liturgy, sermon and prayer. We are familiar with the way issues of status emerged in pew disputes, of how state edicts found promulgation via the pulpit, and how community relationships were ordered through church rituals. Less obvious to us was the use of the church gathering as a venue for displaying dress. Eyes may have been lowered in prayer, but undoubtedly were also cast in sidelong glances of appraisal, as the congregation assessed one another's garments.]

Vincent 2003, p. 93.
As appears from the clothing regulations issued in Tallinn during the early modern period, the church was one of the main places of interaction that people used to make statements about themselves, including displaying their social position, and the town council’s concern with improper displays echoes continuously throughout the century. The problem with the church was precisely as Vincent has pointed out, namely that it was a place of worship and religious observance. When people indulged in luxury and ostentatious displays of dress, they not only transgressed the law as laid down by the local authority and made claims to a social position they might not have occupied, but they also ignored the so-called laws of God and religion. As is very evident also from especially the later clothing regulations, indulging in luxury incurred the wrath of God and sobriety in both dress and manners was what one was supposed to aim for.323

We remember from the previous chapter that already how one arrived and left the church was regulated – the carriages were to have no ornaments whatsoever and more than one horse in front of one carriage was considered too luxurious.324 According to the 1706 regulation, for a coat with colourful fixings, likewise for a Fontange with one or more colourful ribbons in order to go to the church with these, one had to pay 20 d sm. Additionally, maidservants and women of lower sorts (in German Weiber) were not allowed to appear in church with golden and silver real or fake decorations or with expensively lined coats.325 Arguably, the various limits and restrictions set in the clothing regulations applied to all kinds of public spaces but in all of these instances it is noteworthy that the church as a specific place is highlighted. Because of the above-mentioned duality of being both a public and a religious space with a guaranteed audience, the risk of both transgression and making false claims within the social hierarchy was doubled.

Moving on to the examination of non-religious public spaces, such as the guild houses and the town hall, there emerges a clear social hierarchy that represents the hierarchy present in the relations of its members. According to Ivar Leimus, the two potential places for meetings between the members of the Gemeinde were either the Town Hall square or the Great Guild itself. In the first instance guild aldermen and town council members met on the square in order to discuss any problematic issues and their potential solutions and/or the time and place for the next meeting. If further debate or consolidating the views of the town community was necessary, the representatives of all three guilds gathered in the Great Guild. Sometimes, for example when a dispute needed settling, representatives of the guild also went to the town hall, and every now and then the councillors also visited the Great Guild for other social purposes, for example to

323 EAA.1002.1.14, p. A2r, TLA.230.1 Bs7, p. 410r.
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325 TLA.230.1 Bs7, p. 411v. For a discussion of how women of different social status were termed in the regulations, see chapter 2.2.3 “Gender.”
celebrate Christmas or as honourary guests when a guildsman’s family member got married.\textsuperscript{326} On the other hand, it does not emerge from the sources that the aldermen of the Great Guild would have ever visited either of the artisan guilds and it is very unlikely that they did.\textsuperscript{327} The reason for this is that whereas the town hall square can be considered as a neutral space, the guild houses were ‘subjective’ in that they were associated with their members and their social standing. If a merchant had gone to an artisan guild it can be interpreted as lowering one’s social standing. Thus, social interaction in a physical space and between physical spaces by the way of their inhabitants was governed by a set of unwritten rules that maintained the social order.

Guido Ruggiero has suggested that there were many ways in which a Renaissance city was lived and read, and for different people it meant different things. For the upper classes, the city was a product of their wealth, power and imagination and was both consciously and unconsciously reincorporated in their values and culture. For the lower classes there were other readings and other consensus realities about the city’s identity and significance. Thus, as already pointed out in the beginning of this section, the modern understanding of public space and the basic distinction between public and private spaces does not work for Renaissance. What we would label today a public space, such as a town hall square, for example, “was for the upper and middling classes of the time at least more masculine and identity giving (in the sense of providing a sense of being a member of a civic community and the groups of that community) than public”.\textsuperscript{328} Therefore, the physical spaces one inhabited, just as the clothing one wore, also influenced and became a part of one’s identity.

In the previous two chapters gender and how it related to the creation of social hierarchy and costume in the early modern society have been discussed. Space within early modern urban community could similarly be gendered or non-gendered, albeit the lines are again at times difficult to draw. If we again take the example of a wedding, the wedding ceremony took place in the church, which was a gender-neutral space, as both men and women had access to it and were expected to inhabit this physical space on a regular basis. On the other hand, the wedding party that followed could be held either at one’s home or one of the guild houses, which meant that the exclusively male professional and social space temporarily turned into a space for both men and women. Lyndal Roper has argued that “Oscillating between single-sex celebrations and parties for men and women together, wedding festivities constantly created and reflected on sexual difference. So important was sexual definition that, according to an ordinance of 1571, male

\textsuperscript{326} Von Nottbeck and Neumann 1904, pp. 88-9.
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\textsuperscript{328} Ruggiero 2007, pp. 85-86.
bankrupts could be made to suffer the indignity of sitting among the womenfolk at weddings.”

This adds to our understanding the notion that the two genders were distinctly defined against each other when they occupied the same physical space, yet spatial arrangements were not static and could change depending on the social context.

Finally, home as the most private of spaces will be considered. In stark contrast to the public nature of the church and the street, there emerges a curious instance in the 1691 and 1696 regulations, where it is stated that night caps must be without any lace decorations whatsoever. Such intrusion into the private sphere is in stark contrast with the general tone of the regulations which mostly concern themselves with public displays of excessive clothing. One can but wonder why the councillors thought it necessary to regulate such a small and seemingly unimportant item that one would have only worn in the privacy of the home with a potential audience of two or three people. Such concern points to the argument that clothing was not only something external deployed in front of an audience to represent one’s social position, but it was indeed part and parcel of one’s identity and persona. That meant that not only was it important to maintain a so-called exterior appearance of a moral, rational, God-fearing human being but one was supposed to display these traits all the time, even in the privacy of one’s home. After all, God was omnipresent.

As already pointed out in the second chapter, based on sumptuary legislation in Tallinn such religiosity in regulating clothing and external appearances increased rather than decreased as the century progressed. In the German areas, on the other hand, it appears to have followed a reverse route, beginning with moral and religious considerations and moving to economic considerations. These increasingly religious overtones can be seen within the larger religious context of the seventeenth century. Firstly, Tallinn had remained autonomous in church matters until 1692, when the 1686 Swedish church law was enforced there and consequently the church and religious life became increasingly centralised. Secondly, even a century after the Reformation the local population in the Estonian countryside observed a mixture of folk belief, Catholicism and Protestantism and towards the end of the century Swedish authorities organised an extensive church visitation campaign in order to enforce the adoption of correct Protestant teachings. Consequently, the heightened religiosity of the period can be seen to reflect in official legislation.

---
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However, as already suggested earlier, the notion of public and private has been problematized as being a simplification with regards to early modern space. Guido Ruggiero, discussing a gathering of a male circle of friends in a private home in Renaissance Florence, instead lays great emphasis on how a space was used:

Hearth and table were transformed from domestic space to civic/masculine space by male use; and the tale makes this perfectly clear, briefly noting that the conversation turned on matters of the men’s crafts and professions. How space was used, then, could transform it profoundly, and here the gendered use of space breaks down the modern concept of public versus private space which seems in part to turn around the home and the domestic.334

Thus, the public and private spaces are transformed by how they are used by different genders, which underlines the previously discussed interaction between gender and space. Additionally, as revealed through the discussion of religion, a space was not just any one specific thing with a specific purpose. Even though a home was by and large a private space, it can also be seen as a religious space most of the time and could also be specifically masculine on some occasions or feminine on other occasions depending on how it was used.

4.3. Change and continuity during the seventeenth century

Based on the clothing regulations, this chapter has discussed the temporal and spatial aspects of social interaction in early modern Tallinn and it emerges that concerning the “when” and the “where”, the seventeenth century was one of continuity. Regulation was mainly thought to be necessary during various occasions that involved a significant audience and a complicated web of intrapersonal relationships. The primary example for such an event was the early modern wedding. The presence of an audience provided an excellent opportunity for the public manifestation of the social position one laid claim to, and its consequent presentation not only through one’s external appearance but also on certain public occasions, such as hosting a sumptuous wedding celebration or presenting expensive gifts at somebody else’s wedding. Finally, the discussion of an early modern wedding as a primary representative of a temporal setting subject to town council’s regulation has also revealed that the temporal and the spatial were indisputably connected to each other, as the temporal event needed a spatial context in order to take place.

When it comes to the discussion of the role spatiality played in early modern social interaction, it should be emphasised that the various labels often applied to make analytical distinctions are arbitrary and in some cases leave room for ambiguities. Following from the various ways early modern space can be analysed, the discussion has revealed that space was just not any one thing.

334 Ruggiero 2007, p. 90.
A religious space could at the same time be a public space, but religion could also permeate other spaces that were not primarily thought of as religious, such as one’s private home. It has also been suggested that the differentiation between public and private space is not very useful and we should instead focus on how early modern spaces were used and what kinds of identities were created in and through them. Finally, spatial arrangements were by no means static, as appears from the discussion of how a space was used and how this use could be gendered or non-gendered. For example, the use of a guild hall for a wedding when its everyday purpose was to be a professional and social point of connection for a limited group within the society, as well as its use by both genders when it was generally limited for male use demonstrates both the flexibility and the complexity of an early modern space with its multitude of purposes, uses and meanings.
5. Costume and control: summary

By analysing the clothing regulations issued by Tallinn town council during the seventeenth century, the present study has examined the early modern social order within an urban setting. The larger problem of how social order and sartorial practices interacted with each other was divided into three sub-questions to help stimulate a more layered understanding of early modern society. The first question focussed on how the town council imagined the social order in its ideal form, who they thought was or was not part of it, how they imagined and categorised people, groups and classes and how the social hierarchy consequently emerged. The second question then opened up the issue of how this complex social order was supposed to be manifested and become legible to all of its individual members. The third aspect of the study analysed the temporal and spatial arrangements of the visualisation of social order, especially paying attention to occasions when and physical spaces where the visualisation was problematic.

In answering these questions, the focus was first on how the social order was perceived in its ideal form by the town council. Even though consensus was emphasised in the regulations, in reality the town council tried to assert its eminence by setting itself at the top of the social hierarchy. By arguing that they were already free from the vices of immorality and vanity, the town councillors legitimised their claim for power. Had their office not bound them to dress accordingly, they would have clothed themselves in a modest habit. Since they were so moral and not blinded by luxury or selfish greed, they were suitable to adopt the role of a beneficial father and rule Tallinn because they could pass judgement on what was good and bad, what was moral and immoral and what was beneficial to the townspeople at large. In this way they justified the preservation of social order, including the visual display of this order as a matter of social responsibility for the community.

The study then went on to discuss the people who lived in Tallinn and how they were categorised by the town council. In the most obvious way, the inhabitants of Tallinn could be divided into the minority who had citizen rights and the vast majority who did not. In order to get a deeper understanding of how the town council thought of the people who lived in early modern Tallinn, four categories were employed for analytical purposes: status, ethnicity, age, gender. One of the main conclusions to be drawn here is that there are numerous points of intersection, which goes to show that the social order was more complex than what appears from the clothing regulations. More importantly, it might be surprising that in such a multi-ethnic environment as Tallinn, except for very few occasions no ethnonyms were mentioned in the regulations. I argued that for the contemporaries it would not have been a problem, as ethnicity worked implicitly through the other categories, such as one’s status. For example, a low-status
artisan was very likely to be of Estonian and a high-status merchant of German background. Based on the regulations, however, it does not emerge how the majority of the people were expected to dress when they were very clearly part of the town and were expected to adhere to the regulations yet had been completely left out of them.

To become legible and legitimate, the social order that was imagined by the town council had to be visualised explicitly. In order to answer the second question, I delved deeper into the regulations to uncover the specific items that were perceived as problematic and consequently regulated by the town council. Here my assumption was that items that were not included in the regulations were also not considered problematic. The various items were divided into four categories: clothing, accessories, fabrics and means of transportation. Fabrics and pieces of clothing are obviously very much connected to each other, but for analytical purposes they were kept apart, although points of intersection were acknowledged. It transpires that when costume is concerned, the regulations were not so much concerned with the cuts or colours of the individual items but rather with the quality of fabrics. Some fabrics, such as silk and velvet, were completely forbidden or only allowed to a very limited circle of people highest up in the social hierarchy or in very limited amounts. It emerges that the lower down one moves on the social scale, the worse the quality of the fabrics becomes. Consequently, social hierarchy ideally became visualised in the hierarchy of the fabrics.

To provide a counterpoint to the ideal of social order, an analysis of the punishments deemed appropriate for offenders was provided. At least four different kinds of punishments can be identified, additionally the unofficial social policing by other members of the community. Above all it transpires from the text that the punishments were often dependent of the offender’s position within the social order. For example, a range for a fine was often given so that even though those who were higher up in the social order were allowed more luxury, they also had to pay a higher fine than those lower down. On the other hand, the only instance where imprisonment as a direct method of punishment was mentioned was in the case of servants, which is in any case harsher than merely paying a fine. Finally, the ban of appearing in public places with the forbidden item of clothing should also be emphasised, as it underlines the public nature of the crime and the potential audience whose presence made it possible to make claims to a social position one in fact did not occupy.

The final question touched upon the temporal and spatial aspects of regulations in order to examine specific occasions and specific physical spaces that were considered problematic and consequently subject to regulation by the town council. No other occasion is taken up in the clothing regulations in such a detailed manner as marriages (it should also be mentioned that the constant concern with weddings during the whole early modern period is reflected in the
numerous wedding regulations that were also issued by the town council). The early modern wedding is the best representative of an occasion that involved social interaction and audience and thus opportunities for status manifestation through appearances but also presentation of gifts. At the same time it was infused with significant religious meaning. It is also an extremely good example of a point of intersection, as a wedding ceremony included both temporal and spatial arrangements, or in other words the “when” and the “where”. Generally, people were allowed to appear in better costume on their wedding days (and also other festive occasions), however, similar social hierarchy in fabrics that was discussed in the second part of the study, was also present here. Above all, marriage like other social occasions was subject to regulations because it was public, which meant that it provided an opportunity to make claims to a social position one did not in fact occupy through appearing in unsuitable clothing.

Finally, various physical spaces, which were perceived by the town council as being central for social interaction and thus were subject to regulation, were examined. Firstly, I argued against the prevalent notion of public and private space and suggested that there are alternative ways of analysing an early modern space, for example through the lens of religion, purpose or necessity. Additionally, just like a fabric meant different things within different contexts, so did a physical space. A guild hall was a masculine semi-private space, but when a wedding celebration took place, its context was transformed into that of a public festivity. Therefore, early modern space was not something static that could be labelled any one thing, but it could be a number of things at any time and could change depending on the social context or how it was used. The various limits and restrictions set by the town council applied to all kinds of spaces where an audience was likely to be present but church as a specific place was highlighted due to it being both a highly public and a highly religious space. Not only did excessive luxury incur the wrath of God, with a guaranteed audience, the risk of both transgression and making false claims within the social hierarchy was doubled.

During the early modern period, religion played a significant role both in the ideas about social order but also as a motivation behind sumptuary legislation. The religious importance of adhering to the clothing regulations appears from the invoking of clergymen who were ideally supposed to support the town council's work and preach against the immorality of excessive consumption. Furthermore, the idea of avoiding luxury for moral and above all religious reasons was grounded on the reasoning that any misery that befell a community, such as economic decline, war, disease and famine were all a consequence of God’s anger. Thus, anyone who violated secular laws also set themselves above God and the God-given social order. I also pointed out that unlike in many other European countries, the religious importance for avoiding luxury and overconsumption increased rather than decreased during the course of the seventeenth century, however, this
appears to not have been connected with the maintenance of the social order, as the elaborate hierarchy that emerged by 1665 had been discarded in the regulations by 1690.

The final issue that should be discussed is that of gender and gender concerns in early modern society. Based on male costume and accessories, it is possible to conclude that even though concerns about femininity and masculinity were undoubtedly present in the discussions about external appearances, what constituted “masculine” and “feminine” differed markedly from our understanding nowadays. For example, colourful fabrics, numerous accessories and jewellery were by no means considered exclusively female but were an integral part of male costume. The study also explored the creation of a collective identity through regulating foreign influences on female dress. It was argued that even though foreignness manifested itself externally through unrecognisable appearances, this concern was not there with regards to male costume. It was perceived that foreign costume would take one’s heart and the only way to maintain a healthy body politic within the community was to keep to the local traditions. Rather than automatically banning everything of foreign origin, however, the regulations made rather generous allowances to those whose costume was strictly not local. Instead of being straightforward assimilation, it was a process of exchange, whereby foreign fashions influenced, were taken over by and adapted to the local sartorial culture. As a final point I argued against the prevalent assumption that women were seen as the big spenders and the sumptuary legislation was there simply to regulate female dress and consumption. Instead, male costume was targeted in roughly the same amount and the later regulations lost the gender distinction altogether.

In conclusion, by looking at issues of categorisation the present study has attempted to enhance the current understanding of how ideas about social order and external appearances interacted with each other in an urban environment. This was done by looking at clothing regulations, which are instrumental to looking at ideas and concerns about early modern social order. Sumptuary laws in general and clothing regulations in particular tell us about official attitudes in areas that touched upon people’s everyday lives and experiences – how one dressed, how one went to the church, how one got married, how one was buried. The importance of studying early modern sartorial practices has been noted elsewhere. Daniel Roche suggests that “the logic of clothing offers a way of understanding and a means of studying the social transformations taking place within urban melting-pots [. . .] the history of material culture and the history of social behaviour are directly linked.”335 Thus, a study of sumptuary legislation is also a study of the social culture of early modernity.

335 Roche 1996, p. 4.
5.1. Questions for future research

The present study has looked at how the social order was perceived by the town council during the seventeenth century. However, the source base for this study has been limited to sumptuary legislation. There are other kinds of written sources emanating from the town council that would complement the study of how social order was imagined and created within the early modern society and address the issues of social imaginary vs. social reality, but these have been consciously left out of the present enquiry. Before a clothing regulation was issued, it was very likely debated at the town council meetings and noted down in the council meeting minutes (or at least a reference to it being discussed). Looking into the council minutes would thus provide an insight into the minds of the councillors and help to establish the social context and relevant arguments for sumptuary legislation, that is to say why they argued for the social order they argued for.

Secondly, except for a very few instances, this study is a history from the official perspective and has not dealt with questions such as how the townspeople themselves perceived the social order and their respective positions within it. Judicial material such as court cases provide a counterpoint to the official social ideal as they shed light on instances where normality had been disrupted and the town council’s regulations disputed or ignored. Of course, not all such cases reached the court and therefore any generalisations about popular responses have to be carefully substantiated. Finally, guild archives would provide complementary material about the interaction between the town council and the guild members who formed the town community or Gemeinde and were an integral part of governance processes. As the guilds regulated the behaviour and clothing of their members, it would be interesting to see how social hierarchy functioned at the micro-level and what kinds of issues concerning appearances were addressed within the corporations. Ultimately then, examining such tensions between the imagined social order and the reality would contribute greatly to a more nuanced understanding of how an early modern society functioned.

336 Gierlich 1991, p. 293. The 1631 regulation, for example, was a result of a decade of discussions in the council and at least two instances in 1622 and 1627 have been recorded in the council minutes.
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Appendices

Image 3: engraving from A. Olearius' travel writing depicting three women and a maidservant with Tallinn in the background. Olearius 1647, pp. 88-89.