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Dress Matters
Clothes and Social Order in Tallinn, 1600–1700
This dissertation explores the relationship of clothes and social order in early modern Europe. The period has often been characterised as inert and immobile, with especially middling and poorer people living in a sartorially drab world, but a number of historians have demonstrated that it was also a period of profound material change, with consumer demand, democratisation of fashion and global trade engendering cosmopolitan sensibilities earlier than thought. Based on an examination of seventeenth-century Tallinn, I analyse how social order influenced sartorial expression and how clothes shaped order through affirmation, negotiation and subversion. The interaction between clothes and social order was complex, with both elements acting as moving parts within the ideal. While on the normative level, clothes were thought to have the primary function of visualising order, on the everyday level clothes could often obscure order and complicate the desired visualisation. Through the circulation of clothing as fungible items and as mediators of intricate emotions and social relations, much of clothes’ complexity in the seventeenth century stemmed from their resistance to being anchored to a single function, whether manifesting status, demonstrating appreciation or helping poor people survive. The results arrived at have two key implications. Firstly, Tallinn, while undeniably an unequal and hierarchical society, was hardly static. The inherent dynamism suggests that social order, rather than being considered as an independent structure, should be viewed as negotiable and requiring the participation of people, space and materiality. Secondly, the study problematises the chronology that has a modern consumer society gradually replacing the ancien régime of fashion. Rather than an uncomplicated narrative of progress, I argue that aspects of both systems co-existed in parallel within a society that did not necessarily demonstrate any of the other tendencies assumed by proponents of ‘consumer revolution’.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D kmt</td>
<td>Daler kopparmynt/Thaler kupfermünz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D smt</td>
<td>Daler silvermynt/Thaler silvemünz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rst</td>
<td>runstycke/rundstück</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rtl</td>
<td>Riksdaler/Reichsthaler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Tlr</td>
<td>Daler/Thaler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrst</td>
<td>vitt runstycke/weiss rundstück</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This dissertation is concerned with clothes. Dress, understood in the broadest sense as bodily adornment, has been important in every society and every social group. In the seventeenth century, individual sartorial choices could have an impact on aspects of life that today we would find surprising. A pamphlet translated from German to Swedish lamented in 1690 that women in high French head-dresses called *fontange* and low-cut gowns promoted vanity and lust in married men and lowered the morals of the nation. Such attire was also un-Christian.\(^1\)

While issues concerning the morality of dress are universal, other commentators also pointed out that fashionable excesses were economically ruinous and linked them to various social upheavals like war, plague and, not least, a sequence of ‘monstrous births’.\(^2\) Wearing certain clothes could thus have moral, religious, social, familial, reproductive and economic implications not just on an individual but on a national level.

Historians have shown that elsewhere in Europe, other commentators voiced similar concerns about the possible negative impact of certain attire.\(^3\) Even peripheral areas of Europe were affected by what were considered by many to be pernicious fashions such as the *fontange*. In Tallinn, the sumptuary law issued in 1691 painted a gloomy picture of the ruin of the citizenry as a result of sartorial excesses and female pride.\(^4\) Even worse, maidservants were dressing like their mistresses. The law then forbade excessive toupees and hairpieces made with expensive gold and silver bands, feathers or other trimmings.\(^5\) Fifteen years later, the term *Fontangie* officially entered sumptuary legislation, which declared the impossibility of keeping up with changes in fashion and announced that anyone who paid an annual fine for a variety of garments, including the above-mentioned *Fontangie*, could continue to wear them. A fine of twenty D smt was attached to

---

\(^1\) Gottlieb 1690, p. 81. The Swedish translation was made by Nicolaus Bergius, a Swedish pastor, see Möller 2014, p. 80. De Marly has argued that *fontange* was not the entire headdress but rather the topmost bow in the arrangement. On the complexities of late seventeenth-century women’s headdress see Marly 1975, pp. 61–69.

\(^2\) Seth 1716.


\(^4\) In the seventeenth century, Tallinn was called Reval in German and Swedish. I am going to refer to the town as Tallinn throughout this dissertation.

\(^5\) 1691 clothing regulation, Pabst 1857, p. 239.
excessive head-dresses with any of the above-mentioned decorations. Some scholars have already observed that new styles did not simply spread in an uncomplicated manner from the European fashion centres to peripheral areas in the early modern period. Indeed, the examples above show us that innovation and change in fashions was not the prerogative only of large urban centres.

In early modern Tallinn, a corporatist town by the Baltic Sea, there was acute awareness of the impact clothes and sartorial change had not just on the people but on the community at large. Tallinn, albeit not a metropolis in the Western European sense, was a sizable town of about 7,000 to 9,000 people some distance away from the urban centres of Western Europe. Situated on the borderland between East and West, it had long-established trade relations in both directions and boasted a notably multi-ethnic population that included Germans, Swedes, Finns, Russians, local people and many others. In a place like Tallinn, with a theoretically well-pronounced social hierarchy, distinctions based on appearance were of fundamental relevance. The questions to be asked here is to what extent the social hierarchy in Tallinn was stable and unchanging and whether and to what extent it was influenced by processes taking place elsewhere in Europe. This dissertation will show that corporatist societies like Tallinn were exciting and dynamic, with intersecting hierarchies and conflicting notions of order, allowing opportunity for both horizontal and vertical mobility. But what was the exact relationship between clothes and social order in early modern Tallinn?

---

8 Curiously, the seventeenth century in Estonia appears to have fallen entirely between the cracks with respect to the study of clothes. The medieval period has recently yielded very interesting historical and archaeological research concerning clothes, see for example Koch-Maasing 2013; Rammo 2015. For a good overview article on clothing in Estonia between fourteenth and sixteenth centuries see Pölsam 2002, pp. 22–43. Research on Estonian clothing culture in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been rather limited. In the nineteenth century, sumptuary laws appear to have been of most interest, see Hansen 1894; Päabst 1857, pp. 197–241; Stieda 1887, pp. 78–88. For my own article on seventeenth-century sumptuary laws see Pajur 2017, pp. 21–38. There are also some older bachelor theses that deal with the issue of early modern clothing, but the hard copies are generally difficult to locate, see for example Kukke 1992; Päkk 1987; Turba 1989. Estonian folk dress from the eighteenth century onwards has mostly been examined from an ethno-graphic perspective, see for example Manninen 1927. Despite the increasing availability of visual source material, clothing in eighteenth-century Tallinn has mostly been examined on the basis of inventories, see Russak 2007, pp. 45–117. Although emphasis is on wealthier burghers, on clothing in eighteenth-century Tallinn, see also Pullat 2016, pp. 169–193.
1.1 Delimitations of the study

1.1.1 Why clothes?

Clothing is a unique example of material culture especially suited to the study of past human experience. Clothes are not exclusively prestige and luxury objects – even the poorest members of society have clothes.9 Clothes cover our nakedness, hiding, accentuating and modifying certain parts of the body. Thus, they form a material boundary between ourselves and the external world and we share a special, intimate relationship with them. Further, according to John Styles, of all the material things people possess, their clothes are most consistently on display.10 Worn for the better part of our lives both at home and in public settings, clothes make visual statements about their wearers in a way that other material possessions, like furniture or books or dishes, do not. Ultimately, both in past societies and current ones, clothes and appearances have also been subject to control in a variety of ways, and from these efforts we can learn something about society’s ideas about how people and their clothes were and are supposed to relate to each other.

We already know a considerable amount about clothing in early modern societies. Scholars have analysed a wide variety of written sources (diaries, letters, account books, wills and inventories but also plays and poems), visual sources (portraits, prints, fashion magazines, tailoring books) and extant garments, both separately and in combination with other sources. We know a great deal about the contents of early modern wardrobes, and how clothes were constructed and worn in the early modern period.11 Scholarship on fashion and the dissemination of new styles has also been the focus of several works, problematising the idea that fashion trickled down from the elites to the common sorts of people and from Western Europe outwards towards the periphery.12 There is also research detailing how gender has been constructed and expressed through clothes and appearances and how this has changed from period to period.13 More recently, dress has also been considered in the global context, showing that fashion was

9 Marie Ulväng 2012, p. 12.
10 Styles 2017, p. 34.
11 Though older, the overview works of Riitta Pylkkänen and Jutta Zander-Seidel still retain their relevance as good overview works, see Pylkkänen 1970 and Zander-Seidel 1990. On the construction of garments, see for example the Patterns of Fashion book series started by Janet Arnold that includes drawings, descriptions and patterns based on extant garments. For seventeenth-century Germany, see also Pietsch et al. (eds.) 2008, which includes photos, textile analyses and tailoring techniques. On seventeenth-century Sweden, see for example Aneer 2009; Eva I. Andersson 2017, pp. 171–189.
12 For a recent contribution, see Welch (ed.) 2017. On the Scandinavian context, see for example Engelhardt-Mathiassen et al. (eds.) 2014.
not a uniquely Western phenomenon and demonstrating the dependency of Europe on global connections in order to create its own fashionable look.\textsuperscript{14} Finally, clothing and appearances have also been examined as a cultural phenomenon that shaped societal formation in the early modern period.\textsuperscript{15}

However, while this scholarship offers us valuable insights into the sartorial lives of early modern people, we still do not know enough about exactly how clothes were made, acquired, exchanged and valued in everyday life during the early modern period.\textsuperscript{16} Above all, this is the case for clothing of the lower strata of society, understood to be ordinary and mundane rather than spectacular and glamorous. While we know a great deal about novel goods and new consumption practices, practices that were less visible, required less reflection, and communicated fewer social messages have been neglected. This is understandable, because source material is biased towards the upper and middling strata of the society for which such remarkable goods were more available. Additionally, the garments of ordinary people were often made of non- or semi-durable fabrics, meaning that the garments themselves seldom survive.\textsuperscript{17}

Seen in this light, the limited yet steadily growing scholarship on the clothes of middling and poor people is even more valuable. Scholars including Beverly Lemire, Margaret Spufford, Susan Mee, and John Styles, among others, have analysed a wide variety of written sources in order to shed light on the clothing resources and strategies of non-elites, their participation in commercial exchanges, and various social circumstances that conditioned their consumption.\textsuperscript{18} Instead of confirming the simplistic Veblenian emulation thesis, according to which the primary consumption goal of middling and lower classes was to emulate the rich in order to gain social status, Styles demonstrates that in the eighteenth century, dressing was a crucial resource to lower-class people helping them to find work and a suitable marriage partner.\textsuperscript{19} At the same time, clothing continued to be an important economic resource and a disposable asset that could be converted into money. Concerning the ‘involuntary consumption’ of servants and poor people, he concludes that people employed different strategies, with some identifying with and embracing the livery of their wealthy master or the badge of the deserving poor while others chose to avoid these options.\textsuperscript{20} He thus demonstrates that the clothing choices and strategies of poorer people could be as individual, varied, and complex as those of their social superiors.

\textsuperscript{14} Belfanti 2008; Lemire 2016b; Lemire 2018; Lemire & Riello, pp. 887–916; Lemire & Riello 2019; Schäfer et al. (eds.) 2018.
\textsuperscript{15} Jones & Stallybrass 2000; Richardson 2004; Rublack 2010; Vincent 2002; Vincent 2003.
\textsuperscript{16} O’Malley & Welch (eds.) 2007, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{17} Rublack 2013, p. 42.
\textsuperscript{19} On emulation, see Veblen 1912[1899], p. 104.
\textsuperscript{20} Styles 2007, pp. 247–301.
Clothes in the early modern period are an exciting object of study because early modern society was pervaded by ideas about hierarchy and order. Clothes were central to hierarchy because the early modern social order was a visual order: it needed to be enacted and performed. In a society ‘where one needed to read and be read’, as Daniel Roche has aptly phrased 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.’ Social difference was thus ideally manifested through clothes, and the emerging hierarchical order was supposed to be legible to everyone. Confusion in appearances, as we saw earlier, was threatening, because an order that relied so heavily on visuality could easily become disorder. That clothes had both the capacity to order people and affirm their place and at the same time obscure people’s position and so disrupt this order preoccupied early modern authorities all over Europe.

Scholars have shown that in the early modern period clothes and textiles were also an important economic resource for people from the poorest to the richest. Serving as an alternative currency that could be used in more or less formal commercial networks, clothing played a crucial role in the day-to-day survival of many people. The mechanisms that facilitated the exchange of and trade in clothes included auctions, pawnshops, theft, peddling, payment and so forth. However, people’s economic opportunity and participation in exchange networks were influenced by ethnicity, gender, social and marital status, age, political power and influence within the guild system. While wealthy merchants and guild members could enjoy access to well-regulated market mechanisms and networks, unmarried women, people of low social status, ethnic minorities and those on the margins of society had very limited access to these types of markets and instead had to rely on informal and unregulated networks, often made up of family members, friends and acquaintances. Such networks could be crucial in overcoming temporary hardship. Those who were less fortunate, either because they lacked family and friends or had not cultivated a creditworthy persona, were forced to find alternative, often illegal, ways to survive. Clothes, whether pawned, stolen or sold formed an important link in people’s strategies of survival.

Clothes were central to second-hand trade for various reasons. Clothing was widely available, as everyone owned at least some clothes. Despite the increasing availability of cheaper clothing and fabrics, textile goods nevertheless retained their use value over long periods of time and people continued to invest in them so that they could later exchange them for other goods and services or cash on

---

21 On this, see for example Alm 2016, pp. 42–62.
22 Roche 1994, p. 443.
24 Allerston 1999, p. 46.
25 Stabel 2003, p. 58.
26 Fontaine 2014.
the extensive second-hand market. Through the early modern period and into
the nineteenth century, clothing and textiles made up a significant part of house-
hold expenditure, and second-hand acquisition was thus an attractive way of ac-
quiring necessary things for the household. The second-hand clothing market
distributed an expensive commodity – cloth – within society and enabled those
who otherwise might have been unable to do so to acquire relatively costly gar-
ments for a smaller cost. Significantly, everyone participating in the second-
hand markets could readily evaluate clothes and textiles, as there was widespread
knowledge about fabrics and fashion styles. People from all social backgrounds,
as this dissertation will demonstrate, were knowledgeable about how much vari-
ous textiles and goods were worth in relation to each other, and not only what
their ‘real’ money value was, thus making the operation of commercial networks
possible.

A third way in which clothes have been shown to have structured people’s
daily existence was through shaping their social and emotional lives. The material
privation that characterised many early modern households meant that clothes
were treasured as gifts and bequests and indicated ‘the emotional quality of con-
nections to particular relatives and friends’. Gift-giving was an important part
of the ancien régime economy. As well as being practical for the reasons indicated
above, a garment symbolised affection and esteem as well as the obligation and
commitment that the donor had demonstrated towards the recipient. Bequests
of clothes became the material carriers of emotions and social investments that
the testator had made, but they also served as reminders of the deceased that
endured beyond the grave; clothes could have a strong commemorative ele-
ment. Objects thus structured how people felt and thought about their network
of relations, and what kind of importance they attached to each particular person.
Clothes as gifts and bequests could also affirm individual identity and communal
belonging.

This brief overview of scholarship on early modern clothing shows that
clothes were flexible and dynamic, even controversial, and shaped people’s lives
in a variety of different ways. However, it is also immediately visible that the
scholarship leans heavily towards Western Europe and large commercial centres

27 Beverly Lemire for example has demonstrated that clothing and textile goods made up the vast
majority of all pawned items in England between the seventeenth and early nineteenth centuries,
see Lemire 2005, ch. 4.
28 Lemire 2012, p. 146. It has been shown previously that in Sweden for example many groups of
people depended on second-hand goods well into the nineteenth century, see Göran Ulväng et al.
29 Allerston 1999, p. 46.
31 For a discussion of various early modern value systems see for example Crowston 2013, p. 55.
34 Lambert 2014, p. 49.
like England (especially London), France and the Netherlands. Scholars have previously shown Britain’s central role in the Industrial Revolution and earlier, in the so-called consumer revolution, which brought with it expanding markets and greater choice in ready consumer goods for an increasing number of people. Compared to that, we know less about the middling and poorer sorts of people who did not live in the commercial centres of Europe and did not enjoy the same proximity to this material wealth. Therefore, it is crucial to investigate the material lives of early modern people in peripheral parts of Europe to see if and to what extent people in the borderlands experienced similar or different developments.

1.1.2 The consumer revolution and its critics

In a pioneering collection of articles on consumption from 1982, Neil McKendrick claimed that ideas about social emulation, increasing disposable incomes and the increasing availability of inexpensive goods sparked a ‘consumer revolution’ in eighteenth-century England. McKendrick and other authors in the volume argued that in the eighteenth century, Great Britain and England in particular experienced a radical commercial transformation. The number of goods bought on the market increased dramatically, as did the number of people who belonged to the middling groups of society. These people also developed taste, or a particular attitude towards consuming certain kinds of goods. These processes resulted in the creation of a mass market for a broad variety of consumer goods and the emergence of modern consumer patterns based on desire and pleasure rather than need.

The idea of a ‘consumer revolution’ has received its fair share of criticism. Firstly, it is teleological. It emphasises modern-seeming consumption patterns at the expense of the multi-faceted and often contradictory consumption practices of the past. Instead of examining these practices on their own terms, in this Western-centric narrative, the birth of a modern consumer society in England is traced back to somewhere in the eighteenth century, when its society supposedly transformed from need to desire. Secondly, focus on concepts such as ‘consumption’, ‘consumer’ and ‘consumer behaviour’ runs the risk of ignoring the multitude of other ways in which humans interact with the material world. Rather than looking at the complex ways in which things were acquired, exchanged, used, passed on and discarded, there has been a bias towards shopping and the purchase of new goods. But very few people bought new things and as already mentioned above, the alternative ways in which clothes circulated played a much

---

37 For consumer revolution see especially the two edited volumes Brewer & Porter (eds.) 1993; McKendrick et al. (eds.) 1982.
38 McKendrick 1982, pp. 9–33.
39 McKendrick et al. (eds.) 1982.
40 Trentmann 2004, p. 376.
41 Trentmann 2009, p. 286.
more prominent role. Things could also be gifted, borrowed, made oneself. Thirdly, consumer revolution does not take into account economic activities in a society that was only partially money-based; where income was seldom purely monetary; where women’s work was often unpaid; and where the money value of goods – to the extent that they could be valued in money terms – was highly dependent upon social context and often open to negotiation.\footnote{Crowston 2013, pp. 2–3.} Consumption is thus a much broader phenomenon than simply shopping and the term might not accurately describe the full range of practices, mindsets, strategies and institutions in and through which people interacted with things in the early modern period.

A final point in the criticism of the term is that the consumer revolution starts too late. It has been shown that the consumer revolution was less a revolution and more a slow-moving process that started long before the middle of the eighteenth century and was less western than some might want to believe. Global trade was apparent already in the sixteenth century and earlier in Asia, and there is evidence that individual strategies and improvisation led to sartorial diversification and commodified appearances.\footnote{Rublack 2010, pp. 259–285.} Furthermore, the idea of fashion as a distinctly Western phenomenon has also been criticised, since non-Western societies have in fact displayed similar changes in their clothing cultures.\footnote{On fashion as a Western phenomenon, see for example Belfanti 2008, pp. 419–433; Braudel 1985, pp. 312–321; Francks 2015, pp. 331–361; Rublack 2010, pp. 3–4, 280–282. On the distinction between fashion and dress/costume see also Roche 1994, pp. 44–66; Roche 2000, pp. 193–196.} As Ulinka Rublack has observed, the ‘birth of modern civilisation’ cannot focus on the exceptional role of Europe, since Europe was not the only or even the most important centre of cultural and material change during that period.\footnote{Rublack 2010, pp. 3–4.} Beverly Lemire and Giorgio Riello have for example demonstrated the central role of Asia in propelling the fundamental changes in the European fashion system, initially through silks and later through printed cotton textiles.\footnote{Lemire & Riello 2008, pp. 889, 907.} What was happening in Tallinn in the seventeenth century is worth knowing about because it will question the narrative of an uncomplicated spread of change and innovation in clothing from the centre to the periphery. Secondly, it will help re-evaluate whether Western European developments were really unique to Western Europe.

To sum up, while the literature that sprang from the ideas of consumer revolution has vastly increased our knowledge of the material environment of the past, it is not without its problems. The search for innovation and modernity has privileged activities and practices that appear modern to us, ignoring those that appear traditional. The claim that people only learned to consume in the eighteenth century, coupled with a lack of knowledge about the clothes of the vast majority of the people below the social elite has led to sweeping statements such as that before the eighteenth century people lived in a ‘drab sartorial world’ (Jan
de Vries) and that after 1700 a ‘rather grim, hierarchic society gave way to a more colourful, shimmering universe’ (Daniel Roche).\(^{47}\) Seventeenth-century Tallinn, in a sense, is a least-likely case, so by focusing on the century that preceded the allegedly monumental changes and on a place with a pronounced social hierarchy it is possible to see whether the change really was as abrupt as de Vries and Roche claim or whether the seeds of this new colourful and shimmering sartorial world had already been planted in the seventeenth century.

1.2 Analytical concepts

1.2.1 Clothes as material culture

Material culture studies were initiated and shaped by the fields of anthropology and archaeology, which is unsurprising considering the centrality of artefacts to these fields.\(^{48}\) Somewhat later, material culture studies also became an established part of historical inquiries and now the study of material culture is widely accepted as crucial to understanding people’s lives and experiences in the past.\(^{49}\) While there has been a move away from a Eurocentric perspective, the overwhelming majority of studies still focus on Western Europe, above all eighteenth-century Great Britain. Partly this has to do with the special role attributed to Britain in the birth of the ‘modern consumer society’ mentioned earlier, which has resulted in myriad works about consumer habits, commercial goods, luxuries and collectibles.\(^{50}\) A further contributing factor is the availability and richness of the source material.\(^{51}\) However, these very successful studies on shopping, taste and aesthetics, as well as on gender and identity, have had a problematic side effect, namely that the concept of ‘material culture’ has crystallised into an area of research where the sources, questions and results are taken for granted. Scholars have ‘analysed more groups and more objects in more places and times, but the research agenda has remained remarkably unchanging’.\(^{52}\)

Another problem is that many studies of early modern material culture have used the terms ‘consumption’ and ‘material culture’ interchangeably without engaging critically with the terminology. A narrow focus on consumption as the


\(^{48}\) Tilley et al. (eds.) 2006, p. 3.

\(^{49}\) To name just a few recent contributions to early modern material culture, see Ago 2013; Findlen (ed.) 2013; Gerritsen & Riello (eds.) 2014; Richardson et al. (eds.) 2017; Schmidt-Funke (ed.) 2019. The increased interest in the study of material culture has also resulted in useful guidebooks, which focus explicitly on how material cultures of the past can be studied, see for example Forssberg & Sennefelt (eds.) 2014; Harvey (ed.) 2009.

\(^{50}\) Findlen (ed.) 2013, pp. 11–12.


purchase of new things has already been mentioned as a potential problem, since it tends to be biased towards modern assumptions of what consumption is. Furthermore, many early modern historians have drawn too heavily on the idea of ‘conspicuous consumption’ as an instrument of social power.\textsuperscript{53} In their view, consumption of certain kinds of status goods, including clothes, produced social rank and reproduced social inequality.\textsuperscript{54} The problem is the focus on more unusual, spectacular and extraordinary objects at the expense of goods that nowadays are understood to be ordinary and non- or semi-durable.\textsuperscript{55} The vast majority of early modern objects, including clothes, that surrounded people on a daily basis did not belong to this ‘spectacular’ category. The emphasis on exceptional things, moreover, runs the risk of creating a static and relatively undifferentiated picture of Renaissance society.\textsuperscript{56}

Because this dissertation proceeds from clothes rather than people or practices, I have chosen to use the term ‘material culture’ instead of ‘consumption’, because the latter term, in my opinion, emphasises human action and the idea that things are necessarily acted upon. Previously, material culture has been defined and understood as ‘the things with which people interacted, the spaces in which they did so, the social relationships which cluster around their associations – between producers, vendors and consumers of various kinds – and the way knowledge travels around those circuits of connection’.\textsuperscript{57} The materiality of the objects is further connected to more abstract ideas, as in their engagement with the material world humans are involved in different physical and mental activities, social relations and institutions.\textsuperscript{58} Material culture thus involves a wider variety of mind-sets, ideas, strategies, practices, people, and institutions than consumption does.

For the purposes of this dissertation, the most important aspect of material culture is that, in the human-object interaction, objects are not passive. As Daniel Miller has observed, things are not simply constituted by people; they cannot be reduced to a role where they merely represent people or some aspect of society. People and things mutually constitute each other, and they are dependent on each other. This reciprocal relationship is moreover not free of conflict; on the contrary, at the same time as materiality allows and enables humans certain actions and possibilities, it also coerces and limits their space for manoeuvre.\textsuperscript{59} In such

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{53} Trentmann (ed.) 2012, p. 9.
\item \textsuperscript{54} Trentmann 2009, p. 288.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Rublack 2013, p. 42.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Cohn 2011, p. 998.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Richardson et al. (eds.) 2017, p. 4.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Trentmann (ed.) 2012, p. 3. In a similar manner, Daniel Miller argues that ‘materiality’ cannot be limited to objects because the definition breaks down when we consider the ‘large compass of materiality, the ephemeral, the imaginary, the biological, and the theoretical’, all of which is in fact external to the object itself, see Miller 2005, p. 4.
\item \textsuperscript{59} Miller 2010, pp. 5, 12–13, 50, 80. Some scholars have also employed the somewhat controversial term ‘agency’ in the discussion of human-object interaction. The controversy stems from the fact that for many people agency appears to be intimately connected to reason and intention. If this is the case, so the argument goes, it can only be exclusive to human beings, see for example Giddens
analyses, order and power are not structures used to explain other social phenomena but rather they are created, maintained and undermined through the interaction of people and things and become something that has to be explained.

If objects are not simply containers of meaning ascribed to them externally by human action then it makes sense to make them the centre of analysis. This has some important implications. By studying the material characteristics of social phenomena it is possible to see how materiality enables or conditions human action. Clothes and their materiality thus become a lens through which to examine the people, ideas and practices, all of which were an essential part in creating social order in seventeenth-century Tallinn. Additionally, the sharp divisions between surface and interior and meaning and expression are not taken for granted. Finally, when we think with clothes instead of thinking about clothes, they become analytical as much as empirical objects. Through examining concretely the materiality of clothes in the seventeenth century, it is possible to make visible on a more abstract level how on the one hand things were influenced and controlled by ideas of order and on the other hand how they participated in the shaping of order at the crossroads with people and society.

1.2.2 Social order

Early modern European society was characterised by overt inequality, hierarchy and subordination. Where people found themselves in the hierarchy depended on numerous factors, including gender, wealth, occupation, age, marital status, ethnicity, access to political power and institutions, and so forth. Some hierarchies, such as the guild systems found in many places in Europe, were institutionalised and thus governed by laws, while others were more informal and based on traditions and unwritten rules. The order that emerged, however, was thoroughly hierarchical.

Two well-known examples from early modern Sweden, which in the seventeenth century included Estonia, make it evident that there existed concurrent intersecting systems of organising the society hierarchically. In the Society of Estates people were divided into noble, clerical, burgher and peasant estates. The primary function of this categorisation of people was political representation in the Swedish parliament. Each estate had its own function, duties and privileges,
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& Pierson 1998, p. 88. To distinguish the ways in which objects influence people, an alternative argument has been made for ‘material agency’, where agency is not a property but rather a ‘tension of mediated activity’ that emerges from the process of human-material engagement, see Malafouris 2008, pp. 33–34. In his reconciliatory attempt, Bruno Latour has emphasised that agency should be seen as a whole range of ‘metaphysical shades between full causality and sheer existence’. ‘In addition to “determining” and “serving as a backdrop for human action,”’ he suggests, ‘things might authorize, allow, afford, encourage, permit, suggest, influence, block, render possible, forbid, and so on,’ Latour 2005, p. 72.

60 For a good overview of the concept of orders and class in early modern Europe see Bush (ed.) 1992. For a bottom-up analysis of early modern relationships of power between different dominant and subordinate groups see Braddick & Walter (eds.) 2001.
but everyone supposedly worked for the common good and a harmonious society.\textsuperscript{61} It is important to stress that this kind of division did not necessarily reflect reality, because many people were left outside the society of estates.\textsuperscript{62} Additionally, since it was primarily a political way of categorising people, it might not offer an accurate reflection of the socioeconomic hierarchies. An alternative way of conceptualising order in early modern Sweden is according to Luther’s schema of three estates – the political estate (government), the economic estate (household) and the spiritual estate (church). These were patriarchal systems: each estate had its own (usually male) ruler and subordinates. Unlike in the political estate system, each person was a part of more than one of Luther’s estates, as most people were expected to obey the head of the household, the priest of their local congregation, and the king. These hierarchical relationships within each estate structured human life under God’s authority.

Such conceptions were by no means unique to Sweden. The division of society into three estates ‘became the dominant normative model throughout Europe [. . .] and was used and debated until the end of ancien régime, when its legitimacy as a guiding principle for conveying privileges and political power was successfully questioned.’\textsuperscript{63} But as the two Swedish examples will indicate, there were differing notions of inequality and hierarchy that ordered people in different social contexts. As often as it divided groups, difference could also be created within groups of people. How society was ordered was thus by no means straightforward. As Peter Burke pointed out some time ago, the image that we have of a well-ordered society of separate estates should not be made to seem clearer in the minds of contemporaries than it actually was.\textsuperscript{64} Hierarchy and inequality are undoubtedly important for discussing and conceptualising early modern Europe, but we should not assume that all relationships reflected and reproduced a hierarchical social structure. The early modern social order was not one singular system, nor was it static.

We saw above that clothes were central in articulations of social order, because early modern order by its nature was visual. The discursive ideal of social legibility, in which everyone’s rank could be read from their external appearance and inserted neatly into a hierarchical social order, was one way of ordering society but it was surely not the only way. If we see the legible social order as the only ‘form of visibility’, the material culture of clothing becomes a form of expression that represents an already existing social order, which comes into existence elsewhere and by other means.\textsuperscript{65} Not only does this reduce the scope of individual

\textsuperscript{61} Stadin 2004, pp. 21–23.
\textsuperscript{62} This group was called ofrälse ståndspersoner and consisted of people like military officials, doctors, pharmacists, accountants and ironmasters. Considered to be of relatively high social standing in the eighteenth century, they nevertheless lacked representation in the two higher estates (nobility and clergy). For a classic work on the Swedish estate society see Carlsson 1973.
\textsuperscript{63} Gestrich 2015, p. 297.
\textsuperscript{64} Burke 1992, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{65} Sennefelt 2015, p. 180.
agency, it also ‘obscures the generative possibilities of perception and cognition, as well as the ordering capacities of the practices of looking’. A person might have displayed and meant any number of things with their appearance but we do not know if onlookers understood and interpreted that appearance in the way it had been intended. For this reason, the material culture of clothes in the early modern period cannot be viewed strictly as a manifestation of status. An examination of clothes not only shows us how appearances were connected to social order and how social rank was visualised, but also what the nature of early modern order was and how it was contested and undermined at every turn.

This dissertation will consider early modern Tallinn as a society where inequality and hierarchies were a part of people’s daily lives. But the creation of difference through appearances was not an uncomplicated process that resulted in a stable social structure where everyone did what the laws stipulated. Instead, the actions and strategies of different groups of people within this system were complex and versatile and did not necessarily follow normative boundaries, especially because the boundaries themselves could be flexible and negotiated based on the social context and a variety of different categorising criteria. Following from this understanding, clothing in the seventeenth century did not just manifest and represent a uniform and unchanging social order. Instead, clothing becomes a lens through which the creation, negotiation and undermining of social difference will be examined. Focus will thus not only be on how clothes were thought to reflect the social order but also how they actively shaped it.

1.3 Design of the study

The aim of this dissertation is to study the relationship between clothes and social order in early modern Europe. Moving away from the idea of clothes as representing and visualising a stable social structure in a hierarchical society, I will instead explore both clothes and social order through their dynamic relationship with each other. My overarching research question is how clothes as agents shaped, negotiated and destabilised the social order in seventeenth-century Tallinn, but also how they were influenced by social order, both as it was conceived discursively on the normative level and practiced by people on the everyday level. Using the concept of material culture as a metaphorical kaleidoscope, the focus will be on clothes, how they served as a site of, but also actively participated in, social processes and negotiations of order. My dissertation argues that the relationship between clothes and social order was not self-evident, unanimously understood and accepted. Already in seventeenth-century Tallinn, a peripheral town with a seemingly fixed social order and a material culture characterised by inertia rather than innovation, the relationship between clothes and social order was dynamic, changing and filled with conflicts.

Following the introduction, the dissertation has eight chapters. Together with the introductory chapter, chapters Two and Three constitute the background to this dissertation. Chapter Two focuses on the source material on which this research is based. The chapter explains why I have chosen certain types of sources in order to answer my research question and describes the particularities of seventeenth-century source material from Tallinn. Chapter Three is a second background chapter that describes how the town of Tallinn was organised in the seventeenth century. Though it had been a part of the Swedish empire since 1561, Tallinn occupied a rather unique position within that realm, and this position is apparent in the town’s separate governing system, attempts at self-determination and regular conflicts with the central authorities. The seventeenth century was tumultuous in many ways, and the fluidity of the social system was also reflected in the struggle for political influence between different factions within the guild system.

With the help of more specific research questions, Chapters Four to Eight will each examine the dynamic interplay between clothes and social order. Chapter Four adopts a top-down perspective in order to understand how early modern authorities conceived of social order. It analyses order as a discursive ideal and its visualisation as it was expressed in seventeenth-century sumptuary laws. The chapter consists of two parts. The first part examines which groups of people were addressed in sumptuary laws, what modes of categorisation the laws employed, and how this corresponded to the guild-based structure. The second part of the chapter examines what material criteria were used in the regulations to draw the delineations between these groups. While early modern society might appear ordered and orderly, a recurring theme in this chapter is the inherent dynamism of Tallinn, reflected in the constantly changing social order and its visualisation.

Unlike the previous chapter, the following chapters move from the normative top-down level to the everyday level in order to understand the interplay between clothes and social order as it happened. Chapter Five takes as its starting point the inherent dynamism in the social order and its visualisation and argues that clothes mattered to seventeenth-century people but that they were meaningful in different ways. The first part of the chapter examines the role of social order in the period’s religious and economic worldview and asks why a legible sartorial order was an ideal towards which the authorities strove in the seventeenth century. The second part of the chapter looks at the different ways in which people categorised other people on the everyday level and asks what role appearances played in these categorisation processes. Finally, the third part looks at social conflicts on collective and individual levels and analyses how social order was negotiated through dress and appearances.

Chapter Six takes a dive into people’s wardrobes in order to examine the sartorial order that becomes visible through the clothing resources at the disposal of early modern households. After a brief quantitative overview, the chapter first examines the relationship between clothes and social standing using specific material criteria that I consider especially meaningful in this context. This part will
also examine how inventories might aid us in tracking change in fashions over the course of the century. In order to underline the dynamism inherent in clothes as agents, the second part discusses a sample of inventories in order to show how, despite a discursive ideal of a social order that attempted to attach certain material markers to certain groups of people, they could still employ different strategies in engaging with the materiality of clothes. Finally, in order to bring together social order on the normative level and how it emerges through everyday practice, the chapter answers the question how the authorities’ attempts to create a specific kind of visual hierarchy affected people’s appearances.

From the previous discussion on the relationship between order and clothes it appears that whether on the normative or on the everyday level, order was a social phenomenon. The categorisation and ordering of people into a hierarchy, as well as the later negotiation of these positions, always took place in the relations between groups of people. For the order to be visualised and uniformly understood, it also had to be recognisable to the people who constituted it. Chapters Seven and Eight are also social in nature, but they deal with activities, practices and processes whose explicit purpose was not necessarily to affirm social hierarchy. It is nevertheless important to examine these other social contexts in which clothes as dynamic agents shaped people’s daily lives, because they shed light on whether and in what ways ideas about order and hierarchy manifested themselves in people’s material interactions.

With a focus on bequests of clothes, Chapter Seven explores clothes as material mnemonics and mediators of social relationships. As a particular moment in life imbued with great symbolic significance, the prospect of imminent death forced people to consider their social networks and revealed the relationships to which people attributed importance and the ways they chose to materialise these relationships through clothes. After a brief overview of the legal context of inheritance in early modern Tallinn, the second part of the chapter focuses on parent-child and spousal relationships and how clothes were used to express familial expectations and encourage people to behave in certain ways. The second part looks at social relationships more generally and examines how people reasoned about and organised their social networks through clothes and how these emerging hierarchies may be compared to the discursive ideal of social order.

Finally, Chapter Eight is concerned with clothes as facilitators of commercial exchange in the early modern period. It gives serious consideration to the idea of fungibility of clothes during a period where money was not always in wide use and analyses how the fungibility of clothes and their monetary value functioned in a hierarchical seventeenth-century society. The chapter is divided into two parts. The first part explores three different contexts in which clothes commonly appeared as a substitute for money, and questions whether in a society where clothes had an active role in categorising people and creating and visualising social order it was possible to disentangle clothes from their social embeddedness. The second part adopts the opposite perspective and examines three ways in
which the fungibility of clothes was conditioned by people’s individual desires and societal expectations. The concluding chapter summarises the main results.
CHAPTER 2
Method and Source Material

Because clothes are such a constant part of people’s daily lives, it is not surprising that information concerning their material qualities, price, acquisition, valuation, use and behaviours related to them can be found in a wide variety of different sources. At the same time, the task resembles looking for a needle in a haystack, since it is difficult to find sources for the early modern period that answer precisely and exhaustively the questions that we pose to them. Often a mundane and self-evident part of everyone’s daily activities, clothes were a part of life that did not always warrant explicit discussion in the sources or was mentioned only with respect to specific issues. As mentioned earlier, the garments themselves have rarely been preserved and visual and written sources are similarly far from complete. Above all, it is difficult to access and assess the material lives of the middling and poor sorts of people. Consequently, most historians working on the early modern period commonly combine information from different types of sources in order to get as complete an overview as possible. But while the approach is not new, it hardly ever warrants explicit discussion.

Before delving into early modern dress and social order, it is therefore necessary to examine the kinds of sources that will be used and how they will be used in order to fulfil the aim of this dissertation, that is, to study the complex relationship between clothes and social order in early modern Europe. This chapter will first explain the methodological approach I have chosen. Secondly, I will give an overview of the source material used in this dissertation and explain why I have chosen to make use of these specific sources. I will discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each source and consequently the approaches I have taken in order to answer my research questions. The four main sources include summatory laws, inventories, wills and court cases. In addition to the above-mentioned material, other sources, such as petitions, letters and other accounts, have occasionally been used in order to support the arguments. The chapter demonstrates that by combining information from a broad base of sources that until now have largely been used in isolation from one another, it is possible to improve our understanding of clothes as complex agents in the early modern period.
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67 On this, see also Roche 1994, p. 20; Vincent 2002, p. 31.
68 There are, of course exceptions to this, see for example Hayward 2009; Styles 2007. Hayward’s study on sixteenth-century England incorporates sumptuary laws, wills and inventories. Styles’ study on popular dress in eighteenth-century England discusses a broad base of sources such as
2.1 Method

Social science researchers have called the use of multiple methods, sources, perspectives or investigators ‘triangulation’. The simple premise of that approach is that by using complementary methods and sources, we can increase our understanding of the issue or problem under scrutiny. Using both qualitative and quantitative methods to collect data from different types of sources increases the reliability of conclusions that scholars can draw about the question or phenomenon at hand. A similar concept that has been used in Swedish research is ‘source pluralism’, which in itself means nothing more than that a researcher uses a variety of different sources in order to answer a specific question. Often, there is simply not enough evidence in one type of source material, or it only helps scholars understand one part of the phenomenon. Sumptuary laws, while being an excellent source for examining authorities’ ideas about social hierarchy and the relationship between order and appearances, tell us nothing about what the order might have looked like from the perspective of a seventeenth-century artisan or maidservant. If we want to understand the interplay between how order dictated appearances on the one hand and how clothes affected social order on the other, then it is important to include sources that help us understand the question from both perspectives.

A central question for anyone working with such an approach is the dissonant and contradictory nature of data with which historians of older periods often work. An explicit principle of the source pluralist method is for example that the credibility of information increases when the various sources agree with each other and decreases when the sources contradict each other. Yet, the increasing number of sources makes it more difficult to compare them to each other and assess their relative importance. I maintain, however, that that is not and should not be seen as a problem, since levelling out the various sources so that they all fit neatly together cannot be the goal of using such methods. Depending on the nature of the question, each source will provide a different answer, and some sources will provide better answers than others. Sources that offer contradictory information therefore raise not only the issue of how reliable they are but also the kinds of questions historians should be posing to them. However, we cannot expect the emerging picture to be uncomplicated – to the contrary, this dissertation will show that once we get away from the seeming neatness offered in the sumptuary laws it will emerge just how complex and contradictory the business

court materials, account books, travel narratives and parish poor records, among others, in order to examine the role clothes played in shaping the lives of the common folk.

69 On triangulation see for example Moran-Ellis et al. 2006, pp. 45–59; Vikström 2010, pp. 211–221.
70 Myrdal 2007, p. 497.
72 Myrdal 2012, p. 165.
of clothes was. The task is not to ensure that every piece fit neatly into a larger narrative but rather to offer an interpretation of this complex outcome.

Whether this method is called source pluralism, triangulation or something else, a broad source base and both qualitative and quantitative methods are necessary for this study, in order to access the nuances of the various aspects of the relationship between dress and social order. Moreover, this approach serves two other important functions. Firstly, it separates my dissertation from the majority of earlier studies on dress that only occasionally deal with more than one type of source material. Secondly, my goal has not been just to include clear-cut, exhaustive and representative source material. The main purpose of this dissertation is to show the nuance and depth in early modern clothing culture. Instead of focusing on the question of representativity, the main task has been to collect the scattered sources that together would be sufficiently comprehensive.

2.2 Sumptuary laws and the control of clothing

It has been suggested that the peak of sumptuary regulation coincided with the transition from the early modern to the modern era. However, there was in fact great variation on the local level, in terms of the intensity with which such laws were issued, which aspects of personal consumption were subject to regulations as well as who was or was not subject to them. Looking across Europe, in broad terms, the number of sumptuary laws peaked somewhere between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries. While in England sumptuary laws were not issued after 1604, elsewhere in Europe, for example in Sweden, they were issued until the late eighteenth and even into the nineteenth century. Recently, moreover, sumptuary legislation has been examined in the global context, thus reminding us that regulations concerning dress and appearances were not a uniquely European phenomenon. Examining the characteristics of sumptuary law in Tallinn thus alerts us to the complexities inherent in regulating people’s dress and consumption habits but also to the social and historical context in which these laws were issued.

In Tallinn, sumptuary laws existed from the end of the fifteenth to the beginning of the eighteenth century. If we compare the number of clothing regulations or Kleiderordnungen to other types of sumptuary laws, such as those regulating weddings, funerals and baptisms, it becomes clear that in the seventeenth century clothing was the most vigorously regulated aspect of individual consumption and
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73 Alan Hunt 1996, p. 28.
75 Riello & Rublack (eds.) 2019.
76 For transcriptions both in Low and High German of the 1497 sumptuary law against excessive luxury during weddings and the 1524 sumptuary law against luxury in clothing and other things see Pabst 1857, pp. 197–241.
behaviour. Eight sets of clothing regulations have been preserved from the beginning of the seventeenth century until 1706.77 Additionally, two drafts from 1641 and 1650 have been preserved in the archive of St. Canute’s Guild. The 1641 draft was not accepted by the guilds and hence the new regulation was never officially issued. The 1650 draft is not complete.78 The length of these regulations varies considerably, ranging from a few pages to around twenty. On some occasions the legal provisions of the regulations were numbered, on other occasions (mostly from 1690 onwards), the whole text was simply in continuous prose. Finally, but most importantly, the clothing regulations issued in Tallinn were a combination of both prohibitions and allowances for each group in question, for example allowing certain kinds of fabrics while forbidding others. As will emerge, what was forbidden and what was allowed to each group of people depended not only on people’s social position and the materiality of the clothes but also on occasion and space.

Scholars have rightfully been interested in sumptuary laws, because they inform us about so many different things: dress and the spread of new and foreign styles, the creation and visualisation of social order, attitudes towards and behaviours related to material culture, even governance and the expansion of a state’s control over its subjects.79 As attempts to confine specific behaviours and the consumption of certain commodities to social elites, and thus enforce rigid status structures, sumptuary laws show medieval and early modern authorities’ efforts to order the society on local and state levels. While dress has perhaps garnered the most attention, sumptuary laws did not only curtail the consumption of luxury goods, including goods of foreign origin, fine apparel, fabrics and

77 Most of the regulations can be found in three collections of the Tallinn City Archives: collection 230 Der Revaler Magistrat inventory 1, no. Bs7/1 Kleider-, Hochzeits-, Kindtau-, Begräbnis- u.s.w. Ordnungen 1497-1738; collection 190 Archiv der St. Kanutigilde inventory 1 no. 2 Resolutionen von Heeremehäfen und Königliche Lüt. AI; collection 191 Revaler Kaufmanns- oder Grosse Gilde inventory 1 no. 19 Arme-Ordnung, Rewiertete Ordnung des allgemeinen Gottes-Kastens. Kasten-Ordnungen, Kleider-Ordnungen. The 1691 regulation has been transcribed in Pabst 1857, pp. 237–241. The 1696 regulation can be found in printed form in National Archives (hereafter RA), archive EAA collection 1002 Viljandi magistrat inventory 1 no. 14 Sammelband von Ordnungen der Städte Riga, Pernau, Reval und andere. Teils Drucksachen und Kopien. The 1639 regulation has recently been translated into Estonian, see Kõiv 2014, pp. 190–197. Another clothing regulation was issued sometime between 30 November 1636, when it was referred to as an upcoming or future regulation and 17 March 1637, when a complaint by town councillor Andreas Stampeel about ‘the newly published regulation’ was recorded in the town council meeting minutes, TLA.230.1.Ab51, f. 66r, f. 88r.


79 From older works, see for example Baldwin 1926; Greenfield 1918. There are a number of local studies, on early modern Sweden see Andersson 2014; Andersson 2019; on Germany, see Eisenbart 1962; Zander-Seidel 1988, pp. 59–75; on England, see Hayward 2009; Pitman 2019, pp. 65–87; on Italy see Kovesi Killerby 2002; on Tallinn, see Pabst 1857, pp. 197–241; Pajur 2017, pp. 21–38; Stieda 1887, pp. 78–88.; For a recent volume of articles that puts sumptuary laws in global context see Riello & Rublack (eds.) 2019.
accessories, but they also regulated gift-giving and events like christenings, weddings and funerals.\textsuperscript{80} The laws did not develop in isolation from people’s daily practices – they influenced people and were influenced by the people. In choosing to obey or transgress the clothing regulations, people still operated within the legal framework. Sumptuary laws are further valuable because they reveal to us, albeit in codified form, something about the prevalent clothing, customs and attitudes during the period in question, which otherwise might elude us because these might have been too familiar to put down in writing.

Early modern societies, as explained in the previous chapter, were unequal at their core, with numerous intersecting hierarchies constantly at play. In such a hierarchical society, sumptuary laws served as a tool for social distinction because clothes were key agents in making the emerging social order visible.\textsuperscript{81} Clothing was abundant in sumptuary law because of the opportunity for public display that clothes offered. Although rather selectively, sumptuary laws determined the ideal sartorial expression for each social rank. But by doing so, the laws also indicated to people how to ‘achieve social ascent’ through aspiring to the wardrobes of their social betters.\textsuperscript{82} An order based on visuality was fickle, because although outside appearance was supposed to be a reflection of what was underneath, appearances could easily be manipulated, and people could make claims to social positions they did not in fact occupy. In a society obsessed with ordering and visualising that order, unrecognisability was threatening. If a person could not be recognised by his or her appearances, then how would everybody else know where he or she was on the social scale and how he or she stood in relation to other members of the society? The complexity inherent in early modern urban societies was increasingly perceived as a threat against the legibility of the social order, resulting in an increased desire to control appearances.

Whilst sumptuary legislation does not provide a particularly new source material, this dissertation will approach it from a perspective that until now has received limited attention. Previously, much of the scholarship has been interested in the motivations that lay behind issuing sumptuary legislation. These will be explored in depth later in this dissertation, so for now it suffices to mention that the main concerns were to visualise and preserve a hierarchical social order, curtail the consumption habits of rival groups, preserve the state’s economic position and ensure the morality of consumption from a religious perspective. These issues were also present in the clothing regulations issued in Tallinn. But my point of departure is concretely the first of these aims and the notion that sumptuary

\textsuperscript{80} Brown Ahlund 2015, p. 81; Kovesi Killerby 2002, p. 2; Pajur 2014, ch. 4; Rublack 2010, pp. 266–267. Riello & Rublack call for a distinction between ‘sumptuary law’ and ‘clothing law’, suggesting that the former were intended to forbid the wearing of specific items and the latter were instead aimed at forcing people to wear or use specific garments, such as in late seventeenth-century Russia by Peter the Great or in nineteenth-century Japan by the Emperor of Japan, see Riello & Rublack (eds.) 2019, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{81} Hayward 2009, p. 21; Jaritz 1993, pp. 8–31.

\textsuperscript{82} Riello & Rublack (eds.) 2019, p. 5.
legislation regulated appearances in order to create and maintain social order. I am consequently interested in the groups of people that clothing regulations described and the sartorial boundaries that were created between them. From such a focus we will gain insight into one part of this dissertation’s aim, namely how clothes were ideally thought to create the social order in Tallinn and how this order should be constructed. An examination of the sumptuary laws from the whole century furthermore enables me to adopt a diachronic perspective and to see how this order and its visualisation changed over the course of the century.

There are, of course, certain limitations we should be aware of when working with sources like sumptuary laws. Examining sumptuary laws means adopting a top-down perspective and looking at how early modern authorities envisaged their relationship to their subjects. When the town council in Tallinn attempted to regulate how individuals were to dress and conduct themselves, how they were to go to church, get married or be buried, they were interfering in the most quotidian and intimate practices of people’s lives. But the laws do not shed light on the effect that the laws had on sartorial practices, or on how the townspeople themselves experienced the sartorial order and their respective positions within it.

A wider problem with looking at the material culture of clothing only as an expression of an externally created social order is the emphasis on the perspective of those in a position of power. As such, it takes for granted that what was displayed was also what was seen. The problem with such a semiotic approach is that by prioritising display over the practices of looking and observing, order and hierarchy are assumed already to have come into existence by some external means and material culture becomes a mere representation or manifestation of that hierarchy. Additionally, this approach emphasises that people primarily wanted to dress above their social standing and consume what their social superiors were consuming, an idea that has also been criticised. Moreover, scholars have demonstrated the importance of semi-luxuries for many non-elite consumers and shown the presence of ideas like usefulness, civility, and ingenuity. Clothing practices were complex, and appearances were used by the poor and rich alike not only to express social and economic aspirations, but also religious, professional and familial affiliations as well as identity, beliefs and values. Sumptuary laws should thus be placed in a wider societal context that goes beyond the narrow understanding of them as a tool for preserving social order. This dissertation will thus move away from the idea of sumptuary laws as a reflection of the social order. Using not just clothing regulations but also a variety of other sources, I want to examine the relationship of dress and social order more

86 Berg & Clifford (eds.) 1999; Fairchild’s 1993, pp. 228–248.
broadly, not just by looking at how social order dictated and influenced dress but also how this order changed and was shaped by clothes in turn.

2.3 Taking stock: inventories

Since the 1980s, historians from a wide variety of subdisciplines have used probate inventories to examine the everyday lives of people before the twentieth century. As sources that can at times be incredibly rich in detail, they have allowed scholars to answer questions concerning wealth and economic development, agrarian practices and expansion of markets, the material culture of the home, individual self-presentation and cultural transfer, to name but a few. They have also been used for exploring clothing, consumption of clothes, and adoption of new styles and fashions. One advantage of inventories is that they are available in large numbers and for many regions and periods, thus enabling historians to draw comparisons between different time periods and geographic regions. However, we should not be deceived by the inventories’ seeming completeness, as they are neither uncontaminated records of an objective reality, nor simple literary manifestations divorced from materiality. Before embarking on our study of clothing in seventeenth-century Tallinn, it is therefore necessary to address some of the challenges presented by inventories.

Approximately 1,100 inventories have been preserved in Tallinn from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. The sample in this dissertation consists of 105 inventories drawn up between 1600 and 1700 (Table 2.1). All the inventories in the sample were drawn up in connection with a person’s death. I chose inventories that listed clothes and where it was possible to establish the social background of the person, i.e. occupation if it was drawn up for a man and husband’s occupation in case it was drawn up for a woman. The inventories have been broken down according to social belonging (Table 2.1) and gender (Table 2.2).

---

88 For a pioneering collection on probate inventories see Schuurman & van der Woude 1980.
89 The following list is by no means exhaustive but see for example Ago 2013, pp. 103–122; Eva I. Andersson 2017, pp. 171–189; Buck 2000, pp. 25–38; Dahl & Lempäläinen 2014, pp. 1–14; Hayward 2009; Roche 1994; Spufford & Mee 2017; Sturtewagen 2016; Marie Ulväng 2012. Inventories are also an important part in Jutta Zander-Seidel’s work on Nürnberg in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Zander-Seidel 1990.
90 Riello 2013, p. 127.
91 Estimation by Kodres 2014, p. 109. I suspect that the total number might be larger because in the seventeenth century, inventories were commonly recorded in court books. They also appeared in inheritance disputes, for example in the Orphans’ Court.
92 Occupations represented in the group ‘artisan’: bladesmith, butcher, button maker, carpenter, chamois preparer, clockmaker, cooper, cordovan maker, furrier, glazier, goldsmith, hatmaker, locksmith, miller, mint master, organ builder, painter, pewterer, sable dyer, saddler, sculptor, shoemaker, silversmith, tailor, tawer (dresser of white leather), weaver (linen and hemp); occupations represented in the group ‘journeyman’: coppersmith, merchant, potter; occupations represented in the group ‘labourer’: cook, fisherman, house servant, weigher; occupations represented in the group ‘merchant’: alderman of Great Guild, merchant; occupations represented in the group ‘mil-
Since the social position of married women and unmarried daughters was tied to the occupation of and/or guild membership of their husbands and fathers, I followed a similar principle in categorising women’s inventories in the sample. The one lone inventory in category ‘other’ (Table 2.2) refers to a man and his son-in-law whose joint inventory was drawn up in 1658 during a plague epidemic. Presumably, until their death they had been the surviving members of the same household.93

Table 2.1. Number of inventories by social group in Tallinn, 1600–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social group</th>
<th>1600 – 1625</th>
<th>1626–1650</th>
<th>1651–1675</th>
<th>1676–1700</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeyman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The first question is that of representativity. To what extent are preserved inventories actually representative of the population as a whole? In several places in Europe, for example in Sweden after 1734, the law required that the estate of every deceased person over the age of eighteen be recorded.94 However, while the law may have been followed more carefully in towns, inventories from the countryside are still sporadic despite legislation.95 As the belongings of poorer people, and in some places those of never-married people and women, were seldom written down, wealthier estates tend to be overrepresented in inventories.96 This is also true in my sample. Related to wealth bias is age bias. As inventories were usually taken at the end of someone’s life, the owners of the goods tended to be older. This meant they were also likely to be wealthier on average than younger people, having had time to accumulate wealth during their lifetime.97 Other biases include family size, as larger families might have had more need to

93 Inventory of Hans Straetman and his son-in-law, bladesmith Hans Wede from 1658, TLA.230.1.Bt11, f. 70v–71v.
94 Riello 2013, p. 128; Marie Ulväng 2012, p. 36.
95 Marie Ulväng 2012, p. 40.
97 Keibek 2017, p. 11.
detail the possessions for inheritance purposes, and the complexity of credit and debt relationship, as again there might have been more incentive to draw up an inventory in order to protect the interests of creditors. Therefore, we have to accept from the outset that people with fewer material assets and less complicated credit networks as well as people with smaller or no families are likely to be underrepresented in the inventories.

Table 2.2. Number of inventories by gender in Tallinn, 1600–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>1600–1625</th>
<th>1626–1650</th>
<th>1651–1675</th>
<th>1676–1700</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In my chosen sample, only eleven of the 105 inventories were drawn up for women and a further twelve for married couples (Table 2.2). To find out whether my sample was particularly skewed, I included more inventories that have been left out of the final sample, because I was unable to establish the social background of the persons for whom they were drawn up. In the sample of 232 inventories between 1600 and 1700, thirty-two were left by women, which only marginally increases the percentage. Therefore, we can conclude that women are particularly underrepresented in the Tallinn inventories. This finding appears to be in line with what most but not all previous research has found elsewhere in Europe. This is interesting since women generally tended to outlive their husbands and it would technically not have been a problem to draw up an inventory for them. Out of the eleven women for whom an inventory was drawn up, three were married when they died, seven were widows and one woman’s marital status is unknown.

A closer look at the inventories does not reveal a pattern with respect to the women’s wealth or social status either. Eight of the women were from artisan households, one was the widow of a town councillor and one was the widow of a town council registrar. Moreover, one inventory was also drawn up for Hans Keibek 2017, p. 9.

Overton et al. 2004, p. 23; Marie Urväng 2012, p. 43. Ogilvie et al. have found that women were overrepresented in seventeenth-century Württemberg for inventories drawn up after an individual’s death, see Ogilvie et al. 2011, p. 8.

The social status of artisan women was as follows: widow of a furrier, widow of a goldsmith, wife of a silversmith, widow of a linen weaver, widow of a miller, widow of a shoemaker, widow of a glazier, wife of a butcher.
von Renteln’s servant Kay, who was most likely of Estonian origin. Kay’s inventory only included two garments, a skirt and a collar. The remaining inventories included between nine and eighty-one garments. It is thus not possible to distinguish a pattern in these inventories – some had almost no possessions and some had significant amounts of it. The gender disparity is striking in light of the fact that of the 117 preserved seventeenth-century wills discussed in the next section of this chapter, forty-one were left by women, which is a much higher proportion. Based on the wills and inventories it is evident that women owned, managed and bequeathed property in seventeenth-century Tallinn.

There is also uncertainty concerning whether the estate has been recorded in its entirety and whether the financial valuations are accurate. Considering the frequent practices of borrowing and lending between households, especially among the lower ranks of the society, the goods present in a household at the time of the inventory might represent only a fraction of what had been available to the household at other stages of its life cycle. A related but equally important question is whether items in the inventory really belonged to that household. Further, some scholars have suggested that objects of low value, broken objects, and things like earthenware and toys, as well as pets, may have been omitted from inventories. On the other hand, failure to accurately record the estate of the deceased by withholding goods or providing false information was a punishable offence in a number of different places in Europe. While not much can be done about it beyond accepting that the inventories are not complete sources, it is unlikely that systematic omission of significant parts of the estate was widely practiced in Europe.

Despite their importance for the daily household economy, clothing and textiles were not always consistently recorded in inventories and the detail with which they were recorded varied greatly. Many earlier scholars have taken it for granted that the items listed and valued in an inventory belonged to the person for whom the inventory was drawn up. But the truth is that we can only guess at the connection between a person and the list of possessions. Sometimes inventories rather straightforwardly indicated that the deceased person had not owned or worn the clothes. A short inventory drawn up jointly in 1658 for Hanss Straetman and his son-in-law, Hanss Wede, a bladesmith from Halle, mentioned

---

101 Inventory of Hans von Renteln’s servant Kay, 1622, TLA.230.1.Aa47/a, f. 231r.
102 Comparing auction protocols and inventories, Sofia Murhem et al. have for example demonstrated that in Sweden between 1728 and 1900, movable goods were consistently valued below the market price in inventories, see Murhem et al. 2019, pp. 1–24.
103 McCants 2013, p. 319.
105 Gudrun Andersson 2009, p. 135; Pelus-Kaplan & Eickhölter 1993, p. 298. Occasionally, the inventories of Tallinn also indicate that family members present during the inventory were threatened to provide truthful evidence of the deceased person’s estate or otherwise receive a fine so the idea appears to have been familiar there as well. See for example fisherman Jürgen Fryman’s inventory from 1693, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 151r.
two skirts, two doublets and an old fur cap, all of which had belonged to Wede’s dead wife. There is no information about the men’s own clothing.107 Lawyer Friedrich Heilgendorff’s inventory explicitly stated that his clothes were of no consequence and then listed his wife’s clothes in detail!108 This indicates that there was no agreement on whether to list only the deceased person’s clothes or the whole household’s. In one inventory, moreover, the appraisers admitted about two garments that ‘to whom they belong one cannot know’.109 Inventories usually lack information about who in the household owned and/or used one or another garment, how and from whom they had acquired it, when, where and how often it had been worn, how it looked and sat on the body or what repair work had been done on it. These inclusions and omissions by appraisers, and their insufficient knowledge about ownership should alert us to how little we can actually know about individual consumption practices based on inventories.

Two final issues relevant to this study are terminology and financial valuations. Often, clothing terminology was not gender-specific, meaning that it is not possible to accurately reconstruct the differences between men’s and women’s clothing, or the clothes of different age groups, based only on inventories. Additionally, terminology most likely changed over time and the same garment could come to be referred to by another name. Dress terminology was also dependent on geography, social belonging and surely on age, gender and the knowledge of the onlooker/appraiser.110 Finally, the inventories of Tallinn are also somewhat peculiar in that they seldom include financial valuations, making it difficult to draw any definitive conclusions about people’s wealth or how much their wardrobes were worth in relation to the rest of their possessions.111

What the inventories of Tallinn do demonstrate, however, is just how likely it was that at some point or another every household would contain items that were owned by someone else. On several occasions, items that had been pawned and therefore were not physically present in the household were recorded in the inventory. Sometimes, things had been lent out to friends or family or given away without further explanation. Chamois preparer Florian Frisel’s best clothes, for example, were in the household of his younger brother Martin who promised to return them.112 In another case, one widow had given away her late husband’s hat before the inventory began.113 These items might have been physically absent but they were still in some manner tied to their previous household. Death meant that ownership, far from being clear and straightforward, had to be negotiated.

---

107 Inventory of Hanss Wede and Hanss Straetman, 1658, TLA.230.1.Bt11, f. 70v–71v.
108 Inventory of lawyer Friedrich Heilgendorf, 1692, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 100r.
109 Inventory of Literatus Hinrich Bröcker, 1668, TLA.230.1.Bt12/1, f. 61r.
110 A good example of this is discussed in Buck 1977, p. 99.
111 In my sample, twelve out of 105 inventories include some kind of financial valuations of clothes. However, it does not mean that every garment in the inventory was consistently valued, rather it was most often clothes that were bought by someone or garments in artisan households obviously meant for sale where the financial value was recorded.
112 Inventory of chamois preparer Florian Frisel, 1675, TLA.230.1.Bt12/IV, f. 33r.
113 Inventory of sculptor Elert Thiel, 1675, TLA.230.1.Bt12/IV, f. 42r.
and restructured. In this way, inventories can show us a variety of ways in which early modern people interacted with their own and other people’s goods. It has been suggested in previous research that inventories are static, recording stocks rather than flows.\textsuperscript{114} However, this dissertation argues that rather than providing us with a snapshot or a postcard-like image of the household’s total possessions that has been frozen in time, inventories can and should be seen as just one step in the transaction process that was triggered with a person’s death. They do not represent the conclusion or often even the beginning of this process, but instead are a part of the circulation of material goods. As the discussion above reveals, they are not complete documents and we will not get an objective overview of clothes in seventeenth-century Tallinn. Yet, despite their shortcomings, an overview of clothing resources based on inventories is invaluable for providing a much more nuanced and sophisticated picture of early modern dress, something that we would miss entirely if we were to rely solely on normative sources such as sumptuary laws. They are therefore integral to the research aim of this dissertation, which is to better understand the relationship between clothes and social order. In order to understand the social context within which sumptuary laws were issued, it is necessary to start by looking at what the sartorial base from which the laws proceeded looked like in reality.

2.4 Early modern wills: negotiating relationships

While making sure that our social and material lives are in order before we pass on retains its importance even in the present day, death generally does not have the same kind of immediacy that it did in the early modern period. Whole families and communities could be wiped out in a short period of time due to disease, war and hunger. Organising their material lives was one of the ways in which early modern people could prepare themselves but also their family members in case something happened to them. To that end, people could either make arrangements orally or in written form, detailing how the transfer of their goods should take place and who should get a piece of the pie.\textsuperscript{115} However, transferring property freely to whomever one wished was not allowed and there was a legal framework in place, which specified the disposition of different types of property, the amounts that could be bequeathed, as well as the possible circle of recipients. Ignoring these rules could mean a lengthy inheritance dispute or even the post-mortem nullification of the arrangements the testator had made. This legal framework was useful in case one died intestate, as it theoretically increased

\textsuperscript{114} Overton et al. 2004, p. 87.

\textsuperscript{115} On wills as sources see for example Goose & Evans (eds.) 2000, pp. 38–71; Herzog & Hollberg (eds.) 2007.
predictability and reduced the number of property disputes.\textsuperscript{116} In practice, people’s intentions for who would get a share of their earthly possessions not infrequently clashed with the law and with established customary norms as well as with the understanding of those they left behind, who might have a completely different idea about how big their share should be.

This dissertation uses all of the seventeenth-century wills from Tallinn I have been able to locate – a total of 117 wills left by 125 people. As already mentioned, forty-one wills were left by women, twelve were left jointly by husband and wife, and sixty-four were left by men. The reason why these numbers do not match up is because four people made two wills,\textsuperscript{117} How old people were when they made a will is hard to say, since indicating a person’s age appears not to have been customary in Tallinn.\textsuperscript{118} While some made their wills on their deathbed, as we saw above, others were better prepared and could even make a new will before they passed away. The social background of the testators was broad – roughly half of the testators, or husbands and a father in case of female testators, had sworn a burgher’s oath. The social spectrum of the testators ranged from butchers and millers to clergymen, town councillors and burgomasters. The majority of male testators were married, while of the female testators five were unmarried, nineteen were married and twenty-seven were widows.

While the management and transfer of immovable property has perhaps garnered the most interest from historians over time, there are now a number of valuable studies on bequests of movable goods.\textsuperscript{119} The main reason for making a will, it has been suggested, was that the person was discontented with the succession as dictated by law and wanted to leave bequests to relatives, friends, or religious institutions other than the main heirs.\textsuperscript{120} In making arrangements for the transfer of property after their death, then, people actively pondered the social mesh that was constructed by interactions with friends and family. Through the

\textsuperscript{116} Korpiola & Lahtinen (eds.) 2018, pp. 2–3.
\textsuperscript{117} Gorriess Specht left a will in 1664 and 1674, see TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 350r–353r, f. 354r; town councillor Matthias Poorten left a will in 1633 and 1638, see TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 254r–267v and f. 413r–413v; Gerdrut Fiant left a will in 1653 and 1660, see TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 286r–289r and f. 291r–293r; Erasmus Pogatz and Bette Reier (Reiger) left a will jointly in 1612, see TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 251r–252r and f. 337r–339r. Reiger also left a will of her own in 1637, see TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 270r–271r.
\textsuperscript{118} For example, furrier Hans Holzkampf was 57 years old when he died, see TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 131r–132r. Elisabeth Kriedt’s husband Hinrich Bade, also a burgher of Tallinn, was 69 years old when he died in 1677, see TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 37r–41r.
\textsuperscript{119} To name but a few studies on early modern real property, how it was conceptualised, managed and transferred and what kinds of legal restrictions were in place see for example Ågren 2009; Brewer & Staves (eds.) 1995; Erickson 1993; Marrese 2002. For studies on bequests and gifts of movables, see for example Ågren 2002, pp. 419–423; Benadusi 2004, pp. 805–826; Berg 1996, pp. 415–434; Howell 1996, pp. 3–45; Lambert 2014, pp. 46–59; Liddy 2015, pp. 273–289; Maegraith 2018, pp. 103–136; Ogilvie et al. 2009, pp. 149–159; Sundelin 2008, pp. 26–37.
\textsuperscript{120} Hahn 2015, p. 34.
act of bequeathing property they defined ‘the contours of their own kin relationships’ and confirmed the value that was placed on each relationship.\(^{121}\) By specifying what was to happen to their material possessions, the testators influenced personal relationships and had a direct impact on the material lives of others. By linking the past to the present and the future, the bequeathed goods also provided a sense of continuity for those left behind and established a connection to the deceased person.\(^{122}\) ‘Objects,’ as Martha Howell puts it, ‘made social relationships concrete.’\(^{123}\) Through the process of will-making, including thinking in advance about doing it, the nature of an individual’s kin but also the wider social network is made visible.

As ego documents wills are surely valuable as a way to understand the lives and personal experiences of early modern people. However, like any other source they have limitations. For example, not everyone left behind a will, and in fact very few wills have been preserved compared to the number of people who lived and died in seventeenth-century Tallinn. Perhaps these people had little or nothing to bequeath, or they died suddenly, or they were content with how their property would be transferred to heirs as determined by law.\(^{124}\) The bequests made in wills almost never indicate the aggregate wealth and possessions of an individual.\(^{125}\) In her study of 337 wills from medieval Tallinn Kadri-Rutt Hahn has observed that, above all, wills dealt with acquired property and not patrimonial property. As the transfer of patrimonial or inherited property to the next heir was regulated by the law, she suggests, there was no need to make special provisions for it in the will.\(^{126}\) On the other hand, this did not necessarily mean that acquired property was always described in great detail. Clothes and textiles were an important material resource for every early modern household. Their availability, but also their usefulness and value suggest that they would frequently be bequeathed in wills. Yet, only about half of the wills of Tallinn mention bequests of clothes and those that do vary greatly in detail. Therefore, wills can provide us with valuable insights into how people thought about and chose to bequeath their clothes, but they do not give us access to early modern wardrobes in their entirety.

Additionally, wills provide a selective picture of the testator’s social network. As mentioned above, the division of patrimonial property was regulated by law, and people only occasionally mentioned it in their wills. Therefore, it is difficult to determine the exact number of family members or what the family structure looked like.\(^{127}\) On the other hand, people had the right to decide how to distribute

\(^{121}\) Hahn 2015, p. 34.
\(^{122}\) Ariès 1982, p. 577.
\(^{123}\) Howell 1996, p. 44.
\(^{124}\) Liddy 2015, p. 276.
\(^{125}\) Berg 1996, p. 418. Contrary to what Heinz von zur Mühlen has claimed for seventeenth-century wills from Tallinn, they almost never include debts or arrears, or precise valuations of the testator’s estate, see Mühlen 1980, p. 266.
\(^{126}\) Hahn 2015, p. 29.
\(^{127}\) Hahn 2015, pp. 16–17.
their acquired property, and the wills usually focused on individual bequests to people other than lawful heirs. Thus, while lawful heirs such as family members may have been underrepresented, wills bring to light certain relationships and people, such as friends and servants that might otherwise be obscured. Due to the reasons mentioned above, wills are therefore less helpful in establishing the total wealth and assets of a testator or his or her family structure. On the other hand, these issues are less of a problem for my study, because I am above all interested in the utterances made in wills about clothes and what social relationships emerged through clothes, because that is another important factor in understanding how the ideas of social order and its visualisation through appearances influenced people’s bequeathing practices.

Another issue that is equally important if we want to learn something about people’s emotional states and motives for making specific bequests to family and friends is that, while individual objects can be described in great detail in wills, these descriptions seldom include emotional language that is recognisable to us. At other times, the transfer of goods is sketched out using the least possible number of words. There is an additional problem of voice. Many people relied on a scribe to write their last will and testament and therefore it is difficult to know to what extent the sentiments of the will are the author’s own and to what extent they might have been summarised or paraphrased by the scribe or simply be conventional to the genre.

Finally, the question of the wills’ correspondence to legal framework and local custom should be addressed. The law, it has been suggested, was always to some extent conditioned by local customs and individual preference. While Lübeck town law, discussed in detail in Chapter Seven, provides a part of the legal framework that surrounded wills in early modern Tallinn, lack of other normative source material makes it difficult to establish whether the law was applied or whether people were even aware of it. Additionally, the town council continuously issued other decrees, which regulated different aspects of life in town in a more detailed manner. The problem is that neither these regulations nor customary law became codified into positive law. A very relevant example is the gender of those who left a will. According to Lübeck law, adopted by Tallinn in the thirteenth century and modified in 1586, a married woman could not make a will unless her deceased husband had explicitly granted her that right. Yet, out of the 117 seventeenth-century wills I have identified, forty-one were left by
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128 Hahn 2015, p. 29.
129 Liddy 2015, p. 274.
130 Liddy 2015, p. 276.
133 Although the term used in the law is wife or Frau, the formulation about the deceased husband would imply that this provision in fact concerned widows. Lübeck law did not explicitly mention not yet married or married women. Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 142. A similar requirement appears to have been present in the English common law, see Erickson 1993, p. 139.
women, among them also married women and those who had not yet married. Additionally, although this was never codified in any laws, the town council explicitly stated in one of its verdicts from 1621 that both men and women, without discrimination, had the authority to bequeath their property. Women leaving wills and transferring property was evidently an established and accepted practice in Tallinn. Thus, when people made their wills and when the town council and the lower court evaluated their lawfulness, it is not always possible to figure out on what laws, customs, and precedents they were basing their decisions.

Ownership of or claims to some kinds of immovable property were undoubtedly fundamental to people’s material security in the early modern period. It is perhaps for this reason, coupled with the careful regulation of property in various legal codes everywhere in Europe, that we have a great deal of knowledge about its role and importance in society. Yet it seems that we know comparatively less about movable goods, even though most wealth was movable in the early modern period. Movable goods were more widely distributed in the society, and as a bare minimum everyone had to have at least the clothes on their backs and something to eat on a somewhat regular basis. As movable goods, clothes were also crucial to many people’s livelihood in the seventeenth century. Wills are an important source, because unlike sumptuary laws and inventories, they allow us to get closer to how people thought about their clothes and their social network. Descriptions of clothes and descriptions of relationship dynamics in wills show people’s intentions about their things and how they depicted their relationships materially through clothes. Having acknowledged the limitations of wills, I maintain that they are still an excellent source for studying the relationship between clothes and social order in the seventeenth century.

2.5 Social history through the lens of court records

Early modern social history has been greatly enriched by the study of court materials and of ordinary people who appeared in court as plaintiffs, defendants, and witnesses. As other kinds of sources are often biased towards the social elite, court materials offer us information about the role clothing played in the life of the non-elite, especially their material interactions. For example, commercial networks, especially those where most participants were people on the margins of the society, are notoriously difficult to study. We also know little about
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134 For example, in England the percentage was smaller between 1550 and 1750, as women left around twenty per cent of the two million wills, see Erickson 1993, p. 204. Of the ninety-six wills left in Tallinn in the sixteenth century, thirty-nine were left by women, see Hahn 2015, p. 158. It has been suggested that wills can be regarded as one of the main genres in which women wrote or dictated in the early modern period, see David 2004, p. 220.
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how exchanges between people took place, how items were valued and how this value was negotiated. With court material, however, we might get a better understanding of how people who could not afford new clothes acquired them, the circumstances in which their networks were formed and what held these together. Whether implicitly or explicitly, clothes were always a central part of people’s lives, and consequently they appear in a broad variety of court materials, not least in those that concerned theft, indebtedness and violence.

For this dissertation, I have looked for court cases in which clothes appear. This resulted in a variety of cases that were concerned with clothes both directly and indirectly.138 The years that were covered by the sampling of court materials are as follows: 1600–1603; 1606–1611; 1612–1630; 1640–1646; 1660–1662; 1667–1673; 1690; 1699; 1700.139 On the whole, seventeenth-century judicial sources from Tallinn are very uneven. While there are no or only a few court cases from some years, for other years, especially towards the ends of the century, hundreds of cases were recorded each year in the court records. For this reason and for other reasons explained below, I have chosen not to quantify the court cases in any way. Instead, I have chosen to make use of cases that inform and illustrate the complex relationship between people and social order on the everyday level from different perspectives. In cases of theft, dealing with stolen goods but also indebtedness, clothes were often at the centre of the problem. People could provide descriptions of their possessions, how they had been acquired, where and when these had been stolen but also what the garments may have been worth. In other cases, clothes were more incidental. For example, in cases of violence or injury to honour, people often provided descriptions of other people’s appearances, including clothes. Clothes may not have been central to their case, but their indirect appearance in people’s narratives is further evidence of how material culture structured people’s activities and experiences on a daily basis and how they observed the others around them.

Although court materials are central to our understanding of how people below the social elites experienced and reasoned about their material condition, they have their drawbacks. In seventeenth-century Tallinn, they are very fragmentary. Very few cases that appear in court books in the seventeenth century are complete in the modern sense. For the most part they do not include the charges, witness depositions, minutes from when the case was tried or the final

138 In their research on gendered work patterns in early modern England, Jane Whittle and Mark Hailwood distinguished the information about work activities found in court materials as integral, related or incidental to the court case, see Whittle & Hailwood 2020, pp. 3–32.
139 If not indicated otherwise, folders are generally called either Protokoll des Niedergerichts or Niedergerichtsprotokoll or some variation of the words, TLA.230.1.Aa44 (1600–1603), Peinliches Halsgerichts-Protokoll Aa44/a (1602–1603); Aa46/a (1606–1611), Aa47 (1612–1620), Aa47/a (1620–1622), Aa48 (1623), Aa49 (1623–1629), Aa50/c (1630), Aa50/m (1640), Aa50/r (1645), Aa56/a (1660–1661), Aa56/c (1662), Aa63 (1669–1670), Aa88/b (1690), Aa97 (1699), Aa130 (1700); Acta Crimin- nalicia TLA.230.1.Bj25/II (1640–1646), Bj28/1 (1667–1673); Documents concerning the assault and insult to Pastor Gottfried Stecher committed by Albrecht Fiant in public street, TLA.230.1.Bj45 (1681–1683); Revaler Burggericht, RA, EAA.2.2.1324 (1694).
sentence.\textsuperscript{140} Often, court cases simply appear as summaries made by the scribe. When interrogation transcriptions are included, often they contain only answers and no questions. Additionally, the court case itself could either be a culmination of or simply one step in a much lengthier legal dispute.\textsuperscript{141} In this case, what had happened previously, why the plaintiff finally decided to turn to the court or how the case was finally concluded remains opaque. We therefore have to accept from the outset that reconstructing full narratives or figuring out exactly what had happened is usually not possible.

Moreover, as the information that has been preserved is often in the form of brief summaries there is uncertainty about the extent to which the speech of ordinary people was omitted or modified by the scribes in order to fit the formal arena of the courtroom and the written documentation.\textsuperscript{142} The question of spoken language and its mediation is especially interesting in Tallinn, where non-German witnesses and defendants were often asked whether they understood German.\textsuperscript{143} Although the sources do not indicate the presence of an interpreter, the parties had to make themselves understood to each other, so it is reasonable to believe that questions and answers were translated in some way, however imprecisely. The second issue that is always a particular problem in court cases is that we do not know when people were telling the truth and when they were lying, and they certainly had incentive to lie. As Alexandra Shepard has observed, ‘litigants’ and witnesses’ statements were shaped by and for their audience at court and offer no more than a set of partial and contrived narratives rather than a recreation of the events themselves.\textsuperscript{144} We also have no knowledge about non-verbal communication such as intonation, gestures, and posture, which undoubtedly formed a vital part of people’s interaction with the judicial authorities.\textsuperscript{145} Thus, what the court finally accepted as truth, what (some) witnesses agreed on as truth, and what defendants, perhaps under torture, accepted as truth, is not necessarily what actually happened.

Concerning the cases that were brought to court, there is also the question of how representative they are. One of the great advantages of using seventeenth-century court materials from Tallinn is that they bring marginal groups, especially people of local origin, into the picture. This is essential, if we want to broaden the top-down perspective on early modern social order and also include the experiences of those at the bottom. On the other hand, we might ask if the cases of theft heard by the court are illustrative of theft as a whole in the early modern period. Arguably, many more people stole in the early modern period than ended

\textsuperscript{140} On this point see also Fohringer 2014, pp. 259–260.
\textsuperscript{141} Kermode & Walker 2005, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{142} Gaskill 2003, p. 24.
\textsuperscript{143} For example, in a court case from March 1640 against Georg von Renteln, seven Estonian peasants were questioned as witnesses by the court. Six of them said they understood no German at all, while one, named Matz Oynas, said he did not understand much German, see TLA.230.1.Aa50/m, f. 22r–23v.
\textsuperscript{144} Shepard 2006, p. 131.
\textsuperscript{145} See also Corfield 1991.
up in court. However, people of higher rank, those who possessed social credit, were also more likely to work out an extra-judicial arrangement with their victims, since most people were more interested in getting back their belongings rather than seeing their neighbours and friends suffer heavy penalties.\textsuperscript{146} Moreover, if a theft took place within a household, it could very well be that the head of the household, rather than turning to the court, recovered the stolen items and decided how to discipline the servant or other household member who had transgressed.\textsuperscript{147} From the court materials it also emerges that many people successfully managed to steal over a long period of time without being discovered, which also supports the idea that the majority of thefts went unpunished.

Similarly, cases of indebtedness that ended up in court probably represent a disruption of normal economic practices; they ignore credit relations that functioned normally and debtors who paid their debts on time, or those who managed to reach an agreement with their creditors.\textsuperscript{148} Most people were not in fact interested in turning friends or acquaintances who owed them money in to the court, because debt was a normal part of life for most people. Rather, they wanted to sustain long-standing credit networks. Those cases that did end up in court were thus peculiar in some way. The people who ended up accused in court usually lacked necessary knowledge or networks to successfully redirect the stolen goods, or necessary social connections and credit to reach an arrangement with the wronged party.

Finally, the legal framework within which the court operated is not always clear. To give an example, Lübeck law identified three different types of theft: robbery, church theft or \textit{Kirchendiebstahl} (the most serious crime), and ‘regular’ theft.\textsuperscript{149} The harshness of the punishment appears to have been contingent upon the crime that had been committed, the gender and age of the offender and the financial value of the stolen goods. The 1586 codex for example stated that for thefts of goods worth more than five Lübeck gulden, men were to be hanged and women beheaded.\textsuperscript{150} However, there were few references to a legal code or any kind of legal framework in the court proceedings themselves so we do not know on what the court’s reasoning and judgement were based.\textsuperscript{151} Evidence from court cases suggests that as punishment people were also fined, whipped, branded, put in the pillory, banished from town, especially if they were not from Tallinn to begin with, and mutilated through cutting off an ear.\textsuperscript{152} Death by beheading, hanging or the wheel were also possible punishments but they appear

\textsuperscript{146} On reluctance to prosecute and extra-judicial settlements see also Lenman & Parker 1980, pp. 11–48.
\textsuperscript{147} Kamp 2016, pp. 532, 543; Kilday 2014, p. 511; Schwerhoff 1999, pp. 149–155.
\textsuperscript{148} Groebner 1993, p. 192.
\textsuperscript{149} Nottbeck 1884, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{150} Nottbeck 1884, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{151} Ze’evi 1998, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{152} Kamp highlights banishment as a more common punishment for foreigners and migrants in early modern Frankfurt, whereas locals were more often punished with fines or incarceration, see Kamp 2016, p. 544. One man Tönno, for example, who hailed from Saaremaa (Ösel at the time),
to have been used mostly with repeat offenders when other punishments had not served as a deterrent. The court materials therefore indicate a flexibility in the court’s operations, even though it is not always possible to deduce the motivation behind their decisions. Additionally, there is seldom information about if, when and to what degree these sentences were carried out.

The next chapter will explain that in the seventeenth century, Tallinn was made up of two distinct political and judicial entities. The lower court of Tallinn town council was thus only one of the judiciary mechanisms in early modern Tallinn. On the Dome Hill, the Castle Court heard cases involving its inhabitants, but also other Swedish bureaucrats, members of the military as well as nobility who had received land from the Swedish state. Occasionally, people from the upper town also appeared in the lower court and vice versa. While it makes sense to assume that where a case was heard depended on where the crime had been committed, exact lines between the jurisdictions are difficult to draw. Additionally, certain offences related to clothes, such as overstepping the sumptuary regulations, were occasionally discussed at the town council meetings rather than in court. As these were mostly directed at women from wealthier backgrounds, we must also allow for the possibility that cases involving the town’s social elite might also appear there rather than in court books.

Last but not least, something should be said about the question of gender in connection to the court material. In their study of early modern gender and crime, Walker and Kermode have observed that the quantification of historical criminality has led to interpretative difficulties and obscured the role of women in criminal activities, since women, with some exceptions, simply do not appear...
in early modern criminal records as often as men. A careful reading of the Tallinn court cases has revealed that women played a variety of roles in theft-related activities. While men were accused of theft more often in Tallinn, women were central to the consequent distribution of these goods, through friends and acquaintances, by acting as fences and by reworking the stolen items. If we want to understand their significance in the legal proceedings, it is necessary to set people’s but especially women’s actions within their social context. Moreover, categorisation of different activities into legal and illegal where there might have been no clear-cut boundaries for contemporaries also restricts our understanding of people’s actions and strategies. For these reasons, this dissertation will not quantify the court records, the many people who appeared in court alone or in groups, or the accusations they made or that were made against them. Instead, court materials will provide a lens through which to trace the networks in which clothes circulated, the emotions they elicited and the strategies, activities and attitudes they inspired. This will be a further important element in improving our understanding of how exactly the idea that appearances and social order were supposed to correspond to each other influenced people in their daily activities.

2.6 Conclusion

To sum up, this chapter first explained why, in order to gain a new understanding about the relationship between dress and social order in early modern Europe, it is necessary to use a variety of different sources and approach these both quantitatively and qualitatively. It is not my explicit aim, however, to demonstrate a harmonious picture of the relationship between clothes and social order and a correlation between the normative and the everyday levels. To the contrary, I expect that we are left with a much more complex understanding of early modern material culture.

Secondly, I explained the choice to use sumptuary laws, inventories, wills and court cases as the main sources for this study. While these have been separately analysed by historians interested in clothing on countless occasions, they have rarely been treated together. But there are more important reasons for choosing these four types of sources. Firstly, taken together they enable us to examine the relationship between clothes and social order from the top-down as well as the bottom-up perspective. It is important that an examination of clothing regulations is accompanied by a study of inventories, in order to compare how clothes were thought to visualise social order and the actual clothing resources that were available to people. Secondly, wills and court cases allow us access to people’s own ideas about their own and other people’s clothes that the laws and inventories do not do. Furthermore, court cases include socially marginal groups that are hidden in other sources. Taken together, inventories, wills and court cases all

contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between clothes and social order on the everyday level, but each illuminates a different angle. These sources are diverse, and as discussed above, each has advantages and disadvantages. Taken together, however, they can provide us with a detailed and rich insight into how clothes and social order related to each other in early modern Europe both on the normative and on the everyday level.
Tallinn in the seventeenth century, if one is to believe Adam Olearius, was ‘a town blessed by God and Nature [. . .] that stood bravely like Numantia against the Tsar’s attack.’ However, only a decade or so earlier, representatives of Tallinn were told by Swedish authorities that their town was ‘a dead donkey’, essentially meaning that Sweden preferred Narva as the hub of their Baltic trade to an economically declining Tallinn. This contrast is highly indicative of the situation Tallinn experienced in the seventeenth century. As in the rest of Europe, this period in what is now known as Estonia was one of war, conflict and political fragmentation. With the beginning of the Livonian War in 1558, the old confederation system collapsed and between 1558 and 1710 Estonian territory was subject to several different rulers. Because of the frequent armed conflicts on Estonian territory and the general social turmoil that accompanied it, the period from 1558 to 1661 has also been termed Estonia’s Hundred Years’ War. It took roughly a century for the old power structures of the Livonian Confederation to dissolve and for the Kingdom of Sweden to emerge as the sole ruler of the land. As a consequence of the Livonian War the population decreased by around 55 per cent and by 1601 no more than 135,000 people lived in what is now Estonian territory. Despite frequent plague epidemics, hunger and the continued armed conflicts in the first half of the seventeenth century, when it finally came to a close the population had increased to approximately 400,000 people.

The consolidation of Swedish rule was a lengthy process. Whereas the northern parts of present-day Estonia, including Tallinn, voluntarily submitted themselves to the protection of the Swedish king in 1561, after the end of the Livonian War in 1583 the geographical territory of the Livonian Confederation was still divided between Sweden, Denmark and Poland. The island of Saaremaa (Ösel) only came under Swedish rule in 1645. As a result of the different ways in which Sweden had acquired the lands on the other side of the Baltic, there were differences in the power relationships it had with the newly acquired territories. Since
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Figure 3.1. Tallinn in the seventeenth century

the northern part of Estonia including Tallinn had submitted itself to Swedish rule voluntarily, King Erik XIV had guaranteed the privileges of Tallinn as well as the local nobility in the counties of Virumaa, Järvamaa and Harjumaa (Wierland, Jerwen and Harrien respectively). The remainder of the Duchy of Estonia as well as the Duchy of Livonia and the islands, on the other hand, were considered conquered territories and therefore it was not seen as necessary to guarantee the privileges of local nobility to the same extent, or even to consider them equal to their northern counterparts.\textsuperscript{163} The peaceful time under Swedish rule did not last long, however, as the Great Northern War broke out in 1700 and the Swedish Baltic provinces were integrated into the Russian Empire in 1710. What came to be known later in the popular imagination as ‘the good old Swedish time’ was over.\textsuperscript{164}

\section*{3.1 A divided town}

In the seventeenth century, Tallinn comprised of two distinct entities, the lower town and the upper town on the Dome Hill (Figure 3.1). The privileges of the lower town were recognised by the Swedish crown on several occasions, meaning that it maintained a distinct social, political and cultural identity very much influenced by the former Hanseatic towns of Northern Germany.\textsuperscript{165} The present dissertation mainly focuses on this part of Tallinn. After 1561, the upper town, which had previously housed both the Commander of the Livonian Order and the Bishop of Tallinn, became the seat of Swedish royal power and the Duchy of Estonia.\textsuperscript{166} The upper town also served as the centre of the Estonian Knighthood, the governing body of local nobility who were of German and Swedish background. This local Swedish government was headed by a Stadtholder, later titled Governor and then Governor General. He was responsible for military, economic, administrative and also some judicial matters and had to represent Sweden’s interests on the local level but also defend local interests in Stockholm.\textsuperscript{167} With the Castle Court being its main adjudicating body and the Svea Court of Appeal serving as its court of appeal, the Dome Hill also had a distinct judicial system.\textsuperscript{168} The privileges of its burghers were recognised in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries by the king, and they were united by the Dome Guild.\textsuperscript{169} The upper town also had its own churches and a school.

\textsuperscript{163} Talve 2004, p. 121.
\textsuperscript{165} Brüggemann & Tuchtenhagen 2013, p. 99; Veispak 1990, p. 237. Tallinn’s privileges were acknowledged by the Swedish crown in 1561, 1570, 1594, 1607, 1613, 1646 and 1675.
\textsuperscript{166} Brüggemann & Tuchtenhagen 2013, pp. 87–99.
\textsuperscript{167} Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, pp. 76–77.
\textsuperscript{168} Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, p. 104.
\textsuperscript{169} Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, p. 103.
Figure 3.2. Panorama of Tallinn in the seventeenth century

Source: Adam Olearius, Offt begehrte Beschreibung Der Newen Orientalischen Reise, Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel: 263.1 Hist. 2°
After Riga, Tallinn was the second largest town in the Swedish Baltic provinces. Although precise numbers are hard to come by, its population during the seventeenth century, including both the lower town and the Dome Hill, is said to have fluctuated between 7,000 and 12,000 people. In the 1630s, around 5,000 people are estimated to have lived in the lower town and its outskirts outside the wall, with a further 2,000 people on the Dome Hill. Sixty years later, in 1690, Paul Johansen and Heinz von zur Mühlen put the population of the lower town around 5,400, although excluding the outskirts, meaning that the population had increased somewhat over the course of the century. Though Estonia gradually came under Swedish rule, the confusion caused by armed conflicts, changes in power but also long-term migration in the preceding centuries, resulted in a notable ethnic diversity. Although numbers vary over the early modern period, towards the end of the seventeenth century, around half of Tallinn’s inhabitants were estimated to be Germans, ten to fifteen percent were Swedes and roughly forty per cent Estonians, Finns, Livonians and other groups considered to be Undeutsch, discussed in detail later in this chapter.

Tallinn’s position on the Baltic Sea was rather unique. In the seventeenth century, Tallinn’s trading ties in the West were primarily with Lübeck and the Netherlands. Dutch merchants retained and even increased their dominant position over time. These Western European trading centres were close enough to allow one ship to take two to three and sometimes even four trips in one year. Flax and hemp were the primary export goods, while cloth, herring, salt, wine and spices were the primary import goods. Tallinn was also attractive to Russian traders because of its supply of goods from Western Europe. Salt played the most important role in Tallinn’s trade with Russia, but other goods for which there was great interest in Moscow included metals from Sweden as well as luxury goods, including textiles, from the Netherlands and elsewhere in Europe. On a local level, contact was maintained with regional ports around the Gulf of Finland and there was also a history of peasant trading with the Southern Finnish coast.
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170 Gierlich 1991, p. 281; Johansen & Mühlen 1973, p. 95; Pezold's estimation for the 1680s lies between 8,000 and 9,000 people Pezold 1975, p. 11. Based on a mustering roll from 1688, Heinz von zur Mühlen calculated that around 10,000 people lived in the lower town, which together with the Dome Hill would have amounted to a total of around 12,000 people, see Mühlen 1992, p. 18; Stefan Hartmann’s estimation for the year 1708 put the population of the lower town including the outskirts at around 9,000 people, see Hartmann 1973, p. 86.


173 Mühlen 1992. According to Heldur Palli’s estimation the proportion of Estonians in towns was between forty and sixty per cent and the proportion of Germans was also between forty and sixty per cent, see Palli 1993, p. 197. For the previous century, Anu Mänd has estimated based on Johansen and Mühlen that Germans made up one third of the town’s population, Swedes one fifth and Estonians less than half; see Mänd 2005a, p. 26.
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the seventeenth century, trade with Sweden also became more important but it was never as important as the European trade.\footnote{Kotilaine 2005, p. 38.}

But the lower town did not remain unaffected by the general social and political upheaval that accompanied the end of the confederate system and the establishment of Swedish rule. By the seventeenth century, the Hanseatic era was over, and Tallinn’s role in facilitating Russian transit trade to Western Europe was quickly diminishing.\footnote{Kotilaine 2005, p. 37; Küng 2017, p. 31.} Despite the efforts of the town council, an increasing amount of Russian trade went through without stopping in Tallinn, and the town was experiencing steady economic decline in the first half of the century.\footnote{Küng 2017, pp. 25–37; Küng 2018, pp. 4–19.} Rye from the surrounding countryside became the main export commodity of Tallinn.\footnote{Gierlich 1991, p. 125. Other important export goods included both Livonian and Russian flax, all kinds of leathers and furs, wax, tallow, and fish, see Gierlich 1991, pp. 129–130.} In order to develop local trade, Swedish government did have some grandiose plans, like setting up a spinning and a weaving mill as well as a rope walk in Tallinn to produce sail cloth and rope from Russian flax and hemp, but these plans did not come to fruition.\footnote{Kotilaine 2005, p. 148.} Tallinn was also forced to lend financial support to Sweden’s wars with Poland.\footnote{Gierlich 1991, pp. 84–91.} Moreover, there were regular outbreaks of plague and the whole country was ravaged by famine in the first and last decades of the seventeenth century.\footnote{Brüggemann & Tuchtenhagen 2013, p. 162; Gierlich 1991, pp. 313–316; Liiv 1938; Seppel 2014, pp. 33–49; Weinmann 1991, pp. 36–50.} This, together with persistent ideas of strict social differentiation between merchants and artisans and merchants’ intolerance towards foreign traders hampered economic development and meant that there was a constant need for wealthy long-distance traders to bring in capital.\footnote{Weinmann 1991, pp. 28–31.}

While Tallinn might appear a backwater of secondary economic importance, the situation was not uniformly gloomy. Tallinn was spared the continuous warfare that Sweden was fighting on many fronts. The town’s fortifications, which were still largely medieval, were updated in the last decades of the century, although the work was cut short by the Great Northern War.\footnote{Laidre 1999, pp. 103–106.} In the lower town, buildings were increasingly being built of stone and thus, even when there were fires, they did not destroy the whole town. The influx of many learned intellectuals from German areas meant that the town experienced a cultural and literary explosion.\footnote{Heero 2019, pp. 143–160.} In 1631, Tallinn Gymnasium was opened, and three years later a printing house attached to it was launched.\footnote{Klöker 2005, pp. 256–266, 350–355.} German-language occasional poetry or \textit{Gelegenheitsdichtung} practiced by many local writers meant that Tallinn stepped out of literary irrelevance.\footnote{Klöker 2005, p. 570.} In 1689 the first local newspaper \textit{Reval(i)sche Post-}
Zeitung was published. Last but not least, change was also reflected in people’s material lives. Inventories reveal the appearance of new goods, often of foreign origin, which could have a high monetary value. Equally important were new behaviours and ways of thinking associated with objects like books, portraits, mirrors, clocks, musical instruments and so forth. The seventeenth century also saw the establishment of new crafts in Tallinn, many of which were concerned with the production of various clothing elements and accessories.

3.2 The social composition of Tallinn

In the seventeenth century, the society of Tallinn was dominated by merchants involved in long-distance trade, who made up the town’s social elite, and by artisans of a variety of different crafts. According to data from 1687, approximately 400 artisans were active in Tallinn, with approximately 200 merchants listed as Great Guild members. Based on a muster roll from 1688 Heinz von zur Mühlen divided the households of Tallinn into four groups: upper-class households including merchants, town councillors and members of the professional class, such as doctors, lawyers, writers and so forth who numbered approximately 1,800 people; a middling class with households headed by members of St. Canute’s Guild who numbered approximately 2,700 people; lower middle class artisans of St. Olaf’s Guild and other groups such as coachmen and boatswains together with their households who numbered approximately 2,000 people; and finally, the lowest classes containing everyone else, such as craftsmen of Estonian origin, labourers and servants, who numbered approximately 3,500 people.

A small minority of the inhabitants of early modern Tallinn who belonged to the upper and middling classes were also burghers. Only those men who were financially independent, meaning they were not in the service of another man or their own father, could become burghers. As burghers were required to participate in the military protection of the town, after 1637 one requirement for becoming a burgher was ownership of a personal weapon. In 1648, another re-
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189 On the publishing of newspapers in the Swedish Baltic provinces and on Reval(i)sche Post-Zeitung as a vehicle for information, see Vanamölder 2012.
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192 Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, p. 139.
193 Mühlen 1992, pp. 28–29. Teet Veispak has calculated that around nine per cent of Tallinn’s population at the time could be included in the group ‘merchants’, around thirty per cent in the group ‘artisans’ and around sixty per cent accounted for the remainder, such as journeymen, apprentices, servants, labourers and so forth, see Veispak 1990, pp. 236–245.
194 According to one estimation, burghers amounted to five per cent of the town’s inhabitants, see Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, p. 67.
quirement stated that the future burgher had to adhere to the Augsburg Confes-
sion.\footnote{Gierlich 1991, p. 22; Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, p. 67. Despite this requirement, there is evidence of people from other confessions swearing the burgher’s oath in the late seventeenth century.} Unlike in some other places, owning property was not a prerequisite for becoming a burgher of Tallinn and candidates could also live in a rented house. The candidate did however have to swear a ‘burgher’s oath’, in which he pledged allegiance to the town council and the Swedish monarch, as well as pay a one-time sum of money called *Bürgergeld*.\footnote{Johansen & Mühlen 1973, p. 287.} The burghers could acquire immovable property, take part in the administration and legislation of town issues through being a member of one of the guilds or the town council, and claim the protection of town jurisdiction outside of town.\footnote{Gierlich 1991, pp. 22–3.} On the other hand, as already mentioned above, being a burgher also involved duties. In addition to providing military protection, burghers were also expected to pay an annual tax called *Bürgerschoss* calculated on the basis of the number of household members.\footnote{Gierlich 1991, p. 69.}

Becoming a burgher was a prerequisite for social and political advancement in the early modern town. Upon marrying, a merchant journeyman or previously unmarried merchant was expected to leave the Brotherhood of the Blackheads, a guild for unmarried merchants and merchant journeymen, and become a member of the Great Guild, where he could potentially become an assessor or an alderman and later seek to be elected town councillor. At some point, he was also expected to swear the burgher’s oath. However, these events did not always follow in the same order, as there is evidence of men swearing their burgher’s oaths both before and after entering the Great Guild.\footnote{Mänd 2013, p. 236. Mänd has also shown that in practice this was always not the case, as sometimes there were married men amongst members of the Brotherhood of the Blackheads and bachelors in the Great Guild.} The same was true for marriage and giving the burgher’s oath, as evidence from the seventeenth-century Tallinn Burghers’ Book reveals that one could swear the burgher’s oath both before and after getting married, although this tended to happen within a relatively short time period. Therefore, in early modern Tallinn, which was a decidedly corporatist society, men’s personal and professional as well as private and public roles were closely intertwined and the milestones of marriage, entering the Great Guild or an artisan guild and swearing a burgher’s oath were inevitably tied to each other.

In an ethnically heterogeneous early modern community governed by norms and ideals of social hierarchy, the question of ethnicity is unavoidable. Germans had formed the social elite in Estonia ever since the conquest of the Baltic territories during the Northern Crusades. Even though Northern Estonia and Tallinn had been under Swedish rule since 1561 and the number of Swedish merchants and artisans in Tallinn increased significantly during the second half of the sev-
enteenth century, most Swedes in the lower town remained in the middling classes or even in groups with lower social standing.201 When it comes to Estonians, it has been suggested that in the seventeenth century they were not a differentiated ethnic group in Tallinn, and that the term Estonians or Ehsten was used only to denote serfs living in the countryside. In fact, there were free Estonians, Latvians and Livonians living in towns but tellingly they were referred to as non-Germans or Undeutsch. This was not meant to denote ethnic belonging but rather one’s position on the social ladder. As such, it carried certain negative connotations.202 Although the people of Estonian origin living in Tallinn were free, the negative connotations of being the descendants of unfree people in the countryside must have been transferred onto them.

Theoretically, one’s ethnic background was not a factor in swearing a burgher’s oath. The Commerce Contract or Kommerzientraktat signed in 1648 by the town council, and a commission headed by Governor Erik Oxenstierna, stated that people of all ethnic backgrounds had the right to become a burgher in Tallinn.203 However, the other prerequisites made it quite impossible for men of Estonian background, but also for other groups denoted as Undeutsch, to become burghers. Teet Veispak, who has studied the numerous letters of birth that were issued to people of Estonian background, argues that most men fulfilled the requirement of having been born to free and married parents. However, unlike Germans and Swedes, their ethnicity was omitted in the letter, which later became detrimental to their social ambitions. A standardised template of a letter of birth from the end of the sixteenth century made it abundantly clear that ‘honest birth’ implied a certain ethnic background, as no person of honest and honourable birth could be born of Jews, Wends, Undeutsch or Finns.204 As the majority of artisan crafts in Tallinn required a German background, it was practically impossible for Estonians to enter the better crafts.205 To enter St. Olaf’s Guild as a lower artisan, such as a stonemason or a carpenter, a letter of honest birth was not necessary and consequently men of Estonian background could be admitted to that guild.206 The lack of access to most guilds and the impossibility of becoming an independent master meant that Estonians were most often found in somebody else’s service and could not afford to pay the Bürgergeld.207 Therefore, the

202 Veispak 1990, p. 242. 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 population. Rather, Kala suggests, 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.
203 Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, p. 68; on the contract, see also Weinmann 1991, pp. 12–17.
204 Johansen 1934, p. 184.
207 The book does not consistently include sums paid but in the second half of the century, two Rtl appears frequently. However, this could also vary within one year. In 1681, for example, while most people paid two Rtl, some appear to have paid three Rtl, see Adelheim 1933, pp. 100–101. To
social, political and economic elite were predominantly of German and to some extent Swedish origin. Estonians and other Undeutsch were almost always of lower social standing and excluded from political participation and influence.

Although it is likely that the Burghers’ Book contains some omissions, some observations have been made about the number and composition of the burgheers during the seventeenth century. On average, twenty men swore a burgher’s oath each year between 1624 and 1710, with the lowest number being four in 1640 and highest number being fifty-two in 1684. Roughly one-third of new burghers came from amongst merchants, although in certain years they made up up to fifty per cent. Although members of educated groups, such as teachers, lawyers, clergymen, and representatives of various medical professions occasionally swore the burgher’s oath, it was an exception rather than the norm. Generally, the lack of artisans from the lower crafts in the book indicates that for various reasons they did not or could not swear the burgher’s oath. The book occasionally mentions the origin of the burghers, which indicates that it was above all men from German areas and Scandinavia, and their eventual descendants, who became burghers. Although some names that could possibly be of Estonian origin appear in the book, they are few and far between, which confirms the understanding that people of local origin generally belonged to the lowest stratum of the society.

3.3 A rigid corporatist system?

As the highest judicial, legislative and executive power in the lower town, the town council was the most influential body and the pinnacle of political, social and economic influence. 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. The town council was divided into various big and small offices or Grosse and Kleine Ämten. The so-called ‘big offices’ were deemed to be of greater importance and dealt with issues such as tax collection, coin minting and so forth, and the ‘small offices’ were those deemed to be of lesser importance and dealt for example with issues concerning artisans and artisan guilds. For the present enquiry the most important is the big office of Wetteherren, consisting of two councillors in charge of

increase revenues, the town council raised the Bürgergeld in 1691 so that a merchant had to pay ten Rtl and an artisan five Rtl, see Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, p. 38.

208 Adelheim 1933, p. xii.
209 Adelheim 1933, p. x.
210 Brüggemann & Tuchtenhagen 2013, p. 99.
211 Not to be confused with the two artisan guilds, which were also called Grosse und Kleine Ämten synonymously with St. Canute’s Guild and St. Olaf’s Guild respectively.
212 Gierlich 1991, p. 28.
collecting the fines that were meted out as a punishment for violating town legislation.\textsuperscript{213}

Corporatist bodies, above all guilds, played a central role in the political, economic, social and religious organisation of town life during the medieval and early modern periods. They united men around similar economic and professional activities, protected the interests of their members against other corporations and the town council, provided social security to their members and their households, and organised various devotional activities. During certain times of the year guilds also organised celebrations both for their members and for townspeople. Although none of the exact founding dates for any of the four guilds in Tallinn is known, they all had been established by the end of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{214} The Great Guild probably emerged from the older St. Canute’s and St. Olaf’s Guilds, when merchants decided to establish a corporation of their own. This development emerged concurrently with the increase in their social and economic status and political importance.\textsuperscript{215} The Brotherhood of the Blackheads, which originally united unmarried merchant journeymen and unmarried merchants of either German or local origin, was the last to come into existence roughly around the year 1400.\textsuperscript{216} Unlike in many other Western and Northern European cities, in Tallinn the guilds remained active as social organisations until 1920.\textsuperscript{217}

It is believed that, initially, guilds in Livonia united people from various social backgrounds and only later developed into corporations that united certain occupations and became sharply divided along ethnic lines. In the early modern period, the Great Guild was predominantly made up of merchants involved in wholesale and long-distance trade, while retailers were generally barred from entering. On the other hand, representatives of other occupational groups, such as a few priests and even a painter, are known to have joined the guild.\textsuperscript{218} The two craft guilds in Tallinn were composite guilds, meaning they linked diverse crafts, known in Low German as \textit{Ampt} or \textit{Amt} and in High German as \textit{Zunft}.\textsuperscript{219} St. Canute’s Guild united more prestigious crafts, which were understood to require more skill, such as goldsmiths, bakers, tailors, and so forth, and St. Olaf’s Guild united less prestigious artisan crafts, such as stonemasons, butchers, furriers and others.\textsuperscript{220} There were also numerous artisans amongst the lower classes who did not belong to any corporation.\textsuperscript{221} The question of ethnicity was discussed earlier in this chapter, but it is worth highlighting that the early modern period can be

\textsuperscript{214} Mänd 2013, p. 230; Põltsam 1997, p. 32.
\textsuperscript{216} Kreem & Oolup 1999, pp. 12, 17.
\textsuperscript{217} Mänd 2005b, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{218} Mänd 2013, p. 231.
\textsuperscript{219} Mänd 2013, p. 233.
\textsuperscript{220} Kaplinski 1995, p. 249. For a full list of crafts included in each of the artisan guilds see Gierlich 1991, pp. 53, 55.
\textsuperscript{221} Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, p. 143.
characterised as a period of narrowing opportunities for the advancement of men of Estonian background. In the sixteenth century St. Canute’s Guild forbade access to ‘Non-Germans’. More than likely there were members of Estonian origin in St. Olaf’s Guild, however, its importance in the decision-making processes decreased sharply over the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. As a consequence of numerous conflicts between the two craft guilds they were forced to merge into one St. Canute’s Guild in 1699.

In adopting legislation and deciding matters concerning town life, the town council had to take into account the opinions of the town community or Gemeinde, which was generally understood to comprise representatives of the Great Guild and the two craft guilds. The Brotherhood of the Blackheads, which united unmarried merchants and merchant journeymen, had a purely social function and in theory at least did not take part in any kind of town politics. That the three other guilds ideally took part in the political decision-making is revealed by the fact that almost all clothing regulations invoke the concept of consensus whereby the town council did not simply impose legislation but reached its decision through debate and discussion with the guilds. In the 1639 regulation it was confirmed that all three guilds had with satisfaction accepted and approved the regulation. In the regulations from 1690 onwards the town council stated that with the approval of honourable burghe rs of all three guilds they intended to abolish wanton abuses of luxury once and for all. Preserved copies of clothing regulations in the guild archives as well as numerous discussions about the regulations during the 1630s and 1640s within the guilds indicate that it was a hotly debated issue. Based on the clothing regulations it appears that the town council wanted to leave the impression that the town community actively participated in government and that legislation was a result of negotiation.

In reality, however, there were numerous conflicts within the guilds and between the guilds and the town council in the seventeenth century. The town council was engaged in a constant struggle to assert its independence and pre-

---

222 Margus 1939, pp. 83–104.
223 In the seventeenth century, the alderman of St. Canute’s Guild often represented the two artisan guilds at the town council, giving further evidence of the limited political role of St. Olaf’s Guild, see Weinmann 1991, p. 86.
224 Brüggemann & Tuchtenhagen 2013, p. 108.
226 Gierlich 1991, p. 56.
227 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 317r.
228 1691 clothing regulation, Pabst 1857, p. 238; 1696 clothing regulation, RA, EAA.1002.1.14, f. A3r.
229 The earliest regulation and the 1631 regulation have been preserved in TLA.190.1.2, pp. 387–92 and pp. 392–403. The 1665 and 1690 regulations have been preserved in TLA.191.1.19, f. 86r–93r, f. 113r–115v. For some discussions of clothing regulations in the Great Guild, see for example the guild’s Diarium, TLA.191.1.26, f.38r–39r, f. 43r–44r, f. 110v–116v, f. 121r, f. 125r–126r, f. 140r–148v.
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eminence, which often led to the guilds contesting its decisions.\textsuperscript{230} When it came to the guilds, a lot of the problems were caused by various privileges, such as the brewing privilege, given to the guilds, and questions about the social position of one group in relation to another.\textsuperscript{231} Often, the Great Guild represented all three guilds at meetings with the town council and even went so far as to assert that it was the only representative of the town community.\textsuperscript{232} However, the craft guilds were dissatisfied with their exclusion from town politics and decision-making processes. The amendments to the 1639 clothing regulation that were issued in 1641, which will be discussed in more detail below, are a good example of this. They were met with sharp opposition and resulted in prolonged petitioning from the two craft guilds, which were protesting the revocation of what they considered to be their age-old privileges.\textsuperscript{233}

Another issue was the growing importance of artisans for the town. The seventeenth century saw an increased specialisation of the crafts. Whereas in the sixteenth century, painters, carpenters, sculptors and glaziers had belonged to one craft guild or Zunft, in the seventeenth century all of them established individual craft guilds.\textsuperscript{234} Additionally, the variety of different crafts, especially those focused on clothes and accessories, increased in Tallinn, with hairdressers, wig-makers, pearl embroiderers, button and ribbon makers all establishing themselves in the town, presumably reflecting a growing demand for certain luxury goods.\textsuperscript{235} The changing wealth and status of certain artisan crafts is for example reflected in the efforts of goldsmiths to join the Great Guild. Earlier, they had been accepted into the Great Guild in Riga, Tartu and Pärnu.\textsuperscript{236} The goldsmiths of Tallinn petitioned both the town council and Stockholm, but their application was turned down.\textsuperscript{237} As a consolation, however, they received some favourable concessions with respect to clothing in both the clothing and wedding regulations. The social aspirations of the goldsmiths, however, were strongly opposed by other artisans within the artisan corps.

The social and political battles were not confined to the town, and the town council was embroiled in several conflicts with the central authorities in Stockholm in its efforts to resist central administration. Already at the end of the sixteenth century, the Swedish king decided that Stockholm rather than Lübeck would be Tallinn town council’s highest court of appeal, even though the town

\textsuperscript{230} For a good overview of the mid-century conflicts between the town council and the guilds see Weinmann 1991, pp. 86–135.
\textsuperscript{231} Gierlich 1991, pp. 57–62.
\textsuperscript{232} Margus 1939, p. 104.
\textsuperscript{233} Petition of St. Canute’s and St. Olaf’s Guilds to the town council, 19 September 1642, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 341r.
\textsuperscript{234} Gierlich 1991, p. 185.
\textsuperscript{235} Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, p. 140.
\textsuperscript{236} Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, p. 142. In the seventeenth century, Tartu was known as Dorpat in both German and Swedish and Pärnu was called Pernau in German.
\textsuperscript{237} Friedenthal 1931, pp. 15–17.
still adhered to the Lübeck law.238 Additionally, a number of conflicts arose from the presence of the Swedish garrison on the Dome Hill. Conflicts erupted between Swedish soldiers and townspeople when the town council refused to allow soldiers on the town walls and later refused them guard duty in the lower town.239 Furthermore, towards the end of the seventeenth century, conscious efforts were made by the Swedish state to reduce German cultural, social and economic domination. In 1680, the Tallinn town council, which had until then elected all of its councillors independently, had to accept a burgomaster of justice or Justizbürgermeister, who was appointed by the king and was essentially a representative of the Swedish state’s interests in the town council.240 The Swedish church law of 1686 was also enacted in the Baltic provinces and over the course of the century there were a number of church visitations into various parts of the country in an effort to ensure that people observed the correct Christian faith.241 These actions show that there was a desire to integrate Tallinn into a centrally administered Swedish state.

In conclusion, this short chapter has shown that Tallinn found itself in a rather unique position in the seventeenth century. On the one hand, the town had to come to terms with the fact that its importance as a trading town had sharply diminished. On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that Tallinn was still one of the largest towns in the whole of the Swedish empire. The lower town, a separate entity from the Swedish administrative centre on the Dome Hill, together with its corporatist groups, sought to preserve its distinct identity as a German trading town. However, as will become clear over the course of this dissertation, the guild-based social system of the seventeenth century was not simply hierarchical and static. Various factions within the town did not always co-exist harmoniously, often competing for political influence and attempting to bolster their own position against other groups. The history of Tallinn in the seventeenth century thus cannot be seen as anything other than a history of conflict and resistance to centralisation. The only party missing in this early modern tug of war were the local people.

---

238 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 town council retained 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 the nineteenth century, see Kala 1998.


240 Kodres 2013, p. 189.

CHAPTER 4
Distinguishing Difference

In these times, one notices all sorts of luxury, innovation and even frivolity in clothing among the wives and daughters of common burghers and journeymen that goes against the commendable practices and habits of our dear forefathers, and numerous people have elevated themselves above their rank and wealth and numerous people have erred against the old respectability, and thus angered God, offended the authorities, irritated their neighbours and aggrieved the pious.242

Sumptuary laws, as already mentioned earlier, were not new in the seventeenth century, and they were not unique to Tallinn. Governments across early modern Europe were busy regulating the appearance and consumption habits of their subjects. The aims of the sumptuary project were manifold and often intersected with each other: visualising hierarchy, ensuring an orderly and god-fearing society, controlling the expenditure of groups that were spending above their income and station, fighting change in styles and fashions and limiting the influx of foreign goods. The quote from the 1631 clothing regulation, in which the town council divulged the many sins of seventeenth-century Tallinners, shows that these concerns were of central importance for the council’s attempts to control appearances. People were blatantly disregarding old customs and authorities, even disobeying God. Excess and luxury in clothing that was displayed by some women and journeymen and the confusion it caused meant that the town council in Tallinn was forced to act. The council thus intended to put a stop to the ‘several already proliferating and future innovations’ in the dress of both sexes. The ultimate goal of the law, the 1631 clothing regulation stated, was to clear away disorder in clothing, ‘so that every social class could be recognised and distinguished by their outward appearance’.243

Clothing was clearly an important means through which to provide social definition, and Tallinn town council, through their persistent attempts to regulate


appearances, considered clothes to have ordering – and disordering – capacities. While scholars have previously devoted more effort to examining the aims behind sumptuary legislation, less has been written about the relationship between appearances and order, although the people subject to regulation throughout Europe could vary greatly.\textsuperscript{244} But this relationship was by no means self-evident. This chapter takes as its departure point the town council’s assumption that clothes were active as agents in shaping social order. The aim is to examine the relationship between appearances and order as it was established by the town council in sumptuary laws. The first part of the chapter examines which groups and hierarchies clothes were intended to create in seventeenth-century Tallinn. The second part of the chapter analyses what sartorial criteria were used to draw the delineations between these groups and hierarchies. This top-down perspective is important because it helps us understand better the nature of early modern social order how it appeared on the normative level.

4.1 Discursive orders

Tallinn town council issued clothing regulations on a regular basis in the seventeenth century (Table 4.1). If we include the two drafts from 1641 and 1650 that never became laws, the council issued or at least attempted to issue a regulation during most decades of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{245} This shows just how pervasive the idea of controlling appearances was. However, as Table 4.1 shows, the laws varied greatly with respect to who was subject to regulation, which is a further sign of the complexities inherent in visualising difference.\textsuperscript{246} The table shows two distinct trends – while women were a rather diverse group of people already in the beginning of the century, the visualisation of hierarchy among groups of men became more complex as the century progressed. The elaborate system of visualising hierarchy reached its apex in the 1665 regulation, which distinguished hierarchically between sixteen groups of people. The second trend that is visible is that from 1690 the system of visual distinction all but disappeared. Rather than regulating specific groups of people, sumptuary laws from 1690 simply forbade

\textsuperscript{244} In Sweden, for example, the 1644 sumptuary law was only directed at the nobility, while in 1664 separate sumptuary laws were directed at nobility, clergy and burghers, see Rahikainen & Vainio-Korhonen 2015, p. 30; Runefelt 2001, pp. 168, 171. Similarly, the extent to which men and women were subject to regulation could vary greatly within Europe: Henrician sumptuary legislation did not concern itself with women at all, and the sumptuary legislation of Renaissance Italy was almost exclusively concerned with regulating women, see Hayward 2009, p. 45; Kovesi Killerby 2002, pp. 112–131.

\textsuperscript{245} Draft of 1641 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.14, p. 3, pp. 15–21; draft of 1650 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.14, pp. 47–48.

\textsuperscript{246} Although children were regulated as a group in 1631, 1639 and 1665, they have not been included in the table. The regulations dictated that they should be dressed according to the social position of their parents, see 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, pp. 396; 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 320r; 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.19, f. 88r.
a wealth of items to everyone, occasionally making specific arrangements for certain groups.\footnote{1691 clothing regulation, Pabst 1857, pp. 239–240.} Finally, in the 1706 regulation, the council admitted defeat, claiming the impossibility of keeping up with rapidly changing fashions. This part will focus on which groups were thought to make up the imaginary sartorial order and in what ways people were categorised. My first focus is on the different groups of men and secondly on their wives and daughters. Male and female servants will be discussed in the third section and the final section focuses on how ethnicity figured in this order.

Table 4.1. Social groups in Tallinn clothing regulations, ca. 1600–1706

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of regulation</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late 16(^{th}) to early 17(^{th}) c.</strong></td>
<td>Burghers</td>
<td>Wives and daughters of burghers/Great Guild members</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journeymen</td>
<td>Wives and daughters of members of St. Canute’s Guild</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wives and daughters of St. Olaf’s Guild</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maidervants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet-nurses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wives and daughters of ‘guildless’ men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of groups:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Town council</td>
<td>Women’s Reval attire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Guild members</td>
<td>Artisan wives’ and daughters’ Reval attire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant journeymen</td>
<td>Reval attire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguished artisans</td>
<td>Women’s Dorpat attire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common artisans</td>
<td>Wives and daughters of distinguished artisans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manservants</td>
<td>Wives and daughters of common artisans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maidervants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet-nurses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of groups:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>Town council</td>
<td>Women’s Reval attire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Guild members</td>
<td>Women’s Dorpat attire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant journeymen</td>
<td>Wives and daughters of distinguished artisans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguished artisans</td>
<td>Wives and daughters of common artisans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common artisans</td>
<td>Maidervants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artisan journeymen</td>
<td>Wet-nurses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of groups:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Town council</td>
<td>Wives and daughters of Great Guild members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Guild members</td>
<td>Wives and daughters of St. Canute’s Guild members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant journeymen</td>
<td>Wives and daughters of St. Olaf’s Guild members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artisans of St. Canute’s Guild</td>
<td>Olaf’s Guild members, German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artisan journeymen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnotetext{247}
Manservants and shop boys of German origin
Town council servants
Town officials and lawyers

and Swedish birth
Wives and daughters of lawyers
and judges
Wives and daughters of town council servants
Maidservants
Wet-nurses

No. of groups: 9 7 16

1690
Male persons
Female persons
Maidservants and other female servants

No. of groups: 1 2 3

1691
Male persons
Manservants
Female persons
Maidservants and other female servants
Wet-nurses

No. of groups: 2 3 5

1696
Burghers and their grown sons
Other male persons
Manservants
Female persons
Maidservants and other female servants
Wet-nurses

No. of groups: 3 3 6

1706
Women low social standing
Female servants

No. of groups: 0 2 2


4.1.1 Men within and beyond the corporatist framework

The first clothing regulation was concerned with a very small segment of men (Table 4.1). Only burghers of Tallinn and the ‘young journeymen’ were distinguished in the law.\textsuperscript{248} The law made no distinction between burghers who were merchants and those who were artisans. Burghers and journeymen were addressed on an equal footing except for a ban on wearing velvet lapels for journeymen, which set the burghers on a higher footing.\textsuperscript{249} For burghers, the distinction appears to have been based not on occupation but rather on whether they had sworn the burgher’s oath and participated in town politics. For both artisan and merchant journeymen, on the other hand, the distinguishing factor was where they were in their professional career. However, looking at the groups of women that were distinguished in that same law, the term ‘burgher’ appears to have been used synonymously with merchants. Therefore, while it might initially seem like the law applied to all burghers, regardless of their occupation, it was actually concerned with regulating the appearance of merchants. This also raises the question whether the term ‘journeymen’ referred to all journeymen or only merchant journeymen. In all likelihood, it was the latter. The earliest clothing

\textsuperscript{248} Late 16\textsuperscript{th} to early 17\textsuperscript{th} century clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 387.

\textsuperscript{249} Late 16\textsuperscript{th} to early 17\textsuperscript{th} century clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 387.
regulation thus bears some resemblance to the seventeenth-century guild system that was discussed in the previous chapter, but it is much more obscure and limited in its scope.

As we saw in the introduction of this chapter, by 1631 the town council was concerned that clothing had ceased to create a legible order and seemed to be sending mixed messages. Therefore, the discursive social order in the sumptuary laws became more layered and more concerned with membership within a corporatist group, which became the focus of distinction. Burghers were separated by whether they belonged to the town council, Great Guild, St. Canute’s Guild (more distinguished artisans) or St. Olaf’s Guild (lower artisans). Manservants also became distinct as a group. A rather similar system was also retained in the 1639 sumptuary law, except that the category of journeymen also became more nuanced, as merchant journeymen who belonged to the Brotherhood of the Blackheads found themselves on the same level as merchants. Artisan journeymen were grouped together with artisans.250 This order already overlapped with the guild-based organisation of men, and even went beyond it, also including the town council, manservants and artisan journeymen, who were not part of any corporatist groups.

In 1665, the discursive order expressed in the sumptuary laws became even more nuanced and included two further groups that were not connected to the corporatist groups: town officials and lawyers as well as town council servants. Furthermore, the group of manservants became both broader and narrower. On the one hand, shop boys were put in the same group of male servants, but on the other hand, the regulation explicitly applied to servants of German ethnicity. This system of distinction reflects attempts to capture an increasingly complex urban society. The complexity is moreover evident through the fact that several modes of categorisation were applied and used simultaneously in creating this order. In addition to guild membership, the town council can best be categorised through their political role in town. Artisan journeymen, male servants as well as town officials and lawyers were categorised through their occupation. Finally, ethnicity is also visible as a determining factor in creating the discursive order, separating German servants from non-German ones.

From 1690 onwards, however, there was a sudden change in how the sumptuary laws addressed and distinguished between groups of men. Rather than distinguishing hierarchically between guild members and certain other occupational groups, all men, except for male servants, became a part of the undifferentiated but a significantly more modern category of ‘male persons’.251 In 1696, a slight nuance was added, making a distinction between burghers and their grown sons, other men, presumably everyone who had not sworn a burgher’s oath, and male servants. By 1706 this distinction was gone entirely, as the 1706 regulation did
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250 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, pp. 395–6.
not directly address men at all. The categories of men thus became fewer in number and the categorisation basis also shifted again to reflect a person’s status as a burgher rather than guild membership and in the case of servants, occupation. This change is extremely interesting, because while the sumptuary laws stopped reflecting the guild-based organisation of the town, the guilds themselves had not disappeared. To the contrary, both 1691 and 1696 regulations asserted that the laws had been issued with the full approval of all three guilds (merchant journeymen, as we remember, did not participate in town politics).  

Occasionally, this system of creating difference could be even more complex, because additional distinctions could be made within these groups of men. One such distinguishing factor appears to have been connected to one’s career within the guild and length of membership. The 1665 clothing regulation, for example, forbade silk fabrics for members of the Great Guild. However, guild aldermen, the bench of elders and other distinguished persons of advanced age, could wear certain silk fabrics, specified in the law, on festive occasions. While artisans were entirely expected to stick to woollen fabrics, aldermen of St. Canute’s Guild could have lapels of caffa on their cloaks and not more than one silk ribbon. In this case, a distinction was made for a very small segment of men within the guilds, those who had distinguished themselves through their service. But their use of the most expensive fabrics was still restricted, as the above-mentioned groups of merchants could only have a single garment of certain silk fabrics and artisans could only have lapels of a finer fabric and not a whole garment. Such distinction also contained a temporal restriction, as we saw, since the small merchant elite within the larger group could distinguish themselves only during special occasions. It shows that clothes were not only important in order to distinguish between various groups of men, but they also created a material distinction between people who were formally within the same larger group. Additionally, the above only applied for merchants and better artisans, i.e. the clearly wealthier corporations, as members of St. Olaf’s Guild would be treated as a homogeneous group.

There were also groups within this system for whom clothes functioned differently as a marker of rank and position. As discussed above, it is not entirely clear whether journeymen had been a homogeneous group at the beginning of

253 For a glossary of fabrics and items of clothing, please refer to Appendix 1. The 1639 clothing regulation made a similar difference between guild members, allowing the most senior members of Great Guild and Brotherhood of the Blackheads to wear cloak lapels of velvet, whereas the remainder of the guilds brothers were supposed to stick to caffa, 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 319r.
254 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.19, f. 86v–87r. An alderman was a chairman of the guild who was aided in his work by two assessors (bisitter). Often, aldermen were senior members of the guild, in terms of age, who had also demonstrated their administrative skills through holding other posts in the guild. Previous aldermen and assessors formed the guild’s Bench of Elders or Ältestenbank, Mänd 2005b, pp. 176–177.
255 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.19, f. 87v.
the seventeenth century or whether the term journeymen only referred to merchant journeymen. In 1631, however, merchant journeymen belonging to the Brotherhood of the Blackheads appeared as a distinct group and in the next regulation, artisan journeymen also became a separate group. While merchant journeymen continued to be likened to merchants in their appearance with a few exceptions, clothing functioned differently as a visual marker for artisan journeymen. They did not have a corporation of their own. Moreover, the understanding was that they would stay in Tallinn temporarily, and thus they were allowed to wear the clothes they had with them. However, their attire had to be respectable and similar to those of local people. Arguably, the expectation was that their dress should not be more ornate and costly than what local people of similar social standing, above all artisans, were wearing. While their appearance would distinguish journeymen from abroad because their clothing did not need to exactly match the local visual conventions, it could not be so unfamiliar as to render them entirely unrecognisable by appearance alone.

Another such group was the town council, who also issued the sumptuary laws in the seventeenth century. While it was absent from the other regulations, in the middle decades of the century, the town council clearly imagined itself at the top of the hierarchy created by clothes, separate from other groups of people and exempt from the limitations set forth in sumptuary legislation. This was explicitly stated at the beginning of clothing regulations issued in 1631, 1639 and 1665. As the wording remained virtually unchanged, it is worth quoting in full:

Because it cannot be confirmed that in his attire, any member of the town council conducts himself [as if he was] above his social standing but it is rather felt that each of them would prefer to dress in a poorer and lowlier habit, if only they were not required to do so once in a while in honour of the town, the council and their status; consequently, less reformation is necessary for this social group.

This is a convoluted way of saying that sumptuary legislation did not apply to the town council because its members were on top of the social hierarchy and could not dress in a way inappropriate to their social standing. The laws did not say that they had to wear velvet or a fur cap but the implication was that appropriate attire was part and parcel of the office, and the office together with its accompanying social standing required appropriate manifestation. Additionally, they were above the rest of the town community in moral terms, in that luxury and opu-
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256 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 319v.
258 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 86v. Weilen nicht zu befinden, das sich jemand innerhalb Rahts uber seinen Standt in Kleidung verhalte, besonders vielmehr erwurrt wird, dass Ein Jedweder sich lieben in schlechtern und geringern Habit, kleiden wurde, was Er solches nicht der Stadt, dem Raht-Stuhl und seinem Stande zu Ehren dan und wann them muset; Also bat dies Standt in so weit destoweniger reformation nöthig.
259 This has also been called righteous or necessary luxury, see Hayward 2009, p. 22.
lence were, in their case, no longer a threat. In this way they essentially also legitimized their claim for the highest office in the town – not blinded by vanity and sinful luxury, they were suitable to be in charge, 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. It is also important to mention, and we will return to this issue several times, that immunity from sumptuary laws did not extend to the wives and daughters of town councillors.

Often, the town council adopted a paternalistic tone, which, depending on the context, could be seen as either encouragement or admonition. Although slightly different from the explicit assertion of the council’s position at the top of the urban social hierarchy, it can still be viewed within the same framework. By reducing the community to the role of errant children and adopting the paternal role, the town council asserted its right to power and its 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 give it direction. Within that framework, political 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 through appearances therefore became a matter of social and moral responsibility for the community. Their status as town councillors and the important role that they had conceived for themselves meant that clothes did not distinguish them as a group in any specific way, but rather they were free to choose the most appropriate expression for their important role.

The system of distinction between different categories of men became more complex as the century progressed and by 1665 it was a veritable maze. While there was some overlap with the formal corporatist system, the visual hierarchy described in the sumptuary laws eventually became more complex and extended beyond the guild system. The discursive social order is also made more complex by the fact that the basis of categorisation was not always the same and also changed over the century. While guild membership was a prominent factor in creating the social hierarchy, at different times other elements like occupation, length of career, status as a burgher, political power, marital status and ethnicity were all mixed into the equation. Understanding the discursive social order created in sumptuary laws is further complicated by the fact that the town council was not always consistent in their use of these categories. In the first regulation, for example, the term ‘burgher’ seems to refer to merchants. But in reality, artisans and also town councillors could be included in the group, as many of them.
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260 The expression in German was väterliche Vermahnungen, see for example 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 86r; 1691 clothing regulation, Pabst 1857, p. 238. A similar point has been made by Leif Runefelt. He argues that because man is inherently selfish and greedy and cannot therefore control his passions or indulgence in luxurious consumption, there is a need for the figure of a Hausvater in order that the social order should be maintained, see Runefelt 2001, pp. 99–116. On paternalism as a mode of government, see also Greenfield 1918, p. 133; Alan Hunt 1996, pp. 196–201.
had sworn a burgher’s oath. This is further evidence of difficulties in deciding what the defining feature of these different groups should be and how to compress all of the different intersecting categories into neat and clearly separate groups.

So far, it is evident that social order as a discursive ideal was not built on one but rather different layers of distinguishing factors. Comparing it to the ways categories were weighed against each other in reality adds even more complexity. Merchant journeymen and unmarried merchants who belonged to the Brotherhood of the Blackheads were as a rule not burghers of Tallinn and did not formally participate in town politics. But in the sumptuary laws, they were grouped together with merchants of the Great Guild. As sons of members of the Great Guild and merchant journeymen of German origin, they had a higher social status than members of the two artisan guilds who theoretically could be and in the case of better artisans often were burghers of Tallinn. Another example would be goldsmiths, who belonged to St. Canute’s Guild and ferociously contested the decision that forbade them to wear velvet and pearls in church. Despite their status as artisans, they worked with the most valuable metals and jewellery in the world on a daily basis. Consequently, they argued that they should have the right to wear the above-mentioned items. In the 1640s the goldsmiths also attempted to join the Great Guild, petitioning both Tallinn and Stockholm, 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.261 Therefore, the question was not just how different categories of men should be separated from each other and what criteria were used in the creation of this order but also what the hierarchy of these groups should look like. The town council evidently attempted to organise different groups of men hierarchically, but because there were so many criteria that were in constant interaction with each other, that became an impossible task.

To sum up, clothes were thought to discursively create the social order along lines that were similar to but did not entirely overlap with the formal corporatist system described in the previous background chapter. According to this, the town council together with the three guilds were the most important bodies in shaping town life. However, this section has shown that the order envisaged in the sumptuary laws was initially much vaguer and later much more intricate than the guild-based system. Over the course of the century, the four corporations became separated from each other in the regulations, but the laws additionally regulated groups of men that were outside of this framework. So, on the one hand, the scope of the laws broadened. But a rough approximation of the numbers brought in the previous chapter further highlights that even when they were in their most detailed form in 1665, there were still perhaps 3,000 to 4,000 people that were left entirely out of the sumptuary laws, including the entire professional class but also many servants, labourers and artisans who did not belong to any of

---

261 Friedenthal 1931, pp. 15–17.
the guilds. An additional problem was that there were so many additional categories beyond guild membership that determined where one would be placed in the hierarchy, that these were not used consistently in the laws and kept changing over the course of the century. Furthermore, they did not necessarily overlap with the categories that people considered important as distinguishing factors in reality. The various groups of men that were included in the laws and the changing basis of the categorisation shows just how dynamic and under negotiation the sartorial order was.

4.1.2 The women of Tallinn

In the previous section, we saw that the social order became more intricate over the course of the century, as more groups of men became regulated. One significant distinction between men and women was that the hierarchy for women was already more complex from the beginning of the century (Table 4.1). Unlike in the case of men, the regulations made a clear distinction between merchant wives and daughters and the wives and daughters of members of two artisan guilds who were on an equal footing with each other but lower in the hierarchy than merchant wives and daughters. More importantly, the regulation also mentioned wives and daughters of ‘guildless’ men, which was in all likelihood a very large category of people; however, this group of women disappeared from later regulations. With the exception of servants, the way that women were distinguished from each other in sumptuary was thus from the beginning connected to the guild membership of their husbands and fathers.

While wives and daughters of the two artisan guilds were initially placed on an equal footing, by the 1630s there also emerged a more nuanced visual hierarchy between them. This system was also similar in 1639 but in 1665, further groups of women – wives and daughters of lawyers and judges as well as these of town council servants – beyond the guild system were added to the clothing regulations. Like in the case of men, the discursive social order of women was at its most complex in 1665. As with their fathers and husbands, this complex social order based on appearances disintegrated in the 1690s and the clothing regulations from 1690 onwards addressed all women except for servants as ‘female persons’. One change for women was that until 1690 the position of women within the social order was always tied to the male head of the household, either through their guild membership or occupation. From 1690 onwards, however, this relationship was no longer emphasised in the sumptuary laws.
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262 Late 16th to early 17th century clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 387.
263 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 401.
264 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/1, f.320v–323r; 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 89v–91v.
There were also occasional distinctions made within the larger groups of women tied to the corporatist system, but they were based on other criteria than for men. One such factor was a person’s marital status. For example, unmarried women were occasionally banned from wearing things that were allowed for married women, such as golden rings and necklaces. 266 Through some specific items, in 1665 a hierarchy was also set up between unmarried daughters of merchants and artisans. Merchant daughters were allowed to wear pearls with their dress, while it was forbidden for daughters of artisans. All unmarried daughters of merchants and artisans were allowed to wear ear roses according to old custom, but while colourful ribbons were allowed for merchant daughters on festive occasions, daughters of better artisans could only have black ribbons. Presumably, the daughters of lower artisans could have none. While daughters of distinguished artisans could wear laces with gold, silver and silk, daughters of common artisans could wear simple black velvet laces. 267 Thus, a woman’s marital status could be visible in her appearance through two different ways, indicating not only whether or not she was married but also where she belonged in the social hierarchy.

Another distinction that concerned wives and daughters of lower artisans was based on ethnicity. The various prohibitions and permissions that the 1665 clothing regulation made for these women only applied to those whose husbands and fathers were of Swedish or German birth. The wives and daughters of artisans of Estonian origin should dress like servants. 268 As discussed in the previous chapter, ethnicity affected the possibilities of men to advance socially and politically in Tallinn. But this was also the case of women and therefore it is not surprising that such ideas also permeated the hierarchies of women. Nor is it surprising that the question of ethnicity only became explicit in the group of lower artisans, because the socially exclusive merchant and better artisan groups would not have included any men or women of Estonian origin anyway. Once again, it shows how the intersecting categories of gender, ethnicity, marital status and guild membership were in constant interaction in creating a complex visual hierarchy.

In the section above, I explained that while town councillors were included in the sumptuary laws, they explicitly exempted themselves from following it. However, my impression is that the same was not the case for their wives and daughters. As a group, these women were not mentioned in clothing regulations, and consequently, this conclusion can only be drawn from the frequent conflicts over these women’s sumptuous dress in the seventeenth century rather than form any specific regulations provided in the sumptuary laws. 269 Presumably, since town councillors were elected from amongst merchants who belonged to the Great
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267 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 90r–91v.
268 TLA.191.1.19, f. 91v.
269 These conflicts will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.
Guild, their wives and daughters would have been considered to have a similar social standing as merchant wives and daughters. Consequently, my understanding is that they were to adhere to the same sartorial rules, even if it was never explicitly stated in sumptuary laws.

In the first four decades of the seventeenth century, another complex mode of distinction between women that was made in the sumptuary laws concerned the question of ‘local’ and ‘foreign’ dress. The reason why foreign fashions appeared in Tallinn in the first place, the earliest clothing regulation explained, was that foreign women were marrying into Tallinn. Since getting an entirely new outfit was a costly enterprise, women of foreign origin who had married men from Tallinn could retain their usual dress to avoid expenses on getting an entirely new set of clothes. While these women were allowed to continue wearing their customary dress, this could not be overly sumptuous, the law stated. These women’s daughters, on the other hand, who were born and grew up in Tallinn, were obliged to adopt the local dress. It was also made explicit that no woman who had so far dressed according to the local style could adopt a new foreign fashion. These concerns with foreignness were by no means unique to Tallinn. In Sweden, apparently, the exceptions made for foreigners also caused concerns, since especially women pretended to be foreigners in order to wear fashions forbidden by law. In the German areas, foreign influences in clothing were also subject to discussion, and people were fully aware of the creative power of clothes to ‘mould a person and materialise identity’. Clothes thus struck at the heart of ideas about identity and nationality.

A further clarification was made in the 1630s, with the unwanted foreign fashion being termed ‘Dorpat attire’ or *dörptsche tracht*. This attire was not connected to any of the guild groups discussed above. Rather than being foreign in terms of exotic imported styles and fabrics, however, ‘Dorpat attire’ above all denoted the fashion of the nobility. This style also had certain characteristic traits. Included in this attire were round headgear made of sable fur, knitted stockings, some kind of high shoes, and shoe ribbons made of silk and shoe-roses, all of which were forbidden in the clothing regulation. Also included in ‘Dorpat attire’ were bracelets with corals and trimmings with pearls, which were only allowed on Sundays and other festive occasions. Though some of the wearers of this style surely originated from Tartu, or Dorpat as it was known at the time, it is
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270 Late 16th to early 17th century clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 388
271 Late 16th to early 17th century clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 389; 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 397.
272 Eva I. Andersson 2019, p. 163.
274 Ernst Gierlich has made an explicit connection between noble attire and ‘Dorpat attire’, see Gierlich 1991, p. 294. Although the sources never explicitly mention ‘Dorpat attire’ as being noble, I find it a reasonable conclusion and an explanation for why the town council regulated it so vigorously.
275 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, pp. 399–400.
276 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 400.
unlikely that everyone from Tartu wore this type of dress, and equally unlikely that all who wore clothes in this style came from Tartu. Rather, it appears to have been a general label for dress considered noble and thus inappropriate for the family members of merchants.\textsuperscript{277} It is unfortunately impossible to establish how the term came into existence, from where its wearers originated, whether it had specific characteristic features beyond the ones mentioned in the regulations and finally, whether these features remained the same or changed over time.

Table 4.1 moreover shows the real difficulty in weighing the different modes of categorisation against each other and trying to put them in writing. The 1631 regulation made two different sets of provisions, one with respect to the local and encouraged ‘Reval attire’ or \textit{Renalsche tracht} and the other with respect to the unwanted ‘Dorpat attire’ that the town council was forced to tolerate. While ‘Dorpat attire’ appears to have applied to all women generally, ‘Reval attire’ was divided into ‘women’s Reval attire’ and ‘artisan wives’ and daughters’ Reval attire’. But the same regulation also made other provisions for artisans’ wives and daughters. For example, while the rules concerning wives and daughters of better artisans stated that high headgear made of sable and marten were forbidden, the part in which their Reval attire was discussed made no such rule.\textsuperscript{278} Moreover, wives and daughters of merchants are missing entirely in this regulation, which suggests that they may have been the group addressed in ‘women’s Reval attire’. It is virtually impossible to understand which groups of women were found in these various groups and which mode of categorisation was to take precedence. It is very likely, however, that since the council probably meant dress that was considered noble under ‘Dorpat attire’, these regulations would have only concerned the wealthiest segment of the society, such as wives and daughters of merchants and more distinguished artisans.

Despite rigorous attempts at regulation, it is therefore not surprising that the issue of ‘Dorpat attire’ continued to cause disorder. Even though the town council would have liked to see women wearing only ‘Reval attire’, ‘so that there would be a respectable equality and likeness amongst them’, ‘Dorpat attire’ had become so prevalent that banning it would have been accompanied by great difficulties.\textsuperscript{279} The council therefore made a number of concessions in the 1639 clothing regulation. Since the round fur headgear was so popular that no other kind was worn it was difficult to forbid it entirely, but permission to wear it was granted only to the wives of Great Guild members. Furthermore, the headgear was supposed to be without decorations, not too high, and could not cost more than ten Rtl.\textsuperscript{280} Additionally, the women wearing noble dress were allowed to wear small golden necklaces (pearls around the neck remained forbidden) and whereas in the 1631

\textsuperscript{277} Late 16\textsuperscript{th} to early 17\textsuperscript{th} century clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 388; see also Gierlich 1991, p. 293.
\textsuperscript{278} 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 399, p. 401.
\textsuperscript{279} 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, pp. 396–7.
\textsuperscript{280} 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 321r.
regulation only bracelets with average-sized corals were allowed, the 1639 clothing regulation conceded that bracelets could be worn according to the wearer’s liking, either with corals or reasonably gilded, and that trimmings with pearls could be worn all the time, not just on special occasions.\(^{281}\) Finally, whereas in 1631 only cloaks made of silk grosgrain were allowed to married women adhering to the Dorpat style, in 1639 they could choose from damask, silk grosgrain or Turkish grosgrain, according to their status.\(^{282}\) This fabric hierarchy hints that status probably depended on whether they were married to a merchant or an artisan. Thus, acknowledging that the noble dress could not be banned, attempts were made to confine its spread and make sure that the material elements of the dress were suitable for the wearer and her social status.

That the noble dress itself underwent changes is also evident from the regulation issued in 1665. Not specifying any details, merchant wives and daughters were banned from wearing all kinds of noble attire, regardless of whether this was to be worn in public or in the privacy of one’s home.\(^{283}\) However, the details described above, such as the fur headgear, the corals and the necklaces, which earlier had been a part of the noble attire, had by 1665 been integrated into the wardrobes of merchant wives and daughters. While noble dress was still undesirable and something that distinguished those women who did not belong to the sartorial landscape of Tallinn from those that did, the material content of noble dress had changed. The sartorial indicators that had previously been associated with nobility had over time instead become associated with merchant wives and daughters, something which also shows the dynamism inherent in clothes.

To sum up this section, sumptuary laws reveal a similar complexity in attempts to distinguish between groups of women. Often, a woman’s place in the social order depended on the position of her husband or her father. Wives and daughters of merchants were thus distinct from wives and daughters of better artisans who in turn were distinct from wives and daughters of lower artisans. However, the regulations extended beyond the guild framework, occasionally including groups of people that were left outside the guilds and their households, such as wives and daughters of men who did not belong to any guilds. Additionally, female family members of town councillors occupied an ambiguous position, since their fathers and husbands were exempt from regulation and they themselves were not. But how their position was to be visualised through appearances remained unclear. But there were also other ways of categorising women, like marital status, ethnicity and whether one was a local person or a foreigner. It is thus evident that while the guild membership of their husband or father was important in the seventeenth century, it was not the only distinguishing factor. It is also evident that just like in the case of men, many women were left outside of this
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\(^{281}\) 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 400; 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 322v, f. 322r.

\(^{282}\) 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 400; 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 322v.

\(^{283}\) 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 90r.
Furthermore, the laws were not infrequently unclear with respect to who they attempted to regulate. The discursive social order that clothes were thought to create between and within groups of women was therefore more intricate and dynamic than initially appears.

4.1.3 Servants

The most consistent distinction that sumptuary laws made in the seventeenth century was to separate out categories of servants (Table 4.1). Specifically, wet-nurses and maidservants were consistently addressed in the sumptuary laws.\textsuperscript{284} Maidservants were seen to be especially susceptible to the temptations of sumptuous dress, and new fashions and their luxurious dress already concerned the town council in the 1620s.\textsuperscript{285} This was perceived to be a major problem throughout the century, and even in the 1690s maidservants were accused of aping their mistresses and dressing above their station.\textsuperscript{286} The sumptuary laws of the 1690s moreover took direct action to combat this perceived threat. The clothing regulations determined maidservants’ wages, and fabric and clothes were to become a part of their wage, so that they could have less choice in how to dress themselves. Wet-nurses were to receive their entire wage in clothes. Additionally, both groups were forbidden from moving freely from one employer to another in search of better wages that they could then spend on clothes.\textsuperscript{287} Especially maidservants were identified as the culprits in obscuring the visual order and therefore the clothing regulations took rather drastic measures in order to reduce their opportunity for free sartorial expression and make sure that their position would be visualised appropriately. The problems inherent in servants’ dress become especially clear if we consider that when the guild-based visualisation of hierarchy abruptly ended in the 1690s, female servants continued to be a target of regulation.

At the same time, it is also evident that while regulation amongst the wealthiest segments of the society could be extremely detailed, making a distinction between those lower down on the social scale was not necessarily always a priority. In the first half of the seventeenth century the distinction between servants and female family members of artisans was not that strict. The 1639 regulation, for example, stated that female servants and wives and daughters of poorer artisans could generally dress in a similar manner, with the exception of certain better woollen fabrics that were forbidden to servants. They were also encouraged to wear sleeves

\textsuperscript{284} 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 400; 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 324v.
\textsuperscript{285} See for example town council meeting minutes from 1622 and 1627, TLA.230.1.Ab41, f. 41, f. 312; TLA.230.1.Ab44, f. 44v, f. 266–267;
\textsuperscript{286} 1691 clothing regulation, Pabst 1857, p. 239; 1696 clothing regulation, RA, EAA.1002.1.14, f. A3r.
\textsuperscript{287} 1696 clothing regulation, RA, EAA.1002.1.14, f. A3v–a4r.
of coarse grosgrain or wande so as to set them apart from artisan wives. As already mentioned above, artisan wives and daughters of Estonians were also supposed to dress like servants rather than other artisan wives. In the 1690s, however, as we saw above, while the rest of the women came to be addressed as a homogenous group, maidservants and wet-nurses were clearly distinguished from them. Thus, there was a clear development through which the appearance of these two groups of female servants would make them clearly distinct from other groups of women.

Male servants were not subject to regulation to the same extent as female servants. They were addressed as manservants in the regulations of 1631, 1639, 1691 and 1696. The 1665 regulation, however, made a further distinction by only regulating shop boys and male house servants of German origin, who would be distinguished by their woollen clothes. These woollens, which could also be imported, were in all likelihood of better quality than what was available to male servants of local origin. A main concern that appears from sumptuary legislation is to make sure that it was possible to distinguish between servants and journeymen. In order to make this distinction, shop boys were not allowed to wear any ribbons on their hats or fine double stockings so that they could be distinguished from journeymen, who were of a higher social status. However, servants of local origin were not distinguished in any specific way, most likely because it was assumed that they did not have enough resources to acquire an outfit that could be confused with that of a journeyman, while those of German background might have such resources.

A further differentiation that was occasionally made within the groups of both male and female servants was connected to the length of their service. Those maidservants and wet-nurses who had been in the service of the same master for some years could have clothes made of finer woollens. Similarly, the 1639 regulation stated that male house servants who had been in the service of the same master for three or more years, could obtain new livery made from a better woollen. The 1665 regulation also specified that a servant who had served his master for four years could be dressed somewhat better, as long as there remained a difference in appearances between servant boys and journeymen. These small distinctions both for men and for women were thus based on their work history and not on their marital status or the status of a family member. In this way the dress of servants could be a mark of individual qualities and loyalty towards their master that set them apart from others within their group. Most importantly, it

288 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/1, f. 324v.
289 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 88r–88v.
290 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 88v.
291 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 92v. 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, see 1691 clothing regulation, Pabst 1857, p. 240; 1696 clothing regulation, RA, EAA.1002.1.14, f. A4r.
292 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/1, f. 320r.
293 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 88v.
is evident that far from lumping all people of low social position into the same grey mass, clothes could also be extremely important in setting servants apart from others within their group.

4.1.4 Ethnicity

The final category that this part discusses is ethnicity. While it is obvious by now that early modern hierarchies could be incredibly complex, ethnicity, as we have already seen, had a special relevance in a multi-ethnic society like Tallinn. How clothes distinguished between Germans or Deutsch and Non-Germans or Undeutsch was never an explicit issue, but one’s ethnicity was always interwoven with all the other distinguishing criteria, such as gender, occupation, guild membership, wealth and one’s status as a burgher, that placed a person or a group of people into an intricate hierarchy. As Chapter Three explained, while theoretically one’s ethnicity was not an obstacle to becoming a burgher, in reality the possibilities of Estonians to exert any influence in town politics were severely limited, as they could not swear a burgher’s oath and were increasingly excluded from the artisan guilds. Regardless of whether Undeutsch referred to serfs from the countryside or Estonians, Latvians and Livonians living in the towns, there was a clear power dynamic based on ethnicity that structured the interactions and daily experiences of the people in Tallinn. One’s ethnic belonging was thus also implicitly included in this discursive visual order.

Because the other factors that distinguished between groups of people were inextricably linked to ethnicity, it is not a surprise that it never warranted explicit discussion in matters of clothing. Arguably, however, ethnic belonging in fact surpassed other types of group belonging. As already discussed above, the 1665 clothing regulation clarified that all previous points 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 common servants. Though appearing to be a small detail, it gives a vital clue about how people compared different group belongings against each other. Everybody was aware that any social advancement 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. They were not equal to their guild brothers of Swedish and German origin. Ethnicity was thus always a distinguishing factor, but it made a distinction between groups of people in a fundamentally different way. While there could surely be Germans and Swedes who placed low in the social hierarchy, it was equally likely that there were wealthy Germans and Swedes living in Tallinn. But the group of Undeutsch or people of local origin were not just ethnically different, they were invariably at the bottom.

---

294 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 91v.
4.2  Sartorial signs

Having examined the different groups and categories of people that at different times were thought to make up the discursive social order, in the following section I will examine the material criteria that aided in making this order visible. Clothing regulations are intriguing sources, because what is often not discussed is that they could be both all-encompassing and extremely detailed. Let us look at two examples. The 1639 clothing regulation specified that silk fabrics were forbidden to the artisans of St. Canute’s Guild, but they could wear fabrics like floret, gewand, grosgrain, Turkish grosgrain and four-ply. Their cloaks could be decorated with one ribbon.295 The same regulation, however, regulating merchants and merchant journeymen specified that their hat bands could not be golden, silver or made with pearls, and that their collars could not have any embroideries or laces. Moreover, shoe roses were forbidden, as were gilded and silver-plated spurs on boots.296 Therefore, there was no uniform approach towards which details of dress got regulated – for one group it may have been headwear, for others cloaks or muffs, yet for others jackets and doublets. The above-mentioned example also shows that in addition to restrictions, clothing regulations could also provide allowances in dress.

In order to not be overwhelmed by the sheer wealth of detail that meets anyone attempting to tackle sumptuary laws (see for example Table 4.2 on the variety of fabrics) and systematically examine the various sartorial rules and regulations, I have chosen to focus on certain material aspects of dress that were especially important for creating a distinction between different groups of people. I have selected the following criteria that appear in sumptuary laws as particularly meaningful in visualising the discursive social order: the fabric of the garment, various ornaments or add-ons worn with the outfit, the garment’s financial value and finally, how occasion and space dictated distinctions between people.

4.2.1  Fabric

The quality of fabric was a primary way of creating difference between groups of people and that applied for both men and women. Although fabrics were an important part of sumptuary legislation throughout the century (Table 4.2), since the ideal social order was at its most complex in the 1665 regulation, the discussion is primarily based on that. In the 1665 regulation, most senior and eminent members of the Great Guild and Brotherhood of the Blackheads were allowed to wear a suit of silk on Sundays and on festive occasions. Some restrictions did apply on fabrics, as glossy and unshorn velvet remained entirely forbidden and plush, satin and brocade were allowed only for doublets and jackets. All mer-

295 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/1, f. 319r–319v.
296 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/1, f. 318v.
chants and merchant journeymen could wear cloaks of cheaper silks like silk gros-
grain, taffeta and terzenel on Sundays and festive occasions. For the remainder of the time all merchants and merchant journeymen were expected to stick to woollens like gewand, Turkish grosgrain, polemit and similar fabrics.\textsuperscript{297} Members of St. Canute’s Guild could not wear any clothes or stockings made of silk, and the fabrics allowed to them included mediocre Prussian woollen, polemit, grosgrain and four-ply. Only the aldermen of the guild could have cloak lapels of caffa, which would set them apart from all other artisans.\textsuperscript{298} The common artisans of St. Olaf’s Guild could have clothes of polemit and coarse gewand.\textsuperscript{299}

Table 4.2. \textit{Fabrics in Tallinn clothing regulations, ca. 1600–1706}\textsuperscript{300}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Late 16\textsuperscript{th} to early 17\textsuperscript{th} c.</th>
<th>1631</th>
<th>1639</th>
<th>1665</th>
<th>1690</th>
<th>1691</th>
<th>1696</th>
<th>1706</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bomseid</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadelcloth</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocade</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camlet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth of gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth of silver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damask</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dussincken</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floret</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-ply</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gewand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossy velvet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosgrain</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homespun</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kammergeisch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kersey</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutschbay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lace</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mageir</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marten</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{297} 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 87r.
\textsuperscript{298} 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 87v.
\textsuperscript{299} 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 88r.
\textsuperscript{300} From 1690 onwards, the regulations did not make a gender distinction and simply listed forbidden fabrics.
| Meissen cloth               | x |
| Oberkiker                   | x |
| Packlacken                  | x x x |
| Plush                       | x x |
| Polemit                      | x |
| Puke                         | x x x |
| Rasch                       | x x x |
| Russian wende                | x x |
| Rösselchen                   | x |
| Sable                        | x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x |
| Satin                        | x x x x x |
| Says                         | x x x x x |
| Scharlacke                   | x |
| Schiertuch                   | x x x |
| Silesian linen               | x |
| Silk (un-specified)          | x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x |
| Silk camlet                  | x x |
| Silk grosgrain               | x x x x |
| Silk terzenel                | x |
| Soltwedel cloth              | x x x |
| Squirrel                     | x |
| Taffeta                      | x x x |
| Terzenel                     | x x x |
| Trip                         | x x x x |
| Tuch                         | x |
| Turkish grosgrain            | x x x x x x x x |
| Unshorn velvet               | x x |
| Velvet                       | x x x x x x x x x x x |
| Wande                        | x x x x x x |
| Watman                       | x x |
| Wolf                         | x |
| Woollen (unspecified)        | x |
| Woollen camlet               | x |
| Woollen damask               | x |
| Woollen grosgrain            | x x x x |

A similar hierarchy appears among women, although some allowances were made to women with respect to silk. Merchants’ wives and daughters were also banned from wearing silk on workdays but they could have silk jackets. On festive occasions and Sundays, they could wear clothes of silk, but fabrics like caffa, velvet, satin and plush could be used for single garments and not for entire outfits. Wives and daughters of better artisans also had to stick to woollen fabrics on workdays, but on festive occasions and Sundays they were allowed certain cheaper silks like taffeta and terzenel on jackets and skirts. These could also be worn together not just individually. Wives and daughters of common artisans were only allowed woollen fabrics, such as trip, Turkish grosgrain, mageir, says, oberkiker and others of similar value. The gradations of fabric quality were similar for men and women but unlike merchants, their wives and daughters could evidently wear a silk jacket also on weekdays. Additionally, although the types of silk fabrics were restricted, wives and daughters of better artisans were in fact allowed to wear a silk gown on festive occasions, unlike their husbands and fathers.

The fabric quality was equally important for both male and female servants. Their clothes were generally made of a variety of woollen fabrics, but it is apparent that there was also variety within these fabrics. For servants, as explained above, the quality of their wardrobe was primarily connected to the length of their service, as they could upgrade their wardrobe after some years of service. The 1639 regulation stated that male house servants could wear an outfit of Russian wande or watman. After three or more years of service, they could obtain a new livery made from a better woollen fabric, such as Soltwedel or Meissen cloth or packlacken. Similarly, in 1665, maidservants and wet-nurses were allowed clothes of coarse woollens like wande, yet after a year of service they could be allowed better woollens like grosgrain, woollen damask, kutschbay, says, bomseid or other woollen that did not cost more than one Rtl per yard.

We saw above that the law provided general guidelines for each group of people but did not strictly limit the number of fabrics available to each group or specify every single suitable fabric. Neither did the number of fabrics decrease as one moved lower down the social scale; rather, their quality got coarser and consequently they were also cheaper. Furthermore, more exclusive fabrics like silk usually could not be used for the whole outfit but rather had to be combined with other fabrics of poorer quality. Additionally, by indicating a few of the most common fabrics in each category and adding the formulation that people belonging to a certain category could wear ‘other similar fabrics’, the sumptuary laws also relied heavily on people’s skill and knowledge in distinguishing between different types of fabrics as well as evaluating their financial value in relation to each

---

301 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 89r.
302 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 91r.
303 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 91v.
304 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/1, f. 320r.
305 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 92r.
other. The seventeenth-century sartorial system, where different factors such as gender, social position, temporality, and specific garments were evaluated against each other, was thus highly complex and relied not only on people’s cooperation but also their competence in evaluating their outfits.

The sumptuary laws also demonstrate change that occurred over the course of the century. In the beginning of the seventeenth century, silk fabrics, above all velvet, were generally forbidden to both men and women. For example, velvet was forbidden to burghers and journeymen, as were silk stockings. Wives and daughters of burghers were similarly not allowed to wear any velvet or silk skirts or capes.\textsuperscript{306} However, by 1665, the number of available silk fabrics, as we saw above, had increased considerably. Certain new silk fabrics like taffeta, terzenel and satin had become permissible for some groups of people and under certain conditions. Even better artisans and their family members were permitted to wear cheaper silk fabrics in certain circumstances. The 1696 regulation, moreover, allowed all women except for female servants to wear cloaks of black unspecified silk.\textsuperscript{307} While it surely remained expensive in the seventeenth century, sumptuary laws provide evidence that the wearing of silk democratised somewhat and the circle of people who could and did wear silk fabrics widened significantly.

While the material hierarchy appears most clearly in the 1665 regulation, the fabric used for clothes was the most common way to differentiate between different groups of people in the sumptuary laws. In a very schematic way, the fabrics used for seventeenth-century clothes could be divided up as follows: the most expensive imported silk fabrics like velvet were generally forbidden in sumptuary laws and later allowed in smaller quantities for the wealthiest merchants; cheaper imported silk fabrics and better-quality woollens, which were also usually imported, were allowed to both merchants and better servants; finally coarse, usually locally produced woollens were allowed for lowest artisans and servants. But in creating the order discursively there were several factors at play. It was not just the fibre of the fabric that was important. Other factors that played a role in distinguishing between different people included how fine or coarse the fabric was, how much of one or other fabric had been used and how it had been used in making the garments, whether the fabric was imported or local and on which occasion it was worn. Of course, these factors were mutually dependant, as more exclusive imported silk and woollen fabrics would have been costlier than a locally produced coarse woollen.

\textsuperscript{306} The earliest clothing regulation forbade velvet and silk to women, and clothes, gloves and muff made of velvet to burghers and journeymen, late 16\textsuperscript{th} to early 17\textsuperscript{th} century clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, pp. 387–8.

\textsuperscript{307} 1696 clothing regulation, RA, EAA.1002.1.14, f. A3v.
4.2.2 Accessories

Accessories also created fine yet important distinctions between people (Figure 4.1). Clothing regulations specified not one but at least five different ways add-ons could create distinction: their material, length, width, weight and whether they were real or imitation. For example, the 1665 sumptuary law stated that artisans of St. Canute’s Guild generally had to stick to woollen fabrics, but guild aldermen and the bench of elders could have one decorative silk ribbon that would distinguish them from their guild brothers. At the same time, members belonging to the lower of the two artisan guilds could have no decorations whatsoever. On the other hand, the sumptuousness of accessories was heavily limited throughout the century also for merchants. The same 1665 regulation, for example, forbade all hatbands and belts with gold and silver thread or pearls, collars with embroideries or lace, all other ribbons, cords, laces, sashes and so forth with gold or silver thread, golden trims and all other excessive adornments.\textsuperscript{308} German shop boys could have at most four yards of ribbon decorating their hose.\textsuperscript{309} What was forbidden to merchants, was doubly forbidden to everyone else, reminded the law.\textsuperscript{310} Thus, while accessories like bands and ribbons themselves were not forbidden, they were supposed to be simple and there were not supposed to be too many of them.

Accessories could also make a distinction between women, and the regulations generally allowed them more finery than was allowed to their male household members. The 1639 regulation specified that the golden necklaces worn with the ‘Reval attire’ should not exceed fifteen lod in weight.\textsuperscript{311} However, the system of distinction could be rather dizzying, as the 1665 regulation demonstrates. Merchant wives and daughters could wear golden cords, ribbons and laces on their clothes as well as bracelets of gold and corals and diamond rings. On the other hand, certain things like galloons and passementerie that were sewn through with gold or silver thread were forbidden.\textsuperscript{312} There could also be no golden ornaments on their shoes. Furthermore, unmarried women of this group could also wear pearl trimmings and pearls around their neck, but colourful, golden and silver ribbons around the neck or on gloves were not allowed.\textsuperscript{313} Pearls were forbidden entirely to wives and daughters of better artisans, but they could use silk ribbons or ribbons woven or crocheted of gold and silver thread (the precise technique was not described).\textsuperscript{314} Wives and daughters of common

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{308} 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 87r.
\item \textsuperscript{309} 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 88v.
\item \textsuperscript{310} 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 88r.
\item \textsuperscript{311} 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 320v. One lod was equal to roughly 13 grams, see Svenska Akademiens ordbok (SAOB) lod (1941).
\item \textsuperscript{312} 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 89r.
\item \textsuperscript{313} 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 90r.
\item \textsuperscript{314} 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 90v.
\end{itemize}
artisans could only wear one silk ribbon or cord and unmarried women specifically could have velvet trims with no gold or silver. In the discursive order, a woman’s social and marital status was visualised through a complex interaction of material and fabric and their combinations, specific kind of design for which they were used and where it was located on the attire.

Not only was there a huge variety of different types of accessories and add-ons, their importance is also demonstrated by the meticulous and continued regulation throughout the century. The sumptuary laws from 1690 onwards, rather than being concerned with fabrics or garments, focused almost exclusively on limiting the use of just such elements, for example describing the width of the accessories, their content and production technique as well as place of origin. The 1691 regulation, for example, stated that while handkerchiefs decorated with lace were allowed for women, the lace could not be wider than the width of four fingers. It is not surprising that accessories made up such an important part of sumptuary laws. Accessories, like ribbons, buttons, bands and belts, were an integral part of seventeenth-century attire because they literally held it together. At the same time, they could also be made of incredibly expensive materials. Clothing was costly, and accessories provided a way of renewing one’s wardrobe relatively cheaply, compared to making a new garment or an entire outfit. Even small alterations, an added ribbon here or a trimming there, distinguished a person, and could make a difference between outdated and stylish. Furthermore, accessories added value to garments beyond the fundamental use value, and thus bestowed more status on the wearer. The ‘use value’ of a coat with gaolions or ribbons or other trimmings might have been the same as that of a coat without any accessories but the former’s ‘status value’ was incomparably higher.

---

315 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 91v.
317 1691 clothing regulation, Pabst 1857, p. 238.
318 On silk ribbons in early modern Europe, see also Caracausi 2019, pp. 39–61.
319 Currie 2007, p. 167; Möller 2014, p. 52; Pajur 2017, p. 32. On the cheaper cost of accessories and the mockery they drew in the eighteenth century, see also Vickery 2013, p. 880.
Figure 4.1 Ribbon made of brown taffeta, seventeenth century

Source: Lehv paelaga, TLM _ 16328 H 1809, Tallinna Linnamuuseum (Photo: Ervin Sestverk)
4.2.3 Financial value

A further aspect of clothes that was occasionally used to create a distinction between various categories of people in sumptuary laws was the financial value of the garment. We saw in the section discussing fabrics that people were expected to have a sharp eye and a keen sense of what different fabrics were worth in relation to each other so as to judge whether wearing those fabrics was appropriate or not. Occasionally, however, sumptuary law made this job easier by explicitly indicating the financial value considered appropriate for each category of people. In 1665, wives and daughters of merchants could thus manifest their social belonging through wearing Swedish caps, boat caps or caps made of sable fur, but the cost of those could not exceed twenty Rtl.321 Wives and daughters of better artisans could wear sable fur caps costing no more than ten Rtl, and wives and daughters of lower artisans were allowed caps of striped marten or only poor sable not worth more than six or eight Rtl.322

For men, similar rules could apply. The earliest clothing regulation for example stated that the collars of burghers and journeymen could not be made of more expensive linen than nine or at most ten Mark.323 According to the 1665 regulation, the wealthiest merchants and merchant journeymen could also wear caps of sable fur not exceeding twelve to sixteen Rtl in value, according to the wearer’s rank within the group.324 However, neither the common artisans nor the more distinguished ones could wear any sable headgear. Compared to their female household members, it appears that men’s wardrobes were expected to be of lower financial value. As we saw with women, there was again a direct correlation between the quality of the material and its monetary value. Another thing worth mentioning is again the responsibility that the sumptuary laws placed on people in conforming to the rules and knowingly choosing a fabric or garment of appropriate price for their social standing.

4.2.4 Occasion and space

The criteria already discussed – fabric, accessories and financial value – were all concerned with or connected to the physical characteristics of dress. However, there were other external criteria employed in the sumptuary laws that determined the appearance of different categories of people in relation to each other. We have already seen in the section concerning fabrics that Sundays and festive occasions, such as weddings, were temporally distinct from workdays and that the former allowed a little extra luxury in appearance for certain groups that the latter did not. A general observation is that most clothes were supposed to be of woollen fabrics but on special occasions, the sumptuary laws allowed the social
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321 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 89v.
322 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 90v, f. 91v.
323 Late 16th to early 17th century clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 388.
324 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 86v.
elite to distinguish themselves by wearing silk clothes. However, as a general rule the whole outfit could not be made of silk. While other occasions, like baptisms and funerals were subject to sumptuary laws, no other celebration appears as problematic to the early modern authorities as the wedding celebration. Involving both a temporal and spatial dimension, weddings were probably the most expensive celebrations in people’s lives in the early modern period, with respect to guests as well as participants. The wedding ceremony and the concurrent feast was a joyous social occasion, but it was also infused with religious meaning. Thus, a formal justification for wearing a sumptuous dress during Sunday sermons, weddings, baptisms and funerals might have been to praise God, but it was equally important to accentuate one’s social position. These civic-religious celebrations undoubtedly afforded people the opportunity to make visual statements about their position within the community.

Whether for weddings, funerals or Sunday sermons, people often found themselves in the church. Unsurprisingly, then, church was the setting for many conflicts over social position. Church offered an opportunity for social display but also meant that people were actively monitoring their fellow churchgoers. Therefore, appearances were also regulated specifically with church in mind. For example, the 1691 regulation stated that going to church in too sumptuous dress could incur a fine ranging from twenty to 200 Rtl, depending on the wearer’s social position. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, all women who wished to go to church in a colourful mantua or a headdress with colourful ribbons could do so but were obliged to pay a fine of twenty d smt. However, while for some groups certain spaces functioned as a way to display their best apparel, in spite of the financial penalties, others were restricted from doing so. The last clothing regulation issued in 1706 for example forbade all women of low social standing and maidservants from going to church with expensive lined fur cloaks or golden and silver decorations, regardless of whether these were real or imitation. While the church as a space was accessible to everyone no matter what their social standing was, it did not mean that social standing was absent within it. Church was a potent site of social engagement because it was where the community regularly gathered. ‘The overt order of the day may have been worship, but equally important was the social agenda underlying liturgy, sermon and prayer,’ Susan Vincent has observed. The church thus became a venue in
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325 Roper 1985, p. 74.
326 Bulst 1993, p. 35.
327 In the seventeenth century, regulations were issued with regularity not only in connection to weddings, baptisms and funerals, but also visits of Swedish monarchs and other royal representatives, as well as swearing the oath of allegiance to the Swedish monarch, see Kodres 2013, pp. 183–204.
328 1691 clothing regulation, Pabst 1857, p. 238.
331 Vincent 2003, p. 93.
which status and wealth were displayed and where intra-community relationships were negotiated.

To sum up, the main ways in which clothes created social difference in sumptuary laws were through fabrics, accessories, financial value, and finally occasion and space. A very important result of this section is to show that since an outfit was always an aggregate of different visual and material elements, these elements of dress constantly interacted with each other in visualising a person’s social order. An expensive garment of silk could thus only be worn by a specific section of a specific group of people during certain temporal moments, which by extension also implied the space or spaces in which it would be worn. Conspicuously absent from this scheme of creating difference is colour, which previous research has been shown to be of considerable importance elsewhere in Europe. Furthermore, people were knowledgeable and expected to be able to distinguish between a huge variety of different fabrics, their value, and whether they were appropriate or not to wear in different circumstances. Women were expected to know how much gold necklaces weighed and to distinguish between real and imitation jewellery. In this way seventeenth-century people were expected to actively participate in the creation and visualisation of difference.

4.3 Conclusion

This chapter has examined how social order was created normatively in sumptuary laws and how clothes were meant to visualise difference between groups of people. One important outcome is to hugely complicate our understanding of early modern sumptuary laws. Rather than demonstrating a scaled-down version of the early modern society, the town council in Tallinn rather attempted to capture the multiplicity of ways in which people could be categorised in early modern Europe. While guild membership played an important role as a basis for distinction, sumptuary laws show continued efforts to categorise people in other more nuanced ways. Even so, while sumptuary laws show attempts to keep up with the complexity of urban society with its intersecting categories, hierarchies and identities, on the normative level social order never came to include all inhabitants of Tallinn. Seventeenth-century clothing regulations thus aimed not to regulate the appearances of every inhabitant of Tallinn but rather mainly those groups in and near the elite who were perceived as particularly threatening to the social ambitions of other people of similar position. After 1690, however, the number of groups subject to regulation decreased sharply and the laws entirely lost their guild-based structure. This shift may indicate a change in the town council’s attitude towards the purpose of sumptuary laws – dressing above one’s rank was still
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332 For references on colour see footnote 495 in this dissertation.
condemned in the 1696 regulation, but top-down attempts to organise people hierarchically were discontinued. 333

The second part of the chapter examined what material criteria were employed in sumptuary laws in order to visualise the social order. This revealed three important things. Just like in the case of groups of people, who were categorised in numerous different ways by the laws, distinction between them was also made through a variety of social and material criteria that were in constant interaction with each other. Even though the ideal was to create a legible, clearly recognisable order in appearances, the material criteria that would visualise a person’s position were in fact quite complex. A person’s position within the hierarchy would emerge through an interplay between fabric and materiality, finish, price and place of origin, but also location on garment as well as temporality and spatiality. Finally, people were not meant to be passively accepting these attempts to order the society. Instead, they were expected to be active in shaping it, and to display a high level of ‘dress competence’ in observing and evaluating their own and others’ appearances based on both the material and the social criteria outlined above and their mutual interaction. 334 Far from taking away all initiative from individuals or expecting them to passively comply, early modern clothing regulations show that people were expected to weigh their options and possibilities and to actively engage in the creation of their and others’ appearances.

333 1696 clothing regulation, RA, EAA.1002.1.14, f. A2v.
334 On ‘dress competence’, see Vincent 2003, p. 140.
In October 1700, butcher Gottfried Mittag came to see Christoph Michael, bailiff of the lower court of Tallinn town council. In Mittag’s absence, his wife had let some soldiers bring a very sick soldier into their house. The soldiers promised to come and retrieve him again in the morning but by midnight the soldier was dead. Because he felt it to be his duty, Mittag had come to let the court know what had happened. He described the soldier as Finnish and wearing a grey watman coat and a blue waistcoat. A physician and a surgeon who had examined the body determined that the young man was around twenty years old and looked quite thin. His body, apart from being quite yellow, did not have any visible wounds or other signs of physical injury. A passport was found on him, which indicated that the young man was called Martten and was indeed from Finland. The dutiful butcher had already made enquiries about the dead soldier in the suburbs as well as on the Dome Hill based on his clothes, but nobody recognised him. That is not surprising, since the Great Northern War had broken out that same year and a Finnish soldier dressed in grey and blue woollen was surely not a rare sight in Tallinn at the time.

Based on the description above, Daniel Roche’s claim that it was only in the eighteenth century that people acquired a keen sense of observation seems off the mark. The case above demonstrates that people in the seventeenth century were skilled in the art of reading and interpreting external signs, noticing the complexion, physique and not least the fabric and colour of others’ clothes. Not only the other soldiers’ statements but also Martten’s clothes would have identified him as one of them. Based on the information that was available to him, the butcher had made enquiries about the soldier in the two places – the Dome Hill and in one of the suburbs – where he thought Martten would be recognised. But nobody came forward, and he was later buried in a poorhouse coffin in a suburb outside the city wall. This was no coincidence, as the court decided that it was appropriate for a person of his social belonging based on the information they had received from the various witnesses.

As the previous chapter explained, there was a prevalent idea in early modern Europe that people could be recognised and identified by their appearance. The
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335 Gottfried Mittag’s statement, 22 October 1700, TLA.230.1.Aa130, f. 438v–441r.
treatment of Martten after his death was very much in line with this assumption. But recognisability in the early modern period had a dual meaning. Not only was it important to know and read other people, to ‘identify’ them, but recognisability was also important in claiming and bestowing hierarchical recognition and advantage.\textsuperscript{337} Dress, a primary means of identification, was threatening because it could clarify and affirm social order, but it could also conceal and disrupt it. Precisely because of this dual capacity of clothes, regulation of appearances was thus necessary, ‘so that disorder in clothing would be cleared away and every social class could be recognised and distinguished by their outer appearance’.\textsuperscript{338} The previous chapter detailed how social order was discursively created through appearances in sumptuary laws and explained that they used complex and intersecting categories in order to create that order and visualise it. Keeping in mind the dynamism inherent in organising the society, the aim of this chapter is to examine this social order when it came into contact with reality. The first part of the chapter examines why order in appearances was something towards which the town council strove. The second part of the chapter analyses how order and recognisability functioned on the everyday level through examining how people categorised other people. The final part of the chapter examines how social order was negotiated through conflicts on collective and individual levels.

5.1 Motivating order

As we saw in the previous chapter, for much of the seventeenth century the town council in Tallinn issued sumptuary laws in order to establish a hierarchical social order that would be legible to all.\textsuperscript{339} But the motivations and ambitions behind legislating people’s appearances and consumption habits were much broader in the early modern period, stretching beyond the immediate concern of visualising social hierarchy. Related to the preservation of hierarchical order were attempts by some groups to exert political influence, regulate the behaviour and consumption of rival factions or redefine boundaries between these groups.\textsuperscript{340} Sumptuary laws were also intimately tied to economic issues, and they voiced a recurring concern over the fact that people spent what they did not have, which not only led to financial ruin but also enabled them to pretend to occupy a higher social

\textsuperscript{337} Alan Hunt 1996, pp. 108–109. According to the ‘discourse of recognisability’, it was not just necessary that society be hierarchically ordered but also that that order be visualised in a specific manner, see Runefelt 2015a, pp. 31–32. On Lesbarkeit der Welt, see also Dinges 1993, pp. 90–112.

\textsuperscript{338} 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 393. damit die Confusiones der Kleidung abgereinett, vndt ein iglicher Standt, auch an dem Euserlichen habit erkandt, vndt unterscheiden werden könte.

\textsuperscript{339} Englund 1989, p. 74; Harte 1976, pp. 139–143. The aim of regulating appearances as a way of preserving a given social order has also been called an ethical aim. The ethical argument proceeds from the understanding that there exists a hierarchical social order and that one’s position within that order should be recognisable from a person’s appearance, see Runefelt 2001, p. 157.

\textsuperscript{340} Runefelt 2001, p. 159.
position.\textsuperscript{341} On a macro level sumptuary laws were connected to the development of mercantilist thought and sought to balance the state’s finances by favouring domestic production.\textsuperscript{342} Last but not least, sumptuary legislation was also concerned with questions of morality. Luxury consumption and the desire for material things had long been associated with sin, because these violated the divine order and undermined the stability of the society.\textsuperscript{343} Importantly, women, their consumption, honour and sexuality were perceived as particularly problematic and always present in sumptuary laws.\textsuperscript{344} The importance of each of these could vary according to time and place, but sumptuary legislation was almost invariably concerned with several of these issues at the same time.

Yet, while some have attempted to trace a linear change from preserving the hierarchical social order and motivating sumptuary laws with concerns over morality to regulation connected to the development of mercantilist thought, others have been more sceptical.\textsuperscript{345} Especially the idea that luxury debates became detached from questions of morality has been criticised. Dianne Owen Hughes has shown that even if economic aims behind sumptuary laws in Italian cities became more common over time, they were still sporadic or subordinated to concerns over social order.\textsuperscript{346} Leif Runefelt has argued that in a hierarchical society, luxury, usually referred to as excess (Sw. överbąd and Ger. Überfluss or Überflüssigkeit), was understood as something that was forbidden, something to which one had no right.\textsuperscript{347} So defined, luxury meant living a lifestyle that exceeded what was appropriate to one’s social position and the economic means that were thought to accompany that position. In that way, luxury became relative, and relevant for people of all social ranks. While living moderately and appropriately for one’s rank was virtuous, living excessively was vicious. Therefore, the concept of excess itself was ethically charged and underpinned all discussions of what we today understand as luxury.\textsuperscript{348} Even after luxury debates came to an end in the eighteenth century, a reconceptualization of vice and virtue into ‘use’ and ‘abuse’ and ‘productive’ and ‘unproductive’ in political discourse meant that consumption continued and indeed continues to be moralised to this day.\textsuperscript{349} The first part of this

\textsuperscript{341} Smith 2002, p. 78.
\textsuperscript{342} Alan Hunt 1996, p. 8; Runefelt 2001, pp. 157–159; Smith 2002, p. 70.
\textsuperscript{343} Alan Hunt 1996, pp. 81–82. See also Howell 2010, p. 263; Vries 2008, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{344} In Sweden, Eva Andersson has written extensively on gender and sexual morals in sumptuary law, see for example Eva I. Andersson 2014, pp. 57–70; Eva I. Andersson 2019, pp. 152–156.
\textsuperscript{345} For example, Bo Ek, who distinguished between a variety of different motivations behind sumptuary legislation, argued there was a change from a concern to differentiate between the estates to promoting national economy and a positive balance of trade, quoted in Eva I. Andersson 2019, p. 145. Others who have claimed there was a shift from primarily ethical and social concerns to economic considerations include Peter Englund, although he is only concerned with nobility, and Alan Hunt, see Englund 1989, p. 85; Alan Hunt 1996, pp. 33–34. See also Rublack 2010, pp. 266–267.
\textsuperscript{346} Hughes 1983, pp. 77–79; Runefelt 2001, p. 160.
\textsuperscript{347} Runefelt 2001, p. 165. See also Sekora 1977, ch. 1.
\textsuperscript{348} Runefelt 2001, p. 166.
\textsuperscript{349} Hilton 2004, pp. 101–123.
chapter therefore focuses on the societal concerns over excessive consumption and examines in what particular way these were voiced in Tallinn.

5.1.1 A godly worldview

In the seventeenth century, a godly worldview was fundamental to the workings of the society and a hierarchical order. Order was sought after because excesses in clothing and appearing to be of higher social standing than one was, made God angry.\(^{350}\) To quote the opening lines of the 1665 clothing regulation:

> After this good town and community has been struck by God's rod with scarcity and general decrease in sustenance, it should seem due to each and every pious Christian man that one and all can only avert prospective punishments through repentance, prayer, an honourable life and change. However, next to other vices, the excessive opulence in clothing has even increased to an extent that no one seems to have heard of moderation in clothes and instead all laws and previous decrees are boldly being looked down upon. Further, it has been made difficult to the authorities to execute these laws, so that it must be assumed that this town will perish, if the evil is not averted with quick remedy. The preachers have not let their admonitions cease and the honourable town council has grasped the seriousness of the situation. After previous decrees have been watered down by many an innovation, the council has now revised the decree and added with punishments and relentless execution. Each and every one has to adhere to this law, which will spare him from future harm.\(^{351}\)

Excessive clothing was thus shameful; it was a sin. But dressing above one’s social standing and wealth did not only have private consequences, it could bring down God’s wrath on the whole community.\(^{352}\) Critics commonly associated urban life in the early modern period with disorder and a variety of behaviours considered dangerous, such as sexual deviance, drunkenness, violence and excessive consumption, as well as general moral decay.\(^{353}\) God’s punishment because of excessive luxury and unrepentant sinners was fundamental to explaining the

\(^{350}\) 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 393.
\(^{351}\) 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 86r. *Nachdem in diessen Schwürigen und beschwerlichen Leufften die Rabte Gottes durch Tewrungh vnd allgemeine Abnehrung der Nahrunge diese gute Stadt vnd Gemeinheit fast sehr drucket, das einem Jedweder frommen Christlichen Biederman gebühren wolte, ins gemein vnd ein Jedweder bey der Seinen die vor Augen schwebende vnd künfftige Straffen, durch Busse, Gebett vnd eine Ehrbahres Leben vnd Wandell abzuwenden, demnach gleichwohl dem zu wiedern, nebenst andern Lästern, die vbermässige Vppigkeit in Kleidern demmassen zu nimpt, dass nuhnmehre keiner der Hoffart vnd Neuen Munster weder Maase weiss noch wissen will, besondern alle gesetzten vnd vorhin publicirte Ordnungen frech vnd ingeschevets verachtet, vnd der Obriigkeit die Execution aber die maessen schwer vnd sawr gemacht wirdt, dannenher zu vermuten, es werde diese Stadt unter diessen Laster zu boden gehen, wofern durch Zeitige remedirung dem Vbell nicht vorgekommen wurde. So haben nicht allein die Herren Prediger an öffentlichen Ermahnungen, vmb die Gemeine zuerweichen, nichts erwianden lassen, besondern es hatt auch E. Hochw: Raht den Ernst ergreffen, vnd die vorige Ordnung, nach eingeschlichenen viele vielen Neuerungen, nochmahlen revidiren, auch die Straffe vnd unnachbleiblichen, strenge Execution anhangen müssen, damit sich Jedweder darnoch zu richten vnd für Schade zu hüten wisse.

\(^{352}\) 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 393.
\(^{353}\) Alan Hunt 1996, p. 176; Scott 2016, ch. 3.
many social upheavals, such as economic decline, war, famine and plague that befell the Baltic area in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Although not explicitly mentioned here, people were surely aware of the biblical precedent set by God’s destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, in which the sins of some resulted in the judgement of many. Thus, dressing above one’s social standing had serious consequences for the well-being of the community, and it was therefore in every individual’s interest to keep their own and others’ desires in check.

In the seventeenth century, civic order was rooted in the religious ideal of society comprised of three estates. The idea of a tripartite social order that developed from the eleventh century onwards was justified by medieval theologians such as Thomas Aquinas using the argument that the universe was made up of complementary yet diverse elements. A well-ordered society, he argued, required social inequality. In the sixteenth century, propelled by the Protestant Reformation, urban authorities envisioned a ‘godly order’ that was based on the idea of a hierarchical society. While the town council officially issued sumptuary legislation and enforced a legible hierarchical order, this order and its enforcement through legislation was based on a Protestant understanding of society and the place of each person within it. Religion thus became a tool through which to enforce a patriarchal, conservative, corporation-based civic order. When people indulged in luxury and ostentatious displays of dress, they not only transgressed the civic law as laid down by the local authority by making claims to a social position they did not have, but even worse, they also set themselves above God by ignoring divinely established social differences.

As pointed out earlier, it has been suggested that religious and moral arguments were increasingly replaced by economic considerations in the authorities’ efforts to legislate luxury. In Tallinn, however, religiosity as it appears in sumptuary laws appears to have intensified as the century came to a close. To quote the 1696 clothing regulation:

Angered by exuberance, luxury, pride and splendour, God let his wrathful punishing rod be seen so that the sustenance diminished with each day and the land became haunted with crop failure; finally everyone shall reflect on himself and make the authoritative orders and the clergy’s Christian admonitions his guidelines so that he can let go of luxury and pride and through obedience and humility verify his own Christianity and strive to be reconciled with God. Unfortunately,
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354 Ericsson 2002, pp. 91, 284. On famine as divine punishment see also Cunningham & Grell 2000, pp. 200–247. 1602/1603, 1656/1657, 1669/1670, 1695–1697 have been identified as the worst plague and famine years in Estonia, see Küng 2004, p. 332. For the famine that raged during the last decade of the seventeenth century, see Hartmann 1973, p. 149. It has been suggested that during the early modern period there was a general increase in devoutness and piety during catastrophes such as war, plague or famine, see Cunningham & Grell 2000; Gierlich 1991, p. 292.

355 Gestrich 2015, pp. 296–297.
357 Gestrich 2015, p. 297.
the damaging and ruinous sins of pride and luxury are witnessed daily, and especially among the womenfolk, as if it was a virtue of their sex to dress themselves above their rank, strut around in sumptuous clothes and jewellery and oppose good Christian orders. It is certainly to be believed that one will not abstain from sumptuous clothing, which is an unmistakeable sign of an arrogant and proud heart, and make an effort to humbly reconcile with God, he, angered by our sins, will magnify the punishment hovering over our heads to our outright ruin, punish our pride with barrenness and our abundance with scarcity.

The exasperated tone and references to diminished sustenance in the regulation is most likely a direct response to the famine that was ravaging Northern Europe at the time and suggests a town council at its wits’ end. As the century drew to a close, social distress increased rather than decreased in Tallinn, leading the town council to make an explicit connection between people’s indulgence in excess and the famine. At the same time, it should be pointed out that while the clothing regulations from 1690 onwards lacked an intricate social hierarchy based on guild membership, occupation and political role, the authorities’ concern over women dressing inappropriately for their rank is still very much present in the 1696 regulation. Religious motives and the preservation of hierarchical social order were intimately connected through the end of the seventeenth century.

The quote above furthermore reveals the complementarity of the church and the civic authorities in the instruction, guidance and control of early modern people. As people were expected to regularly attend church, it was a convenient venue in which to introduce new legislation and discipline people into compliance. Conflicts over sumptuary excesses that were discussed earlier in the dissertation surely mark out churches as central venues in which appearances were controlled and negotiated. But the quote above also shows a clear development in the role of priests in seventeenth-century Sweden. As Håkan Möller has argued, an increase in their authority meant that their role became more clearly demarcated from that of the congregation and new demands were placed on
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359 The negative concepts associated with excessive consumption here are Übermuth, Hoffarth, Stoltz, Pracht and Üppigkeit.

them as teachers, preachers and moral examples.\textsuperscript{361} It was also a tool to make church control over its subjects more effective. Read in this way, religious concerns for disorder may also suggest that the town council, faced with constant law-breaking and the inescapable flux of the system, was ready to give up the struggle for appearances and hand the issue over to the church.

Since the Middle Ages, people’s desire for material things had been seen as a ‘spiritual threat and a manifestation of temporal evils’.\textsuperscript{362} ‘Old luxury’ was associated with extravagant and unrestrained consumption and with the seven deadly sins.\textsuperscript{363} Instead, it was desirable for every good Christian, after they had paid their fines and prayed, to aspire to moderation and piety so that all excess would be eradicated. But this did not mean that Protestant cultures were to be devoid of material things. Contrasting welfare or living well (\textit{Wohlfahrt}) with excessive luxury or opulence (\textit{Üppigkeit}) and haughtiness (\textit{Hoffart}) in 1706, the town council in Tallinn emphasised the importance of consuming within the means available to each individual. A kind of ‘new luxury’, Protestants legitimised moral forms of consumption that served as a counterpart to extravagant Catholic consumption practices.\textsuperscript{364} Such consumption was based on a regular self-examination as to whether one needed something or was indulging in unjustifiable conspicuous consumption.\textsuperscript{365} While perhaps more restrained and tasteful, this kind of consumption remained inherently hierarchical because its central idea was that while one was free to spend within one’s means, one was not supposed to spend what one did not have. Yet, the contradictions inherent in a discursive hierarchy based on legibility and the everyday material reality are well illustrated by the same 1706 regulation. The town council, while still condemning luxury as immoral and contrary to God’s will, effectively admitted that trying to restrain people’s wants and desires through legislation was futile.

5.1.2 An orderly economy

An orderly society, religious and god-fearing in nature, was closely connected to an orderly economy. On an individual level, curbing people’s expenditure on clothes could above all be seen in the clothing regulations, which often placed a ceiling on the monetary value of a garment or accessory. As we saw in an earlier chapter, the 1665 regulation determined how expensive the fur headwear could be depending on one’s social position.\textsuperscript{366} A 1643 petition from artisans similarly acknowledged the hierarchical status consumption, asking that their wives and
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daughters not be deprived of wearing pearls and sable headwear entirely, but rather that theirs could simply be cheaper.367 A more indirect way to limit consumption was to list the allowed and forbidden fabrics for various social groups. The members of Great Guild were expected to wear clothes of woollen fabrics like Turkish grosgrain and polemit, except on festive occasions when certain coarser silk fabrics, such as silk grosgrain, taffeta and silk terzenel were allowed, but not velvet or brocade. Members of St. Canute’s Guild could wear better-quality woollens, such as floret and Turkish grosgrain, and members of St. Olaf’s Guild were expected to stick to coarse woollens.368 Although not as precise as indicating the money one could spend, it still provided an economic framework within which one was supposed to manoeuvre and consume, establishing for each group what the appropriate expenditure on clothing should be.

The economic reasoning behind social order was certainly connected to hierarchical thinking. In the seventeenth century, luxury was not tolerated in general, but indulging in luxury was worse for poor people, because they not only made claims to a position they did not occupy, but unlike rich people they could not afford it. A land order issued by Governor Gustaf Oxenstierna in 1645 and renewed in 1665 that regulated the weddings, funerals and clothes of the German and Swedish nobility also curbed the alleged excesses of local peasants. Condemning the excessive eating, drinking and gift-giving of peasants in the countryside, the regulation accused them of misusing the resources that had been given to them by God. Exuberance and indulgence were not God’s will, and moreover, the festivities completely ruined them, leaving them incapacitated and impoverished.369 The regulation then went on to ban all such excessive peasant festivities. The rationale behind such economic regulation was that people with insufficient financial means should not spend excessively because they could not afford it and it was also immoral: it threatened both social legibility and was against God’s will.

On the other hand, the balance between necessary and excessive spending could sometimes be difficult to establish and priorities had to be measured against each other. Take the ‘Dorpat attire’, as we have seen, a massive bee in the town council’s bonnet in the first half of the seventeenth century. The council was keen to remove all foreign and unwanted influences in women’s attire, and they would have preferred sartorial unity in women’s dress. However, since acquiring an entirely new attire would have been costly, they conceded that foreign women who had married into Tallinn could retain their old outfit to avoid excessive spending.370 While not wanting to deprive women of their entire wardrobes, they still sought indirectly to influence the economic dimension of clothing by

367 Petition of St. Canute’s and St. Olaf’s Guilds to the town council, 26 April 1643, TLA.230.1.Bs7/1, f. 334r–334v.
368 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 89r, f. 90v, f. 91v.
370 Late 16th to early 17th century clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 388; 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 397.
stating that the skirts of ‘Dorpat attire’ could not exceed their Reval counterparts in value.371 The council thus admitted that to a certain extent, these two ambitions, uniformity in appearances and frugality, were contradictory in a society where many people had a few sets of clothes and these were often acquired second-hand.

However, when it came to individual cases, it appears that the economic circumstances of a person mattered less. In 1636, when on three separate occasions Tallinn Gymnasium teacher Alhard Bondel dodged the town council’s request to come and answer in person for his wife’s sartorial deviance, he was fined 200 Rtl and placed under house arrest until he paid the fine.372 Although he was eventually allowed to return to work, the town council deprived him of six months’ wages until the matter was solved. He petitioned the town council on behalf of his wife who wanted to continue wearing the ‘Dorpat attire’, since acquiring an entirely new outfit was bound to be costly, but the town council firmly denied his request, saying that it would only cause more trouble.373 It was not until three months later that the conflict was solved, with the council reinstating Bondel’s wage after he promised that his wife would stick to the local dress.374 While on the one hand promoting the ideal of thrift, the town council did not shy away from reprimanding individual members of the community on the grounds that social legibility had been obscured.

In Sweden, economy was also a concern on the national level. It has been suggested that the economic rationale for curbing luxury consumption and for striving for an orderly society increased in the eighteenth century, but larger economic motives were not absent from seventeenth-century legislation.375 According to this way of reasoning, imported fabrics were undesirable not only because they did not fit easily into the local visual system but also because, in line with mercantilist thought, they benefitted the economies of other states at the expense of one’s own.376 To that end, rather than importing readymade fabrics, states attempted rather to import raw material from which to produce cloth locally. However, in the case of Tallinn the local economy was never an explicit concern in legislation. Moreover, sumptuary laws also demonstrate how dependent seventeenth-century people were on imported goods. Only the poorest artisans and servants were expected to stick entirely to locally produced woollens, while everyone above them could make use of a variety of imported woollens and silks along with furs and accessories. The long lists of fabrics and accessories of foreign origin indicate that people’s appearances were becoming truly global.

371 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 400; 1639 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 322r.
372 Town council meeting minutes from 12 September 1636, TLA.230.1.Ab51, f. 41r.
373 Town council meeting minutes from 4 October 1636, TLA.230.1.Ab51, f. 46r.
374 Town council meeting minutes from 12 December 1636, TLA.230.1.Ab51, f. 62v.
By the eighteenth century, however, the economic rationale behind the regulation of appearances had acquired a new dimension. Instead of seeing excessive spending as something that was ruinous to people and communities, by 1706 the town council decided to turn it into a profitable affair. 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 Wette-herren will be given free power to initiate legal proceedings and fine everybody without exception, even if the person is from the very 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.377

Thus, even though the town council continued to condemn luxury on moral grounds, it had decided that luxury could also be financially useful for the community. Rather than being a punishment, the fine was increasingly viewed as a kind of luxury tax on items that were not considered necessities. Even though in principle the council repeated and reconfirmed the validity of previous legislation, they admitted that their ability to fight the rapid changes in clothing was limited. Therefore, anyone who wished to wear anything from the long list in the regulation simply had to pay a yearly tax to the fine collectors, after which they obtained a certificate.378 Amends were made and people repented through contributing to the town’s finances. If people’s desires could not be tamed, then they should be exploited for the benefit of the town.

Additionally, with this statement the town council admitted that because especially women were yearning for constant renewal and change, they were not able to keep issuing new laws. It is interesting that in this regulation, the council explicitly states that everybody—including the town council itself—will be subject


378 1706 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 411r. A sumptuary law issued in Sweden in 1716 evidently adopted a similar perspective by introducing a yearly sum to be paid instead of fines, see Runefelt 2001, p. 181. However, unlike in Tallinn, the law in Sweden also determined which groups could wear certain things according to the order of precedence effective at the time, which essentially meant that the economic concerns remained connected to ideas about a hierarchical ordering of the society.
to scrutiny. Presumably, however, it was primarily the councilors’ female family members who the regulation addressed, rather than the councilors themselves. That excesses in clothes continued to be a largely female problem is also reflected by the complaint of several burghers, who were summoned to court in 1708 due to their daughters’ overfondness for finery. They argued that the town councilors should first punish their own daughters for overly sumptuous clothing before going after anyone else.\textsuperscript{379}

The pragmatic approach taken by the town council in trying to raise money through regulating appearances makes sense if one takes into account the increasingly difficult financial situation that Tallinn experienced after the outbreak of the Great Northern War.\textsuperscript{380} While no direct military activity took place in Tallinn, the indirect costs were taking its toll. The town had asked the king for financial help in improving its fortifications, which was denied. Additionally, the town’s financial contributions towards maintenance of the Swedish garrison increased each year. Tallinn was also expected to contribute financially to the Swedish war effort, and although a deputy of the town council was sent to Kammarkollegiet in 1706 to ask for a deferment on contributions, it was not granted. Those who could not pay their part in money, were expected to give brass, copper or whatever objects of value they happened to possess.\textsuperscript{381} That war was weighing on the town is also echoed in the regulation, in which the council expressed certainty that once people corrected their bad behaviour, God would surely be moved not only grant the people peace but also ‘give them all sorts of blessings and sustenance’.\textsuperscript{382} While economic motives emerge in a new way in the last sumptuary law, excesses in clothing and luxury consumption remained morally problematic and firmly anchored to the godly worldview.\textsuperscript{383}

5.2 Observing and ordering people

On the normative level, the ideal of social legibility clearly served a purpose not only in attempting to distinguish people from each other but also in affirming that the distinctions placed people into a social hierarchy. The previous section looked beyond authorities’ immediate concern with maintaining the social status quo and discussed sumptuary laws in a broader societal context. In the seventeenth century, social order was motivated from religious and economic perspectives, two building blocks of an orderly society. It is evident that concerns over religion and economy were and remained intimately connected to the discursive

\textsuperscript{379} Hartmann 1973, p. 151.
\textsuperscript{380} On sumptuary laws being used to generate revenue for the state, see also Romaniello 2019, pp. 375–392.
\textsuperscript{381} Hartmann 1973, pp. 27, 59.
\textsuperscript{382} 1706 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/1, f. 412r.
\textsuperscript{383} On this, see also Runefelt 2001, pp. 186–188.
ideal of a hierarchical social order throughout the seventeenth century. The second part of the chapter moves from the normative perspective to the perspective of everyday practice. It analyses people’s descriptions of other people with a particular focus on clothes in order to examine how observation and ordering functioned in a setting in which the discursive ideal had established a certain set of categories on which order could be built.

In encounters where people had no previous knowledge of each other, clothing appears to have played a prominent role. In 1608, Dietrich Grosse described one of the two men who approached him and Claus Sager as they were on their way home from the market simply as the Yellow Doublet.384 As the confrontation between the four men escalated and swords were pulled, Grosse appealed to the other party, exclaiming ‘May God protect us, are we not one King’s people?’ After that, he told the court, the Yellow Doublet made peace with him. In 1623, when identifying the person who had mortally wounded Hans Murjan, the two witnesses could only point out that the man had been a Finnish soldier in a yellow riding coat.385 In 1697, Anna Funck, innkeeper in a suburb of Tallinn, appeared in court and accused three men of raping her.386 When one of the men intentionally tried to confuse her with his statement by saying that they had gone to the inn together with a fourth man called Andres Wulff, who had worn a green coat, Anna replied that ‘The green coat had done her no harm.’387 Such sartorial metonymies appear to have been a way to describe and identify someone with whom one was not previously acquainted. Colour, especially when it stood apart from the general colour palette of greys, blacks and browns, imprinted itself onto the mind of the observer.

Many of the garments described by people in court did not in fact stand out, because their colour scheme fit into the above-mentioned palette. Yet, even if the clothes were seemingly nondescript, astute observation skills enabled people to draw advanced conclusions about their texture and other characteristics. In 1699, the dress of a woman claiming to be a sailor’s wife consisted of an old grey skirt made of half-linen and half-woollen cloth, as well as a grey sleeveless bodice, and a black cap, according to another woman who was her travelling companion.388 In 1640, when a man involved in a conflict between two groups of men described a carpenter journeyman who had died as a result, he observed that the journeyman had clothes of fine quality and a grey cloak.389 Another man observed an army recruiter in a coat of black velvet when they were drinking in an inn at the same time.390 Yet another man, giving evidence in court about a group of men

385 Thomas Rode’s statement, 28 July 1623, TLA.230.1.Aa49, f. 48v.
386 Anna Funck’s statement, 5 July 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 271v–272r.
387 Anna Funck’s statement, 5 July 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 272v.
388 Catharina Erichstochter contra Lisbeth Simonstochter, 30 August 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 369v.
390 Petition of Rittgart Magnus von der Pahlen to the bailiff, 5 December 1644, TLA.230.1.Bj25/II, f. 139r.
that had attacked him and his friends one evening in the street, described one of
the men as having a buff coat made of leather. Another, a short chap, had been
dressed in a grey suit.\textsuperscript{391} Therefore, people skilfully observed details about clothes
like the design of the garment, fabrics and textures, which might not have been
as obvious to the eye as a flashy colour.

Not only colour, fabric and design were noticeable. Observing the material
condition of the clothes was another way in which people reasoned about people
and their appearances. Witnesses to interpersonal conflicts were skilled in noticing
small details that disrupted the expected appearance. Clothes that had been
stained by blood were an indication that the person had been in a physical encoun-
ter and were often mentioned by people who made statements in court. One
witness observed that the collar of Friedrich Seiger, a suspect in the case of the
dead carpenter journeyman, was bloody. It later turned out that the blood had
nothing to do with the death, but Seiger had indeed been in a fistfight previously.\textsuperscript{392} In 1669, a maidservant witnessing a fight between two men had heard
someone shout: "The coat sleeve of this chap has been slashed, the other must
also have had a knife!"\textsuperscript{393} Another man complained in court that his clothes had
been completely ruined because another man had attacked him in an inn and
punched him in the face.\textsuperscript{394} Before the sailor’s wife and her female accomplice
beat another young woman to a pulp, they convinced their victim to remove her
clothes and were careful also to remove their own clothes, because they did not
want blood to get on them.\textsuperscript{395} Later, they made off with their victim’s clothes.
Blood would have been noticeable on white linen garments such as collars and
shirts. Clothing thus carried physical traces of past encounters. While there were
degrees to how fine or tattered a person’s clothes could be, torn, slashed and
bloody garments attracted attention.

In interactions between people, recognisability can above all be detected
through people’s attempts to say something about the other person’s occupation
or how they earned their livelihood. The Yellow Doublet and his companion
looked like sailors, and the woman who claimed to be a soldier’s wife was ac-
cepted as such by her travelling companions. One man was identified as a car-
penter journeyman and yet another as an army recruiter. In 1612, one woman
described a man who was standing in her hallway as wearing a fox fur cap, a
handkerchief around his neck, and wearing dirty clothes of chamois leather as
well as white woollen stockings. The clothes had led her to believe that he could
be a boatswain, she told the court.\textsuperscript{396} Thomas Luhr identified three men who

\textsuperscript{391} Claus Busch’s statement, 1 November 1670, TLA.230.1.Bj28/I, f. 192r.
\textit{Dieses Kerls rocks Ermel ist durchstochen, der ander muss auch ein Messer gehabt haben.}
\textsuperscript{394} Matthias Feldhusen contra Vincent von Horn and Hanss Belitz, 21 July 1690,
TLA.230.1.Aa88/b, f. 305v.
\textsuperscript{395} Catharina Erichstochter contra Lisbeth Simonstochter, 23 August 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f.
351v.
\textsuperscript{396} Statement of Herman Knemeier’s wife, 19 November 1612, TLA.230.1.Aa47, f. 35v–36r.
came to his yard one night wanting to drink beer and eat as soldiers. Several witnesses in the case that involved the deceased carpenter journeyman stated that the group of men they encountered in the street looked like artisans. Of course, it is impossible to know whether all these people really were soldiers, sailors and journeymen, but it was how they were described by onlookers. Rather than explicitly articulating hierarchy, the purpose of recognisability in these descriptions appears to have been to connect a person’s appearance to how they earned their living.

Implicitly, however, such observations of other people were contingent upon previous knowledge about clothes and the social belonging with which they might be associated. People also reasoned about other people in relation to their own selves, such as comparing physical features and their own social standing. Matz Kurek, a carpenter of local origin who had sold another man his axe, observed that the man was noble-looking, had black facial hair and spoke very High German. The man also had an almost black cloak. Cooper Nils Schruue, who was passing by the two others in the street at that moment, said that the man was of short stature and had black facial hair. He observed that the man spoke almost High German and identified the man’s cloak as brownish. Both observed that the man had black facial hair. The cooper called him short, but the carpenter did not. This would surely have depended on one’s perspective as the noble-looking man may simply have appeared short to the tall cooper. A similar point can be made about the language. For Estonian Kurek, understanding the man would surely have been challenging and thus he chose to characterise the other’s language as ‘very’ High German. To him, the man appeared noble. Schruue, on the other hand, was a burgher, and he chose to describe it as ‘almost’ High German. Moreover, there were nuances in how they described the man’s cloak. These judgements, then, were based on the appearances of others, but also included the onlookers’ own reflections about how they stood in the social hierarchy in relation to the people they were observing. The fact that the man was described as noble by Kurek could have been a result of the Estonian’s unfamiliarity with people like the other man, leading Kurek to believe he was noble.

When people were describing others in the seventeenth century, appearances were an important way by which people recognised and reflected on social difference and how they ordered people into familiar and recognisable categories. Appearances were especially important in cases when onlookers were describing people they had not seen before. It is evident from onlookers’ statements that the expectation to be skilled in looking at and judging others’ appearances was a common feature in the micro-management of order on a daily basis. In people’s descriptions of other people, recognisability emerged as a series of categories

397 Thomas Luhr contra three foreign soldiers, 10 February 1622, TLA.230.1.Aa47/a, f. 247–248.
399 See also Sennefelt 2015, p. 188.
such as gender, social standing, language, ethnicity, local or foreigner and occupation. The question of occupation was the most important feature of personal descriptions, as people almost always connected the appearance and other personal features to earning a living in a specific way. It is evident that while many of the categories used by people to describe others overlapped with those used in sumptuary laws, these categories were flexible and depended on the social context. The practice of recognisability was a highly complex process that involved not only looking but also interpreting the information available and ordering the appearances into a larger system that made sense for each onlooker.

5.3 Negotiating order

A hierarchical social order and its visualisation through clothing was an ideal clearly expressed in the clothing regulations issued by the town council. The system in which everyone would be recognised by their outer appearance was an ideal that also attempted to affirm the rights of some over others to certain kinds of materiality. As the previous chapter showed, however, both the order and the appearances meant to denote it were flexible and under constant negotiation by the groups it sought to control. As the number of distinct groups increased in the society, it has been suggested, the prospect of mobility between them seemed more real and consequently required more regulation.\(^{400}\) The inherent problem of controlling appearances was that as the clothing regulations attempted to lay down hierarchical boundaries between groups, they contributed towards giving an additional incentive to people’s social aspirations.\(^{401}\) The final part of this chapter therefore examines how social order was negotiated in daily life on two different levels, between different groups on the one hand and between individuals on the other hand.

5.3.1 Clothes and corporatist conflicts

In Tallinn, dress played a key role in seventeenth-century conflicts over political control. On one level were the numerous conflicts between the town council and merchants of the Great Guild that generally centred around involvement in decision-making processes. Tallinn itself was spared from Swedish wars of the seventeenth century but the town’s trade and economy were significantly impacted by heavy taxation as well as the mid-century plague epidemic.\(^{402}\) Since merchants were disproportionately affected, they insisted on being more involved in the

\(^{400}\) Harte 1976, p. 140.

\(^{401}\) Jütte & Bulst 1993, p. 5.

\(^{402}\) For a good overview of the mid-century conflicts between the town council and the Great Guild, see Weinmann 1991, pp. 113–136.
town’s financial politics. There were also complaints about the council’s inefficient and inflated bureaucracy, negligent maintenance of the town and even nepotism. The Great Guild also attempted to send an embassy to Stockholm in the 1660s, because the recalcitrant behaviour of the town council had irritated the central authorities in Stockholm who were threatening to limit Tallinn’s economic and military autonomy. For their part, the town council attempted to maintain their political authority and curb the influence of all the guilds, but Great Guild in particular. In conclusion, the mid-century conflicts resulted in increased political participation of the Great Guild and the increase in importance of the role of the Swedish Governor. At the same time, however, the town council managed to avoid an increase in the direct rule of the king.

These tensions were also reflected in the debates at town council meetings that focused on the sartorial excesses committed by the female family members of the town’s social elite. The central problem in striving for political control was the question of noble clothing, also referred to as the ‘Dorpat attire’. As we have seen, the town council had insisted that they themselves need not be subject to regulation, since they were evidently immune to sartorial excesses. However, the same was not true of their wives. In March 1637, town councillor Andreas Stampeel complained about the newly published clothing regulation. His wife Elisabet had had a velvet cloak since before they got married; hence she had made no improvement to her wardrobe. The cloak was from her father, who had been ennobled by Gustav II Adolf in 1617. Consequently, he argued, she should be allowed to wear the cloak without being criticised. Town councillor Matthias Poorten was fined a whopping 1000 Rtl because his wife had donned the ‘Dorpat attire’. He protested until he was finally permitted to pay only half of that sum along with a promise that as long as his wife was outside of Tallinn she could wear whatever she wanted but she had to stick to the local ‘Reval attire’ when she returned to town. It is unclear whether town council members occasionally wore noble attire, since there are no instances of them accusing each other of sartorial excesses. However, the vigorous policing of each other’s wives suggests that the accusations that one’s wife was being disruptive to social legibility was a way to put rivals in the town council on the defensive.

A succession of merchant wives were similarly accused of disrupting the social order because they donned noble clothes. The wife of merchant Jürgen Stahl the younger went to church in noble attire at Christmas 1636 and he was ordered by the council to make sure she did not appear in public in that attire again. Herman Luhr had a ‘Dorpat attire’ made for his wife Dorothea in 1634 and despite his claims that he had a rented manorial estate, the town council decided to requisition the outfit. A few weeks later, the council relented, saying that she could

403 Weinmann 1991, p. 93.
404 Town council meeting minutes from 20 March 1637, TLA.230.1.Ab51, f. 88r.
406 Town council meeting minutes from 4 January 1637, TLA.230.1.Ab51, f. 71v.
wear it in the countryside but they forbade her from attending weddings in the ‘Dorpat attire’ in town.407 When another merchant was accused because his wife had made changes to her dress, he answered that she had only changed her dress because everyone else’s wives were overdressing too!408 His observation neatly sums up the problem with a hierarchy that relied on visuality. It could only successfully function in static conditions. Merchant wives and daughters felt required to upgrade their dress to match the other women in their social group and innovated from necessity rather than desire. Furthermore, noble attire was unproblematic while the women were out of sight but posed an immediate threat to social legibility once they decided to return to town. Initially divided on the question of whether to ban the ‘Dorpat attire’ or tolerate it alongside the ‘Reval attire’, the council appears to have understood that it would be impossible to ban it entirely.409 But they could control where the attire was worn.

It was not just the town councillors who found women’s noble dress problematic. Merchants too found that the town councillors’ wives and daughters were disrupting the sartorial order. In November 1666, burgomaster Heinrich Tunderfeldt summarised a complaint that had been put forth by Great Guild alderman Ernst Hahn and a number of merchants.410 Around All Hallows’ time some women had worn pointy Babylonian caps, which was considered entirely acceptable, as exceptions could be made for women due to cold weather.411 However, the wives of town councillors Conrad Meuseler and Constans Korbmacher had evidently been inspired by this and decided to wear a sable fur muff and sable fur lapels, respectively. As the complaint indicates, that was apparently too sumptuous and consequently aroused dissatisfaction amongst some merchants. Then Meuseler, a merchant and a town councillor of fourteen years, did something rather unconventional and decided that the best way to help his wife out was by claiming he was noble. Naturally, people did not believe him, and the general opinion was that even if he could procure a letter of nobility that would document his heritage – something that everyone seemed to doubt – it would be hard to justify giving his wife advantages that other burghers’ wives did not enjoy.

This conflict over recognisability in women’s appearances underscores an important aspect of town politics and clothes as a potential source of conflict. In the 1665 clothing regulation, the town council had explicitly stated that regulation was not necessary for town councillors because they were not prone to excesses

408 Town council meeting minutes from 5 October 1642, TLA.230.1.Ab55, f. 139r.
409 It appears that while older town councillors favoured a complete ban on the ‘Dorpat attire’, their younger colleagues argued for a recognition for both attires alongside each other, town council meeting minutes from 13 September 1639, TLA.230.1.Ab53, f. 340r–340v.
410 Summary by presiding burgomaster Heinrich Tunderfeldt, 2 November 1666, TLA.230.1 Bs7/I, f. 266r–266v.
411 It is not entirely clear in the text whether they mean a specific day, such as All Hallows’ Eve, All Hallows’ Day or All Souls’ Day, or whether it simply denotes the general time period at the end of October and beginning of November. The German term used is beerdigung der Todten.
in clothing. The question is whether their wives and daughters were also included under the council’s umbrella or whether they were subject to regulation as merchants’ wives and daughters, because that is what they also were. For the dissatisfied merchants, however, this case was never only about the mufffs and lapels of a few women – they were voicing their dissatisfaction about a group exempt from regulation by targeting their family members. As a previous chapter explained, the town council was in some ways similar to the group to which they had belonged before, yet in another way their status was fundamentally different. Having been elected from amongst members of the Great Guild, the town councillors were still merchants and burghers. On the other hand, they belonged to the highest legislative, executive and judicial body of Tallinn, and generally distanced themselves from the daily activities of the Great Guild. Although the councillors believed that they belonged to a distinct social group, their former guild brothers evidently believed that, simply because one became a town councillor, it should not mean one was above the law. This was emphasised in the petition by alderman Hahn who pointed out that the would-be nobleman Caspar Meuseler was still officially conducting business in his shop. Either he could choose to be a merchant or a nobleman, but he could not have his cake and eat it too.

Furthermore, merchants were dissatisfied because they perceived the councillors’ actions as disruptive to the legibility of order. As they argued, before the issuing of each new regulation, the town community consisting of the three guilds had to consent to it both in writing and orally. Although precedent was allowed to the town council members to some extent, in this case the councillors were faulted for not accounting for their family members. As the town council did not seem to want to change its mind, the merchants threatened to take the fight directly to the king. Going back to Meuseler, even if the king allowed him to be noble, the Great Guild, of which he was a member, argued that they should have had knowledge of this, so that the members could make a decision as to whether they wanted to have a noble person in the guild. Since he had played the nobility card, however, the general opinion was that he should move to the countryside as befitted his station. The merchants, therefore, perceived the actions of the council and their family members both as socially disruptive and as a threat to their identity and status in town. It is evident from the merchants’ dissatisfaction that social order was supposed to be a compromise, rather than a top-down non-negotiable decision. Even worse, if those highest up acted in a manner that was not consistent with what had previously been established, then those actions in fact could threaten the social order.

The second level where diverging ideas about social legibility became a source of political conflict was the question of artisans and how their position within

---

412 Summary by presiding burgomaster Heinrich Tunderfeldt, 2 November 1666, TLA.230.1.Bs7/1, f. 266v.
Tallinn should be established visually. Increasing wealth and an increasing demand for a variety of luxury goods in the seventeenth century positively influenced the development of crafts in Tallinn and enhanced the role of artisans in town life. As mentioned in a previous chapter, in the seventeenth century artisan craft guilds or Zünfte became more specialised and the number of different crafts increased in Tallinn. This did not go unnoticed at higher levels. In his 1653 report to Queen Christina, Philipp von Krusenstiern observed of Tallinn’s artisans:

There is no monitoring of artisans, who all dupe customers with their sloppy work as they see fit so they acquire such riches that, starting from nothing, they can buy their own houses in just a few years; yet, when extraordinary taxes are imposed, they pretend to be the poorest to avoid paying these taxes, even though with their wealth, clothing and banquets, where all the town council musicians have to be present, they and their family members are no different from the town’s most eminent inhabitants. If one or another artisan is caught because of their sloppy work, or a tailor has withheld fabric, buttons and suchlike, after having paid a small fine to the injured party they still remain honest artisans.\footnote{Translation from Estonian from Kõiv (ed.) 2014, p. 212.}

Krusenstiern’s account was undoubtedly hostile and probably aimed at undermining the traditional organisation of artisan crafts, which he saw as the root cause of poor-quality productions and lack of accountability. Yet at the same time he also acknowledged that this advantageous situation had enabled at least some artisans to amass significant amounts of wealth over a relatively short period of time.

Their improved financial status meant that the artisans found themselves at the intersection of different political interests and constantly having to defend their rights against the other corporatist bodies of the town. Although artisan guilds were part of the town community or Gemeinde and formally exerted political influence, in reality they were often shut out of political discussions by the Great Guild.\footnote{Gierlich 1991, p. 41; Margus 1939, p. 104.} But even more frequently, their rights were encroached upon in the middle decades of the century by the town council, who decided to reorganise the artisan crafts. The 1657 plague epidemic meant a significant decrease in the town population and when the town council wanted to make it easier for foreign artisans to establish themselves in Tallinn and enter a guild, the artisans protested.\footnote{Weinmann 1991, p. 95.} Even though an artisan delegation was dispatched to Stockholm in 1659 to petition the king, their efforts did not bear fruit as their complaints were referred to the local authority – the town council.\footnote{Weinmann 1991, pp. 106–110.} The conflict between the artisans and the town council culminated eventually in the council rewriting the Zunft charters in 1662.\footnote{Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, p. 140; Weinmann 1991, pp. 106–110.} Tailor and guild alderman Hans Kemmerer – who in 1662

\footnote{\textsuperscript{413} Translation from Estonian from Kõiv (ed.) 2014, p. 212.}\footnote{\textsuperscript{414} Gierlich 1991, p. 41; Margus 1939, p. 104.}\footnote{\textsuperscript{415} Weinmann 1991, p. 95.}\footnote{\textsuperscript{416} The main demands of the artisans were being involved in the financial administration of the town to a greater degree and being involved in all negotiations concerning town matters, see Weinmann 1991, pp. 94–96.}\footnote{\textsuperscript{417} Kala & Tamla (eds.) 2019, p. 140; Weinmann 1991, pp. 106–110.}
had shouted in front of the town council that everyone should dress according to what their wallet could tolerate – was accused of inciting a rebellion against the town council and banished from town. Finally, at the end of the seventeenth century, the two artisan guilds were merged into one St. Canute’s Guild.

A recurring concern for the artisan guilds was that the order that the town council was striving for did not recognise their status as burghers and their improved financial situation. Replying to an amendment of the 1639 clothing regulation that had been issued in 1641, the artisans argued in a petition in 1642 that, like members of the Great Guild, they, too were free German burghers, yet had to bear a disproportionately heavy load, presumably with regards to taxation. Although as artisans they earned their living in a different manner than merchants, their fundamental status as free burghers of Tallinn should outweigh their corporate belonging. Their burgher privileges, however, had not been recognised in the laws, including sumptuary laws. Furthermore, they were taxed disproportionately heavily, but this was not reflected in an improved position either, although the wealth of some artisans would have allowed them to dress similarly to merchants. Thus, in another petition from the same year they requested the right to dress like poorer merchants, which, they suggested, had been discussed with and agreed to by the Great Guild. Rather than strict guild membership, artisans argued, wealth and status as a burgher should be factored into the creation of legible appearances.

Another way in which the question of recognisability entered their arguments is that by arbitrarily dividing the artisans into better and common sorts the town council had created an unnatural distinction. As the artisans perceived it, the town council had caused a rift within the larger artisan group and by extension, confused the order. Since the 1630s regulations had separated the so-called better

418 The presiding burgomaster Tunderfeldt swiftly put him into his place by saying that not one’s wallet but one’s rank would take precedence, see Weinmann 1991, pp. 87, 99–108. Kemmerer had apparently been one of the leaders of the artisans’ delegation to the Swedish king in 1659. In 1661, however, the conflict between the town council and the artisan guilds worsened again, as the council approved the request of shoemaker Hans Harrien to join the shoemakers’ Zunft against its will. Shoemakers argued that their authority had been encroached upon and wanted to give themselves under the protection of the Swedish king. Alderman Hans Bartels was accused of being a ringleader and in the ensuing conflict, the town council claimed itself the right to take guild aldermen into custody if they were perceived to be recalcitrant, which the guilds interpreted as a restriction on their freedom of speech. The shoemakers also attempted to legally contest the admission of Harrien into the Zunft, but the town council, in effect also the highest judicial body in town, refused to change its mind. Eventually, the town council had Kemmerer arrested by some soldiers, although the artisans literally did not go down without a fight and Kemmerer was wounded during the physical conflict. With the help of merchant Jacob Höppner, however, Kemmerer managed to flee to the guild house, and in his absence the town council sentenced him to leave the town within three days. The council did, however, allow him to travel to Stockholm in order to appeal the sentence to the king.

419 Petition of St. Canute’s and St. Olaf’s Guilds to the town council, 19 September 1642, TLA.230.1.Bs7/1, f. 341v.

420 Petition of St. Canute’s and St. Olaf’s Guilds to the town council, 15 June 1642, TLA.230.1.Bs7/1, f. 337r.
Artisans and their households from the common artisans and their households, the regulation of 1639 was actually counterproductive to maintaining social order, the 1646 petition warned, because the favouring of one group over the other would cause great discord among the guild members.\textsuperscript{421} The petition also pointed out that, while the goldsmiths in Tallinn were not admitted to the Great Guild, they were granted the right to dress similarly to merchants. If the wives and daughters of goldsmiths could have cloaks of silk and damask, then all the other artisans should have the same right.\textsuperscript{422} Regulation from above, they seemed to suggest, did not help to increase social legibility because it found difference where there was none.

A third issue was that the increased constraints on artisans’ dress meant that there was a threat of appearing poorer than they were, which would once again be counterproductive to social legibility and being recognised as artisans. Since artisans’ daughters were no longer allowed to wear pearl decorations or collars with decorations (although decorations worth up to fifteen Rtl were allowed for daughters of merchants), the artisans of the two guilds argued that their daughters basically looked like servant girls. Therefore, the artisans suggested decorations worth up to four Rtl for their daughters.\textsuperscript{423} Furthermore, while their daughters were more restricted in their clothing, some rich merchants clothed their servants in the same woollen fabrics that were allowed for the doublets and skirts of artisans’ daughters. The artisans therefore wanted an exception so that their daughters could wear caffa and taffeta on festive occasions and could be properly separated from servants.\textsuperscript{424} The 1643 petition assured the town council that while the artisans did not want their family members to resemble merchants – at least not all merchants – neither did they want to look like servants to foreigners who came to Tallinn and for whom the sartorial code might not be clear.\textsuperscript{425} A legible social order thus presumed readability and that everyone would understand it in the way that it was intended to be understood.

Artisans’ complaints about being confused with people of lower social standing highlight two important problems with the social order that was created and visualised by clothes. Firstly, sumptuary law provided a legal framework for people to present themselves and to be recognised properly in their station in the society. With the social order encoded in a new way, however, artisans claimed they could no longer properly visualise their social status, as the visual regime

\textsuperscript{421} Petition of St. Canute’s and St. Olaf’s Guilds to the town council, 9 October 1646, TLA.230.1.Bs7/I, f. 339v.
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that had been imposed from above did not match their perception of themselves. Instead, these visual markers would make them indistinguishable from servants. Secondly, the issue of merchants dressing their servants in fabrics that the lower artisans were wearing highlights another aspect of early modern status manifestation, one where the attire of servants reflected the wealth of their masters. The quality of these could thus make some servants look similar to some poorer artisans. These two instances show the uneasy connection between rank and appearance, as in both cases, clothes as visual markers were perceived to confuse the order rather than making it legible. Consequently, the idea of recognisability was undermined from within.

To sum up this section, it is worth noting the centrality of women’s dress in the struggle to exert influence within the political community. The argument that one should be able to be recognised by others through one’s appearance, which was a necessary precondition for a hierarchical ordering of the society, was made by artisans, merchants and town councillors alike in their attempts to exert their influence in town politics. Thus, they were clearly operating within the sumptuary framework. However, in the conflicts above it emerges that there was no uniform understanding of what the ideal order should be and look like. That was because early modern society was not rigid and unchanging. The town council’s attempts to establish a legible order were met with resistance when other groups with a political stake thought that the legibility of their group had been altered without their consent, either through legislation or through the actions of other groups. On one level, merchants resisted when they believed that the families of town councillors had caused disorder through noble dress. On another level, the petitions of artisans show that they too were concerned about top-down changes that meant that they were no longer recognisable as artisans. While on the one hand there was an ideal of uniformity around guild membership, guild-based sumptuary laws were incompatible with a complex social reality where individuals within the larger groups had wildly differing occupations, financial means, consumption strategies and desires.

Furthermore, while the idea of social legibility was consistently invoked among the above-mentioned groups, many people who belonged to the lower classes were left out of these struggles, which further shows that the struggle for appearances was above all an internal battle. It is not surprising, since the economic situation and social position of the have-nots was not threatening to the town councillors and the merchants in the same way that some wealthier artisans and their families might have been. The heavy focus on the corporations and their households, the distinctions within the merchant and artisan corps, and the responses from the artisan guilds underline the rivalries between these groups. While the hierarchical social order was never explicitly questioned, members of this society had radically differing ideas of their position in relation to its other members, what warranted this social position, and consequently what constituted

426 Bulst 1993, p. 44.
an appropriate visualisation of this position. Even though servants, especially female servants, were frequently targeted for their excesses in sumptuary laws, an analysis of the prominent sartorial conflicts shows that women from merchant and artisan families were the most immediate threat to social legibility. It is therefore unsurprising that their appearances were so heavily legislated. Sumptuary laws were momentary coagulations of a social order in flux and that is why they were constantly challenged. Although the corporatist groups used the rigid sumptuary framework when arguing for an advancement in their social positions, they knew that it did not represent the reality.

5.3.2 Hat honour

The second section exploring how social order was negotiated in early modern Tallinn through appearances focuses specifically on hats and headwear, a category of clothes that frequently appears in onlookers’ descriptions of social conflicts.427 Hats and hair had special symbolic significance in the early modern period. In the seventeenth century, the type of hat worn often served to distinguish a gentleman. Hats were worn both outside and inside, while dining and dancing, until late in the century when wigs became increasingly popular.428 Some sort of headwear was the norm both in public and at home, and not having something covering one’s hair was so extraordinary that some people openly reflected on it. For example, Elert Boss, a witness who appeared in court in 1610, told the court that he had gone out one evening without his hat to move his cattle inside, when he witnessed a conflict between two men.429 Hats were a means of communication that signalled political allegiance, occupation, rank and gentlemanly status, but they were equally important in material negotiations of male honour at all levels of the society.430 Consequently, the head as a symbolic site and headwear figured heavily in narratives of social interaction and conflict. That so many people observed how a person’s appearance changed in connection to loss of headwear indicates that it was afforded special significance in these descriptions.

Headwear and covered hair were equally important for women. Covered hair was a visible symbol of married status for a woman in the seventeenth century and represented a husband’s sexual control over her wife.431 The forcible removal of the headdress was shameful for women, since it evoked undesirable associations with servitude or licentious behaviour.432 The 1665 clothing regulation for example stated that women, married and unmarried alike, were not to wear their...

427 For a great variety of headwear found in Tallinn inventories between 1600 and 1700 see also Table 2.8 in Appendix 2.
429 Elert Boss’s statement, 11 October 1610, TLA.230.1.Aa46/a, f. 307r–308r.
430 Corfield 1989, pp. 64–79; Davis 1987, p. 38; Jansson 1989, p. 26. In the eighteenth century, the two political parties in Sweden were called ‘Hats’ and ‘Caps’, see Roberts 2003.
431 Gowing 2003, p. 58; Rublack 2010, p. 126.
432 Gowing 2003, p. 58.
hair down regardless of whether they were in a public space or in the privacy of their own home. In a conflict between wine merchant Peter Müller and his journeyman Johan Christoph Kluge, the latter physically attacked both Müller and his wife. The argument was about the journeyman’s salary and after the wife gave him a slap on the cheek to discipline him, he retaliated by calling her a whore and punching her so hard that her cap and bonnet both fell off, an event witnessed by two people. This event so greatly distressed her that she fell ill, and the doctor had to bleed her. The description of the conflict in terms of her removed headdress is undeniably evocative. Rather than describing how she fell over or how blood ran from her nose or head, the violence was measured by her flying headdress. Naturally, she was not a whore and her body responded to the stress of a dual insult with an illness. Any other reaction would have been almost unthinkable.

Heads and headwear played a key role in negotiations of social order. Hat-tipping was the norm between men of lower and higher social standing but also between men of junior and senior age in many early modern contexts. It was a gesture of deference and a recognition of one’s own and the other person’s social standing. On the other hand, striking off the hat from another man was one of the most common forms of humiliation and insult used in hostile male encounters in the early modern period. It was a gesture meant to show that one party did not recognise the other’s social position and to show insubordination towards the person whose hat was thrown off. Refusal to show deference towards one’s social superiors through body and dress language was not only a transgressive practice, however. It also gave those with no social or political influence scope for personal expression. The centrality of descriptions concerning face, head and headdress figure so prominently because they were an obvious and visible symbol of social order. A hat lying in the gutter or a punch to the face that sent one’s hat flying, if it had been thrown by one’s social inferior, meant a challenge to the social order. Far from being a reflection of the early modern social order, the body and appearances were thus sites of the active negotiation of this order.

Because it was so symbolically loaded with meaning, a hat could be the figurative match to start a fire. According to witnesses’ descriptions, the conflict between two groups of men, which resulted in the death of a carpenter journeyman in 1640, had escalated when another journeyman’s hat fell off by accident and the boy of Hans Lanting, who was in the same company as the main suspect

433 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 90v.
434 It has been suggested that slaps on the cheek were above all meant to shame and humiliate, not to do serious physical damage. A slap on the cheek could be seen as a demonstration of power that took place within the confines of the household, for example when the master of the household disciplined children or servants, see Liliequist 1999, p. 188; Sennefelt 2011, p. 96.
435 Peter Müller contra Johann Christoph Kluge, 28 July 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 296v.
438 Corfield 1989, p. 64.
Friedrich Seiger, kicked it into the gutter. The other journeymen retaliated by calling the opposing party worthless people or Bernheuter and consequently swords were drawn. The case unfortunately ended in Friedrich Seiger stabbing a journeyman to death. It appears that the hat had simply fallen off from the journeyman’s head but the other man, who was his social inferior and probably his junior in age, who kicked it into the gutter not only made it dirty but potentially challenged the social order by not recognising the superiority of the hat’s owner. In an ideal world of legible social messages, he should have picked it up and handed it back to the journeyman. Symbolically, the hat was a proxy for the head, and it was as if the servant had kicked the journeyman’s head with his foot. The incident was made worse by the fact that the affront to the journeyman’s honour had happened publicly. An inferior’s refusal to recognise his place within the social order meant that Seiger had to retaliate in order to affirm his place in that order.

On the other hand, an inherent problem with a visual social order that becomes apparent in the descriptions of hostile encounters is that clothes actively resisted being the mediators of a single social message. They depended on context. In early 1680s, Deacon of St. Nicholas Church Gottfried Stecher tried to get the town council to recognise that his honour had been seriously affronted by writing a number of petitions, in which he detailed his accusations against merchant Albrecht Fiant. Stecher had attempted to help Fiant and Fiant’s wife solve their marital disharmony but that had enraged Fiant, and he had attacked Stecher in broad daylight by the town hall. According to hat-maker journeyman Hans Julius Kirchner, who had witnessed the event through the workshop shutter, he saw a man whom he did not recognise waiting on the street by the corner of the town hall. When Stecher came along, the man first grasped his hands, and then hit him so that Stecher’s priestly cap fell off. The unknown man then took out his whip and whipped Stecher twice over the head. What they had said to each other the journeyman had not heard. Another witness, German teacher Johann Kahrmann, explained that he had not heard the verbal exchange between the two men either, since it had been a windy day. He added that Fiant’s own hat had also fallen off due to the punch he had given Stecher. Moreover, the absent-minded pastor had forgotten his cap, since Kahrmann picked it up, dusted it off, and went after Stecher to return the cap.

In this case, the priestly cap became a symbol of the negotiation of the hierarchical social order. Fiant, a member of the Great Guild and a part of the town’s social elite with numerous important social ties, clearly felt that Stecher had overstepped by meddling in Fiant’s household. Stecher’s position, on the other hand, was far less well-defined. Although he was an educated man of God, he most likely did not enjoy the kind of economic position in society as Fiant did. Nor

---

440 Documents concerning the assault and insult to Pastor Gottfried Stecher committed by Albrecht Fiant in public street, 1681–1683, TLA.230.1.Bj45, f. 2r–32r.
was he a member of any of the corporations, meaning that he did not have direct political influence. Partly due to Stecher’s ambiguous position in society, it was not entirely clear how personal affronts from such a man should be handled, especially because Stecher thought he was acting in his professional capacity. Instead of overpowering Stecher with physical force, Fiant’s attack was strategic and it sent a clearly legible message to anyone who might witness it. It was meant to humiliate Stecher and underline Fiant’s and Stecher’s respective positions in the social order. The head was often the focus of attack, and violence against it was considered especially serious. The loss of Stecher’s priestly cap and being whipped on the head was damaging to his honour and reputation because it was both reminiscent of a master disciplining his servant and signalled that Stecher did not fulfil his duties as a priest in the way that was expected of him. The hat and its removal were thus filled with multiple meanings. Ideally, everybody had his or her head covered in the seventeenth century. Depending on the social context, however, un-hatting could be seen as a subversive practice, meant to challenge the social position of the other, or as a way to claim recognition and forcefully remind the other person of their subordinate position.

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter has also dealt with social order, serving as a kind of bridge between hierarchical visual order as a discursive ideal and the everyday reality of social categorisation and negotiation of the order. All three parts of the chapter have shown that social order mattered and that appearances mattered, but they did so in different ways. That early modern society was permeated by ideas about hierarchy and one’s place within it is demonstrated by the religious and economic arguments made in favour of regulating appearances. Far from being simply a matter of obscuring the legibility of order, excesses in consumption and claims to a higher social position than one already had had far-reaching consequences. Not only did they make God angry, but they were economically ruinous to both oneself and the whole community. Clothing regulations were not irrelevant in seventeenth-century society, nor were they lacking all connection to people’s lives; to the contrary, they were anchored in this society, to a certain extent structuring but at the same time being far from complete in depicting its complexity.

The second part of the chapter demonstrated that the ideal of social legibility or being recognised through one’s appearance by others, did have a bearing in reality but it functioned in a different way and did not necessarily have the same purpose. Onlookers chose to describe and categorise others with regards to categories that were not so different from the criteria of distinction outlined in the preceding chapter: their gender and ethnicity, their social standing and place of origin. Occupation, too, was an important category in recognising other people.

---

and placing them into a legible social system but when people used this type of categorisation they did not necessarily refer to the corporatist framework. It is evident that the townspeople were also involved in creating difference, but this was an alternative to the sumptuary laws issued by the town council. Above all, these observations show that creating order was not an elite process and that people on all levels of society participated in creating a stratified yet dynamic order.

The final part of the chapter analysed how order was negotiated through appearances in everyday life. Regulation of appearances and arguments for social order became a weapon of corporatist groups in Tallinn as they jockeyed for power, but appearances were also an important element in how questions of honour and order were regulated between individuals. In addition to being an outward sign of one’s rank and position within the hierarchical order, the third part of the chapter demonstrates how in real life, appearances had creative capacities and instead of simply reflecting the order they became sites where that order was negotiated, undermined and affirmed on both the collective and individual levels. In conclusion, the chapter shows early modern people were actively creating and reflecting on social difference through appearances in their daily interactions, but there was no simple correlation to the discursive ideal of social order prescribed in sumptuary laws. Above all, the second and the third parts demonstrate that clothes had a much more dynamic role in early modern society, through which alternative orders emerged and were contested, and that their full capacity to create order emerges only once we look beyond sumptuary laws. This dynamism inherent in seventeenth-century society makes it painfully obvious how impossible it was to agree on either the social order or the clothes meant to visualise it.
CHAPTER 6

Something Old, Something New: Clothing
Resources of Early Modern Households

This dissertation has by now established that the ideal of a hierarchical social order visualised through appearances was not irrelevant in early modern Europe. It has also become apparent that while there was no doubt about the ordering capacities of appearances, the ideal of a legible social order was difficult to achieve because of lack of consensus over how the society was and should be organised and how the order should be visualised. Moving away from the immediate processes of ordering, the capacity of clothes in differentiating between people can also be examined on the basis of the clothing resources they possessed. While information about how, when and where people wore their clothes is elusive, an examination of garments in inventories helps us better understand the tension between politics of difference and the everyday materiality of the clothes that surrounded seventeenth-century people. This materiality undoubtedly also shaped the social order, but what did the order look like as it appears through inventories? This chapter will therefore answer two questions. Firstly, the chapter examines what the relationship was between clothes and social position as seen from inventories, and also discusses broadly the changes that took place in appearances over the course of the century. The second section of the chapter examines a sample of individual inventories in order to highlight the complexities inherent in making the connection between people and clothes. Following from the first question, the chapter finally examines how sumptuary legislation affected clothing as it appears in inventories.

6.1 Clothing in inventories

In total, 105 inventories containing 4,482 records of garments and accessories were consulted for this study. The total number of items of clothing, however, is larger because some clothes were recorded as sets made up of two or three individual garments. The limited information available from the inventories is also apparent from the fact that, while roughly one-third of the garments were described as being male and one third as female garments, in one-third of the cases the appraisers did not indicate whether the garment would have been worn by
men or women. That was most likely because it was obvious to them and not important for the purpose of drawing up the inventory. As also mentioned earlier, financial valuations were rarely provided in inventories, meaning that it has not been possible to establish how valuable people’s wardrobes were in relation to the total wealth recorded in the inventory.

Figure 6.1. Frequency of number of items in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700

The first observation to be made about clothes is the enormous variety in how many clothes a seventeenth-century household could contain. The inventories recorded from two to 506 items of clothing. As Figure 6.1 shows, most inventories in the sample mentioned between one and sixty items of clothing. Forty-five of the 105 inventories included between one and twenty items of clothing, twenty-one inventories included between twenty-one and forty items, and another nineteen inventories between forty-one and sixty. Seven inventories contained between 100 and 200 clothing items. The one inventory that exceeds 200 items was left behind by a merchant named Jürgen Schade and his wife Catharina Gorries in 1671 and contains a remarkable 506 garments and accessories.442

442 Inventory of merchant Jürgen Schade and his wife Catharina Gorries, 1671, TLA.230.1.Bt12/II, f. 93r–118r.
Figure 6.2. Distribution of number of items in Tallinn inventories by social group, 1600–1700


443 Excluding the inventory of merchant Jürgen Schade and his wife Catharina Gorries, 1671, TLA.230.1.Bt12/II, f. 93r–118r.
A second observation is that the number of clothes mentioned in the inventories could also differ significantly within each social group. Figure 6.2 shows that labourer inventories contained fewest items – between 2 and 22. Journeymen inventories contained between 4 and 171 items. Artisan inventories contained between 4 and 93 items with an outlier at 140 and professional inventories mention between 6 and 90 garments with an outlier at 195. In the merchant group the values are concentrated between 5 and 124 and there is also one outlier at 506. The inventories of town councillors included between 7 and 54 garments, with one outlier at a ‘mere’ 146. The one military inventory described 20 items. In order to show the distribution within each group, I have omitted the outlier value of 506 from the figure. In most groups, inventories contained between zero and fifty items and the distribution of the inventories therefore leans towards the bottom of the scale. Only merchant inventories show a more equal distribution. While eight inventories are in the 0 to 50 interval, the other eight inventories in this group are spread from 50 to 550.

Table 6.1. Frequency of number of items in the group 1–20 by social group in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social group</th>
<th>1–5</th>
<th>6–10</th>
<th>11–15</th>
<th>16–20</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeymen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Both Figure 6.2 and a detailed breakdown of the inventories that contained between one and twenty items (Table 6.1) show the presence of all social categories. It is not a surprise that people categorised as labourers generally had the fewest clothes, but it should be noted that one labourer inventory also contained over twenty items. It is also noteworthy that some inventories drawn up for merchants and town councillors, the two groups on top of the discursive visual hierarchy, only mentioned between one and twenty garments. The fact that this group also includes two town councillors and four merchants, out of whose inventories only one contains a gown, that is to say a full set of clothes, is a further indication that these inventories were very likely not complete.444

Conversely, if we look at the other end of the spectrum and examine the inventories that contained above one hundred items, then of the eight inventories three came from the group ‘merchant’, one from the group ‘professional’, two from the group ‘journeyman’ and one each from the groups ‘artisan’ and ‘town council’; in other words, all groups are represented except for labourers and the lone military. Again, although the sample is small, Figure 6.2 shows that there is no group that can be described as having a characteristically high number of clothes in inventories. Unexpectedly, however, compared to other groups in the sample, Figure 6.2 shows that town council inventories on average included fewer garments than merchant, professional, and even artisan inventories. It is therefore evident that we cannot draw very many conclusions based on the number of garments alone. But it also reminds us of the fact that clothes and the consumption strategies of early modern social elites did not necessarily have to be geared towards luxury consumption or status and power manifestation.

In cases of inventories that were drawn up for merchants, artisans and journeymen, there is also the question of what proportion of their clothes and accessories were meant for personal use, to the extent that it is possible to distinguish it, and how many were meant for commercial activities with the purpose of making a living. An inventory drawn up for a hat-maker and his wife mentions forty-two hats that were more or less ready and it was from selling these that he would have made a living. However, even without the hats, the inventory contains a respectable ninety-eight items of clothing and accessories. Sometimes, however, it is difficult to draw this line. The inventories of the two journeymen that contained 171 and 131 items listed them in no particular order. While it is very likely that trading with fabrics, accessories and ready-made items of clothing, such as stockings, gloves, headwear and linen garments, was an important puzzle piece in the two men’s livelihood, no sharp distinction was made by the appraisers between the two types of garments. Only in merchant Jürgen Schade’s inventory were the retail goods or *Krahm-Gut*, found in three different physical locations, separated from the goods presumably meant for consumption in the household. Regardless of whether their immediate purpose was to be worn, lent to a neighbour in exchange for some grain or sold to a paying customer, these clothes constituted a versatile material resource for their owners. Looking at the number of garments in inventories, therefore, is not a very useful way to determine how clothes created a difference between early modern people.

A third observation is connected to the gender of the people for whom an inventory was drawn up. As mentioned in chapter two, of the 105 inventories, eighty-one were drawn up for men, twelve for married couples and only eleven for women. Of the eight inventories that contained more than one hundred items, two were drawn up for a married couple, Jürgen Schade and Catharina

445 Inventory of hat-maker Claus Reimer and his wife, 1658, TLA.230.1.Br11, f. 73r–75r.
Gorries being one of these, and the other one being the inventory of a hat-maker and his wife.\footnote{Inventory of hat-maker Claus Reimer and his wife, 1658, TLA.230.1.Br11, f. 73r–75r.} The remaining six inventories were drawn up for men. Since Figure 6.2 shows that the distribution within each group is rather broad and since the sample of inventories, especially inventories drawn up for women, is rather small, statistical analysis will not yield any meaningful results. However, if the inventories of men, women, and married couples are compared, the median number of clothing items is twenty-seven for men’s inventories, sixteen for women, and fifty-two for married couples.\footnote{I chose the median rather than the mean because the distribution is skewed. The mean of clothing items for men, women and married couples is 42.6, 30.2 and 87 respectively, which reflects the small number of inventories that contain an unusually large amount of clothes.} Even taking into consideration the limited size of the sample and the wide distribution, it is reasonable to conclude that on average, the inventories of married couples and men were likely to include more clothes.

Table 6.2 shows the items broken down into smaller categories.\footnote{For detailed tables of garments included in each category, please see Appendix 2.} An important difference between early modern dress and our own clothes is that early modern people wore many layers of clothes. For his contemporaries, a Russian man who complained to the lower court of the Tallinn town council in 1630 that he was stabbed near the elbow through his three coats and a shirt would thus have raised no eyebrows.\footnote{Gusman Troffimoffsin and Stephan Anreoffsin contra a boy Iwosche, 20 June 1630, TLA.230.1.Aa50/c, f. 68r.} But for a historian aiming to sort the clothes into analytical categories the task becomes more difficult. How the individual garments were referred to was complicated by the fact that the layers were adjusted according to social context, space, season and so forth, as an inner garment could become an outer garment and vice versa. The exact sequence of clothes could thus vary but was surely influenced by resources available to an individual and the clothes’ material condition, meaning that a worn-out, patched jacket would very likely have been worn under a newer one, if this was an option available to the wearer. How one wore these different layers could thus also reveal social position in nuanced ways. The category ‘outer garments’ thus includes the outermost layers such as cloaks, fur coats and overgowns, but also middling layers, such as both men’s and women’s gowns but also jackets, doublets, hose and skirts. Undergarments were all kinds of linen shirts, meant to absorb bodily fluids and so protect the outer garments, but also items like bodices, vests, underhose and sleeping gowns.\footnote{Rather than regularly washing themselves, early modern Europeans maintained hygiene through regularly changing their linen garments, see Mortier 2012, p. 32; Styles 2007, pp. 78–83.} Unfortunately, a numerical table cannot reflect these aspects of the early modern clothing culture.
Table 6.2. Number of items of clothing in each social group in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social group</th>
<th>Accessories</th>
<th>Footwear</th>
<th>Handwear</th>
<th>Headwear</th>
<th>Neckwear</th>
<th>Outer garment</th>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Undefined</th>
<th>Undergarment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>1462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeyman</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town council</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>470</strong></td>
<td><strong>495</strong></td>
<td><strong>249</strong></td>
<td><strong>546</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>857</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>1393</strong></td>
<td><strong>4482</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears from Table 6.2 that, except for the small number of items I have not been able to define, all categories of clothes appear in all social groups. Of course, since some groups are represented with only a few inventories, the overall number of items in some groups is very limited. Furthermore, not all individual items are represented in all inventories; for example, not all labourer inventories contained accessories, shirts or sets of clothes. On the other hand, there is no direct evidence indicating that certain items would have been entirely uncharacteristic of certain groups of people. The next section will therefore ask more precise questions, in order to find out whether and to what extent the wardrobes of different groups of people were similar to or different from each other. The questions that I have posed to the inventories are partly derived from Chapter Four, which established that the main way to make a difference between people through clothes had to do with the quality of fabric and the accessories attached to the dress. Since Tallinn inventories rarely include financial valuations, an analysis of expenditure on wardrobes has not been possible. To ensure that this approach does not leave out other ways of distinguishing between groups of people I have also devised additional questions.

6.2 Going through the wardrobe

6.2.1 Taking stock of silk

When it comes to silk, the main distinction lies in whether inventories contain individual garments made of silk or entire gowns made of silk. Labourer and journeyman inventories as well as the one military inventory contain only individual silk garments. Additionally, in these inventories only small items made of silk, such as sleeves, caps, stockings, a pouch and a belt or body strap, appear. The only silk garment mentioned in a labourer inventory was a pair of sleeves made of floral velvet mentioned in an inventory from 1606. Journeyman inventories describe sleeves of black silk, a belt or some kind of body strap made of yellow silk, silk stockings, two silk caps and a silk pouch. In the inventory of Lieutenant Colonel Adolph Friedrich Taube from 1670, there were two silk garments: a plush cap lined with cross fox and an under-doublet made of silk. While these groups did have silk in their wardrobes, it was confined to small individual items.

In the remaining four groups – artisans, merchants, professionals and town councillors – the silk items were more numerous, and the most significant difference is that these also include entire silk gowns. Andreas Sandhagen, Deacon of St. Olaf’s Church, for example had two black women’s gowns in brocade and

452 Inventory of weigher Carsten Kitzken, 1606, TLA.230.1.Bt7/III, f. 36r.
453 Inventory of merchant journeyman Nicholaus Steinert, 1688, TLA.230.1.Bt13/III, f. 241r.
satin, and one male gown consisting of hose and Leibrock made of caffa.⁴⁵⁵ In saddler Philip Leyer’s inventory there was a women’s gown of taffeta and organ builder Johannes Pauls had a men’s gown of floret.⁴⁵⁶ Among merchant inventories, there were women’s gowns of unspecified silk, damask, terzenel and brocade.⁴⁵⁷ Among town councillors, there were men’s gowns of floret and velvet.⁴⁵⁸ Thus, both men and women could have gowns made entirely of silk, although women’s silk gowns appear to have been slightly more numerous.

In addition to gowns, the above-mentioned four groups also had individual silk garments. These could be smaller garments like those described above, but all these groups also owned more substantial silk garments like skirts, jackets, bodices, doublets and coats. Town councillor Johann Müller had a lining shirt of velvet.⁴⁵⁹ Women also had bodices of satin, damask, floret and caffa.⁴⁶⁰ There were also outer garments made of silk. Chamois preparer Martin Friesel’s wife had a cloak of black silk.⁴⁶¹ The wife of silversmith Christof Derenthal had a cloak of Florentine velvet and the wife of Jürgen Saurer, a barber surgeon, had a cloak of silk damask with velvet lapels.⁴⁶² In merchant Johann Lütgen’s inventory there was an overgown of yellow satin and pastor Matthäus Wilbrandt had a cloak of glossy velvet with lace.⁴⁶³ Cloaks were also made of lighter silks like terzenel, crepe and taffeta. Johann Buchau’s inventory included two women’s cloaks of crepe

---

⁴⁵⁵ Inventory of Andreas Sandhagen, deacon of St. Olaf’s Church, 1662, TLA.230.1.Aa56/c, f. 150r. Leibrock was a type of outer coat.
⁴⁵⁷ Inventory of merchant Matthias Heening, 1690, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 46v; inventory of merchant Assmus Hoetfilter and his wife, 1658, TLA.230.1.Bt11, f. 117v; inventory of merchant Heinrich Dellingshausen and his wife Anne von der Hoyen, 1658, TLA.230.1.Bt11, f. 4v.
⁴⁶¹ Inventory of chamois preparer Martin Friesel, 1692, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 120v.
⁴⁶³ Inventory of merchant Johann Lütgen, 1697, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 210v; inventory of pastor Matthäus Wilbrandt, 1658, TLA.230.1.Bt11, f. 94r.

---
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that were lined underneath with carteck.\textsuperscript{464} Heinrich Lanting and Matthias Heening both had a men’s cloak of terzenel and merchant Anthoni Fiandt had a cloak of taffeta.\textsuperscript{465} Women generally had more silk garments than men, although it should be noted that there is a substantial number of garments that have not been assigned to one or another gender.

There is unfortunately no precise way to estimate how big a proportion silk garments made up of these four groups’ entire wardrobes because it is not always possible to know with certainty whether a fabric was silk or a silk mix. An estimate shows that 26 out of 44 artisans’ inventories contained at least one silk garment, while 14 out of 16 of merchants’ inventories, 23 out of 26 professionals’ inventories and all of town councillors’ inventories contained at least one silk garment. Nearly 6 per cent of artisans’ garments, 9 per cent of merchants’ garments, 10 per cent of town councillors’ garments and 11 per cent of the professionals’ garments were made of silk. The downside of this estimate is that it takes the total number of silk garments from all the inventories and does not take into account how many silk garments each individual inventory contained. The median number of silk garments in these groups was 2 for artisans, 5.5 for merchants and 4 for both professionals and town councillors. These numbers, while perhaps not being the most precise measure, still indicate two things in the comparison of these four groups. Among these groups, artisans had the fewest silk garments. While the percentage of silk garments is the highest in the professional group, that is a result of three inventories containing a significant number of silk garments.\textsuperscript{466} Unsurprisingly, merchant households on average had the most silk garments. What is surprising, however, is that town councillors had fewer silk garments than merchants, being roughly on the same level with the households of professional people in Tallinn.

Another thing that may have distinguished these groups from each other is the type of silk that appears in the inventories. As we also saw in the previous chapter, some silks, above all velvet and brocade, were considered highly exclusive due to the cost of production and the often elaborate patterns of these fabrics. Moreover, sumptuary laws limited their use to certain small groups of people. It is also evident, however, that the heavier and more exclusive silks like brocade, damask and velvet were increasingly complemented by lighter silks like taffeta, terzenel, floret, satin and tobin, to mention a few examples. However, there is no distinction in what kind of silk garments these groups owned. The most exclusive silks – velvet, damask, brocade – in fact also appear in the inventories of labourers (the previously mentioned velvet sleeves of one weigher) and

\textsuperscript{464} Inventory of merchant Johann Buchau, 1700, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 269v.
\textsuperscript{465} Inventory of town councillor Heinrich Lanting, 1644, TLA.230.1.Bt10/IV, f. 308r; inventory of merchant Matthias Heening, 1690, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 46r; inventory of merchant Anthoni Fiandt, 1689, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 34v.
\textsuperscript{466} Inventory of Studiosus Johannes Eric Heeren and his wife, 1673, TLA.230.1.Bt13/III, f. 20r–25v; inventory of Literatus Hinrich Bröcker, 1668, TLA.230.1.Bt12/1, f. 45r–74r; inventory of pastor of St. Olaf’s Church Bartolomeus Berner, 1604, TLA.230.1.Bt7/1, f. 84r–88r.
journeymen (a velvet pouch) and more widely among artisans, professionals, merchants and town councillors. Furthermore, very often inventories simply indicated that a garment was made of unspecified silk, therefore it is not possible to make a distinction between the groups based on specific types of silk.

6.2.2 All fur coats and no knickers

Table 6.3. Furs in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700 (twelve most numerous)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fur</th>
<th>Artisan</th>
<th>Journeyman</th>
<th>Labourer</th>
<th>Merchant</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Town council</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marten</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynx</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross fox</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>155</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>357</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Fur, used frequently to display social rank and continuously a target of regulation, was abundant in seventeenth-century inventories. In total, twenty-one different types of furs were mentioned in inventories. In addition to the most common furs (Table 6.3), others that appeared in inventories included beaver, mink, wild cat, honey badger, beech marten and polecat. While not many garments were made entirely of fur, it was still a vital part of people's wardrobes. Fur is represented in all categories of clothes except for footwear and the undefined items. Fur provided warmth in the cold climate, but it also held significant financial value. The only two garments that were financially valued in an artisan's inventory from 1667 were two boat caps made of fur, one valued at twelve Rtl and the other at five Rtl. In one inventory from 1690, one fine sable fur cap, three pieces of sable for a muff and four smaller pieces of sable were altogether valued at twenty Rtl, which was equal in value to a new silk jacket and skirt. Even furs that were old, shabby or torn were often included in inventories.

467 On fur, see also Alan Hunt 1996, p. 126.
468 Inventory of cordovan maker Hanss Busekist, 1667, TLA.230.1.Bt12/I, f. 39r.
469 Inventory of merchant Matthias Heening, 1690, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 47r.
Figure 6.3. A Livonian peasant, ca. 1700

Source: Jean Mariette, Bonde från Livland som lede kungen av Sverige till Narva för att rädda staden, ca. 1700, Nationalmuseum, NMTiG 2170
The most common fur garments were various types of headwear (Figure 6.3). A variety of different caps were often made entirely of fur, as were a specific type of headgear called *Hülle*, which can possibly be seen on the cover of this dissertation and on Figure 3.2.\(^{470}\) Both caps and *Hülle* were often made of sable, fox, marten or beaver, but also wolverine and lynx. Headwear that was not made entirely of fur often had a fur lining or trim. A variety of furs could also be used for decoration on caps and *Hülle* that were made of other fabrics, for example woolens like polemit, broadcloth and wande, or silks like plush, velvet and taffeta. One journeyman for example had a cap made of plush that was lined with sable and decorated with golden and silver galloons. While inventories of labourers did not mention the fabrics of headwear, the two caps of fisherman Jürgen Fryman were lined with cross fox and the *Hülle* of town council cook Johan Ast was lined with fox.\(^ {471}\) Although not as exclusive as imported marten and sable, it reveals something of the choices that were available to those lower down on the social scale.

Fur was also immensely popular on outer garments, as fur coats were an important way to keep warm in the northern climes. There were no fur coats made entirely of sable or marten, but they could for example be made of squirrel.\(^ {472}\) Fur coats could also be made of lambskin or sheepskin and there is also one fur coat that was made of yellow boj and lined with cat skin.\(^ {473}\) Fur coats do not appear in the inventories of town councillors or the one inventory of military. More importantly, fur was extensively used to line and trim coats, jackets, overgowns, cassocks, waistcoats and cloaks. The garments themselves were usually made of a variety of woollen fabrics. In case of silk fabrics, the garment was commonly lined with either marten or sable. The wife of silversmith Christof Derenthal, for example, had a cloak of Florentine velvet that was lined with sable.\(^ {474}\) While most of the time only one type of fur was used for lining, sometimes combinations of furs were mentioned, like fox and lynx, sable and squirrel and sable and marten. Lieutenant Colonel Adolph Friedrich Taube had a coat made of drugget that was lined with both sable and marten.\(^ {475}\) The wife of pastor Bartolomeus Berner had a red overgown that was lined with marten and squirrel and decorated with thirteen gilded buttons.\(^ {476}\)

In addition to garments that were lined with fur, fur linings could also be written down as separate accessories. Either they were unspecified, or they could be

---

\(^ {470}\) In the Middle Ages, *Hülle* appears to have been similar to a headcloth, which could cover both the head and the neck. In some places it appears to have been a head cover for married women, see Loschek 1999, p. 266. For want of a better term I have translated it as ‘headgear’ in the present dissertation.


\(^ {472}\) Inventory of Dorothea Rotert, wife of shoemaker Thomas Beck, 1622, TLA.230.1.Bt9/I, f. 5r.

\(^ {473}\) Inventory of *Literatus* Hinrich Bröcker, 1668, TLA.230.1.Bt12/I, f. 53r.

\(^ {474}\) Inventory of the wife of silversmith Christof Derenthal, 1638, TLA.230.1.Bt10/III, f. 207r.

\(^ {475}\) Inventory of Lieutenant Colonel Adolph Friedrich Taube, 1670, TLA.230.1.Bt12/II, f. 2v.

\(^ {476}\) Inventory of Bartolomeus Berner, pastor of St. Olaf’s Church, 1664, TLA.230.1.Bt7/I, f. 86r.
a lining that belonged to a specific type of garment: jacket, hose, cloak, coat, sleeves, cape, cap, skirt. Except for one lining made of calf skin, the remaining linings were all made of fur: beech marten, cat, fox, marten, sable, squirrel, and wolf. Merchant Dominicus Lange’s inventory included an ‘inner lining’ of fox fur, town council scribe Andreas Berghusen had a coat lining of fox fur that had been cut off from the coat and pastor Samuel Feig’s inventory contained an old women’s skirt lining, also made of fox fur.477 Such detachable linings had two important functions – they provided warmth during the cold winter months and could be removed for the summer, but a finer or newer fur also displayed the wealth and social status of its wearer. If one garment was worn out, the lining could easily be attached to another one, thus continuing its lifecycle. Fur was also used as a lining on a variety of smaller garments like gloves and muffs, and on undergarments like sleeping gowns, and even a vest and a lining shirt.478 This points to the fact that, while expensive fur was surely a sign of wealth and social position, the practical aspect of fur warming the human body was equally important in the seventeenth century.

To sum up, it is not possible to distinguish between different groups of people based on ownership of fur. Table 6 shows above all that, except for labourers, the remaining inventories included at least one garment with sable fur. Sable and marten do not appear to have been highly exclusive and coveted furs, but seem rather to have been available to many people. People below the social elite, above all artisans and journeymen, had garments decorated with sable. The only exception here is labourers, who did not possess any sable or marten items. Other types of fur also appear widely in the inventories on both ends of the social spectrum, which confirms that in Tallinn the practical function of fur warming the human body was equally important as its ability to visualise the social status of its owners.

6.2.3 Bells and whistles

Chapter Four showed that ornaments and add-ons were among the most frequently regulated elements of seventeenth-century dress. On the one hand, the inventories reveal that there was significant variety in the different kinds of decorations that could be attached to one’s garments. On the other hand, the inventories do not include this information on a regular basis so in a large majority of the cases we do not even know for example how a jacket, doublet or waistcoat was fastened. Sometimes it is evident that the adornments added to the sumptuous description of the garment and were meant to enhance its value, such as a yellow satin overgown with silver buttons or a plush cap with sable fur and

golden and silver galloons.479 But it is also evident that these ornaments could be a means to distinguish garments from one another, especially if there was more than one of the same garment in the household. An overgown with thirty-six silver buttons was thus distinguishable by these same buttons that the other outer garments presumably lacked.480

The only accessory that appears to have created distinction between different groups is a tiny detail called golden buttons. The only two groups where golden buttons appear are merchants and town councillors. Town councillor Arendt Stippel thus had a jacket of brown broadcloth with golden buttons and golden braids as well as a chamois waistcoat with golden buttons.481 Town councillor Johan Müller had a velvet lining shirt with golden buttons.482 Merchant Johann Buchau’s rain cloak of broadcloth had both golden and brown buttons and burgomaster Michael Paulsen had a coat of broadcloth with golden buttons and golden galloons.483 Golden buttons only appeared on male garments. Although there was one velvet lining shirt, golden buttons did not necessarily have to be attached to garments made of silk and could also decorate clothes made of high-quality woollen.

While the inventories of artisans and the professional group did not describe any items with golden buttons, in both groups gilded buttons appear. For example, there was a fur coat with an unspecified number of gilded buttons in the inventory of one linen-weaver’s widow, and pastor Bartolomeus Berner had a pair of sleeves with fourteen gilded buttons as well as a women’s overgown with thirteen gilded buttons.484 The remaining inventories from labourers, journeymen and the one military did not describe any gilded buttons. Silver buttons, on the other hand, appear in the inventories of all groups except for labourers and one military. Tin buttons appeared in the inventories of fisherman Jürgen Fryman (a red broadcloth lining shirt with tin buttons), weaver Andreas Wichman (a men’s jacket with tin buttons) and shoemaker Jürgen von Stahl (a men’s overgown with tin buttons).485 Occasionally, the inventories did not detail the material of the buttons, but it seems likely that in case of golden or gilded buttons it would have been mentioned. Thus, it appears that golden buttons were rather exclusive and rare, while silver buttons were also available to middling groups of people and

480 Inventory of Birgitta Falck, wife of master butcher Jürgen Hinrich Schmidt, 1698, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 231v.
481 Inventory of town councillor Arendt Stippel, 1696, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 179r.
482 Inventory of town councillor Johan Müller, 1638, TLA.230.1.Bt10/III, f. 214r.
483 Inventory of merchant Johann Buchau, 1700, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 269r; inventory of burgomaster Michael Paulsen, 1680, TLA.230.1.13/I, f. 10r.
484 Inventory of linen weaver Engber Per’s widow, 1601, TLA.230.1.Aa44, f. 135r; inventory of Bartolomeus Berner, pastor of St. Olaf’s Church, 1604, TLA.230.1.Br7/I, f. 86r.
tin buttons may have been more characteristic of people of poorer social background.

Otherwise, there is no distinct pattern with the types of add-ons or the material of which they were made. One journeyman had a jacket with silk buttons, while silk ribbons and tassels also appear in artisan, merchant, professional and town council inventories.\textsuperscript{486} Most often, however, the material of the ribbons was not specified, like town council cook Johan Ast’s green ribbon on his gown or the black ribbon on the hose of Lieutenant General Taube.\textsuperscript{487} While golden buttons were exclusive to merchants and town councillors, other ornaments woven with gold thread, above all braids, laces and galloons, appear also in artisan, journeymen and professional inventories. The hat of shoemaker Jürgen von Stahl had two silver braids and one golden braid, and the boot stockings of land surveyor Matthias Andersohn were decorated with golden galloons.\textsuperscript{488} A distinction could also be made between ‘real’ and ‘fake’ ornaments, for example, the bonnet of deacon Andreas Sandhagen’s wife was described as having fake golden and silver laces on it.\textsuperscript{489} The distinction between real and fake accessories again reminds us of the clothing competence of early modern people in observing clothes and their material substance.

Why the presence of certain ornaments was indicated in writing while others were not is difficult to say, but except for the golden buttons, the other things attached to people’s clothes appear to have largely been influenced by circumstance. It is likely that since golden and gilded buttons had a significant economic value, it was thought necessary to record these in writing. One thing worth mentioning, however, is that the various decorations on people’s attire, both in sumptuary laws but also in inventories, indicate that a decorated dress was not a female domain in the seventeenth century. In no way were men’s clothes plainer, less decorated or less elaborate in inventories. However, despite the fact that men’s clothes could be as sumptuous and decorated as women’s, it was primarily women’s dress and consumption habits that came to be characterised as frivolous and immoral.\textsuperscript{490}


\textsuperscript{489} Inventory of Andreas Sandhagen, deacon of St. Olaf’s Church, 1662, TLA.230.1.Aa56/c, f. 150r.

\textsuperscript{490} Rahikainen & Vainio-Korhonen 2015, p. 30.
6.2.4 Old and new garments

Another way to look at the inventories is to keep an eye on the frequency with which clothes were described in inventories as ‘old’ and ‘new’. Garments that were described as ‘new’, ‘newer’, ‘still good’, ‘fine’, ‘proper’ and ‘of very fine material’ appear in the inventories of all groups except for labourers and the one military inventory. The difficulty in working with such descriptions lies in the fact that it can be difficult to decipher what the appraisers meant by their chosen adjectives. The adjectives above indicate that rather than just being ‘new’, there was a whole range of ways to describe a garment’s condition, also when it was in a not new but still seemingly good condition. For example, one hat in an artisan inventory was described as ‘halfway worn-out’.

The term ‘new’ did not mean ‘unused’ so much as that a garment was deemed to be relatively new or in good condition. The newness of clothes in the sense of not having been used before by anyone else did not really matter for contemporaries in terms of how they valued, used, exchanged and thought about their clothes. Since few people had the resources to update their wardrobe continuously with new bespoke garments, the norm for clothes was rather that they had been used and owned by someone else before. Whether an item was ‘second-hand’ would not have been an issue in the buying process, as the object’s value did not diminish in the buyer’s eyes on that account.

Old and used garments appear in the inventories of all social groups and more frequently than new garments. More importantly, the inventories of merchants, town councillors and professionals also included garments not only described as ‘old’ but also as ‘poor’, ‘shabby’, ‘torn’, ‘worn-out’, ‘worthless’ and even ‘eaten by worms’. Literatus Hinrich Bröcker thus had a women’s muff that had been eaten by worms and the same went for town councillor Michael Paulsen’s two hats.

Of course, we should bear in mind that these judgements about the clothes’ condition come to us mediated through the eyes of the appraisers. Nevertheless, lacking financial values in most inventories, these tiny words give us an indication of how the appraisers judged clothes’ material condition and how much the items consequently might have been worth in relation to each other. The inventories also make it abundantly clear that old, shabby and torn garments, or garments that were not complete, were not simply thrown out. Even if they did not have a direct purpose, they were kept in the household as goods that had value and could potentially be reused in the future.

---

491 Inventory of chamois preparer Martin Friesel, 1692, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 120v.
492 Nyberg 2010, p. 125; Marie Ulväng 2012, p. 121.
494 Inventory of Literatus Hinrich Bröcker, 1668, TLA.230.1.Bt12/1, f. 53v; inventory of burgomaster Michael Paulsen, 1680, TLA.230.1.Bt13/1, f. 10v.
6.2.5 Colour

The final aspect of clothing that this section will deal with is colour. Sumptuary laws were only minimally concerned with regulating the colour of garments. Yet, a number of scholars have shown how different colours were meaningful in the early modern period, with grey for example being associated with peasants, yellow often being the colour of stigma, red and purple being associated with royalty and black being a solemn and serious colour. It is therefore reasonable to see whether we can glean any information about how to differentiate people from one another based on the colour of their clothes and whether a distinct hierarchy of colour existed. The question of colour is approached from two different angles. The first problem is to examine whether the colour red can be seen to draw a boundary between different groups of people. Red is a good yardstick because of the cost of production and its associations with luxury and social elites, not least royalty.

In the inventories, red garments appear in all groups except for the military. Even if all the small items like stockings and caps are removed, all the groups had at least one red outer garment. However, a good point to make here, and another limitation of the inventories as written sources, is that we should not let our own assumptions about what red might mean obscure the early modern colour palette and the options that were available to people. Red might have meant anything from a pale pinkish-red shade dyed with whatever was available domestically, like berries or roots, to brilliant imported cochineal red. The word thus contains a whole spectrum of colours. More importantly, something that is not readily apparent from the inventories is the role people could play in the shaping of their own appearances and the skills and knowledge involved in this process – skills like sourcing dyes and dyeing their clothes.

Another way to approach the question of colour is to examine who had black garments. Black was a colour of fashion that originated from the Spanish court and spread over Europe in the sixteenth century. Good-quality, deep black was expensive to dye, and it retained its popularity among the European elite into the seventeenth century. In Tallinn, black garments did not turn up in labourer inventories or in the one military inventory. Additionally, black items were described seldom in journeymen’s inventories, with only two black hats and a pair of black silk sleeves described in the inventory of merchant journeyman Nicholaus Steinert in 1688. However, in the remaining four groups – artisans, merchants, professionals and town councillors – black was the most popular colour for clothes. Moreover, in the artisan inventories, black was more popular than

---


496 On dyeing during the Renaissance period, see also Rublack 2016, pp. 10–11.


grey and brown combined. We should be reminded that more often than not, the colour of the garment was not indicated in the inventories. Still, black did not separate the small social elite of Tallinn from everyone else; rather, it was the absence of black that was characteristic of labourers and journeymen.

A whole spectrum of colour appears in inventories, and it is evident that colourful wardrobes and patterned clothes were not the prerogative of the social elite. While merchant inventories did display an impressive range of colour from brown and grey to turquoise, green, blue and purple-in-white, journeymen were in fact no less colourful with brown, grey, yellow, green, white, red and liver-coloured garments. Labourer inventories included garments in grey, brown and red and there was also a pair of floral sleeves. Even if it was the odd belt or pouch, stockings or caps, people from all social backgrounds displayed colour in their wardrobes. The early modern world was not monochrome.

6.2.6 Change and continuity in the seventeenth century

Based on the clothing resources in inventories, the previous section showed how clothes created difference within and between various groups of people on the everyday level. However, the picture painted above appears rather static and we might consequently think that nothing much changed in people’s appearances during the century. But a diachronic perspective is important, because as we saw in Chapter Four, the ideal of a visual social order on the normative level was also dynamic and constantly renegotiated. Even if my goal has not been to provide an exhaustive overview of seventeenth-century wardrobes, this section will sketch out some preliminary changes with the help of inventories that took place over the course of the century. In addition to the specific aspects of dress that were discussed in individual sections above, I will also discuss certain items of the wardrobe that have been identified previously as undergoing change during the seventeenth century.

As written sources, inventories are not ideal for detecting sartorial change, especially since that change to a large degree was manifested in appearances that are mostly inaccessible to us. To begin with, it is impossible to say how old the garments were or how they came to the household.499 Considering the quality and durability of fabrics in the seventeenth century, it was entirely likely that a garment could be forty or fifty years old by the time it was recorded in the inventory.500 As people aged, they were also less likely to update their wardrobe on a regular basis, since their priorities were mainly connected to the consumption and maintenance of the household, which also suggests that the garments recorded in the inventories were probably not new or made according to the latest

499 On this see also Karlson 1948, pp. 24–47.
500 Jan de Vries has employed the concept of ‘breakability’ in order to describe the developments that took place in European material culture in the eighteenth century, with expensive durable goods being increasingly replaced by cheaper and less durable goods more subject to changes in fashion, see Vries 2008, pp. 129–133.
fashion.\textsuperscript{501} Additionally, taking into account the widespread practice of reworking garments, exchanging and removing parts and using these on other garments, we can say very little about the life cycle of the clothes and whether they reflected the changes taking place in clothing styles. Because the time period between the garment’s coming into existence and its being recorded in an inventory was usually rather long, it is very difficult to use this source to say anything about when and how new fashions were adopted, and old ones disappeared.

Table 6.4. *Silk and silk mix fabrics in clothing in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bomseid</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocade</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burat</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carteck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crepe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damask</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floret</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk (unspe-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cificed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk camlet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk grosgrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk serge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taffeta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terzenel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velvet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Despite these obvious limitations, some changes can be observed from the inventories. Use of silk fabrics, which as we saw in the section above was visible in the inventories of all social groups, appears to have changed somewhat over the course of the century (Table 6.4). It has been suggested that the heavier silk fabrics, such as velvet, damask and brocade, which were generally associated with luxury consumption, were increasingly replaced by lighter and cheaper silks over the course of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{502} As they appear unevenly in the inventories, a straightforward pattern cannot be detected in my sample. Brocade garments were for example mentioned in the inventories between 1651 and 1690. While damask appeared more frequently before 1660, a women’s damask bodice

\textsuperscript{501} Palmsköld 2007, p. 156; Marie Ulväng 2012, pp. 119–122.

was recorded in a cooper’s inventory from 1699 and a women’s black damask cloak appears in Birgitta Falck’s 1698 inventory.\textsuperscript{503} Velvet garments also appear less frequently after 1671, but Pastor Samuel Feig’s inventory from 1693 contained a women’s black velvet jacket and burgomaster Michael Paulsen’s inventory from 1680 also included an old velvet jacket.\textsuperscript{504} The very likely a lag of some decades once again shows the downside of using just inventories in detecting changes in fashion and in people’s consumption habits. The garments left in the household may have gone out of fashion by the time they were recorded in the inventories, but there is no way for us to know it. These garments of velvet and silk may have been kept because they were financially valuable, but people might also have been wearing them, regardless of whether they were fashionable or not.

At the same time, the inventory sample shows the presence of a wide variety of other imported silk fabrics and silk mixes already from early in the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{505} A bomseid bodice was first mentioned in 1601 and burgomaster Wilhelm Becker’s inventory included a men’s gown of burat and a doublet of tobin as early as 1602.\textsuperscript{506} Silk camlet appears in the first two decades and disappears after that. After a hiatus of about three or four decades, there is a significant increase in the variety of silk fabrics mentioned in inventories, with lighter silks and silk mixes like caffa, carteck, satin, silk grosgrain, taffeta and terzenel also being mentioned the inventories (Table 6.4).\textsuperscript{507} Plush is mentioned for the first time after 1651. The last decade of the century also saw new fabrics, like crepe and silk serge, enter the inventories. Floret, on the other hand, appears during the whole century. Although the time periods do not correspond exactly, a comparison with inventories from Stockholm drawn up between 1589 and 1649 shows that there was no straightforward pattern in how early these new silks and silk mixes were first recorded in Stockholm and Tallinn.\textsuperscript{508} Tobin appears earlier in Tallinn than in Stockholm. Burat, caffa, silk camlet and terzenel appear roughly at the same time. Satin, silk grosgrain and plush, on the other hand, appear around a decade later in Tallinn. Some silks that appeared in Stockholm are not mentioned in the inventories of Tallinn and conversely, floret for example did not appear at all in the Stockholm inventories. The table above also shows that inventories often failed to specify what kind of silk fabric a garment was made of, thus making it difficult to draw any definite conclusions about the spread of new silk fabrics in Tallinn.

\textsuperscript{503} Inventory of Mart the cooper, 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 83v; inventory of Birgitta Falck, wife of master butcher Jürgen Hinrich Schmidt, 1698, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 230r.
\textsuperscript{504} Inventory of pastor Samuel Feig, 1693, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 139v; inventory of burgomaster Michael Paulsen, 1680, TLA.230.1.Bt13/I, f. 10r.
\textsuperscript{507} The weave density of both silks and woollens decreased in the seventeenth century, see Styles 2018, p. 76.
\textsuperscript{508} See Table 2.2 in Eva I. Andersson 2014a, p. 21.
Thus, silk fabrics in inventories do not reveal an uncomplicated change. While brocade, damask and velvet perhaps appear less frequently in the last decades of the century, they are still recorded in the inventories. Moreover, brocade items only appear from the second half of the century. Additionally, the lag between garments being made and recorded in the inventories indicates that the various lighter silks and silk mixes described above were very likely present in many households in the first half of the seventeenth century. Another important thing to mention here is that there is no clear pattern of these new silks spreading from the social elite downwards. When we take the decades from 1631 to 1650, when caffa, cartèck, satin, taffeta and terzenel are first mentioned in inventories, these appear to have been available to the groups of town councillors, merchants, artisans and professionals. The wife of silversmith Christof Derenthal, for example, had a satin skirt in 1638. Painter Hans von Hemisen’s inventory from 1641 contained a doublet of satin. Town chamberlain Johan Wibbeking had a gown of black caffa recorded in 1642. Town councillor Heinrich Lanting had two gowns, a doublet and a muff made of caffa, a cloak of terzenel and two doublets of satin in 1644. Town secretary Johannis Brüning’s inventory from 1645 contained a women’s skirt of cartèck, a women’s doublet of taffeta and two other doublets of satin. Rather than being available to and used only by certain groups of people, the use of these fabrics seems to have been more influenced by people’s individual means and desires.

While it is evident that silk was available in many different types, most people’s wardrobes were largely built upon woollen fabrics (Table 6.5). It is equally difficult to detect change here, but some patterns might appear. Wande, a coarse, locally produced woollen, does not appear after 1651, when two pairs of hose made of wande were mentioned in tailor Barthold Oloffsohn’s inventory. The use of camlet and Turkish grosgrain may also have been mostly confined to the period before 1675, as the last garments made of these fabrics that appear are two women’s doublets of Turkish grosgrain in the 1671 inventory of merchant Jürgen Schade and his wife, and a women’s skirt of camlet in locksmith Joichim Gesell’s 1675 inventory. Broadcloth appears after 1641 and polemit and serge become more popular from 1651 onwards. Kutschbay, oberkiker, sajett and tuch are confined to the middle decades of the century. Fustian, kalmuck, Turkish polemit and watman, likely another coarse woollen of local origin, appear late in the century. Certain fabrics, however, appear to have retained their popularity. Grosgrain was used for the better part of the century and other fabrics like boj,

509 Inventory of the wife of silversmith Christof Derenthal, 1638, TLA.230.1.Bt10/III, f. 207r.
510 Inventory of painter Hans von Hemisen, 1641, TLA.230.1.Bt10/IV, f. 263r.
512 Inventory of town councillor Heinrich Lanting, 1644, TLA.230.1.Bt10/IV, f. 308r–308v.
514 Inventory of tailor Barthold Oloffsohn, 1651, TLA.230.1.Bt10/V1, f. 411r.
kirsey, rasch and trip are also mentioned in inventories from early and late seventeenth century. What is important to note here is that even these woollen fabrics were to a large degree imported.516

Table 6.5. Woollen fabrics in clothing in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boj</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcloth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camlet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fustian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosgrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalmuck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutschbay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberkiker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polemit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Says</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish grosgrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish polemit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wande</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A comparison with woollen fabrics in Stockholm inventories from the first half of the seventeenth century indicates an equally complex pattern.517 While camlet and boj did not appear in Stockholm inventories after 1609, in Tallinn both were recorded in the inventories throughout the century. Says, which only appeared in Tallinn in the first decade of the century, was mentioned in Stockholm inventories also later. Similarly to silk fabrics, there are woollens that seem to have been used locally or called by a specifically local name. Perpetuana, frieze and woollens from Lübeck, Görlitz and Scotland do not appear in the inventories of Tallinn. Conversely, oberkiker, kutschbay and sajett do not appear in the Stockholm in-

516 Based on her study of Stockholm inventories, Eva Andersson has suggested that most woollen fabrics were imported from England, see Eva I. Andersson 2014a, pp. 19–20. These lighter finer woollens have been called ‘New Draperies’, see also Harte 1997; Styles 2018, p. 76.
517 See Table 2.1 in Eva I. Andersson 2014a, p. 20.
ventories. Moreover, fabrics like mageir, puke, packlacken and dussincken, mentioned in Stockholm inventories, appear in clothing regulations issued in Tallinn, which suggests that they were also very likely known and used in Tallinn, yet they were not mentioned in inventories. To sum up, while some silks and woollens seem to have reached Tallinn later than Stockholm, others appear simultaneously. There also appears to have been some local preference towards certain fabrics that were either only used in Tallinn or used longer than for example in Stockholm. It is also very likely that one fabric could be referred to in more than one way and that the content of these fabrics changed over the course of the century. The analysis of fabrics in inventories paints a complex picture of change in clothing.

While fabrics indicate a certain kind of change, if we look at the other distinguishing criteria — fur, accessories, old and new garments and colour — in the same way, a similar kind of change is difficult to find. Fur was important throughout the whole century and the most common fur types mentioned above appear on a regular basis in inventories throughout the century.\(^\text{518}\) Accessories and add-ons as well as the age of the garments were not described in the large majority of the cases, which makes it difficult to say whether these aspects of dress underwent change. With respect to colour, change cannot be seen from the inventories either. In the majority of cases, inventories did not indicate the colour of outer garments, but when it was indicated, black was the most popular colour throughout the century, followed by brown and grey.\(^\text{519}\) Red was also present in the inventories through the whole century. Other colours, such as yellow, green and blue appeared more sporadically in the seventeenth century.\(^\text{520}\) This, of course, does not mean that colour was absent from most people’s wardrobes; to the contrary, as the inventories of individuals like Hartmann Graman, discussed below, and the wedding expenditure of Michael Güntherus (Appendix 3) show, the early modern world could be filled with colour. To sum up, while we can see that the fabrics used for making garments did change over the course of the century, the same cannot be said of the other material aspects of dress. This has more likely to do with the nature of the inventories rather than the fact that no change occurred over the seventeenth century. Arguably, the most important element in describing clothes in inventories was the material of which they were made, rather than any other aspect, which supports the idea that clothes were an important economic resource and also described as such in the inventories.

A much more fruitful approach, however, is to look for change in the individual garments worn by men and women. The basic article of men’s dress in the seventeenth century was a gown usually made up of hose or breeches and an upper garment like a doublet or a jacket. It has previously been suggested that

\(^{518}\) In 1601, the widow of linen-weaver Engber Per had a fur coat made of squirrel that had twelve silver buttons and another lining of squirrel, TLA.230.1.Aa44, f. 135r; in 1699, Mart the cooper had two women’s caps lined with marten, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 84r.

\(^{519}\) See Appendix 2.1.

\(^{520}\) See Appendix 2.1.
somewhere in the mid-seventeenth century, the male attire of doublet or jacket and hose was replaced by breeches, vest or waistcoat and coat. In England, for example, this change took place with an announcement made by Charles II in 1666. However, looking solely at the inventories it is very difficult to see an uncomplicated change in Tallinn (Table 6.6). The frequency of men’s doublets does decrease over the course of the century, but doublets of unknown gender are found until the end of the seventeenth century. Additionally, although other types of outer garments for the upper body, such as jackets and lining shirts appear in inventories some decades later than doublets, they exist concurrently for the remainder of the century. How these three garments differed from each other is not easy to say either. Moreover, vests appear sporadically in the inventories. The waistcoat, however, was a new item in the wardrobes of the people and was first mentioned already in 1670, becoming more popular in the 1690s. Usually, waistcoats were made of either woollen, leather or silk.

Table 6.6. Men’s wardrobe in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buff coat</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloak</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doublet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose (Büchsen)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose (Hosen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lining shirt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waistcoat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes in male legwear have also been pointed out by previous researchers, but their transformation is not uncomplicated either. The general agreement is that

522 Kuchta 2002, p. 1
523 Inventory of merchant journeyman Marcus Hasse, 1670, TLA.230.1.Bt12/II, f. 81r; inventory of chamois preparer Martin Friesel, 1692, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 120r; inventory of merchant Hinrich Bröcker and Elisabeth Duborg, 1694, TLA.166.1.208, pages unnumbered.
the puffy trunk hose were replaced by breeches, which for some time were voluminously wide (Figure 6.5), and then got narrower by the end of the century. Some kind of change appears to have taken place in Tallinn, too, where until 1621, men’s lower garments were referred to as Büxen or Buchsen. After that, the male legwear was described exclusively as Hosen for the rest of the century. On the other hand, Hosen appears already in the early seventeenth century, so it is reasonable to conclude that these two garments were in all likelihood also in use concurrently.

Other apparel that reflects the changing styles in men’s wardrobes is for example the buff coat, described in inventories between 1621 and 1658. Buff coats were garments for the torso made of thick leather and usually worn under the cuirass. They could be with or without sleeves. Although buff coats were originally worn in the military context, during the Thirty Years’ War they also became a fashionable garment and at least in the Swedish royal court context, were worn as an alternative to silk garments. Additionally, wigs were introduced in Tallinn by the late seventeenth century, and they can be seen in burghers’ portraits from 1680s onwards (Figure 6.6). In the inventories, wigs appear for the first time in 1687, and by the end of the century, they were recorded in eight inventories. As they were recorded in town council, merchant, professional, journeyman and artisan inventories, it seems they became available to large groups of the society rather quickly. The limited visual material depicting men’s dress in Tallinn during different decades of the seventeenth century shows that it was generally quite similar to its Western European counterparts (Figures 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6).

525 Inventory of potter journeyman Thomas Framholt, 1621, TLA.230.1.Bt8/II, f. 3r.
526 Inventory of weigher Carsten Kitzken, 1606, TLA.230.1.Bt7/III, f. 36r.
527 Inventory of potter journeyman Thomas Framholt from 1621, TLA.230.1.Bt8/II, f. 3r; inventory of merchant Heinrich Dellingshausen and Anne von der Hoyen, 1658, TLA.230.1.Bt11, f. 3v.
528 Aneer 2009, p. 165.
529 Aneer 2009, p. 165.
Figure 6.4. Drawing of a man in contemporary attire

Figure 6.5. A burgher in mid-seventeenth century fashion, detail from a silver tankard, Stanislaus Schultze, 1640–1660

Source: Joogikann TLM_4199 KA 495/V, Tallinna Linnamuuseum (Photo: Meeli Küttim)
Figure 6.6. Portrait of Jobst Hueck, Ernst Wilhelm Londicer (?), 1686–1687 (?)

Source: Portrait gallery in Hueck house, Lai 29, Tallinn, collection of AS Restor (Photo: Pia Ehasalu)
Figure 6.7. Portrait of Anna Hueck, Ernst Wilhelm Londicer (?), 1686–1698 (?)  

Source: Portrait gallery in Hueck house, Lai 29, Tallinn, collection of AS Restor (Photo: Pia Ehasalu)
Table 6.7. Women’s wardrobe in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodice</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloak</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doublet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacket</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lining shirt</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgown</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petticoat</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirt</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waistcoat</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In women’s dress, inventories also reveal some changes (Table 6.7). In the seventeenth century, women generally wore a gown made up of two parts, a skirt and an upper garment, such as a doublet, a jacket or a bodice. While gowns appear in inventories from mid-seventeenth century onwards, the individual garments were more frequently written down separately throughout the century. It appears that while women wore doublets throughout the century, jackets appear in inventories alone and as part of gowns in the second half of the century. While bodices were commonly made of linen, some bodices were also made of more expensive materials, like velvet, damask and plush, which suggests these could be worn instead of a doublet or jacket.531 Additionally, women could also wear lining shirts, and two women’s waistcoats also appear in the last years of the century, one of black silk and the other of purple-in-white silk.532 Three women’s cassocks also appear in the inventories.533 There thus appears to have been a number of different upper garments available for women and these options became more numerous as the century progressed.

While the inventories mostly show the concurrent use of many different garments, one innovation for women was the mantua, a robe or gown of sorts usually worn together with a matching petticoat and a stomacher.534 Although the

---

532 Inventory of merchant Dominicus Lange, 1698, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 252r; inventory of Johann Buchau, 1700, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 269v.
534 Rauser 2020, p. 10.
details are not entirely clear from the portrait, the attire worn by Anna Hueck (Figure 6.7) very closely resembles a mantua similar to those worn by women in Western Europe at the time. Merchant Dominicus Lange’s inventory from 1698 described a mantua of grey crepe, and in 1694, the inventory of merchant Wilhelm Bröcker and his wife included two mantuas, one of unspecified multicoloured woollen fabric and the other of black silk.\footnote{Inventory of merchant Dominicus Lange, 1698, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 252v; inventory of merchant Wilhelm Bröcker and his wife Elisabeth Duborg, 1694, pages unnumbered.} An interesting observation is that women’s fashion in the first half of the seventeenth century (see the cover of this dissertation and Figure 3.2) appears to have been of distinctly local character, while the portraits from 1680 onwards depicted women very similarly to their Dutch counterparts.\footnote{On seventeenth-century portraiture in Tallinn, see Ehasalu 2007, pp. 225–243.}

While the inventories provide evidence of the continued presence of many outer garments like coats, cloaks and overgowns, some garments also disappeared from people’s wardrobes. Headgear or Hülle, also potentially visible on the cover of this dissertation, which was often made of or lined with fur and worn both by men and women, only appears in inventories between 1630 and 1658, although it was regulated in the sumptuary law as late as 1665.\footnote{Two women’s Hülle were mentioned in the inventory of furrier Andreas Winter’s widow, 1630, TLA.230.1.Bt10/I, f. 93r. The last inventory in the sample in which one women’s high Hülle made of fur and one men’s Hülle made of fur appear, was drawn up in 1658 for clock maker Franciscus Zilagius and his wife, TLA.230.1.Bt11, f. 56v; 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 86r.} Sumptuary laws and discussions in the town council indicate that especially women’s headgear was a major concern in the first half of the seventeenth century but perhaps it became obsolete with the introduction of high headdresses such as the fontange. Another garment where one might hope to see change is the ruff collar, which women and men were wearing in the 1630s (see the cover of this dissertation and Figure 6.4). Sometime around the middle of the century starched neckruffs were replaced by collars falling on the shoulder (Figure 6.5).\footnote{Condra (ed.) 2008, p. 131.} However, inventories remain silent on that matter, because all collars were described as Krage throughout the century. Another type of neckwear was the neckerchief, which was already described in 1604, but appears to have become a regular part of men’s and to a lesser extent women’s wardrobe from 1658 onwards.\footnote{Inventory of Bartolomeus Berner, pastor of St. Olaf’s Church, 1604, TLA.230.1.Bt7/I, f. 87r; inventory of tawer Herman Pferdekampf, 1658, TLA.230.1.Bt11, f. 52r.}

On his travels through Sweden and its Baltic territories at the beginning of the seventeenth century, a Rhenish nobleman called Adolf Nicklassen vom Stein-kallenfells took part in a wedding in Tallinn. In his narrative from 1615, he noted that the townspeople were dressed in a rather uniform and very old-fashioned manner, which had been customary in the German lands more than a hundred years ago.\footnote{Velten 1958, p. 17.} If one is to believe seventeenth-century sumptuary laws, however, rapid changes were taking place in appearances, with people adopting new styles
An analysis of fabrics and specific garments does not seem to suggest either that compared to the rest of Europe Tallinn was particularly backwards. Interestingly, the limited visual evidence seems to suggest that local male dress amongst the wealthier members of society did not differ radically from Western Europe, while women’s appearances harmonised with their European counterparts sometime in the second half of the century. The appearance of new fabrics and new garments in inventories indicates that appearances did change, but above all they give evidence of how different fabrics and clothing styles existed concurrently and how garments continued to be used over long periods of time.

6.3 The tales clothes can tell

The previous section discussed certain aspects of people’s wardrobes in the seventeenth century on the basis of their social belonging. It turned out that differences between town council, merchant, professional and artisan inventories with regard to clothing possessions were in fact not that significant. Difference could be distinguished above all in ownership of silk garments and in the buttons described on the garments. Despite the hierarchy present in the discursive social order between these groups, in reality their clothing possessions do not appear strikingly different from each other. The following section zooms in and takes a closer look at one example apiece from merchant, artisan, professional, journeyman and labourer inventories. The inventories are almost all from different decades of the seventeenth century and the people themselves would have been of different ages at the time of their death. Looking at this small sample, however, is enormously useful, because individuals’ material possessions inform us of individual circumstances and strategies during a time period when everyone was necessarily part of some larger group or constellation and when there was a prevalent idea that each person’s rank should be visualised through certain type of materiality.

6.3.1 A complicated family story – merchant Jürgen Schade and his wife Catharina Gorries

By the time burgher and alderman of the Great Guild Jürgen Schade died in the early spring of 1671, his wife Catharina Gorries had already passed away. Schade had come to Tallinn from Lübeck and sworn his burgher’s oath in October 1649. The couple had married that same month. The couple left behind two sons, one minor also called Jürgen and an adult son named Harman or Herman. At the

---

541 1631 clothing regulation, TLA.190.1.2, p. 393; 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 86r; 1706 clothing regulation, TLA.230.1.Bs7/1, f. 410r.
542 Adelheim 1933, p. 30. In the Burghers’ Book his wife was called Elisabeth.
time of Jürgen the elder’s death in 1671, an inventory was done of his possessions.543 The story then became rather complicated, since Herman died at a rather young age in 1675, less than four years after swearing his burgher’s oath and marrying a woman named Agneta Hutfilter.544 After Herman Schade’s death, Hutfilter married another merchant named Zacharias Grünewalt in 1676.545 The situation was complicated by the fact that Hutfilter and Schade also appear to have had children, although their number and age is unknown. In 1677, the town council took up the inheritance question on the request of the custodians of Jürgen Schade the younger, who had travelled to Moscow, since they were apparently dissatisfied with how the goods had been divided and were being used.546 The custodians appear to have been of the opinion that Herman Schade had received an unduly large proportion of the inheritance. What followed was a complicated paper trail of accounts that detailed the expenses and incomes of the remaining members of the Schade family in the 1670s. The Schade case provides vital evidence that the inventory in itself was rarely the conclusion of a process. Complex inheritance processes went hand in hand with complex family situations, especially if there were enough goods to be divided. What came after was often just as chaotic and unclear as what had come before.

Taking into account the considerable wealth of the household that was recorded in the 1671 inventory, and compared to the clothing amassed by his wife, the wardrobe of Jürgen Schade the elder was underwhelming. He had a gown of silk grosgrain that consisted of a jacket, hose and cloak, and a shabby gown of polemit that also consisted of jacket, hose and cloak. Except for these two sets of clothes he only had small items like three pairs of fustian gloves, one pair of mittens, one new and one old sable cap and several different nondescript fur linings meant for jackets and sleeves. There were no shoes, boots, hats or stockings. On the other hand, he had a sizable amount and variety of linen-wear. He had forty-nine shirts in different stages of their life cycle, made both from coarser and finer imported Silesian linen. He also had twenty linen collars made of Dutch linen and a Dutch linen neckerchief. The shirts, collars and the two sets would have afforded him some variety, but they are modest compared to most other merchant households.

His wife’s wardrobe, on the other hand, was more sumptuous, with the majority of the silk garments in the household being hers. She had three gowns, two consisting of a jacket and a skirt and one consisting of a doublet and a skirt. The first was made of black polemit, the second ‘quite new’ set was made of striped polemit and the skirt decorated with ribbons, and the third was made of Oberkiker. While these sets might not have been very eye-catching, the individual garments in her wardrobe surely stood out. Altogether, she had seven jackets: a new

543 Inventory of merchant Jürgen Schade and his wife Catharina Gorries, 1671, TLA.230.1.Bt12/II, f. 93r–118r.
544 Adelheim 1933, p. 80.
545 Adelheim 1933, p. 89.
546 The whole case with numerous different documents is in TLA.230.1.Bt12/V, f. 33r–98v.
rather long plush jacket, another rather old velvet jacket trimmed with lace, a silk grosgrain jacket trimmed with some sort of cords, and another old jacket of black plush. She also had an old jacket of serge and one of tobin. Finally, there was an old short jacket of shabby striped cloth lined with squirrel. Separated from the jackets were doublets. The first doublet was made of Turkish grosgrain and decorated with ribbons, two were made of broadcloth and had a peplum and a third doublet was made of grey serge and fitted around with ribbons. She also had a cassock, which despite being described as old was most likely her most expensive garment. It was made of floral velvet, it had lapels of sable fur and it was lined inside with squirrel.

With these jackets and doublets she would have worn one of her three skirts, one made of black silk grosgrain, the second made of unspecified silk and the third quite new made of red scharlacke. Her other outer garments included three cloaks, one of silk grosgrain and the other two of broadcloth. Finally, she had three caps, a boat cap made of a pair of good sable, a Swedish cap made of taffeta with a sable turn-up and decorated with ribbons, and another cap of moiré silk with a sable tail. Her linen-wear also exceeded that of her husband in numbers. She had a variety of shirts and bodices, altogether ninety. Most of these were made of expensive Dutch and Greipfenberg linen but some were also made of coarser linen. She also had four collars of Dutch linen and kammtuch and seventeen aprons made both of Dutch linen and general fine linen. Last but not least, she had ten old and used bonnets with lace and two without any lace. Therefore, the wardrobe of Catharina Gorries was more substantial than that of her husband's and also eclipsed it in terms of variety and quality of fabrics and the accessories used on them.

Although the total number of the garments in the merchant couple’s wardrobe was 506, the number of garments that can be considered to be only for their personal use was 238. The remainder of the clothes were all meant to be sold either by someone else or left at Schade’s house so that he could sell them. While the number of clothes for their personal use is undoubtedly large and would still place them at the top of the list, it is not dramatically larger than for example Literatur Hinrich Bröcker’s inventory with its 195 garments. Even more importantly, if we take the number of silk garments in relation to the total number of garments in their inventory the result is not very remarkable. Except for the silk stockings meant for sale, the Schade inventory contained eight silk garments including one set. Granted, this calculation is approximate because it is not always possible to say with certainty whether one or another garment was made of silk or wool but the main argument to make here is that rather than certain categories of people being distinguished through their clothes it was rather individuals within each group that were truly remarkable. Moreover, there was also a significant distinction between the wardrobes of the couple with Catharina Gorries clearly choosing to invest in her appearances and her husband being satisfied with a set of silk and a set of woollen clothes. The Schade household was probably as comfortable as it got in the seventeenth century, with money, jewellery,
numerous cooking utensils, several bedsteads and plenty of bolsters and bedding all being available in the household, but that level of wealth for some reason was not reflected Jürgen Schade the elder’s clothes.

6.3.2 ‘A poor widow’ – butcher’s wife Birgitta Falck

Typically for the period, we do not know when Birgitta Falck was born or when she married her first husband, butcher Paul Friedrich, but in February 1674 the couple had a son, also named Paul.547 We do not know when Paul Friedrich the elder died but in November 1676 Birgitta married butcher Hans Ostertag.548 The couple had six children: Hans Heinrich was born in 1677, Ottilia in 1678, Anna Margareta in 1680, Sabina in 1681, Michael in 1683, and Maria Elisabeth in 1684.549 When the inventory was taken in 1698, all except for Anna Margareta appear to have been alive. At some point, Ostertag died, and in December 1690, Birgitta married for the third time to butcher Samuel Friesner.550 We do not know when he died, but in April 1692 Falck got married for the fourth and last time to butcher Jürgen Hinrich Schmidt.551 She died in 1698.

It is evident that even within the confines of the corporatist system, Birgitta Falck led a financially secure life and steadily advanced up the social ladder. Butchers belonged to St. Olaf’s Guild, the lower of the two craft guilds, but within the guild they appear to have been one of the most influential crafts, as guild aldermen in the seventeenth century were commonly elected from amongst butchers or furriers.552 Moreover, Tallinn appears to have been an attractive location for butchers, many of whom emigrated there in the seventeenth century. For example, Hans Ostertag, Falck’s second husband, came to Tallinn from Thuringia.553 While her first husband had not sworn a burgher’s oath, the remaining three all swore the oath at various times. More importantly, Falck herself appears to have had a strong presence in the community of Tallinn. In 1690s, she was named as a witness/godmother at the baptism of six children, five of whom came from artisan families, and one of whom was born to the town’s fire marshal.554 Her status is also indicated by the fact that when she served as a witness at the baptism of cordovan maker Jürgen Frisel’s son in 1695, she was referred to not

553 Adelheim 1933, p. 91.
as the wife of butcher Jürgen Hinrich Schmidt but as Mrs. Birgitta Falck, butcher (Fleischerin).

Looking at the list of outstanding debts in her inventory, it is clear that Falck, alongside husbands number two and four, played a significant role as a money-lender in Tallinn. Moreover, looking at the list of thirty-seven outstanding debts at the time of her death we get the impression that her economic network was broad both horizontally and vertically.\textsuperscript{555} She lent grain to peasants of Estonian origin in exchange for small trinkets and silver items, but she also lent money to other artisans, merchants and educated professionals. Thus, she operated on all social levels. While in some cases the inventory specified that money had been lent from Hans Ostertag or Hinrich Georg Schmidt, in most cases it was unspecified. The sums varied from a few Rtl to 350 Rtl that Secretary Conrad Akenstierna borrowed against some silver. In 1688, Ostertag wrote a petition to the Governor General, trying to claim the sixty-six Rtl plus interest that Captain Adam Johann von Burt had borrowed against some bullocks in 1682 but nothing appears to have happened, since three years later, Birgitta Falck wrote another petition, lamenting her status as ‘a poor widow’ who had been waiting patiently for the debt to be repaid.\textsuperscript{556} It is not known how Falck and her husbands acquired the capital from which they made the loans but the non-payment of one debt was by no means detrimental to her credit activities, which she continued until her death. She may have been many things, but poor she was not.

How might her active social and economic role have translated to her wardrobe? Firstly, the inventory demonstrates well the kind of investment clothes were for early modern people. Falck had a wide variety of different garments in different stages of their lifecycle, some of them being described as ‘old’ while others were not. Moreover, as she acquired new garments, she pawned a lot of the old garments, including two old black jackets of broadcloth, one old jacket of polemit, one old jacket of boj, one old jacket of serge, and a sable fur cap. Pawning old garments may well have been a way for her to generate cash for lending. At the time of taking the inventory, eight garments were still pawned, indicating that she did not have a direct need for them as the clothing resources available to her were sufficient. Further, it is evidence of how people could use clothes as capital.

The inventory of Falck’s possessions speaks of a respectable variety of garments appropriate for a person of some influence within her community. Some garments described as ‘old’, such as a jacket of black silk and a set of jacket and skirt of black taffeta she decided to keep rather than pawn, probably because they

\textsuperscript{555} Inventory of Birgitta Falck, wife of master butcher Jürgen Hinrich Schmidt, 1698, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 234v–236v. The number of creditors was probably significantly larger since the inventory mentions sixty-four silver brooches and forty-six silver rings that had been left as securities and that were weighed together.

\textsuperscript{556} Petition of Hans Ostertag to the Swedish Governor General of Estonia, 10 July 1688, RA, EAA.1.2.482, f. 190r–191v; petition of Birgitta Falck to the Swedish Governor General of Estonia, 29 June 1691, RA, EAA.1.2.517, f. 340r–340v.
were of good quality and would still have been wearable. In addition to taffeta and silk she had a jacket of polemit and one of rasch. She also had a woollen, a linen and a white linen lining shirt. She had six aprons, twenty shirts, a lace neckerchief, five bonnets with lace, two sable fur caps and one marten cap. She also had four overgowns, one of serge, one of French cloth, one that was lined with squirrel and one lined with rosacken. The latter two were decorated with silver buttons. While her wardrobe was generally toned down in colour, it was not colourless, as she had a petticoat of brown kersey, four skirts of red woollen and one of green woollen, but also a skirt of black floral silk, and a brown moiré taffeta skirt lined with yellow linen. She also had a black damask cloak. Even without the pawned garments she had a selection of different garments made of wool and silk, making it easy to adjust her appearance according to space, season and social context. The decision to keep the garments made of taffeta and silk in the household might indicate that, given the chance, she opted for the nicer attire.

All in all, Birgitta Falck’s inventory included eighty-one items of clothing, which attests to a level of material comfort that one might not expect of an artisan household belonging to the lower of the two craft guilds. A brief examination of the other inventories drawn up for people of similar background indicates that the resources available to these households varied widely, with some inventories including very few garments and others displaying a similar number and variety of garments and fabrics like Birgitta Falck’s.557 The importance of looking beyond the confines of the social hierarchy prescribed in the sumptuary laws thus becomes even more apparent. Despite the restrictions that the corporatist structure placed on the political influence and economic opportunity of some artisans, it is evident from Birgitta Falck that individuals designated as lower middle class at best by the law, could still enjoy significant material security and wield significant authority within the community that stretched beyond their immediate corporatist circle. Finally, her inventory reveals to us another important aspect of the early modern ‘clothing competence’. Added to knowledge about the fabrics, their quality and value was the social aspect through which people made daily micro-judgements about what to pawn and what to keep for oneself in order to plan for their future material needs in a variety of social contexts.

6.3.3 Intermediary of the Orient – doctor Hartmann Graman

Born in 1606, Hartmann Graman came from a family of medical professionals. After studying medicine in Leipzig, Jena and Wittenberg, he practiced as a doctor

---

in Halle before being appointed physician to the Holstein-Gottorp embassy to Moscow and Persia. The commercial venture had been proposed by merchant Otto Brüggemann to Duke Frederick III and the merchant’s hope was to convince Shah Safi I of Persia to begin exporting silk through Russia and the Baltic States to Gottorp from whence it would be distributed to Northern Europe. The embassy, which numbered around a hundred people in total, was led by Brüggemann, and Adam Olearius was chosen to be the mission’s chronicler. Their first journey to Moscow lasted from October 1633 to April 1635. After returning briefly to Gottorp, the mission embarked on a second journey in October 1635 that took them to the Shah in Isfahan. After a five-month stay at the Shah’s court, the embassy departed for Europe and in April 1639 it reached Tallinn. While Olearius returned to Gottorp, Graman stayed behind. The drawings Graman made on their journey later served as templates for the illustrations in Olearius’ travel narrative that was published in 1647.

In June 1639, Graman married Elisabeth Fonne, daughter of Tallinn town councillor Johann Fonne. In August the couple moved to Moscow and Graman became the personal physician of Tsar Mikhail I and the latter’s son and successor Alexei. Not much is known of their life in Moscow. It appears that the family kept in touch with relatives in Tallinn. In 1647, Graman asked the Tsar for permission to send his son Johann Hartmann to be educated abroad. In another letter from an unknown time, but no later than the spring of 1653, he asked permission for his wife to travel to Tallinn to visit her seriously ill father. Elisabeth remained there and died in 1655 or 1656. Consequently, Graman sent his remaining children to Tallinn because he felt he was unable to provide them with an education alone in Moscow. It is unknown when, or even if, he travelled back to Tallinn after his wife’s death, but the fact that his inventory, dating from 18 September 1659, has been preserved in Tallinn might suggest that he was released from the Tsar’s service and lived briefly in Tallinn after his wife’s death.

---

559 Brancaforte 2003, p. 8.
563 Inventory of doctor Hartmann Graman, 1659, TLA.230.1.Bt11, f. 202r–206v. He was dead by March 1658 since a memorandum in March 1658 indicated that his monthly salary payments had ceased. According to Heinz von zur Mühlen, Graman died in Tallinn, Mühlen 1980, p. 168. Sabine Dumschat claims that Graman died in Moscow and that his children probably wanted his estate to be sent to them in Tallinn, Dumschat 2006, pp. 132, 473. As evidence, however, she does not appear to quote any primary sources but rather literature from nineteenth-century Russia.
Figure 6.8. Piece of silk brocade, seventeenth century (width: 96.5 cm, length: 113.5 cm)

Source: Tekstiili näidis, TLM _ 4168 H 339, Tallinna Linnamuuseum (Photo: Meeli Kürtim)
In the seventeenth century, foreign medical professionals could enjoy significant material advantages in Moscow. The rumours that spread in the West about the riches of the Tsar appear not to have been very far removed from the truth.\textsuperscript{564} When Graman, his wife, her sister and their servants arrived in Moscow, the Tsar gifted them valuable fabrics, sable furs and seventy roubles in coin.\textsuperscript{565} It is unknown what kinds of fabrics the company received. In 1634, alchemist Wendelin Sybelist, another Western scholar in the service of the Tsar, had received glossy velvet, red damask, yellow damask, green and red taffeta, and blue satin. Upon his arrival in 1643, Johannes Below, another physician at the court of Mikhail I, received twill velvet, glossy satin, and other silks.\textsuperscript{566} It is very likely that Graman received a similar range of fabrics, as expensive silk fabrics appear to have been widely available to people who had entered the Tsar’s service and not just limited to the highest local elites.

His inventory tells a similar story of extraordinary riches. It would not be an understatement to say that, instead of a household inventory, it reads more like the catalogue of an early modern cabinet of curiosities. The inventory of fabrics not yet made into clothes listed black and brown velvet, silver plush, brown and white satin, ‘coarse’ blue satin for lining, satin with red, white and green stripes, white and red floral damask, yellow-in-green East Indian damask, apple blossom Persian damask, orange floral silk and brown-in-white silk, red, brown, and yellow striped taffeta, yellow and red striped silk, yellow-in-flesh-colour taffeta, red taffeta, green taffeta, a variety of colourful, green, and blue-in-white fabrics that were a mix of velvet and linen, white and red striped Persian carteck, and white flor.\textsuperscript{567} All of these fabrics were valued at a remarkable 321 Rtl and 46 M.\textsuperscript{568} The remainder of items in the inventory were not valued, so it is not possible to say how much these made up of the total value of the inventory. However, just like these fabrics, the majority of his inventory was made up of outrageously expensive items.

The clothes in his inventory tell a similar story of exotic luxury. The plainest garments in his whole wardrobe would in all likelihood have been a black and a brown Russian coat, both made of Turkish camlet. Apart from that there was a Persian coat with golden flowers, which were either woven or embroidered, an old yellow satin coat padded with cotton, a black Persian Pfaffen-Rock padded with cotton, a colourful cotton lining shirt, probably printed, and an old black satin pinked gown. He also had eight linen shirts and five gold-embroidered Russian

\textsuperscript{564} Dumschat 2006, p. 128.
\textsuperscript{565} Dumschat 2006, p. 227.
\textsuperscript{566} Dumschat 2006, p. 228.
\textsuperscript{567} Inventory of doctor Hartmann Graman from 1659, TLA.230.1.Bt11, f.205v–206r.
\textsuperscript{568} According to http://www.historicalstatistics.org/Jamforelsepris.htm, in 1659, 821 Rtl could buy the same amount of goods and services as 331473 SEK in 2020 (accessed 17 April 2020). See also Edvinsson & Söderberg 2011, pp. 270–292.
shirts and a coat of red serge that was completely lined with squirrel. Finally, he had two pairs of silk socks, a golden sword belt, a Russian collar of black velvet, two Persian caps, and an old padded Russian cap. There were three women’s shirts, one of them identified as Polish, and a skirt of red-in-yellow damask. Finally, there was an unspecified black bonnet embroidered with gold.

Every single item listed in Graman’s inventory would have reminded the appraisers of his Oriental travels and reaffirmed the connection he had had to the Tsar’s court. No other inventory in seventeenth-century Tallinn contains such a concentrated number of luxurious garments and fabrics. No garment or fabric mentioned in his inventory was of local origin, excepting perhaps some linen shirts. Moreover, it was not just that the garments and fabrics were extraordinarily fine, they were from the East, and thus associated with luxury and exoticism. In the seventeenth century, attitudes towards Persia were ambivalent. In his travel narrative Adam Olearius described the Persians’ lasciviousness and exuberant feasts and the cruelty and despotism that the people allegedly had to suffer. In the Western mind, goods of Persian origin had from the earliest days been associated with corruption and vice. Yet, there was also great demand for them in Europe. As Maxine Berg has observed, it was not just the intricate and exotic fabrics themselves, it was also the skills and production processes, resulting in colours and patterns completely unfamiliar in Europe, that fascinated people (Figure 6.8). Silk fabrics like taffeta and satin were shiny, draped well, and they were cool to the touch. Silk damask was strong and luxurious and woven with gold and silver threads. Another thing is how onlookers would have observed this display. Candlelight would have danced on the smooth surface of the silk and picked up the metal threads in the exquisite damasks and brocades, thus heightening the sensory experience of wearing and observing.

Gramann’s wardrobe made his ‘outlandishness’ explicit. Examining the portrait of Sir Robert Shirley who travelled on a mission to Persia and remained in the service of the Shah in early seventeenth century, Jones and Greenblatt point out that rather than being a form of ‘orientalism’, the portrait depicted him in his livery. When he ‘entered into the Shah’s service, he did so by putting on his clothes, which incorporated him into the body politic of a non-European, non-Christian state’. His refusal to discard these clothes when in Europe allegedly infuriated James I. Arguably, a similar dynamic was at play in Graman’s case, although there was greater ambivalence towards Westerners who adopted a Rus-
sian habit. In 1652, for example, these ‘foreigners’ were forbidden to wear Russian clothes in public. On the other hand, people of foreign origin serving at the Tsar’s court could import all kinds of luxury goods, including fabrics, without having to pay customs as long as their consumption was confined to the household and they made no profit. While the wearing of Russian garments thus was subject to negotiation, the other foreign garments and fabrics solidified Graman’s identity not as a Russian but as a member of the Tsar’s court and a beneficiary of the Tsar’s generosity. Whether Russian or Persian, the clothes were remembrances of his life in the East and could not simply be discarded. In addition to being enormously expensive, they were probably an important element of his identity.

The care and detail with which the appraisers listed Graman’s sartorial belongings suggests that at the same time as they were assessing the goods in front of them, they too meditated on this wondrous sight. Descriptions of the colours indicate the appraisers’ reasoning about the contemporary colour palette and the different fabrics mentioned show their advanced knowledge of the textile universe. What exactly separated East Indian damask from a Persian one is not obvious, especially since in early modern Europe, many things considered to be exotic were simply labelled ‘East Indian’. Yet, it is as if the appraisers felt they had to do justice to the complex material reality in front their eyes, and took seriously their task to identify and name fabrics, colours, material composition and place of origin.

Graman, having spent most of his life away from Tallinn, understandably never became a burgher, although he was intimately connected to the town’s elite. That was probably good, since his inventory indicates that he was not suited for life as a burgher in a small town by the Baltic. His wardrobe, undeniably one of the most exquisite of the century, was very much shaped by his time in Moscow and the privileged position he had enjoyed at Tsar Mikhail’s court. As such, he did not fit neatly into the boundaries of the formal social hierarchy and his wardrobe, which was a material reminder of his global life, did not adhere to any kind of local convention. Tallinn was simply too small and too woollen for this seventeenth-century globetrotter.

6.3.4 The small luxuries of journeyman Marcus Hasse

Even though he had been using some sort of medicine against an unknown illness, Marcus Hasse’s death had apparently been unexpected. He had gone to bed ‘in full health’ but had been found dead in his chamber, which he rented from

---

576 Dumschat 2006, p. 149.
A merchant journeyman from Holstein, he had been in Tallinn for at least four years and he had been employed as a journeyman in the shop of merchant Caspar Dunte until his death. His age was not indicated in the inventory, but he could not have been very old. The numerous books on a variety of different topics in his inventory indicate that he was a man interested in reading and learning. Together with Dunte the two men also appear to have had a rather elaborate credit network, as Hasse had handled the debts of a variety of a number of rather well-to-do people.

Although Hasse’s inventory made no distinction between goods meant for personal consumption and those meant for the market, it is evident that he was dealing with different fabrics, accessories and smaller garments. There were different kinds of fabrics in his room, some ribbons of silk and taffeta and earrings as well as a variety of different women’s accessories. In one box there were six pairs of red woollen women’s stockings, nine pairs of brown perfumed gloves and twelve pairs of white chamois gloves.

Hasse had two complete outfits or gowns. The first gown consisted of a long coat, a doublet and a pair of hose that were all made of castor polemit. The hose had a pair of silver buttons as decoration. The second set was made of striped woollen drujget and consisted of a coat and hose. However, apart from these gowns, he also had a wide variety of other garments for the various layers of dress. He had two cloaks of black broadcloth and one cloak of brown polemit with buttons made of hair. He also had a brown coat with a ragged fox lining and a serge waistcoat lined with lambskin, a doublet lined with goatskin and another doublet of polemit, a brown broadcloth jacket, another pair of hose, three pairs of underhose made of serge, linen and canvas and a pair of overhose. Finally, he had some sort of serge undergown (which the appraiser had initially defined as a waistcoat but then crossed it through) and some sort of apron made of black rasch. Most of these clothes were described as ‘old’ by the appraisers, but there is a significant variety in the different types of garments in his possession, indicating the simultaneous use of more or less fashionable garments. The hose could thus be combined with different kinds of upper garments like a jacket, a doublet, or a coat and in different layers, depending on the weather and occasion. Nothing was made of silk, but there were a variety of woollen fabrics and there was also a certain variety in colours.

While we do not know whether linen garments in his inventory were meant for personal consumption, these would have been helpful in maintaining a decent appearance. He had fourteen fine shirts and fourteen fine half-shirts. He also had seven pairs of fine linen sleeves, seventeen handkerchiefs, sixteen Dutch linen collars, six fine linen neckerchiefs and six pairs of cuffs. He also had three linen night caps. Thus, he would easily have been able to change and clean the linens.

---

578 Inventory of merchant journeyman Marcus Hasse, 1670, TLA.230.1.Bt12/II, f. 80r. The confusion about how ill he really was is caused by the fact that the inventory also mentions medicines in a round box that he had allegedly been using for his illness, see f. 85r.
on a regular basis. Moreover, the fine imported linen surely set him apart from those dressed in local linen. For the wealthy, white crisp linen was a status symbol but for everyone in the early modern society, linens were important for personal hygiene. Worn directly on the body, the linens absorbed bodily fluids so that the rest of the garments would get less dirty. But linens also protected the body from dirt.\textsuperscript{579} As clean water was not available for everyone, people cleaned themselves by changing their linens.\textsuperscript{580} Being clean and neat would have been an important element in individual self-presentation for a merchant journeyman like Marcus Hasse.

It is the smaller items in Hasse’s inventory that are the most indicative of his aspirations and intentions. These indicate that he had likely chosen to invest into more affordable luxuries. For example, he had two hats, one decorated with ribbons and a silver galloon, and the other decorated with ribbons. Moreover, he had two caps, one with sable and marten and the other rather sumptuous with sable and golden and silver galloons. He also had an old muff. Furthermore, there were seven pairs of stockings, of which the most outstanding were undoubtedly two pairs of silk pearl coloured stockings. He also had a pair of Russia leather boots with spurs and a pair of old cordovan shoes.\textsuperscript{581} While his outer garments were made of woollen, these smaller garments like the silk stockings, and an expensive fur cap with decorations would indicate his individual tastes. Even a small item like a comb with a gilded leather case and a mirror are meaningful in this context because they point towards an interest in one’s appearance and reflective self-awareness.\textsuperscript{582}

6.3.5 Inconspicuous yet comfortable – town council cook Johan Ast

Town council cook Johan Ast left behind a brief one-page inventory when he died in 1638. He had just married or was about to be married, since the inventory mentioned a golden ring ‘given to him by his bride’.\textsuperscript{583} The couple did not live together in any case, as Ast had been renting a room in a merchant’s house. Like Hartmann Graman, Johan Ast’s inventory is especially interesting to analyse, because neither a house servant nor an artisan, his position in the town’s hierarchy and its appropriate visualisation is not immediately obvious.

The majority of Ast’s belongings were made up of clothes and a few other smaller items, like books and some pewter bottles. However, his wardrobe cannot be described as anything else than complete. Ast had two full sets of clothes or gowns. The first ‘new’ set consisted of a doublet, hose and a cloak made of liver-coloured Spanish broadcloth. The other ‘daily’ set, also described as slightly

\textsuperscript{579} Styles 2007, pp. 78–83.
\textsuperscript{580} Mortier 2012, p. 32.
\textsuperscript{581} Inventory of merchant journeyman Marcus Hasse, 1670, TLA.230.1.Bt12/II, f. 82r.
\textsuperscript{582} On this, see for example Tjerngren 2014, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{583} Inventory of town council cook Johan Ast, 1638, TLA.230.1.Bt10/III, f. 196r.
worn, was made of unspecified broadcloth. While probably not as expensive as the first gown, the second gown was decorated with a green ribbon. Ast had three linen shirts and six collars. He also had three pairs of stockings, one of which was liver-coloured, probably to match the new gown, and the other two were old woollen stockings. He also had a pair of shoes and a pair of boots. Among his smaller items he had a pair of woollen gloves, a grey hat, one fox fur Hülle and one unspecified Hülle, a handkerchief and a pouch. The total number of items in his possession was twenty-two, but it is notable that compared to many other inventories that lacked complete sets of clothes, his clothing possessions seem to have been a result of a conscious acquisition process. Although his wardrobe was not luxurious, it was comfortable and allowed for variation. He could also change his linens on a regular basis and his clothes could be alternated depending on the season, weather and occasion.

While it is often possible to see where at least some of the clothes mentioned in the inventories ended up, it is more difficult to know where the deceased person acquired their clothes. In the case of Johan Ast, however, it is entirely possible that he had received a part of his wardrobe as wages. In the seventeenth century, town council customarily paid a part of its employers’ wages in clothes or set aside a sum of money for which clothes were to be purchased. For example, the person sweeping the market square in front of the town hall received a specific sum of money annually for a pair of shoes ‘according to an old custom’. Town council fishermen received a pair of gloves of ‘good Russian sheepskin’ as part of their yearly wages. Similarly, the town’s gatekeeper received a pair of good Russia leather boots. It is therefore entirely possible that at least some of the items like footwear or gloves might have been earned as wages. Ast’s consumption also reflects a phenomenon that has previously been called acquiring a ‘bank of clothes’. It was a necessary precondition for getting married, especially for people below the social elite. As the resources of the young family were often geared towards the immediate needs of children and the household, the married couple relied on their previously acquired clothes during these periods. It is in fact entirely plausible to regard the clothing possessions of Johan Ast in just such a framework.

6.4 Clothes – transgressive or compliant?

In Chapter Four, I examined what the social order looked like as it was conceptualised on the normative judicial level and how clothes were thought to create it. This chapter has so far examined the actual clothing resources of early modern

584 Tallinn town council treasury accounts, 1642–1676, TLA.230.1.Ba35/II, f. 113r, f. 118r, f. 122r.
587 Marie Ulväng 2012, p. 119.
households to see how clothing and social position corresponded to each other in reality. Individual inventories from most social groups have also been analysed in detail, in order to show how individual circumstances contributed to dynamism in the social order on the everyday level. This section will compare sumptuary laws and inventories in order to see whether there was a correlation between sumptuary rules and the clothes people actually owned. This question is important and relevant, because previous research has either analysed the sources separately or taken the position that sumptuary laws had no impact on most people, either because they would not have been able to afford the exclusive fabrics and accessories that the laws focused on or because enforcement was not the primary goal of legislators.588

6.4.1 Ambiguities and inconsistencies
Chapter Four showed that the impact of the laws may have been limited in a fundamental way due to the fact that many groups of people were simply omitted from them. While the educated professional group was considered to be part of the social elite of Tallinn, they were excluded from the order created by clothes on a normative level; so were the nobility, day labourers, artisans who did not belong to any guilds and various other marginal groups. The inventories unsurprisingly show that the social backgrounds of the people who lived in Tallinn in the seventeenth century were much more diverse than the groups addressed in the sumptuary laws. Some members of the professional elite, such as Literatus Hinrich Bröcker, pastor of St. Olaf’s Church Bartolomeus Berner or even doctor Hartmann Graman, had rather sumptuous wardrobes on a par with or more exclusive than those of merchants and town councillors. On the other hand, there were also professionals with extremely modest wardrobes, like pastor of St. Nicholas Church Nikolai Specht and pharmacist Johannis Burchart, who owned a mere six garments each.589 It is of course difficult to know exactly what kind of expectations there were for the people who did not fit neatly into the sumptuary framework. Yet, if the town council’s treatment of teacher Alhard Bondel and his wife is any indication (see Chapter Five), they too were expected to stick to some established, albeit unwritten, customs.

If we return once more to Johan Ast, the town council cook, his inventory makes two important points about social order and its visualisation. He was neither an artisan nor a merchant. At the same time, he was not a house servant either. For the present dissertation, he was categorised into the group ‘labourer’ but looking at his wardrobe, it was in fact not much different from those of poorer artisans. Ast had twenty-two garments, which was more than painter


589 Inventory of Nikolai Specht, pastor of St. Nicholas Church, 1658, TLA.230.1.Bt11, f. 58r–65r; inventory of pharmacist Johannis Burchart, 1618, TLA.230.1.Ae9, f. 51r–59r.
Hans von Hemisen (four items of clothing) and organ builder Johannes Pauls (nine) and only slightly fewer garments than sable-dyer Hinrich Beerschwallen (nineteen), all of whose inventories were drawn up not too far apart from each other. But unlike artisans, he was not a part of the discursive order created in the sumptuary law of 1639. Confusion in appearances was not always perceived as a problem: as we have seen, the law was not always careful to distinguish between servants and wives of lower artisans. The fact that some labourers and artisans did not look that different from each other may not have considered problematic by councillors and merchants. However, Chapter Five showed that the ordering attempts were not solely a project imposed on people from above. Those who were being ordered were actively participating in the debates about its nature and the processes of visualisation. Artisans, especially poorer artisans, cared deeply about being confused with people they viewed as their inferiors and such people may well have found the obscured visual message of Johan Ast’s dress troubling.

6.4.2 Ideals and reality

A second way to see what bearing sumptuary law might have had on people is to examine specifically how the contents of people’s wardrobes related to what we know from the clothing regulations. We remember from Chapter Four that rather than being concerned with the cut or colour of the garments, clothes created a difference primarily through fabrics (and by extension, price) and the accessories attached to the garments. Both the design and the colour thus appear to have afforded opportunities for individual self-expression. However, inventories do not help us to a better understanding of the design of seventeenth-century garments. Only rarely were garments described as ‘short’, ‘long’, ‘wide’ or ‘small’, and such descriptions are not particularly helpful in establishing how they might have looked. Colour was more present in the inventories and while black and grey were undoubtedly the most widespread colours, other colours were also worn. Most importantly, bright colours were not the domain only of the elites, as green, red, brown, white and yellow also appeared in households of artisans, educated professionals and even labourers. We might also think about how the perception of early modern people might have differed from our own with respect to colour. Perhaps it was not the hue that distinguished an expensive fabric from a cheap one but rather whether it was lustrous or dull.

Chapter Four also demonstrated a whole world of accessories that played a crucial role in distinction between groups of people. Sumptuary laws detailed a wide


591 For example, two men’s coats were described as ‘short’ in one inventory, see inventory of Catharina Rotert, widow of town councillor Caspar Strahlborn, from 1635, TLA.230.1.Bt10/II, f. 171v.
variety of accessories, like ribbons, bands, laces, shoe roses, belts, braids, buckles, pearls, embroidery, where these could be placed on the clothes, how wide and long they were supposed to be and so forth. The inventories, however, are far less explicit about how clothes were decorated. Either not many garments had decorations in reality, or more likely, it was not important to detail the accessories for the purpose of the inventory. Accessories would undoubtedly have added to the garment’s value, but since very few inventories recorded financial values, it seems that inventories were primarily concerned with identifying the garments. Most often, inventories mentioned buttons, eyelets, ribbons, bands, tassels and galloons. Especially with the first two, it was often specified if they were made of gold or silver, which points to the fact that they would have held considerable financial value and the appraisers thus decided to put it down in writing.

Fabrics and materials were essential in creating a difference between people in sumptuary laws. However, inventories also complicate that picture. For example, although sumptuary laws restricted the use of silk and furs like sable and marten rigorously, these appear regularly in the inventories of those below the social elite. In the 1665 clothing regulation, for example, silk fabrics were generally limited to the most elite merchant households, including aldermen and other eminent people, and wearing them was restricted to individual garments and special occasions. Additionally, certain silks remained forbidden. Male artisans could not wear any silk fabrics whatsoever, though wives and daughters of better artisans could wear one silk garment made of cheaper silk fabrics like caffa, taffeta, and terzenel on festive occasions. The inventories, however, show that out of 105 inventories, seventy-seven contained at least one silk garment. Not surprisingly, all of the town councillors’ inventories included silk garments, and also fourteen of the sixteen merchant inventories. But more importantly, twenty-six of forty-four artisan inventories, twenty-three of the twenty-six inventories of professionals, one of four labourer inventories, two of five journeyman inventories and the lone military inventory included at least one silk item. The inventories challenge the notion that silk was confined to the higher elites. Surely, there were costlier and cheaper kinds of silks. Clearly, then, people below the social elite could and did possess silk garments, even if these were smaller items like collars, stockings, caps or muffins.

It is thus the case that many more people had silk that they would not have been allowed to wear in public. Although the sumptuary laws of the 1690s had lost their guild-based structure, just a few decades earlier Birgitta Falck would not have been able to wear any of the number of silk garments that her inventory described. But wearing and owning were clearly different and therefore we have to consider that there were many other ways in which people engaged with the materiality of clothes: by wearing the forbidden garments in the privacy of their own home, keeping them as a fungible resource to gift or to pawn, or enjoying these material delights through the mere act of possessing them while being aware that they were forbidden. Sumptuary laws were above all concerned with public appearances, but they did not regulate private ownership of silk garments.
Fur also played a role in differentiating between different categories of people, since it was an important and typical component in the wardrobes of most people. Various furs, fur caps, fur coats and fur lapels remained a concern for the town council until the last regulation in 1706. However, regulations mainly concerned the most valuable imported furs like sable, marten, and to a lesser extent grey squirrel. Sumptuary laws generally restricted their use to smaller items, such as caps and muffls, and the 1665 regulation for example tried to regulate how expensive the fur could be depending on one’s social standing. Inventories show that furs were widespread and all households except labourer households had some sort of sable or marten, however old and worn-out it might have been. Clearly, it was not the case that only the social elite could wear sable and marten. Moreover, there was a wide variety of fur of local origin, such as fox, bear, beaver, otter, wolf and lynx. This variety meant that people did not necessarily have to break the law in order to be warm and display their individual tastes and preferences. At the same time, many people did have the resources to break the law if they wanted to.

In sum, the comparison of sumptuary laws and inventories complicates the relationship between order and clothes. The boundaries between different groups were drawn in different ways in the laws and in the inventories. Instead of a neat hierarchy based on guild membership but also including other factors, that is suggested by sumptuary laws, inventories show alternative kinds of visual hierarchies. While the ownership of silk separated the group of town councillors, merchants, artisans and professionals from the group of labourers and journeymen, the question of add-ons, above all buttons, created another type of hierarchy where the material of buttons separated the town councillors and merchants from artisans and professionals who in turn were distinct from labourers, journeymen and the one military person. Ownership of fur did not, on the other hand, create any kind of hierarchy recognisable in the laws. Thus, the material criteria indicated in the laws as particularly meaningful for creating the social order functioned differently on the everyday level and consequently visualised difference in a way not necessarily intended by the laws. This comparison has thus shown that clothes could and did create difference, but they did so in more nuanced ways than is apparent from sumptuary laws.

6.5 Conclusion

This chapter took inventories as its starting point, in order to see what clothes were actually available to people in the seventeenth century. Looking at specific material aspects of clothes as they were described in inventories, it is only possibly to get a partial overview of people’s wardrobes. There is a great deal of information about the kinds of fabrics and accessories that were used for clothes, and occasionally also about their colour and other details. Other details, especially their design and financial valuation, but even whether they would have been worn
by men or women, elude us. Most importantly, however, inventories make explicit that the seemingly neat difference clothes were thought to create between various groups of people did not work either on the normative or the everyday level. It was a messy business. Above all, inventories demonstrate alternative ways in which clothes could create a visual hierarchy, as well as different types of hierarchies that could be created by clothes. Even though we get a sense of the complexity inherent in trying to order the dynamic early modern society from sumptuary laws, the clothing possessions of early modern people concretely demonstrate the grey areas in this hierarchical system, as the boundaries between different categories of people based on ownership of clothes rarely followed the same lines that were prescribed by the ideal corporatist system.

Furthermore, the examination of select inventories shows the importance of looking beyond the numbers and illustrates the importance of individual strategies and desires in shaping one’s wardrobe. Taking the example of the professional group – supposedly belonging to the social elite yet distinctly absent from sumptuary laws – it is evident that while the possessions of some were similar to those of merchants and town councillors, others barely had any clothes at all, making them more like artisans. The same kind of individuality can be observed within the corporatist groups of artisans and merchants, where merely based on the clothes it is not always easy to distinguish between a town councillor and a merchant, between a merchant and an artisan, and between an artisan and a labourer. These issues point to the fact that early modern clothing culture was not a mechanical result of the workings of social order, especially when the order itself was so hotly contested and constantly reconfigured, as revealed by the two preceding chapters. The sumptuary laws issued by the town council were a top-down attempt to articulate some kind of social hierarchy and visualise it through clothes, but as this chapter has shown, it was just one of the many ways in which clothes shaped the social order in the seventeenth century.
In 1636 Tallinn Gymnasium cantor and *collega*, or teacher of younger pupils, David Gallus married Anna Buhrmann, an apothecary’s daughter.\(^{592}\) In Tallinn since 1631, Gallus was one of the many learned Germans who fled the Thirty Years’ War and contributed to the development of a vibrant cultural, educational and literary environment in the 1630s.\(^{593}\) Gallus’ personal life in Tallinn was to be tumultuous and filled with sadness. In June 1637, the couple had a son whom they named Christopher. However, in October of the same year the son contracted scabies and died, having lived barely four months.\(^{594}\) During her six weeks of lying-in, Anna had also been struck by some kind of illness, referred to by Gallus as ‘perhaps the most dangerous of all diseases so that regardless of how many remedies were used, she could not be saved’.\(^{595}\) In December, she died too.

Shortly before he got married for the second time in 1638, Gallus and his mother-in-law Maria Mengershusen divided the belongings of his deceased wife in the presence of town councillor Mattias Poorten and burgher Daniel Glöyen. In his chronicle, written some decades later, Gallus detailed the division of various household textiles, gold and silver items, and money.\(^{596}\) There were also some items that he had evidently hoped he could keep to himself, such as the clothes of his deceased wife, and her portrait. However, to his great dismay, these went to his mother-in-law. He described his feelings as follows:

> I had certain hopes that I would not have to part with anything or very little of my household goods, not least because my mother-in-law had said it to someone or other, and had made promises, that were I to do as she wanted, nothing would be required of me. Indeed, most of what belonged to me at that time, we [Gallus and his wife] had been sent or given by friends and benefactors, who had already received honour and many thanks, and there was very little that had been given by her [Gallus’ mother-in-law]. But that hope betrayed me a great deal, because

---

\(^{592}\) The Autobiography of David Gallus, undated, TLA.230.1.Ak9/a, f. 20v–20r. Gallus himself was born in Mecklenburg in 1603 and came to Tallinn in 1631. For the first three years he served as a tutor and in 1634 he became the gymnasium’s cantor and teacher of youth classes (lat. *collega*). All of this is known to us from David Gallus’ autobiographical chronicle where he recorded events that had taken place between 1634 and 1659.

\(^{593}\) Heero 2019, pp. 143–160.


although everything was to be divided equally between us, in some parts she received more than half of the goods.\textsuperscript{597}

Grief-stricken after the premature deaths of his wife and son, Gallus hoped that he could at least keep the majority of the household goods, as the couple had received many of them from their friends and his mother-in-law had evidently not contributed much. However, the cantor’s hopes were crushed when he was pressured into giving over half of the couple’s linens, pillows, towels, blankets and more to his mother-in-law. He had also yielded his wife’s clothes, which he later learned from a friend he could have kept, two rings that he had given to Anna as gifts, her portrait and even two bowls that his students had given to him as a personal gift. To add insult to injury, his mother-in-law also left him to settle the debt they had incurred during his wife’s illness.

Clothes and other material goods had a force field around them that influenced the people using and handling them emotionally, socially, financially. Gallus would not have worn his wife’s clothes, and yet he was devastated at having to surrender them to his mother-in-law. As material reminders of his wife, Anna’s clothes elicited strong emotions of loss and grief but surely would also have comforted him and reminded him of the happier times they had enjoyed. Gallus’ dismay over his mother-in-law’s behaviour is also understandable if we consider that he was a man of limited means. He was at the bottom of the hierarchy of gymnasium teachers. His salary was lower than that of any of his colleagues and he was not remunerated for any music-related duties he performed at the gymnasium.\textsuperscript{598} The lack of material goods would have interrupted the daily running of any early modern household and it clearly would have put a dent in his economy. Furthermore, the argument over dividing the goods caused a serious conflict between the two extended family members, as Gallus thought he had been wronged. On the other hand, his relationship to his dead wife’s mother apparently did not end, as some time after the death of his wife Gallus noted in his chronicle that he was greatly depressed and had no one to take care of his household, because his mother-in-law had her hands full with her own.\textsuperscript{599}

It is obvious that people thought about and navigated difficult life transitions partly in material terms. This case is unusually detailed in its description of emotions, individual strategies, relationship dynamics and the materiality that surrounded early modern people. Until now, this dissertation has explored social

\textsuperscript{597} The Autobiography of David Gallus, undated, TLA.230.1.Ak9/a, f. 21r. \textit{Ich hatte mir zwar gewisse Hoffnung gemacht, Ich wurde von meinem geringen Suppellecticile oder Eigen thumb entweder nichts, oder auch ja gar wenig dorfen ausgeben, Aldauweil gegenüber einem und dem anderu meine Schwieger-Mutter sich hatte verlauten lassen, und solche Zusage gethan; So ich würde thun nach ihrem Gefallen etc. Solte nichts von mir gefordert werden: Ja auch, weil dessenige fast alle was damahlen verhanden wahr, von andern guten Freunden und Gutthätern vns war zugesand und verbrat worden, die dessen schon Ruum und Danck bekommen hatten; und gar wenig von Ihr war eingeschratt worden. Aber solche Hoffnung hat mich sehr betrugen, denn die Theilung hat mussen in allen gleich beschichen, ist auch in etlichen fast noch über die Helffte ihrer Seiten aus geschlagen.}

\textsuperscript{598} Heero 2017, p. 394; Heero & Kõiv 2016, p. 201.

\textsuperscript{599} The Autobiography of David Gallus, undated, TLA.230.1.Ak9/a, f. 23r.
order as a discursive ideal and examined different ways in which social order was created and negotiated through appearances on the everyday level. It is clear from the case above, however, that if we want to get a better understanding of how clothes shaped people’s lives in the early modern period we have to look beyond the narrow role of clothes in reproducing social order in the way intended by the town council. Clothes clearly had both creative and disruptive capacities, ordering and reordering society and the individual relations in Tallinn. This chapter examines which relationships were the most affected by people’s material arrangements and how clothes mediated emotional states in these relationships in the seventeenth century.

7.1 The legal context of inheritance in seventeenth-century Tallinn

Clothes, then as now, are movable. Unlike houses or land, they can easily be transported from one place to another and passed on from one person to the next. In the Middle Ages, the terms ‘movable’ and ‘immovable’ were used to distinguish between goods that could not be transported from one place to another and those that could. Immovable property, for example land and its appurtenances, was a source of income. That income usually stretched over generations. This kind of property was generally not for sale and its transfer by inheritance or occasionally by gift was regulated carefully in the law; it was ‘heritable goods’. Immovable property thus came to be associated with patrimony. Unlike with patrimonial property, movables, if acquired as opposed to inherited, could be sold or gifted, because there was no predetermined route of transmission after the death of their owner. In most places, their owner could bequeath them freely by making a will. In the early modern period, however, customs and practices concerning ownership of property were also undergoing rapid change. While patrimonial and acquired wealth could be kept apart in theory, the increasing number of people who lived in cities and traded with urban houses and plots as if they were movable seriously undermined ideas about patrimony and land’s immobility.

In the early modern period, property was commonly transferred through making a will. The main principle of the *deutschrechtliche* will, which was prevalent in early modern Tallinn, was the distinction between patrimonial property or *Erbgut* and acquired property or *wohlgewonnene Gut*. Lübeck town law stated that patri-

---

600 Howell 2010, p. 50.
602 Howell 2010, pp. 52–53.
604 Hahn 2015, p. 29.
monial property was all kinds of property or allerhand Gut that a person had inherited from his or her parents or other blood relatives in the order of succession. However, despite a number of inconsistencies in legal terminology in Lübeck law over the centuries, Erbgut or patrimonial property was in practice usually understood to mean immovable property. In any case, everything that was not patrimonial property was acquired property, and this could include both immovable property and movables. What exactly these movables included the law did not indicate, but according to Wilhelm Ebel they would have been various things and money. In early modern England, such goods could include money, clothes, jewellery, household furniture, food and so forth. While it is difficult to know whether this was the case in Tallinn, it seems reasonable that similar things would have been counted as movable goods. A main issue underlying many inheritance disputes in the seventeenth century was whether the property was inherited or acquired.

Every man who owned some kind of property had the right to make a will if he was in full possession of his faculties. According to Lübeck town law, a woman could not make a will unless her deceased husband had granted her that right in his own will. He could presumably also allow it if he was still alive. If, however, she was the wife of a merchant, and demonstrated that to the town council, she could make a will but she could only bequeath her personal property and only with the approval of her custodian(s) and closest heir(s). Reciprocal wills, that is to say wills made by the married couple in favour of each other, were not allowed. Instead, as mentioned before, the wife could use the power of making a will, if this had been explicitly granted to her by her deceased husband, and could bequeath the property that he had left her in his will to her second husband or to whomever she wished. The type of property she could bequeath was not specified in the law but this presumably only applied to her own acquired property. While this was not the case for men, the law tied a woman’s right to make a will to her marital status.

That people married was the norm and expectation during the early modern period. Ideally, the married couple stood at the centre of the early modern household and marriage constituted the core of social as well as economic life. Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 139. The Lübeck town law, which Tallinn had adopted in the thirteenth century and which was revised in 1586, was one of the legal instruments regulating succession, inheritance, and property rights. It was a collection of laws and decrees that provided for self-government of the lower town and touched on a wide variety of issues, including civil and criminal justice, taxation, building, welfare, commerce, morals and so forth.

Ebel has pointed out that a number of legal treatises from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries written as a commentary to Lübeck law extensively discussed the question of whether patrimonial property was only immovable property or could also include movables. Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 139; Ebel 1980, p. 20.

Ebel 1980, p. 38.

Erickson 1993, p. 23.

Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 139.

Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 142.

Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 141.
law therefore also regulated the rights of the husband and wife in relation to each other. If a woman entered the marriage with patrimonial property, the immovable part of such property could not be pawned or sold by the husband without her or her children’s approval.\textsuperscript{613} If the couple wanted to gift goods between each other (not specified what types of goods), the children had to consent to this. If they were childless, they could exchange gifts in front of the town council, and as long as the wife’s custodian had agreed to the transfer it was lawful.\textsuperscript{614} If either of the spouses died, the surviving spouse, after taking his armour and best clothes (widower) or her wedding ring (widow), got half of the goods and the remaining half was divided between the children.\textsuperscript{615} If the couple was childless, and the wife died, the widower gave half of the dowry back to her next heir(s) and kept everything else.\textsuperscript{616} If there were no children and the husband died, the widow took her whole dowry and got half of his remaining property, the other half being divided between his next heir(s).\textsuperscript{617} The law also stipulated that after her husband’s death, whether he had debts or not, if the marriage was childless, she had the right to deduct her dowry, clothes, movable goods and everything else she had brought to the marriage from the estate before the man’s creditors were paid.\textsuperscript{618} The material implications of marriage were thus subject to careful legal scrutiny and women’s property and its management were regulated in great detail.

Not only did Lübeck law establish who could make a will, it also determined the order of succession for receiving patrimonial property. The system of succession or \textit{nehesten Erben} can best be described as concentric. One’s own children were followed by grandchildren, and in case the person had died childless, brothers and sisters were the first in line; then came one’s own parents, in the event they were still alive, then half-brothers and half-sisters, then grandparents, then aunts and uncles (brothers and sisters to parents), and finally their children (i.e. cousins of the deceased person).\textsuperscript{619} The patchwork family structure of the early modern period, with people not infrequently having children from previous marriages, was also reflected in the law, which made provisions for them. It should come as no surprise that relations in real life were infinitely more complicated.

\textsuperscript{613} Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 133.
\textsuperscript{614} Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 134. The question of custodians is really interesting here. Once a woman was married her husband usually became her custodian, but the wording in the law and some legal disputes demonstrate that that was not necessarily the case. In November 1663, Anna Gallus, the sole surviving daughter of David Gallus got married to Michael Günther, also a teacher at the gymnasium. In his chronicle, which is clearly inspired by the chronicle of his father-in-law, he wrote that it took him a year of litigation at the Orphans’ Court and the lower court of the town council until he could wrest the patrimonial property of his father-in-law that belonged to Anna from the hands of her two custodians. The property, to his dismay, had been treated ‘as if it was stolen goods’ and not patrimonial property that belonged to his wife, see The Autobiography of Michael Güntherus, undated, TLA.230.1.Ak9a, f. 44v.
\textsuperscript{615} Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 143.
\textsuperscript{616} Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 144.
\textsuperscript{617} Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 147.
\textsuperscript{618} Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 133.
\textsuperscript{619} Lübeck town law, 1586 codex, Bunge 1842, p. 143.
For the modern researcher, terminology poses an additional problem in establishing who exactly was included in this concentric system. Terms such as *Freund* and *Blutsfreund* could for example be used for blood relatives as well as friends or guild brothers.\(^{620}\) Additionally, the term *Schwager* could be used for a number of male relatives not directly related by blood.\(^{621}\) Last but not least, maintaining frequent contact could be difficult and it was not rare that the testator had no knowledge of which family members and relatives were still alive or who the lawful next heir even was.\(^{622}\)

### 7.2 ‘He, without my deserving it, has looked upon me unfavourably’

By the time David Gallus was writing his will in 1659, he had survived a plague epidemic and buried two wives and seven children. Out of his eight children, only one daughter named Anna was still alive, but she had not yet reached majority. It has been suggested that ‘premature deaths of children serve to unleash particularly strong emotions in parents’.\(^ {623}\) Children were seen as innocents, and both the loss resulting from their untimely deaths and what it represented for the future of their parents both fed an ‘emotionally chargeable symbolic potential’.\(^ {624}\) Undoubtedly, Gallus loved his children and he mourned them. Entries in his chronicle carefully recorded each of his children’s names, the dates of their births and deaths and the names and social standing of their godparents. He also provided meticulous detail about their mostly short lives and the course of their respective illnesses. His second child Johannes was baptised hurriedly in 1640, because he was weak, and it was not certain that he would survive. The boy, who had five godfathers and four godmothers, did survive but only lived six years. Gallus then went on to provide a lengthy and heart-breaking description of his illness and death.\(^ {625}\)

It could not have been easy for Gallus to watch his children perish one after another. In the early modern period, it was not uncommon that parents, because of love for their dead children, became consumed with grief. This kind of loss could result in mourning that was thought to exceed the natural amount that

---

\(^{620}\) See also Hahn’s discussion about the different terminology in Low German used to denote various relatives on father’s and mother’s side, Hahn 2015, pp. 421–440.

\(^{621}\) Hahn 2015, p. 423.

\(^{622}\) In 1607, Simon von Then for example left all of his patrimonial property in Aachen to his ‘next heir’, also giving him a silver jug and half of his clothes. It is not impossible that he simply did not know who his next heir in Westphalia was, as he had lived a long life with his wife in Tallinn and their children had died before him, see the will of burgomaster Simon von Then, 1607, TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 365v.

\(^{623}\) Jarzebowski 2010, p. 188.

\(^{624}\) Jarzebowski 2010, pp. 188–189. See also Hanawalt 2003, pp. 21–43.

would please God. Thus, moderation and ‘appropriate’ grieving, such as through pragmatic and daily material arrangements made for children, grandchildren, and stepchildren, were encouraged. Yet, it is also evident that some people demonstrated excessive care by contemporary standards. According to the law, Gallus’ daughter and third wife should each have received half of his property. But he specified in his will that before the division was to take place, his daughter Anna should get his house with its complete contents, including his clothes, 500 Rtl and a number of other valuable items. He did stipulate, however, that his wife could use the household goods until Anna reached the age of majority or however long they shared the household.

This division of goods would not have been legal; the fact that his widow, Anna Gorries, later contested the will in every single point, arguing that Gallus had not been in possession of his faculties and that proper procedure had not been followed, is proof of its unorthodox nature. Gorries also claimed in her petition that her legal share was too small and had not taken into account the expenses of their wedding and the resources she had expended during the short time they were married. She had managed the household, she had shown love and care to Gallus during his illness until his death, she had loved and continued to take care of Gallus’ daughter, she claimed. Yet, without her deserving it, he had looked upon her unfavourably and deprived her of what should legally have been hers. Gallus, in providing benefits to his daughter that far exceeded custom, had been negligent towards his wife. Conflicting emotions and ideas about the arrangement of family relations were a part of the daily reality for many people, and material culture was often at the very centre of these negotiations. This part will therefore examine how relationships to children and spouses were negotiated through clothes.

7.2.1 Children

Children were the most common recipients of their parents’ clothes. Sometimes, they could adopt their parents’ wardrobes in their entirety. For example, when the painter Hans von Hemisen died in 1641, his daughter was already wearing what little had been left by his wife. The children of lawyer Friedrich Heilgendorff and his wife used the parents’ linen shirts and household linens after the parents’ demise. At other times, however, specific items were picked

---

626 Jarzebowski 2010, pp. 204–205.
627 Will of David Gallus, cantor of Tallinn gymnasium, 1659, TLA.230.1.Bp32, f.3r–4r.
629 Eighteen of the 105 inventories in the sample mention the transfer of clothes from parents to children in the seventeenth century. Bequests of clothes or clothing arrangements with regard to children were mentioned in twenty-one of the fifty-three wills that mentioned clothes.
out and given to children, and especially outer garments like coats and cloaks appear to have been valuable. For instance, the adult sons of Jürgen Fryman, Andreas Wichman, Jacob Müller, Hans Holtzkam and Aloff Brande all received a cloak or coat from their fathers’ clothes.\(^{632}\) As might be expected, daughters often received the clothes of their mothers and sons the clothes of their fathers.\(^{633}\) Two married couples specified just such arrangements in their wills.\(^{634}\) This was not exclusively the case, however. While pastor Samuel Feig’s caps and stockings went to his sons, the inventory specified that his new priestly cloak with velvet lapels, clearly a costly item, was to be altered so that his oldest daughter could wear it.\(^{635}\) Such arrangements remind us that clothes were versatile resources in the seventeenth century, and not immediately being able to wear a garment would not have been seen as problematic.

A related issue in the process of passing on clothes to children was the question of how old the children were when their parents died. Adult children could wear a deceased parents’ clothes with less effort and this pragmatism is surely visible in several of the above-mentioned cases. In many instances, however, the garments needed to be altered, especially in the case of children who had not yet reached majority (see Figure 7.1 for how clothes could be made to fit children in different ages). Nicolaus von der Wiele’s shirts were altered to fit ‘the boy’, presumably his young son, and the shirts of Johannis Brüning and his wife as well as those of Hanss Busekist were altered in order to fit the children.\(^{636}\) The shirts of Jürgen Schade were altered and then sent to his son in Moscow.\(^{637}\) In Jacob Müller’s inventory, these subtle ways of treating children differently based on age become apparent. Whereas the older son took the deceased man’s mourning cloak, his little son was honoured by being given his father’s travelling cloak.\(^{638}\) The cloak of the older son probably fit rather well, whereas the younger son had to wait until he grew into his father’s cloak or eventually it would have been altered to suit him.


\(^{633}\) Maegraith and Lanzinger have in their study of early modern Tyrolean wills observed that there were differences in how sons and daughters inherited from their parents. Sons generally received their fathers’ movables while daughters received their mothers’ movables. Daughters frequently also got less money but more objects, see Maegraith & Lanzinger 2017.

\(^{634}\) Will of Elisabeth Kriedt and Hinrich Bade, 1677, TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 37r–41r; will of Johan Fredrik Goos and Margrita Dyckmans, 1658, TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 62.

\(^{635}\) Inventory of pastor Samuel Feig, 1693, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 138v.


\(^{637}\) Inventory of merchant Jürgen Schade, 1675, TLA.230.1.Bt12/IV, f. 37r.

\(^{638}\) Inventory from rector Jacob Müller, 1676, TLA.230.1.Bt10/V, f. 21r, f. 21v. The German term commonly used in inventories and wills with regard to bequests is verehren.
Figure 7.1. The back of a children’s vest (hand-sewn, mix of silk and cotton, red floral pattern on brown background, cotton lining), ca. 1690–1799

Source: Laste vesti katkend, TLM _ 17049:1 H 1900, Tallinna Linnamuuseum (Photo: Meeli Küttim)
The transfer of clothes affected the well-being of the children after the death of their parents on a very basic material level. While passing on the clothes from parents to children appears uncomplicated on the surface, there were many different factors to consider. Children did not automatically get all their parents’ clothes. Often, they received a select few garments, probably those of best quality. Other relevant issues were the number, age and gender of the children, how the garments would be divided between them, and how much effort it could take to alter the clothes. One important factor that influenced the use and management of household goods, including clothes, was the lengthy time period that sometimes passed between a parent’s death and when their inventory was drawn up. While it was clothes or other household goods, it was precisely the pots, pans, and linens that provided the daily continuity in people’s lives. Therefore, it is not surprising that many children without much ado continued wearing their deceased parents’ clothes.

It is thus evident that most often, some, if not all, clothes remained in the household and would sooner or later be worn by children. But parents also chose to make explicit material arrangements for their minor children, of which clothing was a part. In this context, clothing was usually connected to food and schooling. Testators commonly used expressions such as ‘food and clothing’ or ‘school and clothing’, indicating that the child should have clothes on their back, food on their table and as much education as was appropriate. In 1665, burgomaster Heinrich von Thieren stipulated in his will that his daughter should be given a yearly sum for her maintenance and clothing, presumably by her custodians. In 1671, Hans Holzkampf stipulated in his will that each of his nine children from his third marriage, to Anna Maria Buckss, should receive schooling, food, and clothes up to the value of 300 Rtl, until the sons had entered into service as artisans and the daughters had been married off. While some parents specified an annual sum, others simply stated that the child(ren) should have as much as was necessary for their upkeep until they reached majority. Such arrangements indicate the aspects that parents thought were most important for a child to successfully reach adulthood and also show the active role they took to ensure that their dependants could continue to enjoy material security even after their death.

High mortality rates left many children parentless in the seventeenth century. Consequently parenthood became transferable, meaning that parental duties might be performed by a variety of adults. At the same time, children died in
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639 The longest time period that I have come across is one year and eight months from June 1656 to February 1658 that passed between the funeral and drawing up of the inventory for tauer Herman Pferdekamp, see TLA.230.1.Bt11, f. 51r–52r. An inventory drawn up shortly after a person’s death appears to be an exception rather than the norm in the seventeenth century. 640 Pennell 1998, p. 211. 641 The German expressions were for example Kost und Kleidung but in one case also Kost, Schule und Strümpffe. 642 Will of Heinrich von Thieren, 1665, TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 375r. 643 Will of furrier Hans Holzkampf, 1671, TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 131v. 644 Shepard 2013, pp. 42–43, 48.
even larger numbers, which meant that adults with available material and emotional resources but no children of their own often chose to direct these resources towards minors outside their own household. In such cases, they might make similar material arrangements, of which clothing was a part, for stepchildren, grandchildren or children of other relatives or friends. These arrangements generally also had temporal limitations. In 1601, Cordt Staell stated that his wife should give his dead brother’s son and daughter fifty Rtl each but specified further that Christina the daughter should live with his wife and be provided with clothing, room and board as befitted an honourable young lady until her marriage. Even though burgomaster Hinrich von Lohn’s adult son Georg was very much alive when Lohn made his will in 1625, von Lohn specified that his granddaughter Anna von Lohn should have enough from the inheritance for her food and clothing, presumably also until she married. In 1680, Severin Thomas arranged that his deceased sister’s little daughter should have all necessary food, clothing and maintenance as well as a wedding befitting her station. In 1682, Jacob Felsberg reaffirmed in his will that out of fatherly affection he had promised Anna Elisabet zur Haar, whom he called his stepdaughter, board, ‘schooling and stockings’ as long as God gave him good health, as per an agreement concluded with the girl’s relatives three years earlier. Similar arrangements were made for stepchildren and grandchildren of stepsiblings, and godchildren. People took an active role in taking care of minors and made an effort to materially secure their wellbeing, even if the child was not their flesh and blood. These arrangements frequently included providing clothes.

While Lübeck law acknowledged family configurations in which spouses could have children from previous marriages and asserted that all of them should receive a portion after their parent’s death, children born out of wedlock were worse off, since theoretically, they could not inherit anything if there were any other heirs. Yet, in 1629 Catharine Meideburger chose to make provisions for her deceased stepson’s illegitimate son Jacob Meydeborg. In her will she requested coppersmith Daniel Pöppels to take Meydeborg in for free for ‘a year or four’ and provide him with free board and clothing until ‘he is in the service of some good man.’ On fulfilment of the conditions, Pöppels would inherit a gilded silver object of hers. It is not clear how she and Pöppels knew each other but considering that she asked him to take Jacob into his household and provide for him for an undetermined period of time they must have been relatives or

646 Will of burgomaster Hinrich von Lohn, 1625, TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 181v.
647 Will of Severin Thomas, 1680, TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 382v–383r.
648 Will of stud. theol. u. Bibliothecarius Jacob Felsberg, 1682, TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 88v. The German expression used in the text is Schule und Strümpffe. In 1676, Catharina Kens made such material arrangements for her deceased stepsister’s granddaughter, see TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 85r.
649 Will of Catharine Meideburger, widow of Jacob Meideburger, 1629, TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 227v.
650 The object was called Lande in the will and I was not able to identify what kind of object it might have been. For bequests of clothes that could also come with very direct conditions, such as a request to pray for the deceased person, see also Howell 1996, p. 4.
close friends. Neither her deceased stepson nor her step-grandson was related to Catharine by blood, but lacking any blood relatives, she still took steps to materially ensure the boy’s future. It was perhaps the unorthodox tie between Meideburger and young Jacob that made her want to seal the contract with a material object. Since one could never be sure that the arrangements made in a will would be followed through, she perhaps thought the silver carrot would provide enough of an incentive for Pöppels to do as he had been requested to do.

On the other hand, someone who was parentless could not automatically hope for the benevolence of aunts and uncles, or that that benevolence, once shown, would last forever. Thus, Catharina Spencehusen lamented in her will that she had been raising her nephew Johan Müller, a parentless child, as if he were her own child. She had cared for him and provided him with clothing, linens, and a bed, until he became a craftsman’s apprentice. However, he had shown himself to be ungrateful, and consequently, Spencehusen arranged in her will that her main heirs should be her other sister Christina Spencehusen and the latter’s daughter Christina Sabina Dilfeldt. Lübeck law did state that if one did not have any children or grandchildren, then one’s brothers and sisters would be the next in line as heirs. One interpretation here is that she had raised Müller as if he was her own son and had planned to make him her main heir. When he did not meet her expectations, she essentially used the will to affirm the line of succession as indicated by the law. The ideas of nurturing, material wellbeing and mutual familial obligation were intimately connected to each other. Material arrangements came with expectations of love and care that were to be shown in a certain way. If the heirs did not show the love and gratitude expected of them, the wills could be used to penalise them.

Clothes did not only mediate and materialise relationships between parents and children, they could also embody specific values that parents desired to pass on to their children. One father bequeathed his clothes to his two sons from his first marriage. The first son got a cloak of coarse woolen, a cloak with fox fur, his father’s best set made of floret, and his best sable fur cap. The other son got his long coat lined with fox fur, his grosgrain cloak, and his other sable fur cap. In his will, the father stipulated that the sons were not to take these clothes proudly or wear them with vanity. Instead, they were to wear them in the father’s remembrance and, in order to honour God, in good health and glad and modest contentment, just as he had done. Obviously, the clothes themselves did not change; they were the same as when the boys’ father had worn them. Crucially, however, clothes could be seen to change a person’s mindset when he or she donned them. In addition to concerns about the material wellbeing of the children, and the professional skills they would acquire for the future, adults were
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also concerned about children having a righteous state of mind as they reached adulthood. This included a lack of vanity and excess – albeit according to social status, of course – gratitude to one’s seniors, and the honouring of God. Clothes were thus imbued with symbolic significance that was to endure beyond grave and actively shape the future wearer’s mindset.

Clothes were also a part of the calculations that comprised equal inheritance. Both adult children and minors were to inherit equally from their deceased parent according to the law, and parents took great care to ascertain that all children would receive an equal share of the moveables. Artisan Simon Lorentz chose to leave all of his property to his wife and their four small children, since he had already taught a craft to his adult son and provided him with clothes and shoes at various times. Lorentz had also paid for his daughter’s wedding, including her jewellery and clothing. Hans Holtzkampf used similar arguments when he excluded his sons and daughters from his first and second marriages from the inheritance. ‘With regards to my sons and daughters from the first and second marriage,’ he stated, ‘I have let my sons learn an honourable craft and helped them to the extent that now they can support themselves and do not need my help any more. To both my daughters I have given a dowry as befits their standing and my wealth.’ Indicating that they had supported their children into adulthood, these fathers framed maintenance and care as an advance inheritance. This was also meant to serve as a reminder that they had done their parental duty and shown love and care for their older children.

At what point was care for children no longer the concern of parents? It appears to have been different for sons and daughters. For boys, that milestone was connected to their professional careers, such as entering the workshop of a master craftsman or being employed by some merchant. So, for example, each of Baltzer Fuchs’ three sons was to receive fifteen Rtl for a set of woollen clothes so that they could embark on their journeymen years or ‘peregrinations’, as he phrased it. He further clarified in his will that he had already taught the craft of coppersmithing to his two older sons and they had also received money for the above-mentioned garments. As we saw above, fathers were keen to stress that in addition to clothing their sons, they had also provided them with a good education so that the latter could successfully find gainful employment and begin to support themselves.

For women, parental care generally stopped when the daughter got married and parents had done their duty through paying for the wedding and supplying a dowry. In addition to the unspecified sartorial arrangements that were discussed

654 Will of glassmaker Simon Lorentz, 1637, TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 194r.
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657 Will of Baltzer Fuchs, coppersmith and burgher of Tallinn, 1662, TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 82v.
above, a special concern of parents appears to have been that their daughters should have a wedding according to their standing and wear appropriate wedding attire. In 1633, town councillor Matthias Porten asked the custodians of his two daughters, whom he knew to be honourable and god-fearing people, to make a commitment to provide his daughters with jewellery, clothing and wedding celebrations according to the customs of Tallinn with a sum he set aside for this purpose. In 1673, Margarete Holst gave each of her three unmarried daughters 100 Rtl for a wedding and a further fifty Rtl for a wedding gown, a significant sum compared to the cost of the wedding. In addition to other things, coppersmith Baltzer Fuchs’ daughter was to have as much money as she needed for her wedding, including appropriate attire. In the early modern period, marriage was not just a private affair between two people, it involved an active participation of the kin groups and most importantly, a public celebration. The wedding was a social occasion that enabled the married couple and their respective families to manifest and visualise not only the marital union but also their social claims. Weddings in Tallinn, as in many other places, were often carefully regulated by sumptuary laws, because everyone knew it provided an excellent opportunity to demonstrate the wealth and status of the families of the bride and groom.

To sum up, the parent-child relationships that appear in the seventeenth century are much more complex than those prescribed by law. Unstable social conditions meant that grown-ups could assume any number of parental roles for stepchildren, grandchildren or godchildren that could vary in scope and intensity during different periods in the child’s life. Parents clearly loved their children and wanted to make it explicit through a variety of material arrangements, of which clothes were often a part. These were very practical, such as providing the children with food, clothes and some sort of education but also affirming to already grown children that love had been shown through past care. These arrangements, however, came with clear strings attached to show duty, care and love in return. While it was probably difficult to cut out one’s own children out of the will entirely, the parent-child relationships that were not based on a strict blood relation also demonstrate that material benefits could be withdrawn, if the affection that had been demonstrated in return was considered to be insufficient.

7.2.2 Spouses

Clothes could also symbolise and mediate the love and affection that a married couple had shared. Thomas zur Beck, for example, left all of his movable goods and his clothes to his wife Cecilie for ‘the marital love, grace and goodwill she has shown and given to me in this short time’. While Dorothea von Wehren
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never married her bridegroom Jacob Rahlingk, most likely due to her untimely death, she made her largest bequest to him in 1655, leaving him linen for bed-sheets and shirts, a pair of golden bracelets and fifty Rtl. While the couple never got to share a household, these bequests symbolised the expectation of affection and care that was not to be fulfilled. Additionally, some husbands chose to reinforce the position of their wives. David Becker confirmed that his wife would keep all her clothes and other jewellery she had brought with her, just as the law stated. Peter Hollander similarly confirmed that his dear wife Agathe should keep all of the goods she had brought to their marriage. While that would have been customary according to the law, the explicit separation of his and hers in the will may have been a way to keep his creditors from going after her property.

Spouses were expected to care for and provide for each other in their marriage. Not only care and affection but failure to provide such could be materialised in clothes. One woman, Mettke Hauemann, made it abundantly clear that her deceased husband Cordt Hauemann had not provided what was expected of him. Her will made it explicit that whatever she owned was hers to give away, since she had earned it ‘in hard work and sour sweat’. She had not received anything from her husband; she even added that she had been forced to provide him with a wedding outfit (conveniently left from her first husband). Furthermore, he had received clothes from his half-brother Hans. To repay the favour or perhaps give the brother back what was his, Hauemann gave Hans her deceased husband’s cloak. Her marital expectations had clearly not been fulfilled and she took care to make a note of that. Instead, in an unusual reversal of roles, she, together with Cordt’s brother had been the one to clothe him as well as to support both spouses. Consequently, she made sure to indicate that nobody from his side of the family had any rights to any of the material goods, because he had not fulfilled his duties as a husband and provided for the material wellbeing of the household and his wife.

As we saw from the inheritance conflict between David Gallus’ wife and daughter earlier in this chapter, few people had infinite material resources, and it was thus not unusual that conflicts could arise from the division of an estate. In early modern households, where both spouses could have dependants from previous marriages, taking care of minors and the care expected by spouses were not always compatible. Just like Anna Gorries had done, Anna Busch, who petitioned the town council in the late seventeenth century against her stepdaughter, evidently thought that the love and care she had shown for her husband should have resulted in a significantly larger portion of her late husband’s goods than she actually received. The arguments that she made for her right to a bigger inheritance were threefold. Firstly, her husband had been in poor health during their
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years of marriage, meaning that she had both to care for him and to find employ-
ment in other people’s service in order to support their household. What little
she earned by ‘working hard in a sour sweat’, she had dutifully brought to her
husband.\footnote{Petition of Anna Busch, widow of shoemaker Hans Loffert, to the Orphans’ Court, 2 November 1689, TLA.166.1.409, f. 2r–3r.} Secondly, not only had she shown care for her husband during his ill
health, she had also brought up his daughter Catharina ‘as if she were her own
child’ and taught her different kinds of jobs as was fitting for an honourable
young lady. The fact that Anna Busch had to find employment in other house-
holds and be the sole breadwinner was hard on her, since her father had been a
locksmith and a burgher of Tallinn. As her husband had also been a burgher and
a guild alderman, her unhappiness possibly intensified because she was not af-
forded the life she thought appropriate to her social status.

Her third argument was directly connected to the material resources of the
household. During their marriage, her husband had not given her a single new
set of everyday clothes, but merely a woollen jacket and a gown made of serge.
Otherwise, during these eight years, she was forced to make do with the clothes
she had brought to the marriage herself, which she detailed as follows: a silk
gown, a polemit gown, a serge gown, a red broadcloth skirt, a polemit skirt, a
rasch skirt, a silk lining shirt, a church cap, an everyday cap, sixteen shirts, ten
aprons, twenty-five neckerchiefs, five pairs of knitted stockings that she was
forced to give away as gifts, twelve handkerchiefs, six night bonnets, and four
lace bonnets. She also added that ‘very little or nothing was additionally made
during the eight years.’\footnote{Petition of Anna Busch, widow of shoemaker Hans Loffert, to the Orphans’ Court, 2 November 1689, TLA.166.1.409, f. 2v.}

While the letter submitted by Catharina’s custodians disputed some of her
claims, the arguments she made are revealing of spousal expectations upon en-
tering into the marital contract. The wardrobe described by Anna Busch indicates
that she had entered their marriage with a not insignificant ‘bank’ of clothes.
However, there was clearly an expectation that she would do her part as a wife
and it would be reflected in at least semi-regular updates to her wardrobe.\footnote{For the significance of having a ‘bank’ of clothes as a prerequisite for getting married, see Marie
229–245.} To her mind, she had fulfilled her duties towards her husband and his children, not
only emotionally and educationally through providing love, care and instruction
to Catharina but also economically, by supporting the household and taking
physical care of her husband when he could not work. Not having received the
clothes or the support she was entitled to during their marriage, she at least
thought her affection and above all care of her husband would be compensated
after his death, not least because the couple also had small children.\footnote{Petition of Anna Busch, widow of shoemaker Hans Loffert, to the Orphans’ Court, 2 November 1689, TLA.166.1.409, f. 2r–2v, f. 4r.} That, how-
ever, had not turned out to be the case. Thus, clothes also mediated spousal affection and care in complex ways. Lack of a certain material standard, the feeling of non-reciprocity and disappointment, or the redirection of resources towards other family members like children from a previous marriage were negotiated in part through clothes.

7.2 Ordering emotions, ordering people

In the seventeenth century, the materiality that surrounded people in their daily lives was an important element in how they conceptualised and organised their social network. Wills provide evidence of how people chose to make explicit social ties that had been important to them, sometimes bypassing the legal line of succession. Not only did such bequests confirm that a particular relationship had been important and deserved a reward, but bequests could also be used strategically to exclude certain people. Additionally, they also served as material reminders of the deceased that endured from beyond the grave. But bequests of clothes were not only important from an emotional and personal perspective. It has been suggested that bequests of clothes also affirmed the identity of the donor and their communal belonging, denoting whether the testator and the recipient belonged to the same group or differed in their social rank. As material objects, clothes thus materialised complex ideas and relations between the donor and the recipient.

While not everyone was explicit as to why certain people received certain bequests, the evidence still suggests that the material belongings of a person did help him or her structure their relationships. Catharine Beckman for example made three bequests of clothes. To Anne, her godchild and the daughter of Superintendent Henricus Vestring, she left a variety of bedding items, all of her linens and a velvet bodice with fringes so that the latter would keep her in her kind memory. The wife of Vestring, and mother of Anne, she ‘thanked especially for the friendship and the honour that she has shown me [Catharine] in my weakness’ and bequeathed her a camlet overgown, a skirt of black says and a cloak, as well as another lined fur cloak. Her final bequest was to the old woman who took care of her in her weakness, and it consisted of two skirts, one of coarse woollen and the other of says, and additionally a fur cloak. It should also be mentioned that in addition to these three bequests, she made three other bequests, two to women and one to a man, which consisted of a variety of household items (for the women) and a chest and a bible for the man. Thus, all in all, she made bequests to six people.
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From her bequests we get a very good idea of why people might have made bequests to different people and how they assigned importance to these relationships. The three women to whom she bequeathed clothes all had a distinct relationship to her. Anne was her godchild and her junior in age. Perhaps they shared a close personal bond but perhaps they had not yet formed that bond – the wording does not reveal much here. It could be the case that there was an expectation that one confirm one’s affection towards one’s godchild, which she did through the undoubtedly expensive velvet doublet. It is even more likely, however, that the bequest she left for Anne was intended to symbolise the close friendship that Beckman had enjoyed with the girl’s mother. Moreover, the two adult women had cared for her through emotional and physical labour. Anne’s mother had a close relationship with Beckman, honouring the bonds of her friendship and remaining by her side through her illness, and the third unnamed woman had done a no less significant job by physically caring for her. But while the coarse woollen skirt went to the nameless, probably lower-class woman who had nursed her, the more expensive garments went to the Vestring family, very likely her social equals. A very fine hierarchy thus emerges, where the garments not only materialised sentiment and affection but also affirmed each person’s social position in relation to Beckman herself.

Often these nuances are so subtle so that one might miss them entirely, were it not for the materiality of the garment that indicated how people distinguished between their relationships. Dorothea Knieper left money to the three daughters of Hans Stampehl, the deceased town councillor and alderman of the Great Guild, however, to the oldest daughter she also left a silver jug and a set of mourning clothes.676 Bette Reiger stated that all of her clothes should be divided in a friendly manner between her nieces. However, one of them, Catharina, was to get 100 Tlr, a golden necklace and her best red camlet cloak that was lined with squirrel and decorated with silver gilded buttons.677 Since he was childless, Hans Wangersen had left the rest of his clothes to his brother. However, he did leave a night gown lined with fur to Gott. Vegesack.678 Gerdruth Schroue made four bequests of clothes: she left her best overgown to Bielken Embsinghoff, the second in quality to Timon Embsinghoff’s wife, a third one to Cleidt Dreyer’s wife, and finally, an ‘unmade’ fur cloak to Hans Friese’s wife.679 Distinctions were made between these people either through a bequest of clothes where others received none or through the different qualities of the clothes. Furthermore, the garments could actually have different qualities.
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Reiger’s cloak had itself been a gift to Reiger, given to her by her aunt in 1606 and thus it had most likely assumed the qualities of a family heirloom that she chose to pass on to another female family member. Only Bielken Embsinghoff, the recipient of Gerdruht Schroue’s most expensive cloak, was referred to by her full name, as the other women were identified only by their husbands’ names. Furthermore, Schroue’s bequests are remarkable because she made bequests of money to several men, while to women she only bequeathed clothes and other household items, which might indicate that for some people the gender of the recipient was a factor in the decision-making process. It might also be the case that since the law unambiguously considered a woman’s clothes to be hers, bequests of clothes were more often made by women.

Clothes could also be important in affirming social ties to one’s social superiors. Deacon of St. Nicholas Church Eberhart von Renteln and his wife Gerdrut Fiant did not have any children of their own. They did, however, have substantial means at their disposal. In his will from January 1642, Eberhart von Renteln left bequests of various sums of money to his brothers and sister and their respective children. But he also made two specific bequests related to clothes. In addition to 50 Rtl and a silver drinking vessel, his brother-in-law Hans Ohmb’s little son Jürgen Ohmb should have ‘as many silver buttons as necessary for a doublet, and a coat from my own attire’. His second bequest went to Gertken Knieper, the daughter of an alderman of the Great Guild. She received no bequest of money, but von Renteln left her a velvet doublet and a silk grosgrain skirt for ‘her filial duty and loyalty’.

To understand these bequests, we must look more closely at these people’s background. Eberhard von Renteln had been born into a merchant family and while he was undoubtedly a member of the town’s educated elite, he himself was neither a burgher nor a merchant—he was a man of the cloth. His sister Dorothea had married Hans Ohmb, who had migrated to Tallinn from Schleswig-Holstein and had sworn a burgher’s oath. Consequently, the social hierarchy that had been created in this particular case was very complex. Even without knowing the exact details, it is not hard to guess that the items in both cases were costly. Leaving little Jürgen a symbolic sum of money and a silver drinking vessel, von Renteln also made the two flexible clothing-related bequests. Silver buttons made an expensive doublet look even better and the boy could have as many as he wished. Once he was older, the second bequest allowed him to choose the
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coat he liked best from the wardrobe of von Renteln. The bequest stretching into the future was also a way to ensure his own remembrance. Gertken Knieper was the daughter of a merchant and a burgher. Even if they shared a close personal bond, he also had to be aware of her social status and acknowledge it appropriately. Von Renteln wanted to signify his marked appreciation by leaving her two very expensive garments. On the one hand, they showed him as a person of means and confirmed his position amongst the town’s elite, yet both were still practical and most importantly, appropriate given her social standing. That this gesture was considered proper stands in marked contrast to social norms of more recent centuries that suggest that a respectable woman should never accept expensive, ‘intimate’ gifts, such as clothing, from a man to whom she was not at least betrothed.\textsuperscript{685} It is therefore important to understand that as people were pondering the value and materiality of their clothes and the different ways to signify the important people in their lives, questions of social hierarchy were not absent.

Bequests of clothes were commonly made to servants but there was no uniform practice of rewarding their service. Catharine Meideburger, for example, commemoratively bequeathed her female servant her best grosgrain cloak with marten fur lapels as well as her best black grosgrain skirt in 1629.\textsuperscript{686} In 1607, Mettke Hauemann gave her maidservant her old set of clothes.\textsuperscript{687} In 1655, Dorothea von Wehren left her maidservant Grete a jacket and the other maidservant Anna a skirt of Kutzbay.\textsuperscript{688} As we saw above, Catharine Beckman left the old woman who had taken care of her two skirts of coarse woollen and says as well as a fur cloak.\textsuperscript{689} Johan Schoneker left his maidservant a black skirt of coarse woollen.\textsuperscript{690} Herman Dwele’s maidservant was also to get some garments but it is difficult to understand from the will what exactly these were.\textsuperscript{691} These bequests were not infrequently combined with other things like money, food, or other household goods. It is evident that there was no uniform practice to how people chose to remember their servants in their wills. While some servants were gifted the best garments of their master/mistress, others were simply given whatever was available in the household. Such bequests were an amalgam of different concerns and considerations – payment for the servant’s work but also gratitude for their care and the time they had spent in their master’s household, and perhaps even concern for their survival in the immediate future. In some cases, the clothes
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may have been intended to help maintain them until new employment materialised.\footnote{In his will from 1638, Caspar Asswegen stated that he wanted to maintain his farmhand and his maidservant with some sort of food, wages, and clothes but did not specify more than that, see RA, EAA.858.2.54. The pages in the file are not numbered.}

It is important to recognise that at the same time that people were singling out and including certain people, others were excluded from testators’ material bequests. As we saw above, often this had to do with unfulfilled expectations in connection to care and affection by family members. In 1668, Anna Luhr went to great pains to make sure that, apart from other bequests that were absolutely required by law, everything should be left to her beloved sister Belekken. The latter got all of Anna’s clothes, 500 Rtl, three mattresses, and a garden plot by the Cattle Gate for the loyal care that she had shown Anna in her sickness, ‘when everyone else had abandoned her’.\footnote{Will of Anna Luhr, widow of Great Guild alderman Thomas Bevermann, 1668, TLA.230.1.BN_2, f. 30r.} The garden had been patrimonial property from their father, which makes the will slightly odd. Luhr was very intent on passing the plot on to her sister, but since she did not have any children and her husband was dead, by law Belekken should have been next in line to inherit it anyway. The will specified that the heirs, who remained anonymous in the will, should receive an amount equal to the value of the garden from her remaining property. The exclusion of the heirs is such that we have no idea who they even were, why their claim would have superseded Anna’s sister’s claim, and why they needed to be compensated in the first place. This would have been understandable if the plot had been her late husband’s, but it had been Belekken and Anna’s father’s plot. Anna’s sole purpose was thus to make sure that Belekken would rightfully be compensated for the care that she and no one else had shown her sister.

Although wills only occasionally reveal testators’ explicit intentions through usually fairly stereotypical emotional utterances, post-mortem inheritance disputes often involved conflicting views of what those intentions had been. Especially in cases where the testator/testatrix did not have children or other close relatives, it was not uncommon that the wills were contested by those considering themselves to be the lawful heirs. Sometime in 1620, Johannes Olai, a Swedish pastor in Tallinn, wrote a petition to the town council, lamenting his unfair treatment in the division of widow Agneta Quisterman’s property.\footnote{Petition of pastor Johannes Olai to the town council, 1620, TLA.230.1.Bo10/1, f. 1r–1v.} In October 1619, she had let him write down a will where he listed all of the things she considered hers. The list included items of silver, pewter, iron, copper, some jewellery, some sort of weaving appliances, bedclothes, household linens and some clothes.\footnote{The will was made in Swedish and also translated to German, see will of Agneta Quisterman, widow of linen weaver Marcus Quisterman, 1619, TLA.230.1.Bo10/1, f. 7r (German), f. 14r–15r (Swedish). In Swedish, the will states that *Anno 1619 den 15 Augusti, när Jagh besökte S. först de Marcus Wistermans ännkia husfru Agneta, och meddelsde honne Christis bögvarliga Sacram: thå gjorde hon sin första
These items she carefully separated from the remaining household goods that had belonged to her husband, linen-weaver Marcus Quisterman. We know that there were more things in her household from an inventory that was drawn up in 1620.696

Agneta made the following bequests from her property: to one of her manservants she bequeathed the bedclothes he was already using, a silver spoon and a weaving loom, while the other manservant got three pieces of fabric and a weaving loom. To her boy Berntt she left a cloak of black wande and to the boy’s mother she left a brownish purple skirt. Finally, to her maidservant Madlen, who had served her for three years, she left a woollen skirt. Her other bequests were donations to the poor and for road maintenance. Finally, she left her brother-in-law four Tr and two bedcovers.697 But how did Johannes Olai figure in all of this? In his petition, he explained that he had agreed with Agneta that he would organise an honourable funeral for the widow after her death. In exchange, the widow would leave him the remainder of the things she had indicated in her will.698 This must have been an oral agreement, however, since the will did not mention this.

The importance of textiles in women’s bequests to friends and servants is also evident in the intentions of Agneta Quisterman. The will Olai had written down for her listed a variety of different household goods, yet she primarily chose clothing and textiles to make specific bequests. To her two manservants she also left the weaving appliances, which could indicate that the men had been working for her husband and had continued to work for her after he died. Moreover, the skirt she left to Madlen later became an object of contention in his struggle against the town council; Olai reminded the councillors that Madlen had still not received her skirt, although it had been promised to her by her mistress.699 Here, too, it is evident that clothes were important in materialising personal, intimate bonds between a master/mistress and a servant. The nuances in Agneta Quisterman’s strategy can also be seen in the fact that, by contrast, she gifted only a small sum of money and two bedcovers to her brother-in-law.700 In comparison, it was more impersonal and may not have been so much motivated by any warm relationship as by a feeling that she had to acknowledge him even if it was in a minimal way.

Johannes Olai’s petition stemmed from the fact that, after Agneta Quisterman died, the town council nullified her will, because they argued that the objects

---

Testamente. Thet samma bekristadde hon, then – 27 Octob, och lath anteckna sitt tygh sosom här vnder står. The expression sitt tygh clearly indicates that she considered these things hers beyond doubt.

696 Inventory of Agneta Quisterman, widow of linen weaver Marcus Quisterman, 1620, TLA.230.1.Bo10/I, f. 3r–5r.
697 Will of Agneta Quisterman, widow of linen weaver Marcus Quisterman, 1619, TLA.230.1.Bo10/I, f. 15r.
698 Petition of pastor Johannes Olai to the town council, 1620, TLA.230.1.Bo10/I, f. 1r.
699 Extract from the town council protocol, 21 September 1620, TLA.230.1.Bo10/I, f. 10r.
700 Will of Agneta Quisterman, widow of linen weaver Marcus Quisterman, 1619, TLA.230.1.Bo10/I, f. 15r.
listed were not her own but belonged to her late husband. As the previous section explained, when the husband died, the widow took her whole dowry and got half of his remaining property, while the other half would be divided between his next heir(s). When the town council subsequently went through each of Agneta’s bequests, they upheld only the bequests of clothes.\footnote{Extract from the town council protocol, 21 September 1620, TLA.230.1.Bo10/1, f. 9r.} Johannes Olai was compensated for his services with the sum of nine Tlr, two gilded rings and three gilded buttons.\footnote{Extract from the town council protocol, 21 September 1620, TLA.230.1.Bo10/1, f. 9r.} The weaving looms the council ordered to be sold and the money used to compensate town councillor Carsten Rode in the sum of fifteen Rtl three rst because, incidentally, he too claimed to have contributed financially to her funeral.\footnote{Extract from the town council protocol, 21 September 1620, TLA.230.1.Bo10/1, f. 9v.} Despite Olai’s claims that the property Agneta Quisterman had attempted to distribute was not patrimonial, the town council did not agree with this designation and consequently, it was to go to the deceased linen-weaver’s closest relatives, including, presumably, Quisterman’s brother-in-law. In this case, the implication was that only the clothes and jewels were hers to give away. The question of the dowry was not discussed but she may have married up socially and not entered the marriage with significant material assets.

For his part, Johannes Olai was dissatisfied with this situation. He argued that since he, and not the relatives or friends of Marcus Quisterman, had taken care of the widow, maintained a close relationship over ‘eight and more’ years, and also organised her funeral, he should be compensated for his time, affection and money. The long period speaks to the likelihood that his care was not given entirely unwillingly, although presumably he was well aware of the fact that the widow owned sizeable material assets. His second argument was legal and concerned the nature of her property as well as the inheritance rights. Due to the nature of the property, which he argued was not patrimonial, the will that he made on behalf of Agneta Quisterman was not contradicting any laws and the widow had acted within her rights. She had left a small bequest to her brother-in-law. The fact that the rest of her husband’s siblings and her own sister were not named in the will, Olai argued, while perhaps not entirely customary, was a consequence of the fact that nobody had cared for the woman or even been interested in her existence through these final years.

This case highlights the central issue of daily caretaking activities and their appropriate compensation which, although intended by the testator, could contradict the law. Who had the right to decide what kind of property it was and how it should be divided? According to the law, if personal property – whether movable or immovable – was acquired and not inherited, the testator was free to bequeath it to whomever he or she wished.\footnote{Hahn 2015, p. 29.} Agneta had separated out what she clearly thought were her things and had made written and oral arrangements for their division after her death. The bequests to her servants and the arrangement...
she made with Olai indicate she was aware of the law and careful to acknowledge the people in her life who would otherwise not have been entitled to anything. Most of the things that remained in the household after her husband’s death she did not in fact consider hers. It is also probable that in a relatively small place like Tallinn, she was aware of her late husband’s heirs and had no qualms about how his property was to be divided.

The town councillors, on the other hand, saw all, or at least some, of the goods Agneta indicated in her will as part of the dead Quisterman’s estate. If it was not her acquired property, it was not hers to give away. The problem with refuting Agneta’s understanding of her property was that they offered no alternative division except for seeing the entirety of Quisterman’s household as one. The councillors then designated as heirs people both from her side and her husband’s side, which indicates that perhaps they were not so sure about the right way to proceed. If Agneta’s property was inherited, her sister did have a claim on her property, since she did not have any other surviving relatives. But Quisterman’s relatives were by law not among her legal heirs, and even if they had a right to his property, they did not have any right to hers. The town council, trying to make their own job as easy as possible, upheld the individual bequests Agneta had made and divided the rest of the goods equally between his and her heirs. It is therefore important to bear in mind that while testators tried to use wills in order to put down in writing the affection and care they had received from others in order to erase doubt about it, it did not necessarily mean that their wishes would be fulfilled. Especially in the case of unrelated people like friends and servants, there was always a risk that the caregiving activities and the testators’ intentions could be ignored in favour of legal heirs whose rights were better upheld by the law. In this case, blood ran thicker than water. Because of the town council’s meddling, Agneta Quisterman and Johannes Olai’s personal ties did not receive the material validation for which he had hoped.

In conclusion, it is visible from people’s bequests how clothes could embody sentiment, symbolise affection and love as well as bridge post-mortem absence. On one hand, in their efforts to organise their networks, people were clearly aware of and influenced by intricate social hierarchies and how to appropriately recognise the other’s position. On the other hand, they were affected by relationships of care and support, which emerge as central to people’s motivations for bequeathing material goods like clothes. There was surely an expectation, often expressed in writing, that family members would take care of an aging person. However, for various reasons that expectation did not always materialise and consequently, people attempted to modify the system of inheritance so as to reflect the care and affection they had actually received or hoped to receive. The problem was that emotions like love and affection, disappointment and disapproval that coloured people’s social lives were infinitely more complex in real life than the expected order of succession as outlined in the law.
7.3 Conclusion

In the seventeenth century, clothes were a part of how people navigated difficult life transitions. Clothes were commonly a part of the material arrangements used to provide and reward loyalty and care, whether it was to family members, friends or servants. As appearances were central in how groups of people were recognised and distinguished from each other in the early modern period, appropriate attire was a constant concern for parents, alongside other equally pragmatic things like schooling and food, in providing care for minors. But bequests of clothes also reflected the kinds of expectations that had been placed on children, family members and friends, and whether these had been fulfilled or not. People’s individual approaches to the relations they had cultivated with their friends and family are also visible through differing strategies about how they went about assigning those relations a material form. Not everyone gifted clothes, but those who did could either leave their whole wardrobe to a designated person, or select a few garments that had a high financial value or had attained the status of a family heirloom. The strategies that people adopted with regards to clothes thus reflected their complexity.

Bequests of clothes also had a nuanced capacity to create social difference and affirm social kinship. Men and women who did not have children of their own were especially likely to use clothes in this way, because their beneficiaries often came from outside the circle of immediate heirs. This chapter has shown how the materiality of clothes intersected with considerations of the beneficiary’s social position; clothes could be used to affirm difference, for example through the gifting of used or coarse clothes to people of poorer social background, to celebrate kinship, through leaving carefully selected clothes to friends, and finally, to acknowledge and recognise a person’s social superiority through bequests of appropriately chosen clothes. But it is also evident that certain people chose to ignore these conventions, for example leaving their servants clothes of unusually good quality. Although women have previously been thought to be more involved in materially organising their social relations, it is evident that men also made bequests of clothes to friends and family members with similar motivations.705 Clothes not only embodied financial worth and displayed difference, but they also materialised esteem and commemoration, revealed disappointment and affirmed love, all of which complicated the idea of connecting certain people to certain clothes. Nowhere is this more evident than when people, faced with death, pondered the mesh of their social relations.

705 Vickery 1998, p. 194. In early modern England Miles Lambert has also observed that both men and women made bequests of clothes, see Lambert 2014, pp. 46–59.
CHAPTER 8
Fungible or Not?

fungible
noun, adjective
/'fʌn.dʒə.bəl/
something such as a currency, share, or goods, that can easily be exchanged for others of the same value and type (Cambridge Dictionary)

Early modern Europe was strapped for cash. Even in the commercial centres of Western Europe, for example England, liquidity was limited. In seventeenth-century Tallinn, out of the 105 inventories examined for this study, only thirty-eight – or slightly over one-third – mentioned coins of any kind in the household. The inventories further indicate that what small amounts of money there might have been in the household often had already been spent to cover at least some of the obligations of the deceased person. Yet, on the other hand, early modern households could be stacked with household goods like kitchenware, textiles, clothes, tools and furniture. Additionally, almost all inventories demonstrate the presence of items made of pewter, silver, gilded silver and even gold. Money, while not entirely absent, was not common either, which points towards other ways of conducting business and alternative modes of exchange.

Previous research has pointed out the importance of second-hand markets and alternative ‘currencies’, such as clothes, in facilitating ordinary people’s participation in commercial exchanges. Variables that determined a person’s access to the markets and commercial networks, whether as a retailer or a merchant but also as a customer and buyer, included citizenship, ethnicity, guild membership, age, education or training and gender. Furthermore, social status, marital

706 On seventeenth-century England, see Muldrew 2001, pp. 78–120. Peter Linebaugh has observed that long into the eighteenth century, wage payments to workers in London were not made in money or money was only one of the forms of payment, see Linebaugh 2006, p. 374. On lack of cash in early modern Italy, see Ago 2008, p. 44. The same has also been observed for seventeenth-century Sweden, see Lindström & Mispelaere 2015, pp. 436–437.
status, age and influence within the guild system also influenced economic opportunity and participation in the market system. While wealthy merchants and guild members could enjoy access to a wide range of rather well-regulated market mechanisms and networks, unmarried women, people of low social status and those on the margins of society had very limited access to these types of markets. Those who lacked family and friends, or had not cultivated a creditworthy persona, were forced to find alternative informal and even illegal ways to survive. In focusing on people’s activities and strategies in these alternative markets and exchange networks, the aim of this chapter is to examine how clothes functioned as fungible goods in seventeenth-century Tallinn.

8.1 Fungible fashions

In a society characterised by a lack of coin rather than a lack of material resources, alternative mechanisms like credit and barter played a central role in facilitating exchange. Access to clothes, household goods, tools and other tangible objects was crucial for day-to-day survival. Because of the intrinsic material value (the value of the fabric), clothes often assumed a monetary function, being used not only to acquire cash but as if they were cash. This has led to claims that in early modern society, objects had a different meaning than they do today. Rather than being objects to keep and cherish, goods, the argument goes, inspired a more pragmatic attitude; they were viewed primarily as tools used to obtain other goods. According to this understanding, only after currency became widespread in the society was it possible for objects to be loaded with identity and sentimental values. While the entire chapter is devoted to examining the validity of this claim, the first part of this chapter will scrutinise this argument by examining three contexts in which clothes most clearly appeared in a monetary capacity – as wages, as means of payment and as a means of negotiating credit.

8.1.1 Clothes as wages

Since fabric was relatively more expensive in the seventeenth century and also fairly durable, clothes held very real and tangible value for people. The lack of money in circulation often meant that wages were partly paid in kind. In addition to lodging, food and monetary payment, a part of the wages of servants was also regularly paid in cloth or clothing. Being paid in clothes was an established

---

708 Stabel 2003, p. 58.
709 On poverty and credit, see also Fontaine 2014, pp. 15–40.
710 Ago 2008, p. 43.
712 Ago 2008, p. 57.
713 See also Fairchilds 2007, p. 289; Groebner 1993, pp. 152–156; Lemire 1990, p. 261; Spence 2016, p. 164.
practice in Tallinn and its regulation from the second half of the century is also
visible in sumptuary legislation. 714 The 1665 clothing regulation for example
stated that every master was free to pay his male servants either in money or in
clothes. If wages were paid both in money and clothes, the yearly sum in cash
was not to exceed six Rtl and the servant was to get a linen gown, three shirts,
three pairs of stockings and three pairs of shoes. If payment was only in clothes,
a gown of watman was added to this. Then, in the second year the servant could
get a fur coat and in the third year a pair of chamois hose. A hat, a cap and a pair
of gloves were to be supplied to the servant whenever possible. 715 The cycle was
then to repeat itself but after four years of loyal service, the fabric of the gown
could be upgraded to dussincken, as a mark of the loyalty a servant had shown
his master through his service. The regulation added that if the master knowingly
supplied his servant with better clothes, he had to pay a fine, but if a servant
acquired too sumptuous clothes without his master’s knowledge, he would be
imprisoned and the garments in question confiscated. On the one hand, the reg-
ulation indicated what was considered a reasonable amount of clothes a working
person might need in a year. On the other hand, if we look at evidence from
inventories, full sets of clothes like these rarely appear. If heads of households
did not have these items even for themselves, it is unlikely that they could provide
them for their servants. It is therefore unlikely that masters chose or even had
the ability at all times to reimburse their servant in such a complete wardrobe and
keep updating it regularly. Thus, most heads of households would have likely
paid in a combination of money, garments, food and accommodation.

The practice of paying wages with clothes also applied to female servants, but
clothes formed a flexible part of the salary until 1691, when the clothing regula-
tion mandated that that all wages were to be paid primarily in money. In addition
to a yearly wage between twenty and thirty d kmt, a maidservant was additionally
entitled to three pairs of shoes and thirty yards of linen. Wet-nurses, on the other
hand, were to get all their wages in clothes. 716 The impetus for stricter regulation
was the continued pride and excess in the clothing of female servants. Addition-
ally, complaints had been made about the clothes masters were giving to their
servants, the issue presumably being that, again, these were too sumptuous. A
related problem was the dissatisfaction of servants with the clothes their masters
had given them. Unhappy with the quality of clothes they were given as wages,

714 The town council itself supplied cloth and garments regularly to its employees as a part of their
remuneration. The person sweeping the market square in front of the town hall received a specific
sum of money annually for a pair of shoes ‘according to an old custom’, see Tallinn town council
treasury accounts, 1642–1676, TLA.230.1.Ba35/II, f. 113r, f. 118r, f. 122r. In 1674, four town
council fishermen received a pair of gloves of ‘good Russian sheepskin’ as part of their yearly wages,
see Tallinn town council treasury accounts, 1654–1699, TLA.230.1.Ba35/III, f. 11r. The town’s
gatekeeper received a pair of good Russia leather boots, see TLA.230.1.Ba35/III, f. 12r.
715 1665 clothing regulation, TLA.191.1.19, f. 88v.
716 1691 clothing regulation, Pabst 1857, pp. 239–240.
servants were said to be quitting their service *en masse* before the end of the contract and going to the highest bidder in search of better clothes. 717 Rather than being free in their choice to pay servants with available clothes, heads of households could only pay in money and basic linen. The town council thus attempted to curb the fungibility of clothes in wage relationships by specifying what clothes could be used as payment because the clothes given to servants often were not appropriate for their social position.

The regulation of servants’ wages in sumptuary laws drew attention to another conflict inherent in clothes being both visual markers of social position and an impersonal method of payment. In a society focused on visuality and visual manifestations, it was not surprising that heads of households had an interest in clothing their servants in such a way as to reflect well on the status of the household as a whole. 718 But by supplying their servants with garments that in reality were supposed to be a recognisable visual marker of some other group, they were also confusing the social legibility that the sumptuary laws tried to uphold. The laws made it clear that while servants were partly to blame, heads of household were also responsible for the consumption habits of subordinate members of their households. The last clothing regulation thus stated that a master was liable to pay the fine on behalf of his servants and that would later be deducted from the servant’s salary. 719 The fungibility of clothes in the context of wages shows that simply because clothes changed hands, they did not become devoid of meaning, and a garment that was suitable for a master or mistress could become subversive if worn by a servant, even if it was given as part of wages.

Evidence from court materials also suggests that reimbursing servants in cloth and garments was unexceptionable. In 1699, Maria Matztochter, a maidservant from Helsinki, had stolen money from her master and bought new lining shirts with it. In court, she claimed she had received the shirts from her previous master in exchange for her service. When he was questioned, the earlier master did not recognise the shirts and said that Maria had only worked in exchange for board and lodging. 720 In another case, Cathrin and Margret, two women from Porvoo who were hauled into court because Margret’s brother Ako Hinrichsohn had stolen numerous things from his master and asked them to dispose of some of it. Both claimed they had received the items – in this case cloth – from their master and mistress respectively. However, the good quality of the cloth evidently aroused suspicion when they tried to sell it. 721 These interactions point to one important aspect in which clothing differed from money, namely that clothes

717 1696 clothing regulation, RA, EAA.1002.1.14, f.A4r.
718 On this type of status manifestation, see also Bulst 1993, p. 44.
721 Cathrin claimed that her husband had received red woollen cloth from the king, presumably in exchange for his service, see Jost Dunte contra Ako Hinrichsohn, 30 October 1623, TLA.230.1.Aa48, f. 13r; Margret claimed she had received cloth from her previous mistress in Finland, f. 12v.
could never be entirely anonymous. The cloth Cathrin and Margret tried to sell appeared out of place, because their social position did not warrant them owning, let alone wearing it. Clothes were thus not anonymous, abstract containers of value, freed from their social context the moment they changed hands.

Because clothes did not exist in a social vacuum, in cases of conflict where clothing had been a part of the wage, servants could become vulnerable to accusations of theft by their employer if they decided to leave with the garments. Hanns Truw from Finland, who was accused of stealing a number of household items, explained that he had been in the service of a peasant for almost five years but had decided to run away before the year’s end and take the peasant’s fur coat and a small axe as payment. While Truw had broken what appears to have been a contract of a certain length, he obviously felt that he had sufficient grounds to claim payment for the labour he had performed in service. Though he had taken something that belonged to his employer, he maintained that he was entitled to it because of the work he had done. It is not entirely clear how a decision was made that a single garment or another thing was equivalent to the work he had performed, but as clothes could easily be carried away and there was a second-hand market where one could easily turn them into something else, it is not a surprising choice. The ease with which clothes could be carried surely contributed to their fungibility. While money might not have been available in every household, running away with any tangible thing was surely better than leaving with empty hands. A fur coat in a rural style that belonged to a peasant might not have been too conspicuous a sight, had the ‘thief’ decided to wear it, but it could equally easily have been used to buy temporary accommodation. Still, the household that Truw left was lacking a coat and lacking a farmhand, and their absence would have been a strong hint about what had transpired. It is thus not surprising that Truw did not make it very far before he was caught and brought to court.

That clothes cannot simply be seen as monetary compensation is evident from the ambiguity surrounding the leaving of clothes to servants in wills and inventories. As we saw in the previous chapter, wills and inventories occasionally mentioned that servants were to get garments from their deceased master’s wardrobe, most probably to settle the question of the wage, but in some cases, these were also an incentive, reward or even a token of remembrance. The maidservant who had worked for Johan Ast received one shirt and a pair of shoes from his goods, the inventory stated. Another maidservant was to receive a long sleeping gown made of serge and lined with cat skin from the inventory of mint master Hans Paulsen, because she had ‘cherished and nurtured him in his illness’. The boundary between clothes as gift and clothes as wages is thus not easy to draw.

Whether servants received clothes as a part of wages, on top of wages or in lieu
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723 Accused Hans Truw, 24 July 1624, TLA.230.1.Aa45, f. 29r.
724 Inventory of town council cook Johan Ast, 1638, TLA.230.1.Bt13/III, f. 196r.
725 Inventory of mint master Hans Paulsen, 1641, TLA.230.1.Bt10/IV, f. 281r.
of wages is not always easy to say. The previous chapter showed that masters and mistresses also gifted clothes as a way to express the esteem they had for their servants. The maid had surely provided a service to the mint master, but it is entirely possible that the latter also felt a debt of gratitude to her for having taken care of him and relieved his loneliness (the inventory did not mention any relatives). The clothes, which not infrequently had been the personal belongings of heads of households, created an intimate material bond between a master/mistress and a servant. Clothes were complex because they could carry and mediate complex relationships. The context of the labour relationship cannot be easily separated from the social context of household relations and personal bonds.

8.1.2 Clothes as payment

The section above outlined how clothes could function in the context of wage labour. A closely related function of clothes included instances where clothing was used to pay for many different goods and short-term services. Jacob zur Beck, who organised the funeral of Andreas Winter’s widow in 1630, paid sixty-three Herrenthaler for it. In compensation, he received twenty-four M km and sixty-nine household items from her inventory, among them nine pieces of clothing: a women’s doublet, an old brown cloak, two old grosgrain coats, a lined women’s cloak, two Hüllen and two fur coats. Towards the end of the century, Hans Stackelberg had a pair of hose made for himself, using two buckskins for the hose and a third as payment to the chamois preparer for the service. The maidservant Maria Matztochter lied to the court in 1699, claiming that she had received two shirts as payment for prostituting herself when, in fact, she had stolen them. In 1690, shoemaker Lorentz Niéländé had rented some accommodation for his cattle from hatmaker Martin Herbst for thirty Rtl and four pairs of shoes. One other inventory specified that silver buttons had been removed from a waistcoat in order to pay rent to the landlord for the house the deceased person had rented. It is apparent that clothes and its constituent parts could substitute for money in innumerable transactions, as long as the parties could agree that the exchange had been fair.

Especially for people on the margins of early modern society, clothes appear to have been crucial for making ends meet. From a 1670 court case in which two men were accused of theft, it turned out that one of the suspects, an innkeeper called Arwe, had received neckerchiefs, shirts, bridles, hats, peasant coats and
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726 Inventory of Andreas Winter’s widow, 1630, TLA.230.1.Bt10/1, f. 93r–93v.
728 Johan Paulsen contra Maria Matztochter, 27 September 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 408v.
730 Inventory of lawyer Alexander Tellior, 1696, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 188r.
other things in exchange for beer from a mute beggar identified only as Andersen.731 The beggar had also brought a burial shroud, a neckerchief and an old hat to Arwe’s wife Elso in the innkeeper’s absence, which she similarly compensated with beer. The hat she subsequently passed on to a fisherman because the latter had promised her some fish.732 In a case from 1699 where Simon Pehhe and Simon Tönniesson were accused of theft, Pehhe categorically refuted the accusation and said that Tönniesson had come to his house with some goods and Pehhe’s wife had given him thirty mugs of beer in exchange for some of the linen.733 While money could be and often was a part of these exchanges, it was not the main mode of exchange or end purpose of these transactions. What people gave and received was very much a reflection of the materiality that surrounded and was available to them.

Sometimes, these exchanges could be dizzyingly complicated, and people had to keep track of a variety of goods and numerous people with whom they were dealing before the transaction could be concluded. Both Margret and Cathrin ended up in court because of their dealings with Margret’s brother Ako, but a closer look at their activities helps us to better understand how exactly clothes were exchanged in a monetary context. Although some of her statements contradicted each other, Margret’s main claim was that she gave some of the stolen satin that she received from her brother Ako to Cathrin. Ako himself had also given some satin cloth directly to Cathrin so that she could sell it. In exchange for the satin, Cathrin gave Margret an apron of red rasch, a piece of broadcloth and two men’s shirts, which according to her should have amounted to five Tlr. This piece of satin, however, she was forced to sell to a scribe called Hanss from Turku, receiving in return some herring, a pound of butter and four bread rolls, which according to his calculations were worth four Tlr. Cathrin then took some of the satin cloth and sold it to a journeyman and got six Tlr and some woollen cloth for it. The next piece of cloth she sold to a woman for money. The final piece of satin she sold in a shop and got four Tlr and some yards of grosgrain. According to her statement, however, Ako did not want the grosgrain and she then gave him another type of woollen instead.

Because clothes were valuable and portable, yet had a personal connection to their owner, they also were susceptible to being seized in order to force someone pay a debt. In 1688, widow Britta Jöransdotter sent a petition to Governor General Axel Julius de la Gardie, asking that Dome Guild alderman Erik Grönwaldt release her clothes. Evidently, her late husband had owed Grönwald a debt, which

732 Thomas Witte contra Hans Trommer and Paul Paulsohn, 3 February 1670, TLA.230.1.Aa63, f. 30r.
733 Herman Bluhm contra Simon Tönniesson and Simon Pehhe, 2 January 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 2r–5v.
had resulted in the confiscation of her property, including her clothes. In 1652, Herman Wustman’s manservant Heinrich was already sitting in prison, accused by his master of theft, when a tailor from Rakvere called Erich appeared and submitted his own complaint against the said Heinrich. The latter had apparently attacked him, dragged him by the hair, and taken his hat, all because Erich owed him a barrel of rye. In 1690, Larss Jensohn Blåberg drove his carriage over corn-meter Lantinge Mart’s young pig and killed it. Mart ran after Blåberg to confront him and removed the latter’s hat with the intention to keep it until Blåberg compensated him for the pig. A physical conflict ensued, and Mart eventually had to take his pick between spending four weeks in jail or paying ten Rtl for the physical injury he had caused Blåberg. Rather than stealing, the intention was to temporarily disseize the other party of their clothes. In the above-mentioned cases the hats were a means to receive monetary compensation. Rather than being anonymous objects with an abstract and stable value, clothes were also items with personal value, meaning their owners generally had some incentive to pay their debt.

It is evident from this long and complicated list of interactions and dealings that, whether clothes were acquired legally or illegally, using them as money was widespread but still complicated business. On the one hand, we see that people below the social elite were experienced in dealing with cloth and had a keen understanding of how such commercial exchanges worked in early modern Tallinn. Cloth and clothes could be exchanged together with money or given instead of it. On the other hand, it was also evident that in many cases, parties had not previously come to an agreement about exactly what each was to get out of the exchange, which attests to the temporary nature of these networks. Furthermore, other factors were also important in these dealings, not least that the cloth or clothes had in fact been stolen, meaning they had to be traded off through certain channels and almost certainly below their market value. Furthermore, people like Cathrin could be forced to give away cloth and clothes at a loss simply because they needed to eat. In short, the money value of goods was by no means absolute, but rather highly dependent upon social context and often open for negotiation.

8.1.3 Clothes and credit

We have already seen that clothes had a certain intrinsic value, which was tied to the value of the fabric. As such, they could be used as part of wages and to pay for other goods and services. Because cloth was valuable, garments and textiles were also commonly pawned and used as security to borrow money. In early modern Amsterdam, for example, approximately sixty percent of the outstanding
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734 Petition of Brita Jöransdotter, widow of Swen Borg, to the Swedish Governor General of Estonia, 3 July 1688, RA, EAA.1.2.482, f. 29r–29v.
735 Herman Wustman contra his manservant Henrich, 13 March 1652, TLA.230.1.Aa51, f. 267r–267v.
pawns in one pawnshop were clothes and dress accessories. Even in households of limited means, clothing was widely available and consequently made up a substantial part of these households’ movable assets that could be pawned. A general observation based on inventories and court materials is that clothing and textiles appear in credit relations with some regularity, which shows that they were indeed available to many people and that it was easy to direct them into the market if the situation required that.

Inventories give us especially precise information about the complex ways in which clothes could secure credit for people from a variety of backgrounds. Pawning clothes with a friend or an acquaintance appears to have been an aspect of everyday household management, a way to get other goods, such as foodstuffs, or ready cash. Importantly, clothes could secure credit for both men and women. Eight out of the eighty-one items of clothing recorded in Birgitta Falck’s inventory were pledged at the time of her death, although the inventory did not specify their location or who the creditor had been. The inventory of Catharina Rotert described a bonnet with golden ornaments and trimmed with pearls that had been pledged to her, but the appraisers had not been able to establish its owner. In most cases it is therefore difficult to know where or to whom, for how long and why clothes had been pawned. Only tanner Adam Aven’s inventory includes some details. He had pledged a black polemit skirt to Dierich Witte in exchange for roughly 8.5 kg or one Liespfund of hops Aven had purchased for the value of six Tlr. To Christoffer Koch he had pledged a pair of cordovan shoes and got three Tlr and a pound of hops in return. He never redeemed the pledged items, probably because he did not have the money. But while the garments were not physically present in the household, they were still considered a part of the deceased person’s property and thus recorded together with all the other things.

It is also evident that in such credit relations clothes connected people both horizontally and vertically in the hierarchy. Both of Adam Aven’s pledges were to burghers and merchants, while he was neither one nor the other. Additionally, inventories record several peasant pledges. Presumably, peasants had pawned their clothes to their landlord in exchange for the rent they owed. Merchant
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739 Inventory of Birgitta Falck, wife of master butcher Jürgen Hinrich Schmidt, 1698, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 231r-231v, f. 232r.
741 One Liespfund was equal to roughly 8.5 kg, see Svenska Akademiens ordbok (SAOB) liespfund (1940). Inventory of tanner Adam Aven, 1675, TLA.230.1.Bt12/IV, f. 20r, f. 22v.
742 Inventory of merchant Johann Buchau, 1700, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 266v; inventory of merchant Dominicus Lange, 1698, f. 252v; inventory of weigher Carsten Kitzken, 1606, TLA.230.1.Bt7/III, f. 36r.
Johann Buchau’s inventory shows that peasants had pledged to him items of silver, copper, pewter and iron as well as buckskins and clothes. In total, there were thirty-four pledges of textiles and clothes, including fur coats and other coats, women’s skirts, chamois hose and other items.\textsuperscript{743} It appears the practice of using clothes as securities could but did not necessarily have to involve parties from a similar social background. The pledges in the household of the deceased person and the pawned clothes that were elsewhere indicate that there was knowledge of these transactions having taken place but for some reason, their owners had not come to collect them. Lack of money was most likely one such reason, as people of limited means were chronically short of coin with which to redeem the pledged clothes. On the other hand, the purpose of these pawns might also have been to serve as material reminders of the relationships that they had fostered between the debtor and the creditor. Since many inventories reveal the presence of pledged items, it seems that a swift resolution was for many people either not possible or not necessary.

Another important aspect of clothes being used as securities is that they did not necessarily have to be new or in good condition. In a court case from 1699 it appears that three years earlier, farrier Jacob Köhler had lent 22 Rtl and 64 wrst to master builder Johan Detleff against a security of clothes. Amongst the things that Detleff pledged to Köhler were two ‘more than half-worn’ women’s skirts and a man’s coat ‘gone out of fashion’ with torn embroideries.\textsuperscript{744} We do not actually know the condition in which Köhler had received them or whether they had been used in some manner during this period. But while they were good enough as securities for a loan he had given Detleff, he did not want to keep them and presented them for the court to be valued. It appears that the bailiff had already instructed Detleff to pay back his debt, but the latter had ignored the order. The court finally decided that Detleff had six weeks to come and collect his clothes and pay back the debt, after which Köhler had the right to sell them. Why Detleff had not come to pay his debt and claim his clothes does not appear in the records but it is entirely likely that he had no use for them after three years and would not have cared much if Köhler had sold them. Arguably, however, the non-payment of his debt was treated rather leniently by the court and Köhler had to go through quite some trouble to get back what he was owed.

Not redeeming the pledged items was thus something people did both out of choice and from necessity. However, for some people the materiality and the intrinsic value of a garment also meant that they chose to square their debts with clothes. In 1606, musician Curt Hoffmann was amongst the nine creditors of Jacob Rechenbach.\textsuperscript{745} Rechenbach owed him eight Tlr but he also owed other

\textsuperscript{743} Inventory of merchant Johann Buchau from 1700, TLA.230.1.Bt14, f. 266v.

\textsuperscript{744} Farrier Jacob Köhler contra master builder Johan Detleff, 20 November 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 512v–513r.

\textsuperscript{745} Jacob Rechenbach’s creditors contra Jacob Rechenbach, 13 February 1606, TLA.230.1.Aa46/a, f. 9v–10r. The sums Rechenbach owed to various people ranged from two Tlr and 20 rst to 934(?)
people money. When the court had his clothes valued, Hoffmann decided to take Rechenbach’s velvet hose to cover the debt, although they were valued slightly lower than the sum that Rechenbach owed him. Although all of Rechenbach’s clothes were valued by the tailors, none of the other creditors appears to have received any of his garments. Yet, Hoffmann still decided to accept what was on offer and bring their deal to an end. It is likely that for Hoffmann a bird in the hand was worth two in the bush. Since Rechenbach, a burgher, owed large sums of money to his other creditors, it might have been the case that the creditors would have to compound, or some would take precedence. Rather than being left with substantially less, Hoffmann decided to mitigate the risk and accept the velvet hose instead.

Clothing clearly had monetary value and could be pawned or used to secure a loan. Notably, these practices were used by people from all social backgrounds. However, as we saw in the previous section, clothes were complex agents in the market and their value was a result of many factors. It is clear that the ways people reasoned about the value of garments, their needs and the means available to them were different in each context. Many people never reclaimed their clothes, whether because they no longer had need for the garments any more or had no means to redeem the pledge. Clothes could be used to square off monetary debts, and especially for people of limited means, any kind of physical garment would have been a welcome addition to their assets.

8.2 Unique and non-exchangeable

This section will show why clothes, despite being movable and widely circulated in the early modern society, were not and could not be ‘infinitely fungible’, as Martha Howell has suggested. That was because clothes did not exist in a social vacuum. We did see above that clothes could assume a monetary function and facilitate credit and exchange of other goods and services. However, these exchanges did not happen in anonymous market circumstances. Individual economy in the early modern period was submerged or ‘embedded’ in social relationships. A man ‘does not act so as to safeguard his individual interest in the possession of material goods,’ Polanyi wrote, ‘he acts so as to safeguard his social standing, his social claims, his social assets. He values material goods only in so far as they serve this end.’ Economic relationships were thus always tied to personal relationships. They mutually influenced and could not easily be untangled from each other. I showed earlier that the visualisation of social position happened in a more complex manner on the everyday level than the discursive
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ideal of a sartorial order implies. We may therefore assume that people’s economic activities were also in dialogue with the organising and ordering capacities of clothes and their social meanings. This section will therefore examine instances where clothes could theoretically be fungible but yet were not.

8.2.1 Thieving and desire

People for whom legal commercial activities were unavailable for some reason sometimes resorted to illegal appropriation. Cases of theft are particularly instructive about people’s material lives because they show the constant oscillation between legal and illegal activities. People who lacked social capital, who had a limited contact network or none whatsoever, had to find alternative ways to get by. Since early modern societies were chronically needy, need and the instinct to survive were the decisive motives for property crime.749 For most people, theft was not the primary means through which they earned their living. Rather, they took advantage of opportunities when they presented themselves. Theft networks therefore had more in common with networks of family, friends, and neighbours, than with a criminal underworld. For many people, theft was simply part of their life-cycle experience.750 Deviant behaviour should therefore be seen as part and parcel of the ‘economy of make-shifts’, a term coined by Olwen Hufton in the 1970s.751

While it is very likely that many people stole in seventeenth-century Tallinn, the people who actually faced accusations of theft in court shared certain characteristics. Mostly they were men. Whether they were serfs from the Estonian countryside or people of low social standing from Finland or Sweden, they were outsiders. Often, they came from among the poorest and most vulnerable groups of society. Their lifestyle was precarious and often involved moving from one place to another in search of employment. While some had families, many had left them behind in their search for economic opportunities or simple survival. Even if they had successfully managed to be in someone’s employment for some months or even years, it did not mean a secure life, as seasonality of work and violence often forced them to leave before their contract ended. Thus, regardless of the seeming security that having a job and a roof over one’s head offered, many still chose opportunistic stealing or running away from their employer. Due to their low position in society and outsider status, but also their forced mobility in search of a job, meant that the thin social capital they might have managed to create through odd jobs here and there did not usually hold up when hardship struck.

While opportunistic stealing was surely a part of the survival strategies for many people, another thread that was often woven into people’s stories about
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how and why they stole was a desire to have nice clothes. Although they most often did not dwell on these issues at length, it is evident that many people wanted to have a choice of what to wear and when presented with one, chose whatever appealed to their sense of beauty and aesthetics. In 1700, one peasant who had made off with two chests without knowing what was inside, said in court that he had ‘worn out’ the two neckerchiefs of imported Silesian linen that had turned out to be in one of the chests. The rest of the contents he had either lost or left somewhere.\footnote{Jurgen Murat and his daughter Catharina Murat contra Richmo Hans, 11 July 1700, TLA.230.1.Aa130, f. 265v.} Ten years earlier, two other men had carried off a chest and, opening it, had found money and clothes inside. They took the money and one of the men, called Mart, took one shirt, and they left the remaining clothes together with the chest lying in a yard.\footnote{Jürgen Hinrich Nieländer contra Aimo Hannusse Poick Mart, 8 November 1690, TLA.230.1.Aa88/b, f. 466r.} Later Mart spent two Rtl of the stolen money to have a fur coat made for himself. In 1699, a constable’s wife called Margaret went to retrieve her stolen linens from a thief and noticed that the linens were dirty, as if they had been worn on the body. The thief readily gave her back the stolen things but asked her not to report the theft.\footnote{Herman Bluhm contra Simon Tönniesson and Simon Pehhe, 2 January 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 4v–5r.} Rather than being satisfied with just any kind of clothes, people chose what they liked or needed in the moment. The choice to wear stolen garments may not have been wise but it shows that people of poorer background did not just accept the materiality that was forced on them from above and also wanted to actively shape their appearances.

That nice things captivated people and commanded attention is also obvious from the fact that the behaviour that thieves exhibited was often in direct opposition to what was prescribed by the law, what was expected of someone of their social position or even what was wise. In 1699, Maria Matztochter went on a real shopping spree after she had stolen thirteen Rtl from her master.\footnote{Johan Paulsen contra Maria Matztochter, 27 September 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 408–411.} She bought two lining shirts, some yards of ribbon and some yards of lace from one shop and black Venetian cloth for a cap, a pair of cordovan shoes, and a piece of Silesian linen from another shop. Sometime later, another maid servant testified that Maria had also bought some yards of rasch, a pair of stockings and two gilded rings.\footnote{Johan Paulsen contra Maria Matztochter, 4 October 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 422v.} Matztochter also testified to having bought some yards of blue and some yards of black ribbon. In 1670, another maid servant Marry Matthiestochter stole money on three different occasions.\footnote{Matthies Bagge contra Marry Matthiestochter, 15 August 1670, TLA.230.1.Aa63, f. 184r–185v, the same case also in TLA.230.1.Bj28/1, f. 188r–189r.} With the stolen money, she bought a bodice, a linen skirt, a piece of Silesian linen, a bonnet and a neckerchief, another piece of linen, a pair of gloves, and some red ribbon. Theft was illegal. But sumptuary law, too, wanted to curb servants’ excessive consumption
through regulating their employment terms and strictly limiting the kinds of
clothes they could receive from their masters. So, it was not only about having
clothes and accessories that might have obscured or concealed their social posi-
tion, but it was also the acquisitiveness and desire demonstrated by women, es-
pecially in relation to clothes, that seemed to defy good order. They were not
supposed to possess the necessary means to acquire something expensive or buy
a lot of things within a short period of time, but the sumptuary law also made it
very clear that they were not even supposed to desire these things in the first
place.

Recognisability was also a key question with respect to the materiality that
surrounded poorer people. In 1699, Margareta Jacobs got dragged into court be-
cause she had bought sixteen stolen handkerchiefs from a maidservant, removed
the silk embroidered initials, and then sold them to another maidservant. The
court reprimanded her for not immediately reporting the theft, as the quality of
the things, the silk embroideries and the fact that they were very cheap, should
have alerted her to the fact that they were stolen. A woman named Anno, accused
of being a fence in 1667, was reprimanded by the court for not having returned
a sack with stolen clothes that had been left in her shop.\footnote{Gebhard Himselius contra Anno Jakob Heiko’s wife, 26 March 1667, TLA.230.1.Bj28/I, f. 27r–
27v.} The court fully ex-
pected people from poorer backgrounds to participate in the surveillance of other
people, to observe and understand appearances and to detect if the materiality
was sending suspicious signals. The court’s reasoning shows how much the ideal
of a legible social order was built on the assumed cooperation of people from all
levels of society and how connecting the right material indicators to right people
was a necessary precondition for it to function.

People were observant about the clothes of others, and material signs that did
not seem to be suitable for the person, drew attention. Soldier’s wife Cathrin,
who received some of the cloth that Ako Hinrichsohn had stolen, observed that
it was expensive cloth that did not suit poor folks.\footnote{Jost Dunte contra Ako Hinrichsohn, 8 November 1623, TLA.230.1.Aa48, f. 8v.} When Ako showed the sto-
len things to his sister, Margret told him that the satin and the gold thread would
bring him misery, or so both women later claimed in court.\footnote{Jost Dunte contra Ako Hinrichsohn, 8 November 1623, TLA.230.1.Aa48, f. 8v.} One innkeeper’s
wife got in big trouble when she tried to sell a piece of silver at a burgomaster’s
house, claiming that she had gotten it in exchange for some money and shirts.\footnote{Michael Paulsen contra Anna Jochemstochter, 25 November 1668, TLA.230.1.Bj28/I, f. 85r–
85v.} The burgomaster got suspicious and hauled her into court. Another man, who
accused his manservant of theft, claimed that the servant had acquired shirts and
neckerchiefs made of very fine linen, although when he had come to the master’s
household, he looked ‘quite miserable and naked’.\footnote{Jürgen von Renteln contra Hinrich Michelsohn, 5 January 1699, TLA.230.1.Aa97, f. 7r.} Apparently, not only wear-
ing but also possessing and making commercial exchanges with certain goods
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were transgressive if the person handling these goods was of unsuitable social background. The general understanding among rich and poor alike was that certain people had no business with certain clothes.

A final thing we must consider in this section is the way illegal transactions related to clothes could create new networks of friends, acquaintances and kin, and affirm old ones. The reliance of especially maidservants on friends and acquaintances shows that they were skilled in cultivating personal networks in order to get access to, exchange and share goods. Anna Cathrina Blancken, when accused of theft, said that she had given some silver and black ribbons to the maid of the justice of peace. To another maidservant, she claimed that she merely lent a bodice, as otherwise it would have simply been lying in the household. The discussion above surely shows that people could both accept and reject clothes, and so create space to manoeuvre within this constricted world. Need was an important motive in theft, but it was not the only one, as proximity to luxury and excitement for a new garment would also have compelled some people to steal. Desire to establish reciprocal friendships could also motivate people's subversive practices. The interactions of the poor and the destitute in Tallinn show that clothes created group belonging, albeit in a different manner than prescribed by the authorities. Networks of thieves and peddlers, innkeepers and maidservants that coalesced around clothes demonstrate just how important material culture was for creating this alternative social order.

8.2.2 Compelled to consume?

Many of the activities discussed above were motivated by desire – desire to survive, desire to eat, desire to make friends, desire to have nice things to wear. But in a society that accorded great importance to appropriate visual display, individual wants and desires were always contingent upon legislation and societal norms. Indeed, clothes could also evoke tension and aversion where they were meant to evoke desire.

Michael Güntherus was born in 1627 in the town of Chemnitz near Dresden. He was educated in various schools in Zwickau, Halle, Braunschweig, Homburg and Lübeck. After graduating from Königsberg in 1652 he worked as a tutor in Courland. In 1659, the same year David Gallus died, Güntherus went to Tallinn to become a collega or teacher of the younger classes at the gymnasium. He died in 1696. The connection between the two learned men is important because in

763 On this, see especially Rublack 2001, pp. 92–134.
767 Heero & Köiv 2016, p. 204. The chronicle written by Michael Güntherus closely resembles the one left by his father-in-law David Gallus. Since Gallus left almost all of his belongings to his only surviving daughter Anna, it is likely that the manuscript ended up with Güntherus and he decided to pen his own biographical chronicle. Some time at the end of the seventeenth century the two manuscripts were bound together. See also Heero & Köiv 2016, p. 203.
November 1663 Güntherus married Anna Gallus, the only surviving child of David Gallus, in the Great Guild hall. From his own description he appears to have been very conflicted about the event. The wedding far exceeded Güntherus’ means, he noted bitterly, yet his mother-in-law, with whom Anna Gallus and her custodians had still not resolved their inheritance dispute, forced him to make the wedding overly extravagant. Consequently, he was forced to borrow 200 Rtl from merchant Christoff Koch and eventually pawn the gold and silver he had inherited from his family as well as to sell the silver items the couple had received as wedding gifts to pay back the debt. His financial problems were aggravated by the fact that his bride-to-be had still not received her inheritance from her custodians. The wedding costs were so significant, he wrote in retrospect, that it took him ten years to pay them off.

Güntherus’ chronicle is in no way an account book, and in fact there are almost no accounts, except for the list of expenses connected to the wedding and a later list of expenses connected to improvements to his house. Therefore, he must have considered his first marriage and the wedding a significant event that warranted careful documentation. What was it that put such a dent in his wallet? According to his calculation, the wedding had cost 810 Rtl 2 D and 1 wrst. Expenses on fabrics and accessories accounted for 356 Rtl 1 wrst (see Appendix 3), making this the single largest expense. Expenses on jewellery amounted to 92 Rtl 1 D and the remaining sum was spent on food, including exotic fruits and spices, wine, and salaries for people who were involved in the wedding in some manner. He thus spent almost half of the wedding budget on clothing. To put the sum into context, the house that his deceased father-in-law David Gallus had bought in 1649 by St. Olaf’s Church had cost him 350 Rtl.

The complexity of emotions that clothes evoked is illustrated by the fact that, despite the negative feelings he harboured towards the excessive spending, Güntherus still took time to carefully indicate each element of the couple’s clothes made for their marriage. The list is nothing short of impressive. Both the bride and groom had two sets of clothes made, one for the wedding and another one for future use. While Güntherus had one set made of silk, the other one was made of high-quality woollen fabric. Both of the bride’s gowns were made of silk, one of black silk and the other of black silk and crimson-in-yellow taffeta. Furthermore, Güntherus acquired imported linen from the Netherlands and Silesia for the couple’s shirts and other linen garments. The list also includes enormously expensive imported sable furs for a variety of headwear. The garments were to have a wealth of decorations such as bands, ribbons, braids, buttons,
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laces and edges, all of which would have made the already expensive attire even more elaborate. The ornamentation was to a great degree also made of silk and some of the ribbons were made with gold and silver thread. The smaller items in the list included boot cuffs, gloves, silk stockings in a variety of colours, hats, caps, shoes and slippers both for the bridal couple and others in their household. Finally, the careful attention that was paid to the construction of the wardrobe is indicated by the fact that silk rather than linen thread was used for some of the garments.

Through the detailed list of goods written down by Güntherus there emerges the idea of a cycle of consumption connected to certain important moments in a person’s life. It is also obvious that while the bride’s wardrobe was the costlier of the two, the garments Güntherus had made for himself were neither cheap nor bland. Getting married for the first time was an equally important step for him. The married couple was a central building block of early modern society, and marriage was a religious, social and economic union of two people. Often, weddings necessitated large expenditure and preparations could take months, something to which Güntherus’ list certainly attests. The sheer number of garments and accessories indicate that not all of them would have been worn at the wedding festivities, which also indicates the careful planning that went into the couple’s future material life. Weddings were a key stage in the life-cycle of clothes as well as of their owners, but they were also fraught with tension. In Tallinn, as we have seen, parents took great care to ensure that their daughters would get married in a way befitting their social standing and at the same time the town council often issued regulations to curb excessive expenditure on weddings.

The expenditure on garments and accessories, but also on other things connected to the wedding indicates that Güntherus and his wife were exactly the kind of people to whom such regulation was directed. Yet, this couple, like many other people in the seventeenth century, defies easy categorisation. Anna Gallus’ mother Anna Gutzleff was a merchant’s daughter, and although her father David Gallus himself had been a teacher and cantor, he had also been admitted to the Great Guild in 1643. He also had many friends among the wealthy and the influential. Güntherus, by contrast, was an outsider marrying up, and while he appears to have had regular interactions with several influential families, it does not appear from his chronicle that he himself was ever admitted to the Great Guild in connection to his marriage or to his extended family. At best, his position can be described as ambiguous.

The practical and rational expenditures on the couple’s house in Güntherus’ chronicle stand in stark contrast to the sumptuous list of expenses for their lavish
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wedding. But while in retrospect he may have considered it irrational and unnecessary, it was in fact of the utmost importance that he got married not just in any kind of clothes, but the right kind of clothes, in order to claim recognition in the groups towards which he was aspiring. Viewed in light of the sumptuary law issued two years later and its restrictions directed at merchants, expenditures on the Güntherus wedding were on the edge of being too sumptuous. He had complete outfits made of silk both for himself and his wife, something the couple would have later been able to wear only on certain occasions. The sables were almost certainly too expensive, as were the various ornaments meant for their dress (for merchants, the law forbade all decorations with gold and silver thread and for their wives the use of decorations sewn with gold and silver was similarly limited). The vibrant colour palette of white, black, crimson-in-yellow, orange, yellow, red, peach blossom, white-in-red, black-in-gold would have been a magnificent sight to behold. While Michael Güntherus retrospectively claimed that such apparel was not his preference, in reality it was necessary if he were ever to claim a place among the elite of town councillors, merchants and professionals. In a society where clothes manifested aspirations and anchored social prestige, they were much more than anonymous fungible and exchangeable items.

8.2.3 Bespoke not fungible

The fungibility of clothes in seventeenth-century society was reflected in the fact that they could be desired, exchanged and stolen, however, this transaction did not empty them of their complex social meanings and visual power. The two sections above discussed how clothes exerted a force field with respect to individuals’ desire to have nice things and consequently how that affected the legibility of social order. This final section will look in more depth at desire. Focusing on one case that is essentially about the most fundamental element of clothes – their materiality – this section will examine the fungibility of clothes in the context of producer-consumer relations when ordering bespoke garments.

In the winter of 1692/1693, organ builder Georg Schmidt had ordered a set of clothes from Bengt Holm, a tailor on the Dome Hill. The set would consist of a vest/waistcoat, and an overgown. The men had agreed that Holm would make the waistcoat after ‘the newest fashion’ and to that purpose, Schmidt had provided the tailor with three buckskins, two of them rather large, buttons and silk (presumably for lining) as per the tailor’s request. It was Schmidt’s understanding that the overgown was also to be made according to current fashion.
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Since Holm mentioned journeymen working for him, it is not entirely clear whether he made the clothes with the journeymen’s help or whether he entrusted the making of the garments entirely into their hands.

When he got the clothes from Holm, however, Schmidt discovered that everything that could have gone wrong had indeed gone wrong. Apparently, the tailor had made them in an entirely different fashion than was customary at the time. Holm had not used the silk and instead of using leather for the pockets, he had made them from coarse linen, sending part of the leather back to Schmidt. Instead of using silk thread, he had used ordinary thread and he had not made any buttonholes, presumably going for a simpler solution, perhaps loops. He had also put on two different kinds of brown and yellow buttons. Schmidt could have looked past these issues but what really angered him was that, instead of the buckskin he had given Holm to use for the sleeves, the latter had used some other kind of leather that had been cut in a very sloppy manner and that according to Schmidt was not worth ten cr. Additionally, he had kept the leather, which had cost Schmidt five d. and which was meant for the sleeves, for himself. These pernicious deeds had gone right to Schmidt’s heart, he wrote in his petition to the Castle Court or Burggericht on the Dome Hill.

Being dissatisfied with the situation, yet still wanting to ensure that he actually had a legitimate reason to submit a complaint to the court, Schmidt started looking around for ways to establish whether or not he had been treated fairly. He decided to withhold Holm’s payment for the time being, and he invited the tailor over to his house so that they could inspect his work together and come to some kind of compromise. Holm refused. Schmidt then took the clothes to the tailor’s guild in the lower town in order to establish whether their quality was sufficient and whether he had been treated fairly. There, according to his petition from 1694, he encountered great injustice and despite the one Rtl he had paid to get help, he received none. In addition, he felt himself verbally attacked, as he was essentially told in a very hostile manner to remain silent about his problem. Schmidt’s problems were aggravated by the fact that, while he was busy trying to establish some kind of legitimate basis in order to claim compensation for the ruined clothes, Holm had run out of patience and sued him for defamation in the Castle Court. He argued that Schmidt had insulted his honour and not paid him his wages. He demanded that Schmidt pay him his salary, eighteen Rtl as damages, and make a ‘declaration of honour’.

All of this information comes from Schmidt’s petition to the Castle Court, where he sought redress for the ‘great insult and injury’ he felt had been done to him by essentially opening a new case against Holm. Therefore, it should be kept

776 It is my rather strong impression here that the expression Schneider-Amt in der Stadt refers to the lower town because the inhabited area on the Dome Hill was usually referred to as Domberg or just Dom.

777 Ehrenerklärung – a solemn declaration that one person, who has attacked the other person’s honour, acknowledges the other person as honourable, see http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/Adelung?lemma=ehrenerklaerung (accessed 17 April 2020).
in mind that this was a letter written by a very upset man who thought he had been wronged yet somehow found himself dishonoured and on the wrong side of the law. Schmidt was naturally not satisfied with the fact that, while he had not even had time to put his case together, so to speak, the court had already managed to rule in Holm’s favour. Why, wrote Schmidt, did Holm accuse him of injury to his honour, if two of Holm’s own guild brothers had admitted in the presence of two honest men that Holm had indeed insulted Schmidt and said that he thought Schmidt a dishonest man? Schmidt’s claim appears to have been backed up by some evidence. In a letter from July 1693, written at Schmidt’s request, two men named Gottfried Scholtz and Christoffer Dalwitzer stated that they had heard from tailor Sebold Schmidt (no apparent relation to the organ builder) that Holm had told him, Sebold Schmidt, that he held the organ builder for no honest man until he proved that Holm had indeed exchanged the buckskin in the waistcoat. Schmidt ends his letter with a plea that ‘I will leave it to all righteous minds to judge, if this kind of behaviour should not offend an honest man!’

In his letter, Schmidt also submitted a formal accusation against Holm, which consisted of four parts. Firstly, Holm had ruined the clothes that Schmidt had ordered (including exchanging one of the buckskins), which he was ready to prove with the actual garments. Schmidt demanded that, before he paid Holm his wages, Holm deliver him clothes made exactly according to the style in which he had ordered them. Secondly, Holm had injured his honour by calling him a scoundrel openly in court and later repeating the insult. Thirdly, he demanded a public apology from Holm for having insulted and injured his honour on at least two occasions. Finally, he demanded financial compensation for all the expenses and damages he had suffered.

Schmidt continued his petitioning to the court where he persisted in his complaints against Holm, which resulted in Holm submitting two letters of his own to the court. Even though the court had ruled in favour of Holm in the case he had submitted against Schmidt, still in 1694 he appears not to have received his salary. In the first rather brief letter, he explained that there had already been one court case, and the court ruled in his favour. He also pointed out that Schmidt should bring any subsequent claims he had in connection to the quality of the clothes to the tailors’ guild, very likely because he was sure that they were equally tired of the organ builder and would not give a negative assessment of the garments made in Holm’s workshop.

In the longer reply, Holm emphasised that while Schmidt was trying to make it look as if his new case was about something else, the first case had indeed dealt with all of his accusations and were one to look into the minutes of that case, it would be obvious. Schmidt had apparently claimed that there had been procedural errors in the first court since the garments Holm had made had not been discussed at all. As the clothes were a central part in his complaint, the case had been unjust towards him. However, Holm refuted this in his letter by saying that Schmidt had simply been unprepared in that case. The insults and the garments, according to his understanding, were two sides of the very same coin. The letter
based on hearsay that Schmidt had submitted as evidence, he reminded the court, had not been deemed admissible. More importantly, Holm pointed out that Schmidt directly insulted the court and their decision-making abilities. With the first case, the court had prohibited Schmidt from disparaging the work Holm had done for him. By denying the claims against him and by wanting the court to take up the case again, Schmidt was not only insulting Holm again but also ignoring the court’s decision. Therefore, Holm concluded that Schmidt’s claim was without merit. Whether Holm had in fact ruined the clothes or not he did not mention.

The interaction between Schmidt and Holm highlights the fundamentally different nature of the relationship between the maker and the wearer in the seventeenth century. Turning cloth into garments was a complicated process that involved many stages and many different parties. Customers were interested and actively involved in all stages of the production process and there was widespread popular knowledge about clothes, their material qualities and fashions that permeated all levels of society. Even more importantly, the case shows the kind of significance clothes had for their wearers. Having a new garment made was not only a lengthy process, it involved financial but also emotional investment. In addition to the cost of making the garment, as mentioned previously, Schmidt had also spent money to acquire the buttons and the buckskins, presumably because he wanted to ensure that the quality of the garments met his standard. After he had received the garments, he had to spend money again in order to try to prove that they were of substandard quality. The close proximity of the tailor did not guarantee that the customer was happy with the result and this case highlights how the guild could serve as protection for other representatives of the trade so that accusations of substandard work were left unsatisfied and the honour and integrity of the trade as a whole was left unscathed.

Furthermore, we should not underestimate the personal and emotional investment Schmidt had made in his clothes. That the court case spans two years should alert us to how seriously people took these matters in the seventeenth century. Schmidt’s unhappiness went far beyond dissatisfaction with the garment itself or the money that he had paid. It was also about honour and Schmidt had been deeply affronted. Firstly, he had invested in the waistcoat and the overgown, hoping these specific garments would be manifestation of his aesthetic sensibilities, his sense of fashion as well as propriety. When he received them from Holm, he thought them unrecognisable. In all likelihood they were garments of sorts, but they were not the garments that he had ordered or wanted. They were not the garments in the image he had created of himself and if he did not recognise himself in the clothes, how were others to do that, had he decided to wear them? Clearly, if he could not have the specific garments that he wanted and desired, it was better to be without. What the substandard clothes had come to represent for him was not just the wasted time and money. They also served as a material  

---

778 On this see also Vincent 2002, p. 254.
reminder of having been dishonoured and called a scoundrel. This case vividly demonstrates how once desired clothes became a symbol of the transformed substance of their owner.

8.3 Conclusion

In the seventeenth century, wealth was stored in clothes. Clothes did not just symbolise wealth, they were a type of fungible wealth. This chapter has shown that in the seventeenth century, there was broad agreement in Tallinn about the monetary functions of clothes. With limited circulation of money, clothes could have a monetary function in three different ways: they were often used as part of wages or given instead of money to remunerate wage labour of servants and labourers, they were also used more generally to pay for a variety of goods, and finally they were used in credit relations to pay a debt or compel the debtor to pay theirs. It is also evident that as part of their survival strategies, many people illegally appropriated clothes. Clothes were fungible because they held intrinsic and fairly stable value that was tied especially to the quality of the fabric. They appear to have been especially important for people below the social elite, as lack of coin meant that they had to find alternative ways to participate in commercial exchanges, secure credit or simply survive.

And yet, this chapter has primarily shown how clothes were not like money and that their fungibility could be called conditional at best. I have shown many times over that clothes could not be separated from the social context in which they were used, exchanged, stolen or commissioned. The idea of recognisability and social legibility that rested in clothes meant that the materiality of poor and socially marginal groups was especially intensely scrutinised. The question of who was wearing what was important, but ownership and trading were similarly viewed within a framework where clothes constantly asserted social distinction. The question of hierarchy appears especially clearly in the case of wage payments. Using clothes as wages or other types of payment only appeared in cases where the person who was paid was of lower social standing than the person who was doing the paying or when the parties were of similar social background. A situation in which one would attempt to compensate someone who was one’s social superior with clothes was unthinkable. In the seventeenth century, clothes resisted abstraction and absence of meaning. As we saw in the second part, clothes were fungible, but they were never empty of meaning in the way coin often was. That is because they elicited intense emotional reactions and had social effects on the people. Clothes created identities and allegiances but also exclusion.

---

779 Jones & Stallybrass 2000, p. 27.
780 Valentin Groebner has observed of late fifteenth-century Germany that while it would have been entirely usual to bribe a town official with wine, food and money, a person would never have paid their servant in wine and fish. Conversely, while a servant could be paid in clothes, it would not be suitable as a bribe or trying to compensate a town councillor, see Groebner 1993, p. 263.
Through their fungibility on the one hand and their particularity on the other hand, clothes both created and manifested complex ideas and practices of ordering early modern society.
CHAPTER 9
Conclusion

The early modern period, as the phrase indicates, was a transitional period. On the one hand, it was a period of great social inequality as well as hierarchically ordered relationships, with limited material resources available to most people. There was also a broad commitment to the belief that a person’s position within the hierarchy should be visible and ‘readable’ from their appearance, and especially from their clothes. Sumptuary laws were an important tool of social legibility: they attempted both to uphold the existing social order and to match certain sartorial signs to the different groups in society. Daniel Roche has called the resulting clothing culture an *ancien régime* of fashion, characterised by ‘inertia and immobility, especially among the lower classes and in the countryside; a coincidence of costume and social position; [and] a desire for control’. According to Roche, the system had some dynamism in it due to rising urbanisation and commercial expansion, but it was really only after 1700 that change really took off. Moreover, he implies that social and economic dynamism was confined mainly to Western Europe.

At the same time, several historians have demonstrated the profound material changes that took place in the early modern period. The steady expansion of commerce and the global textile trade meant that most people’s clothing became more cosmopolitan and reliant on developments taking place elsewhere, and this process appears to have happened earlier than previously thought, and certainly before 1700. This more optimistic interpretation sees people gradually become consumers, people who used individual choice and appearances to express a variety of identities and aesthetic styles. Fashion ceased to be the prerogative only of social elites and ‘decorative haberdashery [. . .] added novelty even to old apparel’. The production and supply of clothes also underwent radical changes, with hitherto exclusive goods seeping down to the masses and a wide variety of ready-made clothes being distributed through a wide variety of informal networks. In this ever faster-moving world, sumptuary laws quickly became obsolete, as authorities all over Europe struggled to keep up with an increasingly complex system of production, consumption and dissemination of new fashions. One

783 Lemire 2000, p. 394.
784 Lemire 1997.
influential school of thought has even argued that increased demand for consumer goods, including clothes, caused people – women especially – to become more ‘industrious’, so that they could earn more money to shop.\textsuperscript{785}

My dissertation examines this complex relationship between social order and clothes in early modern Europe where, on the one hand, order determined and influenced sartorial expression and where, on the other hand, clothes influenced that order by affirming, mediating and also subverting it. The contributions of historians discussed above make evident the fruitfulness of a dynamic approach. Accordingly, clothes should not be seen as passive signifiers of the order that was to be signified, but rather as agents that played a role in shaping the early modern society in their own right. Clothes are particularly suitable for a study of material culture because they were connected to people in ways that few other goods were. Because clothes covered human nakedness, they had an intimate relationship to people and their identities. Both luxury objects and necessities, clothing shaped human experience on a daily basis and persistently raised problems that no other material goods did.

Tallinn is especially well-suited to a study of this kind. As much of the life in seventeenth-century Tallinn was organised around the corporations and their households, it provides a very clear example of how a hierarchical social order worked both on the normative level, as a principle according to which society should be organised, and on the level of everyday political, social and economic practice. Just as importantly, Tallinn can serve as a test-case for many of Roche’s claims about an ancien régime of fashion. Because of its clear guild-based political and social organisation, Tallinn is a good locus for re-examining Roche’s claim that early modern society was strictly hierarchical and, consequently, characterised in most cases by inertia. It ticks another of Roche’s boxes in the sense that Tallinn’s economy was on the decline: it lacked the urban dynamism towards which Roche occasionally gestures. Finally, Tallinn clearly is not in Western Europe. Looked at from the vantage point of the major commercial centres of France, England and the like, where Roche glimpsed an economy on the verge of taking off, Tallinn seems peripheral. Though it was not entirely removed from the wider world, it was hardly in the fashion vanguard either. Thus, one underlying aim of this study has been to assess whether early modern cities – even when they were traditionally hierarchical, in decline, and located outside Western Europe – were really as static and unchanging as Roche suggests.

The empirical analysis in this dissertation is based on a range of source material. The diversity of sources has been especially important from a methodological perspective. As normative sources, sumptuary laws enable us to examine the authorities’ efforts to control appearances and define a visual order. In the first half of this study, I looked at sumptuary laws in order to see how social order was imagined discursively and how the ideal visualisation of this order looked. But in order to fulfil the aims of the second half of the dissertation – to examine

\textsuperscript{785} Vries 2008.
both how social order emerged on the everyday level and how clothes became dynamic agents in shaping it – it was necessary to examine other sources. Inventories and wills, also frequently used in studies on early modern dress, have thus been enormously useful for my study. Not only do they reveal the material resources available to early modern people, but they also show the variety of ways in which clothes circulated and materialised relations between people. Finally, court material added two further important dimensions to this study, making visible both everyday practices and otherwise marginal groups and ensuring that this dissertation did not only concern itself with the social elites and middling groups. Although both wills and court cases are mediated sources governed by specific linguistic and judicial conventions, they nevertheless greatly enhance our understanding of how people looked at others and how that shaped their understanding and experience of order.

9.1 Summary of the results

In the next section I will sketch out the main empirical results of this dissertation from two perspectives, the normative perspective and the perspective of everyday practice. I demonstrate in the thesis that in early modern Tallinn, as in many other places at the time, there was a discursive ideal of a hierarchical social order, which was meant to be visualised through appearances. While social legibility was a central motive in the regulation of appearances, in the seventeenth century it could not be uncoupled from religious ideals and economic concerns over people’s excessive expenditure. The order that emerged from sumptuary laws was influenced by but did not entirely correspond to the guild-based social organisation of the town. In addition to guild membership, people were most obviously categorised by their gender, their burgher status, their access to political power, their occupation and length of time in it, their ethnicity and their marital status. These same sumptuary laws also suggest development over time. Throughout most of the seventeenth century, the social order appears to have grown more and more complex; sartorial regulation certainly spoke to an increasing number of groups, and these groups were more and more finely differentiated in terms of how they were supposed to dress. However, for reasons that are still not entirely clear, efforts to represent the changing social order through sartorial regulation suddenly disintegrated in 1690. Sartorial regulation aimed at creating a clear visual hierarchy was done away with except for the distinction between servants and non-servants. While the ideal of social hierarchy certainly did not disappear, the laws now became increasingly concerned with curbing expenditure on luxury consumption regardless of one’s social position.

In the seventeenth century, sumptuary laws appear to have had two simultaneous goals. The first goal was to clarify which groups of people were most threatening to the legibility of the social order and to, so to speak, ‘fix’ their status. Zooming in on these groups, however, shows the second goal, which was to
place people in an intricate and layered social hierarchy determined by multiple factors, with these changing over time. Rather than reducing a complex social reality to a static system, in their efforts to visualise hierarchy the town council appears to have attempted to keep up with it. While sumptuary laws thus point to continued attempts to strive towards an orderly society, they also reveal the richness of the order they tried to represent. A fixed order may have been an ideal voiced in the laws but change and dynamism were inherent in the sumptuary system and it was clearly capable of adjusting to change.

Because the relationship between clothes and social order was never articulated in just one way in the sartorial regulations, in this dissertation I also sought to clarify precisely how social distinctions were to be translated into the look, feel and social appropriateness of actual clothing. There were certain elements that remained stable over the course of the seventeenth century, above all concern with the quality of the fabric (and by extension, also its price) and the types of ornaments that decorated people’s clothes. The basic idea was that how fine or coarse one’s dress would be and how it was to be decorated was supposed to depend upon the person’s position in the hierarchy. However, a closer analysis revealed that the system was infinitely more complex than this. Just as one’s position in social hierarchy was a result of different factors weighed against each other, this position was to be visualised through an intricate and layered interplay of different material aspects like fabric, ornaments, the location of accessories on the garment, but also when and where specific clothes would be worn. The fundamental capacity of clothes to create distinction was never in question, but the groups who were supposed to be distinguished through appearances and in what particular sartorial manner kept changing. The interaction between clothes and social order was so complex because there was all the time not one but two moving elements of this ideal – dress and the social order itself.

Examining the relationship of social order and clothes on the level of everyday practice in the early modern period has also made it clear that clothes did create difference but in an unpredictable way that often stood in tension with the ideal of how society should be organised. While clothes were intended to display social order in one specific way, in reality this relationship was much harder to parse. A comparison between sumptuary laws and inventories of Tallinn showed that the three key material markers of status according to the sumptuary laws were fur, silk and accessories. While fur did not create a difference between people in real life, the two others did do that but along different lines than those established in sumptuary laws. The sumptuary laws tried to limit silk clothes only to the upper reaches of the town hierarchy, but examination of inventories shows that town councillors, merchants, artisans and professionals – as well as their wives – all owned silk garments. Elites and sub-elites do not seem to have been very different from each other in terms of what they owned, despite the complex gradations the sumptuary laws attempted to establish. Access to silk, did, however, separate councillors, burghers and professionals as well as their family members from
other groups of people like journeymen, labourers and servants. Similarly, but-
tons as a specific group of accessories created a difference but these separated
town councillors and merchants from artisans and the professional group who
in turn were separated from journeymen and labourers. Clothes could and did
create nuanced differences between the people who wore them, but the discurs-
ive ideal of the sumptuary laws often followed a different model.

To make this picture even more complex, a closer look at inventories reveals
two things. Firstly, intra-group differences among individuals of roughly similar
social status appear to have been more dramatic than between different groups
of people. Secondly, how people chose to invest in their appearances and ward-
robes did not always conform to the expectations created by sumptuary laws or
to the idea of hierarchical consumption. This reminds us that, although condi-
tioned by ideas of social hierarchy and its appropriate visualisation, we cannot
ignore the role played by individual tastes and consumption strategies in the cre-
ation of order. Additionally, the versatile ways in which clothes could create dif-
ference meant that the borders between different groups and categories of people
became flexible and negotiable, at times hazy, and depended on a variety of fac-
tors. These boundaries should thus be seen as a dynamic and negotiable space,
in which people could modify and adapt their strategies based on their means,
their preferences and the opportunities available to them.

I have further shown that, while on the normative level, clothes were thought
to have one primary aim, that is to say the visualisation of order, on the everyday
level clothes not only created difference in a much more complex way but often-
times did the exact opposite. Instead of clarifying order and creating distance,
through their circulation they created ties between people, including people of
different statuses. A mundane, but still crucial part of everyone’s life, people of-
ten used clothes as part of an emotional economy of gift and exchange within
families, households and friendship networks. People did not only ponder what
significance to assign each relationship and how most appropriately to materialise
and memorialise it, but they also paid attention to the ways that difference or
similarity in social position could be properly acknowledged. It is evident that
ideas of propriety and social position did influence how people materially nego-
tiated their social network. But despite an ideal of hierarchy, in practice emotions
and relationships defied easy categorisation, and they could warrant individual
strategies that were at odds with what was expected, customary, or consonant
with the sumptuary laws. Whether it was given as wages or as a token of appreci-
ation, a garment given by a master or mistress to a maidservant could both
clarify the hierarchy and affirm the position of both parties, if it was appropriate,
or it could subvert the order, if its quality was too fine. Thus, some people left
disproportionately fine garments to those who could not lawfully wear them in
public or disproportionately large amounts of clothes to those who should not
have inherited them. There was no one prescribed way for people to relate to
their clothes, which attests to how clothes could actively affirm order or subvert
it.
There was yet another way in which clothes were an unpredictable marker of social rank on the everyday level of practice. Because they were a fungible alternative to money, they enabled various kinds of commercial exchanges, and those exchanges sometimes transgressed the division between normative social groups. Clothes were relatively more expensive than they are today. But it was also their portability and relatively stable value over long periods of time, coupled with specific market conditions that made them useful as a medium of exchange. Their value and agency as fungibles can be seen through the widespread practices of using clothes as wages and in other commercial transactions and credit relations. They were also frequently stolen. However, despite being fungible, clothes remained firmly embedded in social networks and loaded with deep-rooted ideas about the relationship between a person and an appropriate type of materiality. Through these commercial and other transactions, it became apparent that much of clothes’ complexity in the seventeenth century stemmed from the fact that they resisted being anchored to one singular function, whether it was to manifest status or help poor people survive. People desired nice clothes and small luxuries, and took steps to obtain them by fair means or foul, even when doing so transgressed the rules; however, at the same time, the idea that certain types of materiality should correspond to rank remained ever-present. Clothes actively resisted being anonymous and empty, and being unproblematically exchanged for other goods of the same value and type. They resisted being simple signifiers.

9.2 Concluding discussion

The ideal of social legibility carried with it a number of assumptions about people, the social order and clothes. For example, it assumed that people would easily recognise themselves in the externally assigned group or category and that the latter would not change drastically over time. Similarly, it presumed that people were in basic agreement on the way clothes corresponded to or signified that social order, and that they would assent to this in their own sartorial practices. However, the assumption of a static, clearly legible, consensual and largely unchanging social order was belied by the need to keep issuing new sumptuary laws that addressed new groups or subgroups and put in place new regulations about clothes, fabric and accessories. The repeated attempts to separate certain well-defined groups of people from each other through appearances suggest both that these measures had limited success and that there was never just one way of categorising a person or a group. The same thing was true for clothes, as there was never just one way in which the sartorial order was to be materialised.

Although sumptuary laws are a widespread phenomenon, previous researchers have tended to doubt their effectiveness. But I argue that sumptuary laws were not just a dead letter with no bearing on people’s lives. It would also be an error to think that the hierarchical order was only enforced and upheld by elites. People on all levels of the society not only were expected to but actually did
participate in the creation and negotiation of hierarchy. The difference lay in the fact that on the level of everyday practice, distinction was not always created in the same way and did not have the same function. Moreover, on the everyday level, manifesting hierarchy was not always the first thing on people’s minds. People’s concerns with materiality were much more complex, as appearances helped them to relate to strangers and navigate daily life in Tallinn, but also to organise their own personal networks, thus creating an alternative order of sorts. The normative order and social practices of ordering were surely dependent on each other and without doubt influenced each other, but they were not the same and they did not always function in the same manner.

For this reason, it is not wise to measure the effectiveness of sumptuary laws in terms of how many people were brought to court and convicted of sumptuary offences. Since, as this dissertation has shown, the idea of social hierarchy visualised through appearances was a deep-rooted phenomenon then we must also accept that sartorial ideals probably had an influence on people’s daily lives and how they thought about their own and others’ appearances, even if this did not happen according to the model provided by the authorities. Even though many places in Europe stopped issuing sumptuary laws in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it does not mean that attempts to control appearances suddenly vanished and that consumption was uncoupled from questions of social hierarchy. For example, Michael Kwass has observed that the question of hierarchy continued to exist in eighteenth-century taste debates in France, but that status consumption was reframed along principles like ‘utility, authenticity, individuality [. . .] cleanliness, taste, and health.’ Although a different study would be needed to determine whether Tallinn followed a similar trajectory, I showed how sumptuary laws, rather than disappearing, transformed. In the last decade of the seventeenth century they went from being primarily concerned with visualising social hierarchy to concerns over expenditure on luxury consumption. The idea of luxury consumption, however, continued to be inherently hierarchical long into the eighteenth century: sumptuary laws issued in the Estonian Governorate in 1747 and 1780 that concerned the nobility, generally condemned luxury but tied personal expenditure to a person’s social standing.

What caused the transformation of the sumptuary project in the last decade of the seventeenth century? As we have seen, clothes were in tension with the law because of how versatile and laden with meaning they were and what they could make people do. Clothes were a site where social order was negotiated but

786 Alan Hunt 1996, p. 359. David Kuchta has for example suggested that even though sumptuary laws were not issued after 1604 in England, nevertheless ‘a significant body of opinion existed [. . .] that supported the use of sumptuary law to maintain social distinctions.’ See Kuchta 2002, p. 38.
788 Pallasma 1994, p. 16, 42. The sumptuary law of 1747 was in fact a version of the 1665 Ernewerte Land-ordnung, which was reissued due to the allegedly excessive consumption and luxurious lifestyles. The 1781 sumptuary law was issued amongst economic decline and attempted to curb all unnecessary and excessive expenditure on clothing, transportation and all other kinds of opulence.
they were also intimately connected to many other questions of early modern life. Clothes could incite disruptive outbreaks of individual desire, in which people, who were ideally supposed to have limited clothing resources and to avoid striving after luxury, went on shopping sprees and behaved in other ways that contemporaries found deeply disturbing. Clothes were also linked to important life transitions, like weddings and funerals; and the material displays at such events were often strongly linked to notions of individual and collective honour. There was also the gender issue: the town council, despite its persistent attempts to control women’s dress in particular, simply never seems to have gotten a handle on it. The durability and fungibility of clothes appealed to people, but so did their luxury, because there was something fundamentally attractive in getting a ‘new’ garment, in appreciating its colour and texture and details, in imagining how one would wear it and the reactions it would elicit from others, when worn. The capacity of clothes to create and visualise order was never in doubt, but that did not exhaust their meaning. Instead, the problem became how to articulate and negotiate details within this system and people’s respective positions within the sartorial order, something that was neither given nor self-evident. Lack of agreement on what the order was and how exactly it should be visualised surely contributed to the laws’ transformation.

As we have seen, clothes were connected to the individual in a way that few other goods were, and they persistently raised problems that no other material goods did. Worn on the body, clothes formed the border between how people understood and fashioned themselves and how others saw and recognised them. Clothes had a generative force; they did not just reflect a person’s idea of him or herself but also actively constituted it. Sumptuary laws are thus evidence of how the relationship between appearance and identity was being actively questioned and debated in the early modern society. At the same time as the authorities made increasing efforts to pin down and visualise each person’s identity, individual wants and desires and the emergence of complex commercial networks and new modes of expression through dress made the signs previously thought of as clear more difficult to interpret or wholly obsolete.

Therefore, one of the main results of this dissertation has been to challenge the idea that there existed a durable system of social signs in the early modern period. This thesis shows that even in Tallinn, the increased availability and variety of clothes and accessories, especially after 1650 made it more and more difficult to read and interpret appearances. I also showed, however, that at no point during the seventeenth century was the order that the clothes were meant to visualise stable. Thus, sumptuary laws not only ‘index a dynamic world of consumer goods and bodily practices that provided a map for social ascent and expression’ but they also indexed the dynamism that was inherent in the social order itself.789

---

This dissertation has also demonstrated that both on the normative level and on the level of everyday practice, order involved active participation on people’s part. As part of the project of social control, the authorities were supposed to know where each person belonged in the hierarchy and be able to discern the boundary-blurring aspects of clothes with a keen eye. But similar demands were made upon the people they governed. Time and again, it becomes clear just how high were the expectations placed upon people to know, describe and distinguish between a huge variety of fabrics, their content and production techniques and their price. People had to know whether accessories were real or imitation, whether a jacket or a skirt would be appropriate for a specific occasion and in a specific space and whether it corresponded to their or someone else’s social standing. Clothes and appearances thus required that people be active and heavily invested in their materiality. In this way, social order, rather than being an overarching rigid mantle, became negotiable, requiring the participation of people, space and materiality.

If we return to the idea of the ‘consumer revolution’ discussed at the beginning of this dissertation, can we see the seeds of the modern consumer society, as many historians have found for different periods and different places, in seventeenth-century Tallinn? I would say not. Clothes featured in social, cultural, religious, spiritual and economic practices in ways that cannot be easily separated from each other. Much of the clothing that was supplied within and between households was not bought. People also continued to make long-term investments in clothes. Many people did not have the choice of which clothes to consume – they accepted what was supplied to them by their employer or their parents. Seventeenth-century Tallinn was therefore firmly a culture of livery. In a system of embedded economic relations, clothes were also regularly used as payment and pawned. In the seventeenth century, moreover, the market was not egalitarian and depending on one’s social position, choice could be limited. Furthermore, rather than being governed just by desire or market logic, as we have seen, consumption of clothes was cyclical, and important milestones in life were connected to an increase or decrease in the consumption of clothes. Clothes in seventeenth-century Tallinn largely defy one’s efforts to see them as part of an uncomplicated narrative of progress.

If we stop looking for the active and modern consumer, it becomes apparent instead how the networks and practices around clothes – looking and observation, bequeathing, payment, theft, or just regular buying – were more about the creation and negotiation of social distinction than about the birth of individualism. Early modern consumption activities in Tallinn did not primarily reflect ‘a new perception of the individual’s place in a society’, nor did it ‘reject [. . .] traditional apparel rooted in hierarchy,’ as Beverly Lemire has argued was the case for

790 On this see also Dinges 1993, p. 98.
791 On the culture of livery, see also Jones & Stallybrass (2001), pp. 17–21.
the middle ranks and some labouring people in eighteenth-century England.\textsuperscript{792} On the other hand, Tallinn, albeit an unequal and hierarchical society, was hardly static. It seems equally wrong to characterise the period against a drab unremarkable background of heavy grey woollens.\textsuperscript{793} The notion that there was a fashionable elite and an immobile mass of poor people does not do justice to the dynamism inherent in seventeenth-century urban societies. In Tallinn, there is evidence of considerable variation in poor people’s consumption strategies; moreover, across the social spectrum, from poor to riche, one sees evidence both of individuals who desired to be fashionable and of people who consciously avoided spending excessively on clothes. The situation is complicated by the fact that in addition to individual choice or desire for certain things, there were other logics governing people’s strategies, such as ideas about propriety, familial duty and group belonging. I believe that this is a much more fruitful way to look at how seventeenth-century people related to the sartorial world.

This dissertation has also touched on questions to do with change over time. New forms of materiality and attitudes to consumption have usually been studied within the context of economic growth.\textsuperscript{794} However, Tallinn’s population did not grow significantly in the seventeenth century, the economy did not expand, and there were no systematic efforts to develop manufactures. Its economy is best characterised as stagnant. Yet, this dissertation has shown numerous times that, despite the unfavourable economic situation, both the will and the ability to acquire expensive and aesthetically pleasing clothes that were not purely functional were present, and not just amongst the social elite. Additionally, the fashions of Tallinn were by no means backwards or fundamentally different from those of the rest of urban Europe. The example of Tallinn encourages us to re-evaluate larger narratives about economic welfare and material change, as well as to ask whether it is the case that a rich material culture necessarily has to be a culture of innovation. It may also be that one can have dynamic consumer practices even in the midst of economic decline and a fairly high degree of social inequality.

To sum up, the aim of this dissertation has been to problematise the chronology described at the beginning of this concluding chapter, which saw the ancien régime of fashion replaced with new consumer mentalities and behaviours and the democratisation of fashion through the so-called ‘consumer revolution’. That I have not shown a change in consumer practices in seventeenth-century Tallinn is in many ways an expected result. What my study has shown, however, is that Tallinn was clearly a dynamic society with changes in the social system, fashion and a demand for aesthetically pleasing clothes. Rather than a new system gradually replacing the old one, aspects of both systems co-existed in parallel within a society that did not necessarily demonstrate any of the other tendencies assumed by proponents of ‘consumer revolution’. The paradox of clothes is that,

\textsuperscript{792} Lemire 2000, p. 393.
\textsuperscript{793} Lemire 2000, p. 395.
\textsuperscript{794} See for example Vries 2008; Vries & Woude 1997.
as agents they have always had different functions and contradictory roles. In the seventeenth century, their complex agency became evident not just through their capacity to affirm and subvert order but through their capacity to create a force field around themselves, which consequently influenced people, their everyday practices and networks. These contradictions were present in early modern societies long before the so-called ‘consumer revolution’ and they continue to be present to this day.

ka önnestunud, kui mõned head inimesed naisele appi poleks tulnud. Luhr kirjutas, et tema naine on alati kombekohasel rõivastunud ja et teda ei tohiks hoolimata uuest rõivamäärasest karistada, samal ajal kui Tallinna käsitsöölid oma lapsi nii riidesse panevad, kuidas hing ihaldab. Varauusaegsed rõivapraatikad ja nende regulatsioon oli seega igakülgselt sotsiaalne ja asus erinevate isikute ja korporatsioonide ristteel.


Rõivad on heaks metafoorseks kaleidoskoobiks, millega varauusaegset sotsiaalset lugemist uurida, kuna varauusaegse sotsiaalse kord oli suuresti visuaalne kord. Ei piisanud sellest, et inimene teadis, kas ta on talupoeg, käsitööline või kaupmees: tema sotsiaalne positsioon pidi olema kogu aeg nähtav ja lihtsalt tõlgendatav.

miks „sotsiaalne loetavus“ nii oluline oli. Võimud üle Euroopa olid varauusajal hõivatud luksus- ja rõivamääruste väljaandmisega ja üritasid nende seaduste abil sotsiaalset korda kindlaks määra ja seda ka riiete abil nähtavaks teha.


Rõivapraktikate uurimine igapäevaelus tasandil näitas, et rietuses väljenduvad hierarhial ja inimeste erinevatesse gruppidesse jagamine olid olulised ka igapäe-
vaelus. Erinevus joonestus välja asjaolus, et inimeste kategoriseerimine teiste in-
meste poolt ning konfliktid üksikisikute ja eri gruppide vahel ei toiminud argielus
alati samamoodi ega täitnud alati sama eesmärki, nagu visuaalse korda kujutav
diskursiivne ideaal ette kirjutat. Kategooriad, mida igapäevasel tasandil inimeste
välimuse kirjeldamiseks kasutati, ei erinened palju nendest, mida rõivamäärustes
kasutati: sugu ja etniline kuuluvus, sotsiaalne seisund, päritolu, amet ja keeleos-
kus. Suurim erinevus normatiivse korra ja inimeste kirjeldamise vahel igapäevases
elus oli see, et gildi liikmesust igapäevas kategooriaga ei kasutatud. On ilmne, et
hierarhia loomisesse olid aktiivselt kaasatud ka linnainmed, kes teisi inimesi
enda ümber vaatasid ning selle kohta järeltusi tegid, paigutades nad sobivatesse
gruppidesse ja kategooriatesse. Inimeste poolt argielus loodavad hierarhiad olid
alternatiiviks rõivamäärustes esinevale sotsiaalse “loetavuse” ideaalile. Eelkõige
näitab see, et korra loomine ei olnud üldalt inimestele pealesurtav protsess, vaid
dünaamiliste kategooriatega korra loomisel osaledid inimesed ühiskonna kõikidel
tasanditel.

Lisaks näitab rõivamääruste ja varaloendite võrdlusi, et ka igapäevaelus joonis-
tusid välja piirdid eri gruppide vahel, aga need erinesid teatud määral sellest, kuidas
neid rõivamäärustega ette kujutati. Selle asemel et rangelt eraldada üksisteisest kor-
poratiivsed rühmad (Suurgildi liikmed ja nende pereliikmed Kanuti gildi omandes
ja need omakorda Oleviste gildi omadest), näitavad inimeste omanduses olevad
riided tegelikult kahte erinevat hierarhia. Rõivaste kvaliteed poolt aga erinened
raeliikmed, kaupmehed, küsitöö- ja kaupmehesellid, teenijad ja muud töölibised. Teised
küljest nagu aga näitavad teatud ak-
sessuaarid, eelkõige nööbid, kuidas raeliikmed ja kaupmehed erinesid literaatidest
ja käsitoölistest, kes omakorda erinesid teenijkonnast ja töölistest. Realsus oli
veelgi keerulisem selle tõttu, et igas eelmäinen grupis oli inimesi, kelle garderoob
teiste omadest kardinalalt eelne, mis tuletab mõlemele, et ehkki visuaalne
seisuslik hierarhia oli diskursiivne ideaal, siis ei saa me täielikult ignoreerida iga
inimese enda eelistusi ja maitset, majanduslikke võimalusi ja tarbimissoovi. Sellest
vöib järeldada, et varausaegne ühiskond ei olnud mitte ainult komplekssem, kui
vöiks uskuda rõivamääruste põhjal, vaid ka et rühmadevahelised piirdid olid reaali-
suses hägused ja sõltusid mitmetest eri asjaolust. Seetõttu tuleks ka näha
juteldavaid piire inimrühmade vahel dünaamilise ruumina, mis oli läbiräägitud,
kohati uduine ja mitesugustest teguritest sõltuva, ning kus inimesed said oma
strateegialt vastavalt võimalustele, eelistustele ja soovidele muuta ja kohandada.

Varaloendide analüüs viitab ka sellele, et rõivamäärused olid olnud töhusad võit-
luseid karusnaha ja laia valiku importkangaste, eeskätt mitmesuguste siidmaterj-
alle kasutamine vastu. Erinevalt rõivamäärustes kirjeldatule ei loonud näiteks
soobil- ja nüüsenahad realsuses mingit hierarhia, vaid võisis olla ka eliti mitte-
kuuluvate inimeste seas laialdasest kasutusel. Ka sidkangad olid 17. sajandi maja-
pidamistes palju tavalisemad, kui rõivamääruste põhjal võiks arvata. Järelikult ei
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ole mõistlik mõõta rõivamääriste efektiivsust ainult sellega, kui palju inimesi kohtu ette toodi ja neid liigse lukusest eest trahviti. Kuna antud doktoritöö näitab, et välimuse ja rõivastuse kaudu visualiseeritud sotsiaalse hierarhia idee oli sügavalt juurudunud fenomen, siis tuleb leppida sellega, et diskursiivse ideaalina mõjutas see kahtlemata inimeste igapäevaelul ja seda, kuidas nad mõtlesid oma rõivastusele ja kuidas võrdlesid seda teiste omadega. Selle asemel et keskenduda pelgalt rõivamääriste rikkumisele, olen erinevatele allikatele toetudes uurinud, kuidas seos inimese positsiooni ja rõivaste vahel laiemalt inimeste elu seisuslikus ühiskonnas kujundus. On ilmne, et ideed selle kohta, kuidas teatud rõivad inimese kohta ja tema positsiooni väljendama peaksid, olid ühiskonnas sügavalt juurudunud, aga see ei ühtimud alati sellega, mida võimude poolt ette kirjutati.

Töös tõin välja ka asjaolul, et kuigi normatiivsel tasandil oli rõivastusal üks põhieesmärk – hierarhia nähtavaks tegemine –, siis igapäevasel tasandil ei peegeldunud rõivad korda mitte ainult keerukamalt, vaid vahepeal suisa õõnestasid seda. Rõivad olid harjunuspärane, kuid siiski ülioluline osa inimeste igapäevaelust ning inimesed kasutasid rõivaid sageli peresuhete ja sõprussidemete korraldamiseks ja tunnete väljendamiseks. On ilmne, et arusaamad inimese positsiooni ja rõivaste sobivusest mõjutasid seda, kuidas inimesed oma sotsiaalvõrgustikku materjalselt korraldasid, millist tähtsust inimsuhtete omistasid ja kuidas inimsootide sümbooliseerisid. Aga emotsooniond ja suhted olid pärinesid keerulismad kui seaduses kirjeldatud ja paljud inimesed tegid vastupidiselt sellele, mida oodati, mis oli tavaapära või mis oli seadusel kooskõlas. Sõltumata sellest, kas see anta palgana või määlestusesemena, võis peremehe või -naise teenijale kingitud rõivas nii hierarhiat rõhubada, kui rõivase on sobiv, või hierarhiat õõnestada, kui rõivase olüemise kvaliteet oli liiga hea. Nii jätsid mõned inimesed liiga uhkeid rõivaid neile, kes neid avalikult kanda ei saanud, või ebaproportsionaalselt suures koguses riideid neile, kes poleks neid pärandusena pidanud saama.

ded ei olnud lihtsalt seisusliku korra tähistajad ega anonüümsed maksevähenõndid.


Lisaks pakun omapoolse definitsiooni, kuidas varauusaegset seisuslikku korda paremini lahti mõtestada. Rõivamääruste täitmine ekseptiivseks kontrollimiseks võtisid raamenõudevad endale teoreetilise kohustuse teada, kes millisesse sotsiaalsete rühmat sõltumus, ja pidid suutma rõivaste potentsiaalset hajustamistendentsi erilise hooliga jälgida. Ka igapäevasel tasandil eeldati et inimesed on ülimalt teadlikud sesti, millisel sotsiaalset positsioonil asuvad nad ise ja teised inimesed nende ümber, ning sellest, kas nende rõivastus vastab oodavatele. Ikka ja jälle saab selgeks, kui palju koostööd eeldasid võimud inimestelt ja kui palju kohustusi neile pandi selleks, et diskursiivselt loodud sotsiaalne kord ka päriselus visualiseeriks. Inimestelt oodati, et nad suudaksid eristada küünide erinevaid kangaid,


Näitan oma doktoritöös, et kui lõpetada teadliku ja meile äratuntavalt moderne tarbija otsimine, avaneb meile hoopis vaatepilt, kuidas rõivaste ümber moodsta inimvõrgustikud ja praktikad – inimeste vaatlemine ja kategoriseerimine, pärandamine, maksmine, vargus või lihtsalt ostmine – olid seotud pigem sotsiaalse eristamise tendentsidega kui individualismi sünniga. Tallinna varauusaegsed tarbimispraktikad ei peegelda eemal emajoones muutuvaid harjumusi, uut arusaama inimise kohast ühiskonnas ega lükka ühiskonnas erinevaid tarbimisstrateegiaid. Peale selle võib kogu sotsiaalses spektris, alates vaestest kuni rikastenõu, näha nii inimesi, kes soovisid olla moekad, kui ka inimesi, kes teadlikult vältisid liigset kulutamist rõivastele. Olukorra teeb aga keerulisemaks ka see, et lisaks individuaalsetele valikule...
või tarbimissoovile reguleerisid inimeste valikuid ja tahtmisi arusaamad riite ja sotsiaalse positsiooni sobivusest, pere- ja kogukondlikest kohustustest, rühma-
kuuluvusest ning individuaalset ja kollektiivset auküsimusest. Usun, et antud
lähenemine on palju mitmekülgsem, uurimaks varauusaja inimeste suhteid neid
ümbristeva materiaalse maailmaga.

Teine oluline punkt, mida olen esile tõstnud, on seotud ühiskondlike muutus-
tega. Uusi tarbimisharjumisi ning mõttevõistluste ja tõekspidamiste muutumist
on taavaliselt uuritud majanduslikku kontekstis. Tallinna majandust 17. sajandil
iseloomustab aga pigem paigalseis. Linna elanikkond ei suurenened märkimis-
väärselt, majandus ei kasvanud ja manufaktuuride arendamiseks ei tehtud süste-
maatilisi ja pikaajalisi pingutusi. Samas võime tõdeda, et kuigi Tallinna iseloomus-
tasid pigem ebasoodsad majandusolud, oli inimestel olemas nii tahe, indivi-
duaalne maitse kui ka võimalus soetada kalleid ja ilusaid riideid, mis polnud puh-
talt funktsionaalsed. See oli ka nähtav nende inimeste seas, kes jäid jõukamast
sotsiaalsest eliidiist välja. Lisaks ei olnud Tallinna moemaailm sugugi tagurlik ega
fundamentaalset erinev ülejäänud Euroopa omast. Tallinna näide võiks seega
olla heaks eeskujus, et tõsiselt hinnata majanduslikku ja materiaalse muutuste
kohta käivaid n.-ö. suuri narratiive. Tallinna näitel võib järeltada, et isegi majan-
dusseisaku ja suure sotsiaalse ebavõrdsuse perioode võib iseloomustada dünaa-
miliste, paindlike ja teadlike tarbimispraktikate olemasolu.
Appendices

Appendix 1: Glossary

Bodice – the section of a woman’s gown above the waist
Bohemian bast – shiny colourful fabric with or without silk, mix of silk and wool or silk and cotton, often an imitation, presumably in this case from Bohemia
Boj – coarse thinly woven woollen fabric
Bomseid (eng. bombazine) – a fabric originally made of silk or silk and wool, later also cotton and wool or wool alone for clothes, lining and upholstery, also German bomseid
Boot cuffs – wide frills worn as additions to stockings that could cover the upper part men’s boots, also canons
Brittany cloth – unspecified cloth from Brittany
Broadcloth – fine imported woollen fabric, also Spanish broadcloth
Brocade – thick heavy fabric with a raised pattern, brocading is a technique where metal threads are inserted during weaving to create a pattern, also silk brocade
Buff coat – men’s protective garment made of thick leather, with or without sleeves, originally worn in the military context
Burat – different types of loosely woven fabrics of hair, wool or silk
Caffa – silk plush fabric woven with floral pattern, later also coarser woollen fabric with raised floral pattern, also Kaftsammet
Calmuck – strong thick fulled woollen fabric with a hairy surface, potentially also (black) lambskin from Central Asia
Camlet – fine woollen fabric, initially woven from camel hair or wool woven to imitate camel or angora, also silk camlet – silk fabric woven with camel or goat wool, Turkish camlet
Canvas – strong durable fabric made of flax
Carteck – silk fabric probably quite similar to taffeta
Cassock – an outer cloak or coat of sorts with military roots that had been adopted into civil use by the seventeenth century, worn by men and women
Cloth of gold/silver – silk fabrics wover with metallic threads
Cotton – fabric made from the yarn of soft fluffy plant fibre, originally imported to Europe from India, also catun
Cordovan – fine leather made from horse- or goatskin, also Spanish leather associate with Cordoba
Crepe – general term for a variety of fabrics of silk, cotton, wool or blends that are characterised by crinkled or grained surface effects, also English crisp

795 Under each main fabric, other fabrics that appear in inventories and sumptuary laws are given, for example in addition to camlet, silk camlet and Turkish camlet were also named in the sources.
**Cuffs** – separate decorative frills worn at the lower edge of the sleeve of the garment, made of linen or lace

**Damask** – most often a handwoven fabric made of silk, luxurious and hugely expensive, a variety of different weaving techniques were used to create different sheen, unlike brocade it is reversible since the pattern is woven into the fabric, also East Indian damask, silk damask

**Doublet** – a garment for the upper body worn over a shirt, usually long-sleeved and close-fitting

**Drill** – durable coarse fabric of linen or cotton, also linen drill

**Drugget** – coarse, usually woollen fabric or a mix of wool and linen or silk woven in a narrow width

**Dussincken** – coarse woollen fabric

**Felt** – dense non-woven fabric of wool or animal hair that is made by matting and pressing fibres together

**Flor** – a thin more or less transparent weave of silk, half silk, linen or cotton

**Floret** – fabric made of floss silk (loose or broken filaments of silk from the cocoons), alternatively light, sometimes floral woollen fabric, also silk floret

**Fontange** – women’s elaborate headdress from the late seventeenth century

**French cloth** – unspecified fabric from France

**Fustian** – heavy cloth of wool and linen, later cotton, used mainly for menswear

**Gallon** – decorative woven trim or braid, commonly made with gold or silver threads

**Garters** – bands of silk or ribbons that held up stockings

**Gauze** – thin transparent fabric of silk or linen, later also cotton

**Gewand** – woollen fabric, could also simply mean cloth, also Wandt, Wande

**Grosgrain** – a general term for various kinds of coarse strong-threaded woollen and silk fabrics of lower quality, also silk grosgrain, Turkish grosgrain, wool grosgrain

**Homespun** – locally produced fabric, either woollen or linen

**Hundskot** – woollen fabric from the town of Hondschoote

**Kammertuch** (eng. cambric) – fine linen fabric from the French town of Cambrai often used for smaller garments like handkerchiefs and collars

**Kirsey** – three-ply white or dyed woollen fabric

**Klostertuch** – fine linen fabric from Westphalia

**Kutschbay** – light loosely woven woollen fabric used for clothing, horse blankets and as the name indicates, as carriage textiles

**Leibrock** – could be a type of outer coat or also a shorter close-fitting coat or vest worn by men and women, also a religious garment

**Linen** – fabric made from the fibres of the flax plant, also flax linen, tow linen, unbleached linen, imported linens like Bielefeld linen, Dutch linen, Greipfenberg linen, Silesian linen

**Lining shirt** – a type of garment worn by both men and women as a middling or even outer layer, probably resembled a jacket rather than a skirt
Lace – delicate fabric made in a variety of different techniques in a web-like pattern, originally from linen, silk, gold or silver thread, also bobbin lace, needle lace

Linsey-woolsey – textile with a flax warp and wool (worsted) weft

Lustring – fine, glossy silk fabric

Mageir – coarse woollen or cotton fabric

Mantua – a women’s open robe or gown that became popular in the late seventeenth century, worn with a stomacher and a petticoat, usually it had an arrangement of folds and pleats on the back

Meissen cloth – presumably woollen cloth produced in the German town of Meissen

Night gown – a full-length informal garment worn by both men and women, also sleeping gown

Oberkiker/Überkiker – woollen fabric commonly used for doublets, also Dutch oberkiker

Oilcloth – waterproof fabric, usually flax, jute or cotton, impregnated with linseed oil or beeswax

Overgown – probably a long loose outer gown worn by both men and women, often lined with fur

Packlacken – coarse woollen fabric made in England

Passementerie – all kinds of decorative trims, including braids, tassels, fringes, cords, embroideries and so forth

Petticoat – a woman’s skirt or underskirt

Pfaffen-rock – a wide garment resembling a tunic, has also been likened to a sleeping gown.

Pinking – the cutting of small shapes, for example star or diamond, into the garment to allow the fabric beneath to be pulled through

Plush – shaggy, hairy kind of cloth used for clothing and upholstery. The pile or nap is softer and longer than that of velvet, and it can be made of a variety of fibre types

Polemit (eng. polymite) – multi-coloured, often striped fabric of camel hair mixed with wool or wool mixed with linen, also castor polemit, Turkish polemit

Puke – a type of woollen fabric

Rasch – relatively thin and light woollen fabric, can be calendered, also Kronrasch

Rosacken – unidentified fabric

Ruff collar – a collar of gathered linen or lace, stiffened with starch

Russia leather – leather made by tanning various skins with willow, birch, or oak bark and then rubbing the flesh side with birch oil

Sajett – rather thin fabric usually from worsted, sometimes mixed with silk, similar to serge

Sandinen – unidentified fabric

Satin – refers to a variety of silk fabrics woven in satin weave with one side glossy and the other side dull
Says – finer woollen fabric, also Pudesay
Sharlacke – expensive fulled woollen fabric, especially of bright red colour
Shoe roses – large rosettes made of ribbon or silk band that decorated shoes
Schiertuch – light sailcloth from Westphalia
Serge – woollen or silk fabric, also silk serge, woollen serge, serge de Nimes – twilled cotton fabric from the French town of Nimes
Silk – general term for a variety of expensive fabrics woven from the filaments from the cocoons of silkworms, also half silk, Tours silk
Sleeves – arm coverings that were often made separately and attached to the body of the garment by points or ties
Soltwedel – woollen fabric produced in Salzwedel in Germany
Taffeta – general term for a group of fabrics that are smooth, thin and shiny, also silk taffeta and shot silk taffeta
Terzenel – originally coarser silk fabric produced in Italy, also silk terzenel, wool terzenel
Tobin – watered silk fabric, also silk tobin
Trip – a fabric of wool and hemp or linen similar to velvet and plush, used for upholstery and clothing, also floret trip
Tuch – general term for woollen cloth
Velvet – thick closely woven fabric originally of silk with a soft pile on one side, also Florentine velvet, glossy velvet, unshorn velvet
Venetian cloth – unspecified presumably expensive fabric from Venice
Verandin – cheaper silk fabric or alternatively a mix of silk and wool
Vierdraht – low-value coarse four-ply woollen fabric, also Dreidraht, Fünfdraht, Achtdraht
Waistcoat – a jacket with or without sleeves that became popular in the second half of the seventeenth century.
Watman (sw. vadmal) – heavy fabric made of sheep wool, fulled in order to make it more durable and waterproof
### Appendix 2.1. Colour of garments in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-coloured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turquoise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Appendix 2.2. Undergarments in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700 (ten most numerous items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shirt</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodice</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undershirt</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overshirt</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lining shirt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping gown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirt and bodice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petticoat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>684</strong></td>
<td><strong>449</strong></td>
<td><strong>237</strong></td>
<td><strong>1370</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Appendix 2.3. Cloaks, coats and overgowns in in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700 (ten most numerous items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloak</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgown</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fur coat</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassock</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain cloak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mourning cloak          0    7    2    9
Cape                    2    0    6    8
Buff coat               0    6    0    6
Priest’s coat           0    5    0    5
\textbf{Total}         92   186  106  384


\textbf{Appendix 2.4. Gowns in in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gown unspecified</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacket and skirt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doublet and skirt</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat and hose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doublet and hose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacket and hose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waistcoat and hose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloak, jacket and hose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lining shirt and hose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloak doublet and hose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat, doublet and hose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloak and hose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgown and skirt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{Total}</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textbf{Appendix 2.5. Jackets, doublets, skirts and hose in in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacket</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirt</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doublet</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{Total}</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 2.6. Neckwear in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collar</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neckercchief</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reval collar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian collar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck lace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Appendix 2.7. Footwear in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700 (six most numerous items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boots</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot cuffs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>178</strong></td>
<td><strong>297</strong></td>
<td><strong>491</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Appendix 2.8. Headwear in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700 (twenty most numerous items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cap</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnet</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headgear (Hüße)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night bonnet</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night cap</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat cap</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wig</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasant bonnet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter cap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasant cap</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish cap</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaked cap</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish cap</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasant hat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian cap</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skullcap</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2.9. Accessories in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700 (eight most numerous items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apron</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lining</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeves</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast cloth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuffs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>185</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>194</strong></td>
<td><strong>454</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 2.10. Handwear in Tallinn inventories, 1600–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gloves</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>249</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3: Expenditure on clothing for the 1663 wedding of Michael Güntherus and Anna Gallus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rtl</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>wrst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wedding clothes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 ¼ yards of black silk pudesay à 2 Rtl 24 wrst</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 piece of fine black silk band or ribbon 124 yards</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 yards of black braids à 3 wrst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ½ yards of Bett parchent à 1 ½ D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pound of fishbone à 1 ½ D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 yards of unbleached linen for the bodices 3 D 4 wrst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 yards of fine wide floret band à 4 wrst. 8 yards of self-silk band à 6 wrst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 yards of narrow floret band à 2 wrst. 5 ½ lod of silk à 20 wrst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 yards of taffeta à 1 Rtl 40 wrst. 2 ½ yards of rasch à 40 wrst</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ½ yards of bomseid à 1 D. 6 yards of half-silk band à 6 wrst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 yard of rasch à 40 wrst. 4 yards of narrow floret band à 2 wrst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cloak band à 1 D. 36 yards of nuprelles à 6 wrst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker’s fee for the cloak, doublet and hose 3 Rtl. For the boot cuffs 2 D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For my dearest her gown 3 Rtl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For the black broadcloth gown of hose and doublet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 yards of broadcloth à 2 ½ Rtl 7 dozen buttons à 16 wrst</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 yards of Bett parchent à 1 ½ D 1 yard of braids à 3 wrst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 yards of black ribbon à 8 wrst. 3 lod of quilting and sewing silk à 20 wrst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ yards of stiff linen à 8 wrst 2 ½ yards of bomseid à 1 D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 yards of white linen à 24 wrst. 3 yards of unbleached linen à 20 wrst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker’s fee 2 Rtl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For my dearest her other silk wedding gown and taffeta Petticoat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 yards of fine black floral pudesay à 6 D</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pound of fishbone 1 ½ D. 6 yards of fine crimson-in-yellow taffeta à 1 ¾ Rtl</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 yards of orange silk galloons à 5 wrst. 6 yards of yellow band à 2 wrst</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 3/8 lod of fine gold-in-silver lace à 1 1/8 Rtl. ½ lod of yellow silk yarn 16 wrst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker’s fee for the gown 3 Rtl for the Petticoat 3 D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude for the tailor journeyman (men?) for the wedding clothes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fine Figun Hut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gloves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pair of kid gloves 3 ½ D. 1 pair of catun gloves for the bridesmaid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pairs of fine women’s catun gloves à 1 Rtl and another pair à 3 ½ D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stockings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pair of fine black silk men’s stockings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pair ditto women’s à 4 Rtl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pairs of red women’s stockings à 1 ¼ Rtl</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

796 This sum has not been added to the columns on the right and has not been calculated in the total sum of 356 Rtl 1 wrst.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 pair of peach blossom women’s stockings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pairs of ditto</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Linen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 ¾ yards of Dutch linen</td>
<td>11 2 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ¼ yards of Dutch linen</td>
<td>3 1 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 piece of Silesian linen</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 yards of Dutch linen</td>
<td>15 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lace**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 ¼ yards of fine white edges</td>
<td>4 2 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 yards of ditto</td>
<td>4 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Band**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 piece of white-in-red satin band</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 piece of black-in-gold ribbon</td>
<td>2 1 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 yards of fine wide golden silver ribbon with knobs</td>
<td>2 3 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 yards of black-in-gold ribbon with knobs</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 yards of ditto gold-in-black</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 yards of narrow red-in-white satin band</td>
<td>1 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ¼ yards of black taffeta ribbon</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 yards of ditto wider</td>
<td>3 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 yards of taffeta band</td>
<td>1 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For my dearest her boat cap</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For her round Turkish cap</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For my cap also</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the haberdasher</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the furrier for the felt</td>
<td>3 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the Turkish cap</td>
<td>3 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker’s fee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shoes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 pairs of cordovan shoes</td>
<td>4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pair of new shoes</td>
<td>3 2 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pairs of maidservants’ shoes</td>
<td>5 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pairs of slippers</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>356 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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National Archives

EAA.1 Eestimaa rootsiaegne kindralkubern (Schwedischer Generalgouverneur von Estland)
Inventory 1 no. 482 Eingelaufene Schreiben in Verwaltungs- und Gerichtsangelegenheiten (Suppliken)
Inventory 1. No. 517 Eingelaufene Schreiben in Verwaltungs- und Gerichtsangelegenheiten (Suppliken)

EAA.1002 Viljandi magistraat (Felliner Magistrat)
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EAA.2 Tallinna linnusekohus (Revaler Burggericht)
Inventory 2 Kohtutoimikud

EAA.858 Eestimaa ülemaakohus (Estländisches Oberlandgericht)
Inventory 2 no. 54 Testament des Caspar von Asswegen. Reval 25.01.1638. Copie

Tallinn City Archives

TLA.166 Tallinna Linna Vaeslastekohus (Revalisches Stadt Waisengericht)

TLA.190 Tallinna Kanuti Gild (Revaler St. Kanuti Gilde)
Inventory 1 no. 2 Resolutionen/ n/ von Heerme/ istern/ und Könige Lit. A
Inventory 1 no. 14 Einband Nr. 5

TLA.191 Tallinna Kaufmeeste ehk Suurgild (Revaler Kaufmanns- oder Grosse Gilde)
Inventory 1 no. 19 Armen-Ordnung. Rewidierte Ordnung des allgemeinen Gottes-Kastens. Kasten-Ordnungen, Kleider-Ordnungen
Inventory 1 no. 26 Gildi tegevuse päevaraamat (Diarium)

TLA.230 Tallinna Magistraat (Revaler Magistrat)
Inventory 1 no. Aa Protokoll des Niedergerichts/Niedergerichts-Protokoll
Inventory 1 no. Ab Ratsprotokolle
Inventory 1 no. Ac Nachlass-Inventarien
Inventory 1 no. Ak9/a Die “David-Gallus Chronik”
Inventory 1 no. Ba Finanzwesen, Versicherungswesen
Inventory 1 no. Bj Acta criminalia
Inventory 1 no. BN_2 Testamente des 17. Jahrhundert [sic]
Inventory 1 no. Bo10/I Dokumente über witwe Quistermanns Leib-rente beim Pastor Job. Olai (Prozess)
Inventory 1 no. Bs7/I Kleider-, Hochzeits-, Kindtauf-, Begräbnisse- u.s.w. Ordnungen 1497–1738
Inventory 1 no. BO_9 Varia
Inventory 1 no. Bp32 Dokumente in Sachen der Witwe des Kantors David Gallus contra Testament ihres Mannes
Inventory 1 no. Bt Inventarien

TLA.236
Tallinna Oleviste Kogudus (Die Gemeinde der St. Olai Kirche zu Reval)
Inventory 1 no. 9 Sünni-, abieluregister. Sündide registreerimine 1692–1728. Abielude registreerimine 1694–1749.

TLA.31
Tallinna Niguliste Kogudus (Die Gemeinde der Revaler St. Nikolaikirche)
Inventory 1 no. 13 St. Nicolai in Reval Kirchenbuch: (Getaufte, Getraute, Verstorbene)

Printed sources
Gottlieb, Ernestus, 1690: *Wällustens twenne blås-bälgor, neml. den böga fontangen okk de blätta brüsten, genom hvilka de alamodiske kiätt- ok flätta älskande quinnor, uti sina egna ock många dåraktige manspersons bierta, först uppstånda och utofning kårleks ock elskogs gnista, åkk sedermera den så utblysta, att hon uti en outsäjelig ängsians-låga utbrister ock stadnar ... / till ... effterrättelse och warning beskrefne ock till trycket befordrade af Ernesto Gottlieb. [övers. o. utg. av Nicolaus Bergius.]*
Olearius, Adam, 1647: *Offt begehrte Beschreibung Der Newen Orientalischen Rejse/ So durch Gelegenheit einer Holsteinischen Legation an den König in Persien gesebeben,* Schleswig: Jacob zur Glocken.
Seth, Martin, 1716: *Fontange-predikan, lemnad ut öppnad graf på Habo kyrkogård, af ett dödfödt barn, som af sådan skapnad till verlden kom then 13 augusti 1715, i hemmanet Göila, i Habo församling, hafvande en fontange på höfudet högre än silfwa ansichtet en snipp i pannan med smått krusat hår ther vnder, samt wid tinningarna; en bengiande sante wid wenstra kindbenet. Ingen näsa, men små näseboror. Ingen öfwerlepp. Then högra handen röd; then wenstra hwit. Veptecknad af Mar. Seth ... Skara: tryckt hos sal. Kiellbergs enckia. Åhr 1716.
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