University of Southampton

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

History

Refashioning Patriotic Display in Britain and America: Rebellion, nationhood, and sartorial culture, *c*. 1745–1825

Rosanne Waine

Vol. I / II

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

July 2018

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

ABSTRACT

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

History

<u>Doctor of Philosophy</u>

REFASHIONING PATRIOTIC DISPLAY IN BRITAIN AND AMERICA:

REBELLION, NATIONHOOD, AND SARTORIAL CULTURE, *c.* 1745–1825

by Rosanne Waine

The long eighteenth century was a period in which the material landscape of everyday life became increasingly shaped by commercial enterprise and ideologies of economic nationalism. Manufacturers and consumers of sartorial culture – namely dress, fashionable accessories, and domestic décor – were navigating a burgeoning marketplace of topical goods, in which commodity choice weighed heavily upon the construction of an individual's personal, patriotic identity. Dressing one's body and home to communicate support for the political concerns of the day became commonplace in the British Atlantic region, with objects as disparate as furnishing fabrics, decorative fans, jewellery and household ceramics being used as sites of national feeling and collective memory.

  Historians have long since accepted that dress was employed as both popular protest and patriotic display during periods of political upheaval, most notably by contemporaries of the French Revolution. However, what is less understood is how cultures of sartorial resistance helped shape the patriotic landscapes of post-rebellion societies – a process here termed 'patriotic refashioning'. Composed of two contrasting case studies, this thesis examines the impact of the manufacture and consumption of patriotic commodities during periods of contested nationhood in the British Atlantic region, focussing on the last unsuccessful attempt by Jacobites in Britain to reinstate the exiled House of Stuart to the throne (*c.* 1745–6) and the triumph of American Republicanism through the War of Independence (*c.* 1775–83).

  In order to explore the lived experience of manufacturers and consumers acting at the apex of revolutionary change, this thesis employs an interdisciplinary approach to the study of 'patriotic refashioning' in long-eighteenth-century Britain and America. By performing a cross-examination of documentary, visual, and material evidence – sourced from museum, gallery, and library collections across the United Kingdom and the United States of America – this thesis argues that patriotic commodities produced at times of national crisis significantly shaped both the patriotic display cultures of post-rebellion societies and contributed towards the material memory of civil conflict into the early nineteenth century.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER SIX

THE MAKING OF REVOLUTIONARY MEMORY: THE MARQUIS DE LAFAYETTE'S FAREWELL TOUR OF AMERICA, c. 1824–5

<u>List of Figures</u>

For ease of reading all figures have been presented in a separate volume.

Please see Volume II.

0.1 – Two fragments of copperplate-printed cotton featuring the design 'A la glorie de Louis XVI' in a red colourway. French, produced by Gorgerat Frères et Cie, *c.* 1789 [1995-50-31-a,b] © Cooper-Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum.

0.2 – William Hogarth, 'An Election II: Canvassing for Votes', oil on canvas, *c.* 1754–55 [P56] © Sir John Soane's Museum, London.

0.3 – Set of eleven silver buttons with looped backs engraved with the Jacobite rose, *c.* 1745 © University of Aberdeen, ABDUA: 17618

0.4 – Benjamin West, 'The Death of General Wolfe', oil on canvas, 1770 [8007] © National Gallery of Canada.

0.5 – Transfer-printed earthenware mug, 'The Death of General Wolfe' design. English, 1800 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Museum purchase with funds provided by the Claneil Foundation, 1975.0112

1.1 – Appin Stewart regimental colour carried at Culloden, 1746 [H.LF 17] © National Museums Scotland.

1.2 – Two white cambric roses or cockades, worn by the artist Robert Strange in 1745 [H.NT 241.21 A & B] © National Museums Scotland.

1.3 – Jacket, trews, and plaid, taken from a suit of fine, hard tartan faced with green silk, acquired by English Jacobite Sir John Hynde Cotton during a visit to Edinburgh in 1744 [K.2005.16.1-3] © National Museums Scotland.

1.4 – Domenico Duprà, 'John Drummond, 4th titular Duke of Perth, 1714-1747', oil on canvas, 1739 [PG 1597] © National Galleries Scotland.

1.5 – Hard tartan frock coat of wool, velvet and linen, mid-eighteenth century [K.2002.1031] © National Museums Scotland.

1.6 – Sleeved silk waistcoat, *c.* 1727–60 [A.1906.337] © National Museums Scotland.

1.7 – Embroidered silk waistcoat, eighteenth century [INVMG.0000.0167] © Inverness Museum and Art Gallery.

1.8 – Embroidered wool dress coat, eighteenth century [INVMG.0000.0168] © Inverness Museum and Art Gallery.

1.9 – Allan Ramsay, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788, Eldest Son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart', oil on canvas, *c.* 1745 [PG 3762] © National Galleries Scotland.

1.10 – Robert Strange, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788', line engraving on paper, *c.* 1745 [SP IV 123.20] © National Galleries Scotland.

1.11 – William Mosman, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788. Eldest son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart', oil on canvas, *c.* 1750 [PG 1510] © National Galleries Scotland.

1.12 – Jug of salt-glazed stoneware painted with enamels and with a portrait of Prince Charles Edward Stuart, probably made in Staffordshire, *c.* 1755-60 [C.40-1955] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Credit line: Given by Mrs. M. F. Miller.

1.13 – Brown wool embroidered textile fragment, eighteenth century [A.1995.564] © National Museums Scotland.

1.14 – Gold pin and tartan of Prince Charles Edward Stuart, gifted to Lady Anne Mackintosh at Moy Hall, 1746 © University of Aberdeen, ABDUA: 63392 and ABDUA: 63394

1.15 – Fragment of red tartan, possibly early nineteenth century [A.1987.184 E] © National Museums Scotland.

1.16 – Tartan relic associated with Charles Edward Stuart's escape from Scotland in 1746, contained within the third volume of *The Lyon in Mourning* manuscript compiled by Bishop Robert Forbes, *c.* 1746–75 [Adv.MS.32.6.16-25] © National Library of Scotland.

1.17 – Richard Cooper, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788. Eldest son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart ('Wanted Poster')', hand-coloured etching on paper, *c.* 1745 [SP IV 123.49] © National Galleries Scotland.

2.1 – S. Hooper, 'An officer and sergeant of a Highland Regiment', line engraving on paper, *c.* 1786 [SP IV 270.1] © National Galleries Scotland.

2.2 – Woollen, twill-weave hard tartan man's coat. Scottish, *c.* 1740–50 [E.1990.59.1] © Glasgow Museums.

2.3 – Anon., 'Great Britain's Union; Or Litchfield Races Transpos'd', line engraving on paper broadside, *c.* 1747 [1868,0808.3861] © The Trustees of the British Museum.

2.4 – Glazed oval pendant of copper with waist-length portrait of Prince Charles Edward Stuart in Highland dress, eighteenth century [H.NF 40] © National Museums Scotland.

2.5 – Richard Wilson, 'Flora Macdonald [Fionnghal nighean Ragnaill 'ic Aonghasis Òig], 1722-1790. Jacobite heroine', oil on canvas, *c.* 1747 [PG 1162] © National Galleries Scotland.

2.6 - I.S. Muller, 'A Highland Piper / A Highlander in his Regimentals / A Highland Drummer', etching, published by John Bowles, mid-eighteenth century [M.1966.109] © National Museums Scotland.

2.7 - Unknown artist, 'Le Repas du Chat', coloured engraving, published by Boedlieu in Paris, 1815 [M.1989.112] © National Museums Scotland.

2.8 – Highlander shop figure taking snuff, late eighteenth or early nineteenth century [H.NQ 616] © National Museums Scotland.

2.9 – Unknown artist, 'Captain James Gorry, 87th Regiment of Foot, or Highland Volunteers, 1760', oil on canvas, 1760 [1962-06-13-1] © National Army Museum.

2.10 – Sir Joshua Reynolds, 'John Murray, 4th Earl of Dunmore', oil on canvas, 1765 [PG 2895] © National Galleries Scotland.

2.11 – Sir George Chalmers, 'Mary Macdonald, Mrs John Chichester (1738-1815), oil on canvas, 1780 [987423] © National Trust Images / National Trust Collections.

2.12 – Sir William Charles Ross, 'The Union', watercolour, strengthened with gum, over graphite on paper, *c.* 1790–1860 [1907.1018.54] © The Trustees of The British Museum.

2.13 – Isabella Fraser's tartan wedding dress and plaid, worn in Inverness-shire for the Fraser-MacTavish union in 1785 [L.INVMG.1984.026.a-b] © Inverness Museum and Art Gallery.

3.1 – Woman's dress and skirt of cream-coloured corded silk, said to have been worn by Margaret Oliphant of Gask at the Great Ball of Holyrood after the Battle of Prestonpans. British, *c.* 1745 [A.1964.553 & A] © National Museums Scotland.

3.2 – Cosmo Alexander, 'Portrait of a Jacobite Lady', oil on canvas, *c.* 1745 [207.132] © National Trust for Scotland, Culloden Battlefield & Visitor Centre.

3.3 – J. Williams, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788. Eldest son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart', mezzotint on paper, *c.* 1746 [SP IV 123.23] © National Galleries Scotland.

3.4 – Printed, purple sprig calico relic associated with Charles Edward Stuart's escape from Scotland in 1746, contained within *The Lyon in Mourning* manuscript compiled by Bishop Robert Forbes, *c.* 1746-75 [Adv.MS.32.6.16-25] © National Library of Scotland.

3.5 – Cosmo Alexander, 'John Drummond, 5th Duke of Perth', oil on canvas, mid-eighteenth century [PCF20] © Traquair Charitable Trust.

3.6 – Gold and diamond finger ring containing cameo of James Francis Edward Stuart. Gifted to Andrew Lumisden in Rome. Accompanied by original box, containing a written note of provenance, mid-eighteenth century [X.2015.105.5.1 & 2] © National Museums Scotland.

3.7 – Cosmo Alexander, 'Lady Winifred Maxwell Constable', oil on canvas, late eighteenth century [PCF75] © Traquair Charitable Trust.

3.8 – Woman's riding jacket of blue camblet lined with blue silk. English, *c.* 1750-59 [T.12-1957] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Credit line: Given by Mrs Keelan.

3.9 – Anon., 'Miss Jenny Cameron in a Military Habit', etching on paper, mid-eighteenth century [Blaikie.SNPG.15.3 A] © National Library of Scotland.

3.10 – Anon., 'Jenny Cameron, *c.* 1700-1790), mezzotint on paper, mid-eighteenth century [Blaikie.SNPG.15.7] © National Library of Scotland.

3.11 – Anon., 'The Jiltmegant', etching on paper, mid-eighteenth century [Blaikie.SNP.15.8] © National Library of Scotland.

3.12 – Anon., 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart with Miss Cameron and Miss MacDonald. Oval portraits of Miss Cameron, Prince Charles, and Miss MacDonald (in that order) with text "How happy could I be with Either, Were t'other dear Charmer away. Beg. Op."', etching on paper, mid-eighteenth century [Blaikie.SNPG.9.16] © National Library of Scotland.

3.13 – P. Griffin, 'Jenny Cameron, *c.* 1700-1790. Adventuress; supporter of Charles Edward Stuart', line engraving on paper, date unknown [SP III 13.4] © National Galleries Scotland.

3.14 – Anon., 'Scotch Female Gallantry', hand-coloured etching on paper, *c.* 1745-6 [1898,0520.172] © The Trustees of the British Museum.

3.15 – Order of the Thistle badge belonging to members of the House of Stuart, also known as the 'St Andrew Jewel'. Late seventeenth or early eighteenth century, with mid-1770s additions. These include a concealed portrait miniature of Princess Louise of Stolberg-Gedern, wife of Charles Edward Stuart from 1772. Bequeathed by Henry Benedict Stuart to George, Prince of Wales upon his death in 1807 [RCIN 441923] © Royal Collection Trust / Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2018.

3.16 – Richard Wilson, 'Flora Macdonald', oil on canvas, *c.* 1747 [5848] © National Portrait Gallery, London.

3.17 – Silk tartan pin cushion with a woven silk garter ribbon, inscribed in white letters on a blue ground with maxim 'GOD BLESS P.C. AND DOWN WITH THE RUMP', *c.* 1745 [T.120-1931] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Credit line: Bequeathed by Miss Evelyn Cooke.

3.18 – Loom-woven garter ribbon of green, blue, yellow, orange and white chequered silk tartan, inscribed 'OUR PRINCE IS BRAVE OUR CAUSE IS JUST',

c. 1745 [T.121-1931] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Credit line: Bequeathed by Miss Evelyn Cooke.

3.19 – Stamped silk ribbon commemorating the defeat of the Jacobite rebellion, embossed maxims reading 'CRUSHED REBELLION' and 'GLORIOUS WILLIAM', *c.* 1746 [T.115-1999] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Credit line: Accepted by HM Government in lieu of Inheritance Tax from the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Loxley, and allocated to the V&A.

3.20 – Pin cushion of plate-printed cream satin with blue tassels, *c.* 1746 © University of Aberdeen, ABDUA: 17969

3.21 – Pin cushion of plate-printed cream satin with blue tassels, *c.* 1746 [A.1987.258] © National Museums Scotland.

3.22 – Gold mourning ring for Lord Lovat, executed 1747, inscribed 'SIN LD LOVAT BED 9 APR 1747. AE.80.', and on the inside band 'Dulce et Decorum est Pro Patria Mori', *c.* 1747 [H.NJ 88] © National Museums Scotland.

3.23 – Gold and enamel 'Four Peers' ring, commemorating the four Jacobite lords – Kilmarnock, Derwentwater, Balmerino and Lovat – executed in 1746 and 1747 for their part in the '45 campaign, *c.* 1747 [H.NJ 154] © National Museums Scotland.

3.24 – Bronze medal commemorating the execution of the Jacobite rebels and the role of the Duke of Cumberland in the suppression of the '45 campaign, *c.* 1746 [M.8542] © The Trustees of the British Museum.

3.25 – Anon., 'The Beheading of the Rebel Lords on Great Tower Hill', etching on paper, *c.* 1746 [1880,1113.3456] © The Trustees of the British Museum.

3.26 – Folding paper fan celebrating the restoration of Charles II, printed using woodblocks, *c.* 1660 [Alexander 1723] © The Fan Museum, Greenwich.

3.27 – Panel of raised embroidery work on white satin commemorating the Restoration of Charles II. English, *c.* 1665 [F236] © The Holburne Museum, Bath.

3.28 – Portions of a wall-hanging or furnishing fabric, on coarse hand-woven canvas, printed from wood blocks. English, later seventeenth century [T.17-1914] © The Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

3.29 – Hand-painted paper fan, *c.* 1715–30 [T.160-1970] © The Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Credit line: Purchased with the assistance of the National Association of Decorative and Fine Arts Societies.

3.30 – Hand-coloured, engraved paper folding fan mounted on painted ivory, attributed to Sir Robert Strange, *c.* 1745 [Alexander 626] © The Fan Museum, Greenwich.

3.31 – Hand-painted paper fan fashioned in imitation of the fans attributed to Sir Robert Strange, *c.* 1745 [852870] © National Trust Images / National Trust Collections.

3.32 – Unmounted fan-leaf, celebrating the marriage of Princess Anne to William, Prince of Orange and Nassau. Plate-printed, hand-coloured, *c.* 1734 [1891,0713.375] © The Trustees of the British Museum.

3.33 – Unmounted fan-leaf, celebrating the new reign of George III. After etching by William Hogarth, hand-coloured, *c.* 1761 [1891,0713.425] © The Trustees of the British Museum.

3.34 – Woman's small folding fan with ivory sticks with painted and printed paper leaf, depicting the Battle of Portobello. The fan is signed 'M. Gamble', *c.* 1740 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Museum purchase, 1981-195

3.35 – Folding fan with plain, uncarved bone and wooden sticks and a paper leaf with a map depicting the Battle of Cartagena, which occurred in 1741 between England and Spain over control of Spain's rich holdings in the Caribbean. Signed 'Spalding', *c.* 1741 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Museum purchase, 1985-109

3.36 – Mourning fan of painted vellum with gouache, mounted on ivory sticks and guards. British, *c.* 1751 [T.202-1959] © The Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Credit line: Given by HM Queen Mary.

3.37 – Fan depicting the 'Surrender of the Jacobite leaders to the Duke of Cumberland after the Battle of Culloden'. Hand-coloured, printed paper with wooden sticks. British, c. 1746 [T.205-1959] © The Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Credit line: Given by HM Queen Mary.

3.38 – Fan depicting the 'Siege of Stirling Castle'. Hand-coloured, printed paper with carved wooden sticks, *c.* 1746 [20720] © Stirling Museum and Art Gallery.

3.39 – Hand-painted paper fan. French or English, *c.* 1746 [Alexander 1390] © The Fan Museum, Greenwich.

3.40 – Hand-painted, paper fan mounted upon carved ivory guards and sticks, depicting Charles Edward Stuart as ruler of the Three Kingdoms of Great Britain, mid-eighteenth century [H.1994.1052] © National Museums Scotland.

3.41 – Overpainted, printed paper fan attributed to Sir Robert Strange, made *c.* 1745 and altered during the later eighteenth century [T.204-1959] © The Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Credit line: Given by HM Queen Mary.

4.1 – Charles Willson Peale, 'John Beale Bordley', oil on canvas, *c.* 1770 [1984.2.1] © Courtesy of National Gallery of Art, Washington.

4.2 – Anon., 'The able doctor, or America swallowing the bitter draught', line engraving on paper, 1774. [1868,0808.10059] © The Trustees of the British Museum.

4.3 – Carington Bowles, 'A New Method of Macarony Making, as Practised at Boston in North America', hand-coloured mezzotint, 1774 [1935,0522.2.120.c] © The Trustees of the British Museum.

4.4 – Flax tow, late eighteenth century. Raised by the Holden family in Griswold, VT [1116] © The Daughters of the American Revolution Museum, Washington DC. Gift of Miss Flora A. H. Griswold.

4.5 – R. Sayer and J. Bennet, 'A Society of Patriotic Ladies at Edenton in North Carolina', hand-coloured mezzotint, 1775 [2010,7081.3247] © The Trustees of the British Museum.

4.6 – Quilt, constructed from a variety of recycled materials. American, probably New England, *c.* 1765-85 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Museum purchase, 1974-193

4.7 – Petticoat made from bed quilt. Pale blue Chinese silk and glazed indigo wool. Pennsylvania*, c.* 1750-70 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line:

Acquired by bargain/sale from Jean H. Case, Sarah H. Nietsch, & Lucia B. Lefferts, 2005-299

4.8 – Sewing case, *c.* 1800–40 [W-588] © Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.

4.9 – Sewing case made from Martha Washington's gowns, *c.* 1800 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Gift of Anonymous Donors, 1971-1419.

4.10 – Coat, cotton and wool Virginia cloth. American, *c.* 1780 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Museum purchase, 1964-174,A

4.11 – Jacket made of resist-dyed and printed cotton chintz. South-East India, *c.* 1780 [IS.370-1992] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

4.12 – Amos Doolittle (engraver) and Peter Lacour (draftsman), 'FEDERAL HALL / The Seat of CONGRESS', etching on paper, New Haven, *c.* 1790 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1957.0816 A

4.13 –Suit, *c.* 1789 [W-574/A-B] © Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.

4.14 – Man's frock coat of grey striped wool. English, *c.* 1790 [T.281-1991] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London

4.15 – Coat, *c.* 1790–1800 [W-1514] © Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.

4.16 – Bathing gown, *c.* 1767–9 [W-580] © Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.

4.17 – Apron of blue and white check linen, marked 'EF' and '1776' in white silk cross-stitch. American, *c.* 1776 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Gift of Evelyn Schroedl, 1999-225.

4.18 – Linen plain weave, gingham fragment. New England, late eighteenth or early nineteenth century [98.1822f] © Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

4.19 – John Singleton Copley, 'Samuel Adams', oil on canvas, *c.* 1772 [L-R 30.76c] © Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

4.20 – Printed cotton banyan, *c.* 1780–99 [W-2407/A] © Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.

4.21 – Banyan, cotton chintz from the Coromandel Coast of South-East India, painted and dyed, lined with a European block-printed cotton. Tailored in England, *c.* 1750–75 [T.215-1992] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

4.22 – Voided silk velvet waistcoat, possibly of French or English origin, *c.* 1780–90 [W-2149] © Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.

4.23 – Gown of brown satin-weave silk. Possibly English, *c.* 1790–1800 [W-1523] © Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.

4.24 – Man's coat. Probably South Carolina, *c.* 1805–10 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Museum purchase, 1999-74

4.25 – Man's coat, blue homespun cotton. Probably Connecticut, *c.* 1805–10 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Museum purchase, 1991-442

5.1 – Fragment of the equestrian statue of King George III, *c.* 1770–6 [1878.5] © Collection of the New-York Historical Society.

5.2 – Teapot, ceramic creamware. Inscribed in black lettering 'No Stamp Act' on front and 'America, Liberty Restored' on reverse. Possibly manufactured by the Cockpit Hill Factory, Derby, *c.* 1766–70 [2006.0229] © The National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution.

5.3 – Four fragments of furnishing fabric, copperplate-printed cotton in purple or sepia colourway attributed to David Richards of Manchester, *c.* 1780–5 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1969.3322.001-004

5.4 – 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' furnishing fabric pattern, copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785 [CIRC.93-1960] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Credit line: Given by the Henry Francis du Pont, Winterthur Museum.

5.5 – Selvage detail of 'The Death of General James Wolfe' furnishing fabric pattern, copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, c. 1785 [75.8] © The Daughters of the American Revolution Museum, Washington DC. Gift of Mrs. Watson A. Bowron.

5.6 – Selvage detail of 'America Presenting at the Altar of Liberty Medallions of Her Illustrious Sons' furnishing fabric pattern, copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Museum purchase, 1962.0208

5.7 – 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' furnishing fabric pattern, copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1969.3179.001

5.8 – John Trumbull, 'George Washington', oil on canvas, 1780 [24.109.88] © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

5.9 – Valentine Green (after John Trumbull), 'General Washington', mezzotint on paper, 1781 [NPG.76.54] © National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution.

5.10 – Moulded terracotta medallion, *c.* 1777 [1941-68-1] © Cooper-Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum.

5.11 – 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' furnishing fabric pattern, copperplate-printed cotton in blue colourway, *c.* 1785 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1969.3182

5.12 – 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' furnishing fabric pattern, copperplate-printed cotton in sepia colourway, *c.* 1785 [74.300] © The Daughters of the American Revolution Museum, Washington DC.

5.13 – Reverse orientation of 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' furnishing fabric pattern, copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Museum purchase, 1959-18

5.14 – Copperplate printed cotton depicting King George III and his family, *c.* 1785 [62.43.1] © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

5.15 – Copperplate printed cotton depicting King George III hunting in Windsor Park, *c.* 1785 [62.43.2] © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

5.16 – Chair seat cover of plate-printed cotton in China blue colourway, *c.* 1770–95 [T.527-1985] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

5.17 – Chinoiserie furnishing fabric in a red colourway, *c.* 1775 [T.96-1959] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

5.18 – Copperplate-printed cotton in a brown colourway celebrating the works of David Garrick, *c.* 1785 [1959-51-1-b] © Cooper-Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum.

5.19 – Copperplate-printed cotton in a brown colourway celebrating the voyages of Captain James Cook to Tahiti and New Zealand, *c.* 1785 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Museum purchase, 1963-193

5.20 – Silk, plate-printed pincushion. Possibly English, *c.* 1800–25 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1959.0570

5.21 – Sidewall, showing 'Britannia' pattern. Block-printed on joined sheets of handmade paper, *c.* 1765 [1970-26-2] © Cooper-Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum.

5.22 – Sidewall, showing 'Lexington Minutemen' pattern. Block-printed on handmade paper, *c.* 1775–99 [1960-250-1-a/f] © Cooper-Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum.

5.23 – Block-printed linen bed furniture, manufactured in Philadelphia by Walters & Bedwell *c.* 1775–6 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Gift of Henry Francis du Pont, 1958.0605.001-006

5.24 – Pieced quilt, composed of block-printed textiles by the Waterman family *c.* 1780–1815 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1969.0575

5.25 – Wholecloth quilt, composed of block-printed textiles by the Waterman family *c.* 1780–1815 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1969.0576.

5.26 – Block-printed linen curtain fragment, late eighteenth/early nineteenth century [98.1821] © Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

5.27 – Fragment of roller-printed cotton, *c.* 1876 [T7723] © The National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution.

5.28 – Fragment of roller-printed cotton made to imitate pieced work, *c.* 1876 [T17321] © The National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution.

5.29 – Block-printed cotton handkerchief made in North America, *c.* 1808–9 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Gift of Henry Francis du Pont, 1959.0970

5.30 – Design for the verso of the Great Seal of the United States of America by Charles Thompson, 1782 [595257] © The National Archives of America.

5.31 – 10 cents coin, copper. Displaying profile of Liberty on the obverse and eagle on the reverse. United States Mint, Philadelphia *c.* 1792 [1991.0357.0122] © The National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution.

5.32 – Eagle quilt attributed to Susan Strong, Ohio, *c.* 1825–40 [T14833] © The National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution.

5.33 – Sidewall, showing 'Eagle' pattern. Block-printed on joined sheets of handmade paper, *c.* 1780 [1998-75-166] © Cooper-Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum.

5.34 – Jacquard double-woven, blue and white coverlet manufactured by James Alexander of Orange County, NY, *c.* 1824 [1982.0572.01] © The National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution.

5.35 – Quilt centre, block printed using Prussian blue, *c.* 1790–1800 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Museum purchase, 1960.0008

5.36 – Quilted counterpane, *c.* 1800–25 [T15294] © The National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution.

5.37 – Cotton counterpane – or table cover - block printed using Prussian blue and vermillion, *c.* 1782–1810 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Museum purchase, 1965.0086

5.38 – Quilt centre, featuring a block-printed cotton handkerchief made in Philadelphia, *c.* 1775–90 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Gift of Henry Francis du Pont, 1959.0963

5.39 – '*La Liberté américaine* /American Liberty' furnishing fabric pattern, fragments of copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1783–9 [1995-50-70-a,b] © Cooper-Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum.

5.40 – '*Hommage de l'Amérique à la France /* America Pays Homage to France' furnishing fabric pattern, panel of copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1969.3327

5.41 – Fragment of block-printed cotton in red and purple colourway, *c.* 1785–90 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1969.3326

5.42 – Valance of '*La Fête de la Fédération* / The Feast of the Federation' furnishing fabric pattern, copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1792 [1682-1899] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

5.43 – '*Louis XVI restaurateur de la liberté* / Louis XVI, restorer of liberty' furnishing fabric pattern, copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790–1 [1995-50-37-a,b] © Cooper-Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum.

5.44 – Valance of plate-printed cotton in purple colourway, *c.* 1790 [T.63-1936] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Credit line: Given by The Hon Mrs L Lindley.

5.45 – Revised '*Hommage de l'Amérique à la France /* America Pays Homage to France' furnishing fabric pattern, panel of copperplate-printed bed furniture in blue colourway, *c.* 1789 [40.770a-c] © Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

5.46 – Copperplate-printed bed furniture in brown colourway based upon the work of Henry Bunbury, *c.* 1782 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Gift of Mrs. Katherine Murphy, 1951-492,1-4

5.47 – Detail of revised copperplate-printed bed furniture in red colourway based upon the work of Henry Bunbury, *c.* 1785–90 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Anonymous gift, G1971-1560.

5.48 – Plate-printed handkerchief celebrating John Wilkes, *c.* 1775 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Gift of Sir Denys Lawson, Lord Mayor of London, 1951-447

5.49 – 'America Presenting at the Altar of Liberty Medallions of Her Illustrious Sons' furnishing fabric pattern, copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1962.0208

5.50 – 'The Apotheosis of George Washington' furnishing fabric pattern, copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway attributed to Henry Gardiner of Wandsworth, *c.* 1790–1800 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Gift of Mrs. Paul Moore, 1952.0306.003

5.51 – 'The Apotheosis of George Washington' furnishing fabric pattern, copperplate-printed cotton in blue colourway attributed to Henry Gardiner of Wandsworth, *c.* 1790 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1969.3187

5.52 – Plate- and block-printed handkerchief in blue colourway attributed to Henry Gardiner of Wandsworth, *c.* 1792 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Gift of Henry Francis du Pont, 1959.0957

5.53 – Pieced quilt *c.* 1830–40. Backing fabric was printed in England *c.* 1820 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1969.3058.

5.54 – Plate-printed handkerchief in a red colourway. Scotland, *c.* 1810–20 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Gift of Mrs. Alfred C. Harrison, 1969.0436 A

5.55 – Plate-printed cotton in a brown colourway, pieced. Scotland, *c.* 1810–20 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1969.3843

5.56 – A dressed bed in the McIntire Bedroom, composed of wholecloth quilt and a set of bed hangings © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Museum purchase, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. David J. Grossman (respectively), 1960.0166, 1974.0135.002-010.

5.57 – 'America Presenting at the Altar of Liberty Medallions of Her Illustrious Sons' furnishing fabric pattern, used in a set of copperplate printed bed furniture belonging to the Grant family of Williamsburg, *c.* 1785 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Gift of Anne Galt Kirby Black and Eugene C. Black, 1978-246,1.

5.58 – Double-breasted banyan made of repurposed copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, c. 1830. Pattern is an example of *toiles de Nantes*, titled '*Le Départ de la Garnison: Les Français en Garnison*' and was issued *c.* 1821 [T.377-2009] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

5.59 – Early nineteenth-century patchwork quilt, which contains discernible sections of 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' pattern, *c.* 1785 [T14719] © The National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution.

5.60 – Fifteen pieces of ex-upholstery fabric featuring 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' pattern. Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1780–90 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1969.8394.001-015

5.61 – Bedsheet of bleached homespun linen marked 'E.F.', *c.* 1830 [81.19] © The Daughters of the American Revolution Museum, Washington DC. Gift of Miss Bessie Whelan.

5.62 – Plate-printed handkerchief memorialising the death of George Washington marked 'Sarah. A. W, *c.* 1800 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Museum purchase, 2009-18.

6.1 – Parade banner printed in blue, red, and yellow using a carved cake board, designed by William Farrow of New York, *c.* 1824–5 [Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: IV. 4] © Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.

6.2 – Centre portion of engraved napkin taken from the diary of T. M. Cheney of Boston, *c.* 1824 [Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: IV. 8a] © Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.

6.3 – Printed cream silk mourning ribbon for Lafayette, advertising public funeral rites to be performed in Philadelphia, *c.* 1834 [Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: VI. 24.4] © Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.

6.4 – Detail of appliqued quilt attributed to Pennsylvania region, backed with roller printed commemorative fabric produced in Fall River*, c*. 1876 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1969.1274.

6.5 – Fragment of 'Trafalgar Chintz' furnishing fabric, block printed by John Bury of Lancashire*, c.* 1806–7 [T.98-1959] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

6.6 – Patchwork quilt of block printed cottons commemorating the victory of the Duke of Wellington at Vittoria, *c.* 1829 [T.428&A-1985] © Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Credit line: Given by Mrs Gwendolyn Baker, in memory of her husband, Stephen Baker.

6.7 – Cotton mourning handkerchief for George Washington, plate-printed in Glasgow, *c.* 1795–1805 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Museum purchase, 1956.0038.101.

6.8 – Man's cravat of loom woven silk bearing 'LAFAYETTE' pattern, French, *c.* 1824–5 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Museum purchase, 1969.0064.

6.9 – Plate and stamp printed silk neckerchief, French, *c*. 1824–5 [T15589] © The National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution.

6.10 – French, block-printed silk bandanna worn during the welcome celebrations for Lafayette in Philadelphia*, c*. 1824 [Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: V. 21] © Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.

6.11 – John Lewis Krimmel, 'The Quilting Frolic', oil on canvas, *c*. 1813 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Museum purchase, 1953.0178.002 A

6.12 – Watercolour mourning picture on bleached linen ground, *c*. 1800 [87.5] © Daughters of the American Revolution Museum. Gift of the Friends of the Museum.

6.13 – Embroidered silk mourning picture with painted embellishments, 'Sacred to the Memory of Illustrious Washington', attributed to a school in Philadelphia, *c*. 1805 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Museum purchase, 1956.604.1.

6.14 – Cream silk ribbon printed with memorial scene, *c*. 1800 [2073] © Daughters of the American Revolution Museum, Washington DC. Gift of Miss Bell G. Brown.

6.15 – Mourning armband of cream silk and black crape with a handstitched emblem to George Washington, *c*. 1799–1800 [2073] © Daughters of the American Revolution Museum, Washington DC. Gift of Miss Bell G. Brown.

6.16 – Parade apron, *c*. 1831–2 [2281] © Daughters of the American Revolution Museum, Washington DC. Gift of Mrs. Mary R. Moore.

6.17 – Plate-printed handkerchief in red colourway, *c*. 1785–95. Incorporated into a pieced medallion quilt, *c*. 1790–1810 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Gift of Henry Francis du Pont, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont (respectively), 1959.0958, 1969.0566

6.18 – Block and plate-printed cotton in purple and red colourway, 'The Funeral of Lord Nelson' furnishing fabric pattern, *c*. 1806 [1953-19-1] © Cooper-Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum.

6.19 – Plate-printed handkerchief memorialising the death of George Washington, *c*. 1800 [63.43] © Daughters of the American Revolution Museum, Washington DC. Gift of Mrs. Edwin A. Farnell.

6.20 – Pieced framed centre medallion quilt, incorporating a plate-printed handkerchief memorialising the death of George Washington, *c.* 1810 © The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Credit line: Museum Purchase, The Estate of Muriel and Foster McCarl, 2012-172.

6.21 – A 'Nation's Guest' commemorative umbrella manufactured by Martinot and Roe of New York, *c.* 1824–5 [Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: V. 29] © Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.

6.22 – Clothes brush, with 'LAFAYETTE 1825' printed onto the bristles, *c.* 1825 [Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: V. 7] © Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.

6.23 – Circular hand mirror with pewter edging, displaying watch paper portrait of Lafayette on the verso, *c.* 1824–5 [Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: V. 9] © Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.

6.24 – Pink leather baby shoes printed on the toe with a portrait surmounted by the phrase 'WELCOME LAFAYETTE', *c.* 1824–5 [Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: 8468] © Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.

6.25 – Waistcoat of white cotton muslin, embroidered with silk, worn by Lafayette during his Farewell Tour of America*, c.* 1824–5 [Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: IV.1.2] © Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.

6.26 – Carved ebony snuffbox depicting the scene of Lafayette at Washington's grave. French, *c.* 1830s [Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: V. 15.2] © Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.

6.27 – Plate-printed and hand-tinted silk lapel ribbon depicting America welcoming Lafayette with 'HONOUR GRATITUDE & PUBLIC ESTEEM', *c.* 1824–5 [Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: VI. 14] © Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.

6.28 – Pair of white leather gloves, printed with a dual portrait of Washington and Lafayette surmounted by the maxim 'IMPERISHABLE THEIR FAME', *c.* 1824–5 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Museum purchase, 1955.0103.003, 1955.0103.004

6.29 – Roller-printed cotton handkerchief, depicting the arrival of Lafayette in America, attributed to the Germantown Print-works of Philadelphia, *c.* 1824–5 © Courtesy of Winterthur Museum, Museum purchase, 1967.0144.

6.30 – Blue and white loom-woven coverlet issued to celebrate Lafayette's presence in America on 4 July, variation upon the 'Agriculture & Manufactures' pattern, *c.* 1825 [T18131] © National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution.

Academic Thesis: Declaration of Authorship

I, ROSANNE ELIZABETH WAINE

declare that this thesis and the work presented in it are my own and has been generated by me as the result of my own original research.

Title of thesis: 'Refashioning Patriotic Display in Britain and America: Rebellion, nationhood, and sartorial culture, *c.* 1745–1825.'

I confirm that:

1. This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;

2. Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;

3. Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;

4. Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;

5. I have acknowledged all main sources of help;

6. Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;

7. Either none of this work has been published before submission, or parts of this work have been published as: [please list references below]:

Signed: Rosanne Waine……………………………………………

Date: 12/07/18………………………………………………

Acknowledgements

xxx

My family and friends have been a bedrock of support throughout my academic career thus far. Without their love and encouragement (and often their hospitality), this experience would have been inexpressibly harder. Thank you in particular to the Andersen-Waines for playing host whenever I needed to consult material in London, and to my parents and godmother for always being at the end of the phone when I needed it most.

Finally, thank you to my husband Jack. I doubt I could have achieved this without you.

Abbreviations

AIC:	The Art Institute of Chicago
BL:	The British Library
BM:	The British Museum
CKL:	Carl A. Kroch Library, Cornell University
CWF:	The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation
CHSDM:	Cooper-Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum
DARM:	Daughters of the American Revolution Museum, Washington DC
DBSL:	Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.
FM:	The Fan Museum, Greenwich
IMAG:	Inverness Museum and Art Gallery
JDCMPE:	The Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Winterthur Museum, Garden and Library
JRL:	John D. Rockefeller Jr. Library, The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation
MHS:	The Massachusetts Historical Society
MET:	The Metropolitan Museum of Art
MV:	Mount Vernon Ladies' Association
MFAB:	Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
NGS:	National Galleries Scotland
NT:	The National Trust
NLS:	National Library of Scotland
NMAH:	The National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution
NMM:	National Maritime Museum, Greenwich
NMS:	National Museums Scotland

NRS: National Records Scotland

NYHS: The New York Historical Society

NYPL: New York Public Library

RCT: The Royal Collection Trust

SMAG: Stirling Museum and Art Gallery

TNA: The National Archives, Kew

WHM: West Highland Museum

WM: Winterthur Museum

UAM: University of Aberdeen Museums, Scotland

VAM: The Victoria and Albert Museum, London

In 1789, a furniture pattern titled '*A la gloire de Louis XVI* / To the glory of Louis XVI' was produced by Gorgerat Frères et Cie, a toile manufactory in Nantes **[Fig: 0.1]**.[1] The design was transferred onto a bleached cotton ground using red ink and engraved copperplates. Monochromatic printed cottons, such as this, were most commonly used to decorate middling and upper-class homes in Europe during the second half of the eighteenth century. They normally featured a repeating design inspired by the art, literature or politics of the day, and were fashioned into myriad household furnishings, including window curtains, bed hangings, and seat and sofa upholstery.[2] This furniture pattern is an example of a 'topical good', manufactured to coincide with the early stirrings of Republican rhetoric that opposed the character and purpose of the Bourbon monarchy, a trend which manifested itself in both the material culture and popular discourse of French society on the eve of the Revolution.[3]

The repeating pattern of '*A la gloire de Louis XVI* / To the glory of Louis XVI' is composed of four allegorical scenes denoting peace and prosperity in the nation, separated by swags, floral garlands and cornucopias. Contained within a diamond-shaped frame is the female figure of France. She wears a crown, brandishes a sceptre, and cradles a globe emblazoned with *fleur de lys*. In the early 1790s, these recognisable emblems of the absolute authority of the Bourbon monarchy were painstakingly embroidered over, the crown transformed into a *bonnet de la liberté*, or liberty cap, and the *fleur de lys* partially obscured by a criss-crossing net of silken stitches **[Fig: 0.1*a*]**. This transformative act was performed by an unknown hand in

---

[1] *CHSDM* 1995-50-31-a,b (Two fragments of copperplate-printed cotton featuring the design 'A la glorie de Louis XVI' in a red colourway. French, produced by Gorgerat Frères et Cie, *c*. 1789).

[2] See in particular: Linda Eaton, *Printed Textiles: British and American Cottons and Linens, 1700-1850. Based on the 1970 classic by Florence M. Montgomery* (New York: The Monacelli Press, 2014).

[3] It was not only household textiles which marked a shift in the national iconography of France. For work which addresses transitional furniture styles during the Revolutionary period, see: Leora Auslander, *Taste and Power: Furnishing Modern France* (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996).

reaction to the outbreak of the French Revolution, when the *ancien régime* was violently dismantled and replaced by a Republican system of government.

This warring of iconographies in the material landscape of everyday life is defined in this thesis as 'patriotic refashioning', a process which relates specifically to the political dressing of one's body and home in response to periods of national crisis.[4] It shall be argued that the patriotic refashioning of *sartorial culture* – namely dress, fashionable accessories, and domestic décor – occurred when a nation's state of affairs were thrown into upheaval as a result of civil conflict or rebellion.[5] It was a tangible reaction, expressed in the material choices of political actors, consumers and manufacturers, who were operating at the apex of revolutionary change. This thesis argues that individuals who engaged in processes of patriotic refashioning were not acting solely in response to stimuli in the political world, however. They were also responding to shifting patterns of consumption in the British Atlantic region during the long eighteenth century, which placed an increased cultural importance on certain objects, behaviours, and modes of dress in everyday social life. Finally, this thesis will show that patriotic dress and topical goods fashioned during such periods of national crisis did not simply reflect the turning tide of contemporary events. Rather, these objects had the power to be transformative agents in the national consciousness. Their designs, uses, and extended lifecycles made them the ideal vessels for the formation and conveyance of collective popular memory, informing how periods of rebellion were remembered and incorporated into the national consciousness over the course of the long eighteenth century.

---

[4] The term 'patriotic refashioning' has previously been applied in literature studies by Angela Wright to mean the rebranding of a nation's cultural commodities to meet the needs of a different audience, i.e. sanitising a piece of French prose for a British audience via the process of translation, making it palatable/acceptable for consumption during periods of Anglo-French aggression. See: Angela Wright, *Britain, France and the Gothic, 1764-1820: The Import of Terror* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 33-5. As far as can be ascertained, the term has not yet been used in material culture studies to describe the transformative power of political things.

[5] It is understood that the term 'sartorial' typically refers to clothing, and to tailored fashion specifically. However, in this thesis the term has been intentionally broadened to encompass all modes of dressing and adornment. 'Sartorial culture' is here used as a shorthand for the material culture of body and home, which are considered in this thesis as critical components of patriotic self-fashioning and political participation.

In reference to the above, this thesis will aim to address four major research questions:

- Why and how did political actors use sartorial culture as a means of self-fashioning during periods of civil conflict and rebellion?

- How were such sartorial cultures of rebel identity represented in the designs of commercially manufactured topical goods, circulated during and after periods of national upheaval?

- From the perspective of consumers and manufacturers resident in the British Atlantic region, how were such sartorial cultures of rebel identity accommodated by the material landscape of everyday life?

- Finally, how did the victory or defeat of a rebellion impact on how it came to be represented in the patriotic material culture of national memory?

Research context: Political material culture and the long eighteenth-century experience

'Canvassing for Votes' is one of a series of four vignettes, which were painted by William Hogarth *c.* 1755 [**Fig: 0.2**]. Collectively referred to as *The Humours of an Election*, each painting caricatures a scene from the General Election of 1754. The series as a whole was a pointed commentary by Hogarth on the corruption evident in parliamentary politics of the period.[6] Visible in the top left-hand corner of 'Canvassing for Votes', two women are shown leaning over the balcony of the Royal Oak public house. The woman on the left wears an orange gown, while her companion is dressed in blue – the emblematic tones of the Whig and Tory parties in Britain.[7] This partisan colour scheme can also be observed in a collection of ribbons for sale, which spill from a box of election favours held open by a peddler in the street below. The woman in orange silk points down at an orange garland and implores the Whig candidate, who stands at the entrance to the Royal Oak, to make a

---

[6] Ronald Paulson, *Hogarth: Art and Politics, 1750-1764* (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 1993), pp. 152-184.

[7] Kathleen Wilson, *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715-1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 49, p. 88, p. 91, p. 345.

purchase on her behalf. He obediently produces his purse, as a party agent moves forward brandishing a manifesto.[8]

Hogarth's scene neatly exemplifies how the material culture of political action was intimately woven into the fabric of eighteenth-century social life: from coloured hair ribbons denoting party loyalty to silver coat buttons bearing the controversial emblem of the Jacobite white rose **[Fig: 0.3]**, the most mundane of personal accessories could be refashioned for both political and patriotic ends.[9] Even incorporating divisive political portraits into the designs of everyday ephemera – such as tobacco stoppers, letter seals, and fans – had the power to redefine quotidian practises in the long eighteenth century, allowing their manufacturers and owners to infer their political identities across an array of commonplace activities and gestures, be it 'unbuttoning a coat, smoking a pipe or having a drink.'[10]

The politicisation of personal dress and the material culture of the home was not a phenomenon unique to the long eighteenth-century experience.[11] However, the effects of the consumer revolution that occurred in Britain during this period meant that political and patriotic self-fashioning through material culture became a more accessible pursuit for a broader cross-section of society and through a wider array of objects and visual mediums than had previously been possible.[12] As argued by John Styles in his study of plebeian fashions in eighteenth-century England, 'Material abundance came to play a crucial part in defining what it was to be English for rich

---

[8] *Sir John Soane's Museum* P56 (William Hogarth, 'An Election II: Canvassing for Votes', oil on canvas, *c.* 1754–55).

[9] *UAM* ABDUA: 17618 (Set of eleven silver buttons with looped backs engraved with the Jacobite white rose, *c.* 1745).

[10] Mark Hallet, *The Spectacle of Difference: Graphic Satire in the Age of Hogarth* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1999), p. 30.

[11] See in particular, covering examples of political dressing from the late eighteenth through to the late twentieth century: Wendy Parkins, ed., *Fashioning the Body Politic: Dress, Gender, Citizenship* (Oxford & New York: Yale University Press, 2002).

[12] Neil McKendrick, John Brewer and J. H. Plumb, *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-century England* (London: Europa, 1982); Maxine Berg and Elizabeth Eger, eds., *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century: Debates, Desires and Delectable Goods* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

and poor alike.'[13] Concurrent to this rise in extensive consumer choice was the emergent sense of a shared national identity, which found physical form in the material landscape of everyday life.[14]

The extent to which dress was closely tied to political and patriotic self-expression during the long eighteenth century has featured in the research of multiple scholars, hailing largely from the disciplines of art history, dress and fashion history, and the work of some social and cultural historians. Dominant themes of inquiry have included the emergence of patriotic consumer trends and commodities during periods of international conflict,[15] as well as the material culture of electioneering, popular protest and radicalism.[16] By studying the material culture of patriotic dress and domestic décor, scholars have gained a deeper understanding of how this strand of consumption could stand as a form of cultural citizenship for members of the extra-parliamentary nation – in particular, for unenfranchised women and for those lower down the social rungs.[17]

---

[13] John Styles, *The Dress of the People: Everyday Fashion in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven & New York: Yale University Press, 2007), p. 2, p. 16.

[14] Frank O'Gorman, *The Long Eighteenth Century: British Political and Social History, 1688-1832*, 2nd edn (London & New York: Bloomsbury, 2016); Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, 2nd edn (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2005).

[15] Padhraig Higgins, *A Nation of Politicians: Gender, Patriotism, and Political Culture in Late Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Madison & London: University of Wisconsin Press, 2010); Kathleen Wilson, 'Patriotism, Trade and Empire' in *Nelson, Navy and Nation: The Royal Navy and the British People, 1688-1815*, eds., Quentin Colville and James Davey (London: Conway, 2013), pp. 42-57.

[16] Katrina Navickas, '"That sash will hang you": Political Clothing and Adornment in England, 1780-1840', *Journal of British Studies*, 49/3 (2010), pp. 540-65; Mark Nixon, Gordon Pentland and Matthew Roberts, 'The Material Culture of Scottish Reform Politics, c.1820-1884', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 31: 1 (2012), pp. 28-49; Ruth Mather, 'The Home-Making of the English Working Class: Radical Politics and Domestic Life in Late-Georgian England, c.1790-1820' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Queen Mary University of London, 2016).

[17] Elaine Chalus, 'Fanning the Flames: Women, Fashion, and Politics' in *Women, Popular Culture, and the Eighteenth Century*, ed., Tiffany Potter (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), pp. 92-111; Rachel Wilson, *Elite Women in Ascendancy Ireland, 1690-1745: Imitation and Innovation* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2015), p. 114; Erin Griffey, ed., *Sartorial Politics in Early Modern Europe: Fashioning Women* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2019).

It has been shown that commercially manufactured topical goods intended for the decoration of the home were a significant feature of the material expression of patriotism during the long eighteenth century in Hanoverian Britain, alongside the more public-facing medium of clothing and personal adornment. While popular throughout the British Atlantic region, the fashion for topical goods arguably originated in England in the later seventeenth century, when a market for royal souvenirs emerged to mark the restoration of the Stuart monarchy and the subsequent coronation of Charles II in 1661. Recent work interrogating the form and function of topical goods has shown that they were seldom the product of state-sanctioned propaganda, however, but of independent commercial enterprise. As demonstrated by Eva Giloi in her analysis of loyalist memorabilia manufactured and sold in support of Prussian interests during the Seven Years War, the mass majority of topical goods were the work of private entrepreneurs and not of state officials engaging in reputation management for the monarchy.[18] Also, as shown by scholars such as Katrina Navickas, topical goods were not the preserve of upper-class consumers within British society. Rather, their accessible designs and varying material qualities allowed topical goods to filter down the social scale, enabling a common material literacy of patriotism to develop across class divisions in the British Atlantic region.[19] As shall be demonstrated in this thesis, this was especially true of ceramics and furniture fabrics fashioned during the second half of the long eighteenth century, when the celebration of royal personages as national figureheads extended to encompass popular heroes and politicians tied to Britain's expanding naval, military, and mercantile interests. That such individuals were increasingly becoming the subject of high art and popular print culture allowed their likenesses to be readily incorporated into the material landscape of the domestic space. Buying into what Linda Colley has termed the 'cult of elite heroism', manufacturers would often look to patriotic scenes depicted in visual culture to inform the designs of

---

[18] Eva Giloi, *Monarchy, Myth, and Material Culture in Germany, 1750-1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 25-7.

[19] Katrina Navickas, 'The 'Spirit of Loyalty': Material Culture, Space and the Construction of an English Loyalist Memory, 1790-1840' in *Loyalism and the Formation of the British World, 1775-1914*, eds., Allan Blackstock and Frank O'Gorman (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2014), p. 56.

mass-produced transfer-printed wares, fashioned to appeal to a broad selection of purchasers.[20]

An example of the latter can be observed in those household commodities manufactured to commemorate General James Wolfe, the 'British military martyr' of the Seven Years War.[21] Following his demise at the Battle of Quebec in 1759, Wolfe's image was fast incorporated into various domestic wares throughout the 1760s – from hardy cast iron firebacks in Massachusetts to soft-paste porcelain and tin-glazed earthenware goods coming out of Liverpool.[22] In 1771, Benjamin West's evocative painting 'The Death of General Wolfe' was exhibited at the Royal Academy in London to critical acclaim **[Fig: 0.4]**.[23] Notwithstanding the classical arrangement of the figures, it was initially disliked by George III as he felt West's depiction of contemporary clothing compromised the tragic dignity of the scene. However, it was this very blending of 'realism with classical grandeur' which endeared both the painting and its subject to the public at large and created a lucrative market for copies.[24] Engravings based on West's work rapidly began to circulate in printshops across Britain, while the nation's potteries and textile printers reproduced the image on earthenware and calicoes for popular consumption by an international audience **[Fig: 0.5]**.[25] At the same time that these cheap imitations proliferated in the homes of the middling sort, the original painting was purchased at

---

[20] Colley, *Britons* (2005), pp. 177-93.

[21] Alan McNairn, *Behold the Hero: General Wolfe and the Arts in the Eighteenth Century* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997), p. 166.

[22] Examples of these earlier creations include a cast iron fireback bearing the likeness of Wolfe alongside the monogram of George III (*WM* 1952.0012) and an array of soft-paste porcelain and tin-glazed earthenware goods manufactured by John Sadler of Liverpool, which all date to the early 1760s (*VAM* C.52-1938; *VAM* 414:784-1885).

[23] *National Gallery of Canada* 8007 (Benjamin West, 'The Death of General Wolfe', oil on canvas, 1770).

[24] Peter Paret, *Imagined Battles: Reflections of War in European Art* (Chapel Hill & London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), p. 48.

[25] *WM* 1975.0112 (Transfer-printed earthenware mug, 'The Death of General Wolfe' design. English, 1800); *WM* 1962.0035.001 (Copperplate-printed cotton featuring the design 'The Death of General Wolfe' in a red colourway. English, *c.* 1785).

great expense by Lord Grosvenor and hung at Eaton Hall in Cheshire.[26] This celebratory trend continued well into the early nineteenth century, with the expansion of Britain's imperial ambitions and the advent of conflicts such as the Napoleonic Wars serving to maintain a market for mass-produced material culture dedicated to honouring military and naval heroes as vessels of national pride and aspiration. When Vice-Admiral Horatio Nelson was killed at the Battle of Trafalgar in October 1805, for example, his likeness became the focal point of personal accessories as various as patch boxes, fob seals, and scarf pins, while graphic depictions of the Battle of Trafalgar were also immortalised on glassware and ceramics used at dinner tables or placed in display cabinets across the British Atlantic region.[27]

The sartorial culture of patriotic display in Hanoverian Britain, as outlined above, is currently characterised by its celebration of monarchy, support of imperial expansion, and praise of local manufacturing. While extremely compelling in its own right, this body of material culture represents only a partial view of the national identities operating in the British Atlantic region during the long eighteenth century.[28] Ample opportunity remains to engage with the sartorial cultures of

---

[26] Christopher Christie, *The British Country House in the Eighteenth Century* (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2000), p. 212.

[27] *NMM* OBJ0084 (Pink and white enamel patch box, design of guns and naval trophies surmounted by a scroll inscribed 'Nelson and British Gratitude.' Bilston, *c.* 1805); *NMM* OBJ0094 (Blue and white enamel patch box, inscribed on lid 'WHEN Nelson knew the Battle won he said to fate GODS will be done.' Bilston, *c.* 1805); *NMM* JEW0094 (Pinchbeck fob seal set with a cornelian intaglio, engraved with portrait of Horatio Nelson above the word 'TRAFALGAR', early nineteenth century); *NMM* JEW0327 (Oval black glass cameo mounted on the head of a metal scarf pin, *c.* 1805); *NMM* GGG0450 (Rummer with a bucket bowl, a collared stem with a knop and a terraced foot. Wheel-engraved on one side with a warship in full sail inscribed 'VICTORY', on the other side with a wreath containing the words 'LORD NELSON OCTR. 21 1805', early nineteenth century); *NMM* AAA4957 (Earthenware teapot, transfer-printed in blue with an overall wave design, with motifs and inscriptions celebrating Nelson's victories at the Battle of the Nile and the Battle of Trafalgar, *c.* 1806); *NMM* AAA4860 (Earthenware mug, transfer-printed in blue, fluted and slightly flared at the base with a painted ochre rim. One side bears a portrait of Nelson, inscribed around the portrait 'ENGLAND EXPECTS EVERY MAN TO DO HIS DUTY below 'Shew me my Country's Foes, the Hero cry'd, He saw-He fought-He conquer'd-and he di'd.' On the other side is depicted a naval battle, with the word 'VICTORY' inscribed above, *c.* 1806).

[28] This body of material culture is already being explored in an ongoing research project by Serena Dyer, 'Making Britannia: British Nationhood, Consumption, and Material Culture, 1707-1837'. See

contested and rebellious nationhoods and gauge their lasting influences on the material world, an area of scholarship which is at present largely dominated by analysis of Revolutionary France. Historians of the French Revolution have long since accepted the contentious performative space that emblematic dress and topical goods could occupy during periods of intense national upheaval.[29] Importantly, it was a phenomenon that encompassed the material worlds of advocates on either side of the political coin: as Revolutionaries repurposed the national and monarchical colours of red, blue and white into *tricolore* ensembles of resistance to Bourbon absolutism**,** Royalists who remained resident in Paris during the Terror purchased red ribbons and chokers to wear around their necks as solemn, sartorial memorials to the executed King and Queen.[30] The complexities of the patriotic sartorial culture which underpinned the French Revolution and its Republican aftermath is referred to as a leading example of a phenomenon described by cultural historian Leora Auslander as 'the revolutionary transformation of the everyday'.[31]

The popular intersection of sartorial politics with rebel identity in the material landscape of everyday life was not exclusive to the French Revolutionary experience. However, the subject has yet to be thoroughly addressed in comparable eighteenth-century contexts. By adopting a case study approach, this thesis will show how

---

also: 'Chapter 7: The Patriotic Consumer in England and France' in Serena Dyer, 'Trained to Consume: Dress and the Female Consumer in England, 1720-1820' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Warwick, 2016), pp. 270-309.

[29] There is a large body of scholarship which specifically addresses the form, function, and legacy of dress culture during the French Revolutionary era. See in particular: Aileen Ribeiro, *Fashion in the French Revolution* (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1988); Richard Wrigley, *The Politics of Appearances: Representations of Dress in Revolutionary France* (Oxford & New York: Berg, 2002); Kimberly Chrisman-Campbell, *Fashion Victims: Dress at the Court of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2015).

[30] Sharon Sadako Takeda, Kaye Durland Spilker, and Clarissa M. Escuera, *Reigning Men: Fashion in Menswear, 1715-2015* (Munich: Prestel and Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 2016), pp. 24-31; Caroline Weber, *Queen of Fashion: What Marie Antoinette Wore to the Revolution* (London: Aurum Press Ltd, 2007), pp. 8-9.

[31] Leora Auslander, *Cultural Revolutions: Everyday Life and Politics in Britain, North America, and France* (Berkley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2009). See also: Colin Jones and Dror Wahrman, eds., *The Age of Cultural Revolutions: Britain and France, 1750-1820* (Berkley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002).

participants in two rebellions that occurred in the British Atlantic region during the long eighteenth century utilised emblematic dress and topical goods as material indicators of internal unity and external resistance: the final Jacobite rising of 1745-6 and the American Revolution of 1763-83.

The definition of 'rebellion' as used in this thesis refers to an uprising directed against an established overarching authority. As shall be outlined in more detail below, both the Jacobite Cause and the American Revolution may be characterised as rebellions in that each worked against the governmental and monarchical power structures of the British state. That the former has historically been regarded as a *rebellion* while the latter has been overwhelming remembered as a *revolution* may be partially explained by the failure of one and the success of the other, a concept which shall be explored in this thesis by analysing the formation and character of their attendant ideological and material cultures.[32]

Each of these case studies will demonstrate how contested patriotic identities found material expression in the political dressing of body and home in the British Atlantic region. It shall be shown how political actors, consumers and manufacturers alike employed dress and domestic décor to legitimise their causes of resistance and to ideologically and materially circumvent the authority of the British government and the Hanoverian monarchy. Secondly, each case study will explore how the sartorial culture of rebellion fared in the immediate aftermath of conflict, when victory or defeat dictated how a rebellion was incorporated into the patriotic material culture of national memory. The aim of this case study approach is to bring a new perspective to the patriotic display culture of the British Atlantic region, as currently defined, and demonstrate how the material cultures of rebellion could be accommodated within the prevailing commercial practices of the long eighteenth century despite their inherently controversial natures.

---

[32] J. C. D. Clark, *Revolution and Rebellion: State and Society in England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 115. See also: Brendan McConville, *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Eric Nelson, *The Royalist Revolution: Monarchy and the American Founding* (Cambridge, MA & London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2014).

Sources and Methodology

Instances of politicised material culture surfaced periodically in the British Atlantic region throughout the long eighteenth century, with groups of surviving objects in today's museum collections acting as the physical links between the ideologies of particular movements and the personal convictions of past participants. Central to the analysis of objects in this thesis is the assertion that emblematic material culture is critical to the formation and maintenance of collective popular memories. In terms of constructing national identities in the public sphere, this premise might best be illustrated by the erection of monuments to commemorate significant figures and events. However, this largely civic form of patriotic display culture stands in stark contrast to the highly personal use of patriotic dress and domestic commodities closely tied to the intimate landscapes of body and home.

To better understand the complex space occupied by the material culture of contested national identity within post-rebellion societies, this thesis maps the physical and ideological afterlives of political things in addition to examining an object's period of most active use. This approach has necessitated extensive handling, photography, and comparison of objects across public collections, examining the methods of their manufacture, as well as marking material changes to their designs and iconographic elements over time. However, while the analysis of surviving dress and textile objects is formative to this study, they are by no means the only category of primary source which is addressed. By approaching the subject through the interdisciplinary lens of multiple source types – spanning the material, visual, and documentary – this thesis aims to contextualise acts of patriotic refashioning within the everyday experiences of political actors, consumers, and manufacturers.

A significant benefit to consulting multiple primary source types in conjunction with objects is that museum collections do not fully represent the material experience of past societies. Rather, they fall prey to many of the same biases that influenced the formation of archival and library collections used in historical research: 'prioritising the elite, the prized, the complete and the robust.'[33] Addressing other source types will complicate this issue of exclusivity, and locate the meanings of political things

---

[33] Leonie Hannan and Sarah Longair, *History Through Material Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), p. 31.

within the lives of a wider cross-section of past individuals.[34] Furthermore, by consulting visual and documentary sources in addition to the material we can reconstruct the cultural contexts of these controversial objects in a manner that would not be possible by viewing objects in isolation. The archival sources consulted in this thesis, for example – chiefly diaries, letters, and the account books of businesses and households – have been invaluable for providing glimpses of individual engagement with the material culture of contested nationhood during pivotal moments of political upheaval. Useful for demonstrating the commercial contexts of these objects – such as their monetary value and regional availability – such archival sources have also served to highlight the emotional resonance of objects manufactured and used in periods of conflict, as well as their continued relevance for owners/inheritors in subsequent years.

Historians have traditionally turned to written documents to provide the information required to study the consumer habits of past societies. Probate inventories have proven particularly useful, in that they provide snapshots of the commercial lives of individuals through the meticulous detailing of the contents of entire households.[35] Meanwhile, evidence drawn from various species of life writing – letters, diaries, account books – has allowed historians to engage with the personal experience of everyday consumption, and how such experiences were effected by social considerations of gender and class.[36] The incorporation of object-based evidence into such studies has come to the fore only gradually with the development of cross-

---

[34] Such approaches have been successful in the work of several social and cultural historians, who have deepened understanding of the meanings of dress and domestic décor in eighteenth-century society by approaching the subject through complementary archival, published, and visual sources. This has been of significant benefit to the study of gendered and class-based consumption. See in particular: Beverly Lemire, *The Business of Everyday Life: Gender, Practice and Social Politics in England, c. 1600-1900* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005); John Styles and Amanda Vickery, eds., *Gender, Taste, and Material Culture in Britain and North America, 1700-1830* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2006); Chloe Wigston Smith, *Women, Work, and Clothes in the Eighteenth-Century Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

[35] Lorna Weatherill, *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain, 1660-1760*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 1996).

[36] See: Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1998); Karen Harvey, *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

disciplinary methodologies, born largely out of collaboration with the fields of anthropology, archaeology, sociology and art history. The approaches of art historians – most notably that of Jules Prown – have been particularly influential for social and cultural historians seeking to understand the 'emotional and psychological dimensions of material culture', as well as how to usefully define and contextualise an object via an initial examination of its physical and aesthetic qualities.[37] Prown's method champions the observation of the stylistic qualities of objects, framing them as indicators of the cultural beliefs of those who made them, purchased them, and used them. This approach positions objects as primary sources capable of just as much interpretative depth as the written word.[38]

The majority of objects referenced in this thesis were examined first-hand during a series of research visits to public collections between 2014-18. As an object's material characteristics are often difficult to glean from the study of photographs alone, methods of documentation included checklists and sketches made alongside detailed record shots for later reference.[39] When deemed appropriate by the hosting institution, this process of recording observations and reflections was extended to include evidence derived from the physical handling of the objects themselves.[40]

This close and comparative approach to the examination of extant dress objects has led to a better understanding of details of construction and embellishment, illuminating historical practices of recycling and reuse within the lifecycle of an artefact which might otherwise have been missed.[41] While a fundamental

---

[37] Karen Harvey, 'Introduction: Practical Matters' in *History and Material Culture: A Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources*, ed., Karen Harvey (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2009), p. 2.

[38] Jules David Prown, 'Mind in Matter: An Introduction to Material Culture Theory and Method', *Winterthur Portfolio*, 17: 1 (1982), pp. 1-19; Jules David Prown, 'The Truth of Material Culture: History or Fiction?' in *History from Things: Essays on Material Culture*, eds., Steven Lubar and W. David Kingery (Washington & London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993), pp. 1-19.

[39] As proposed by: Ingrid Mida and Alexandra Kim, *The Dress Detective: A Practical Guide to Object-based Research in Fashion* (London & New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015).

[40] Hannah and Longair, *History Through Material Culture* (2017), p. 123.

[41] Victoria Kelley, 'Time, Wear and Maintenance: The Afterlife of Things' in *Writing Material Culture History*, eds., Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello (London & New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), pp. 191-197; Arianne Fennetaux, Amelie Junqua and Sophie Vasset, eds., *The*

consideration for the study of any object, when applied to the study of dress objects with established political histories, the ability to recognise and date physical changes has allowed the researcher to move beyond the period of an object's initial usage and consider the motivations behind later acts of alteration, preservation, damage or destruction. This method has proven integral for defining when an object became incorporated into the material culture of a rebellion, and how the passage of time impacted on the physical form and patriotic function of that object. As was demonstrated above by interrogating the refashioned iconography of the toile 'A la gloire de Louis XVI / To the glory of Louis XVI' by the Nantes-based manufactory Gorgerat Frères et Cie **[Fig: 0.1 and 01*a*]**, politically-driven reconfigurations could occur in a relatively short space of time, documenting critical shifts in a volatile Revolutionary landscape that might not be otherwise captured in the written record.[42]

Other examples of patriotic refashioning from the material record speak to gradual turns commensurate with the changing fortunes of a rebel movement over a more extended period. The overpainting of symbolic elements on a *c.*1745 Jacobite fanleaf during the 1770s is read in this thesis, for example, as a reflection of a shift in popular sympathies towards the Stuart Cause in the years following the defeat of the last Jacobite rising in 1746 **[Fig: 3.41]**. As shall be discussed in Chapter 3, collectively examining a large selection of Jacobite fans held across multiple public collections allows us to place this single act of refashioning into its proper material, commercial, and ideological contexts. Studying the original design of the fanleaf made by pro-Jacobite engraver Robert Strange *c.*1745 – found in examples held by the Fan Museum, British Museum, National Museums Scotland and the West Highland Museum – uncovers which aspects of the fanleaf were obscured by additional layers of gouache in the 1770s **[Fig: 3.30]**.[43] Notably, the most provocative elements of Strange's original design have been removed from the outer

Afterlife of Used Things: Recycling in the Long Eighteenth Century (New York & Abingdon: Routledge, 2015).

[42] Ulrich Lehmann, 'Material Culture and Materiality: The French Revolution in Wallpaper', in *Writing Material Culture History* (2015), pp. 173-190.

[43] *VAM* T. 204-1959 (Overpainted, printed paper fan attributed to Sir Robert Strange, made *c.* 1745 and altered during the later eighteenth century) and *FM* Alexander 626 (Hand-coloured, engraved paper folding fan mounted on painted ivory, attributed to Sir Robert Strange, *c.* 1745). These two fans are discussed in-depth in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

edges of the refashioned fanleaf: the Hanoverian faction being violently chased down by the god Jupiter and allegories of Rapine and Murder, as the seated figure of Britannia watches in seeming approval of the ascendance of the exiled Charles Edward Stuart, who Strange has depicted occupying the centre of the design. Demonstrably, adopting a close and comparative approach to the study of Jacobite fans allows for a deeper appreciation of how the deliberate alteration of Strange's original design transformed what was once a potent object of support for the '45 campaign into a politically toothless aid to memory of a revolution that almost was, a curio far removed from both the political and monarchical realities of Hanoverian Britain in the 1770s.

To further investigate how the sartorial culture of contested nationhood was utilised, represented, and remembered in the British Atlantic region during the long eighteenth century, this thesis makes use of two main types of visual source material in addition to the evidence presented by objects: professional portraiture and popular prints.

Similar to how seeing extant clothing mounted on a figure allows us to explore how a garment might have been physically filled by a past wearer, the study of dress in visual sources offers the researcher a sensory reading of embodiment that is difficult to glean from the consultation of written documents alone. Referring to depictions of elite fashion in sixteenth and seventeenth-century England, Anna Reynolds maintains that portraiture can communicate many aspects of the lived experience of clothing. As well as demonstrating the 'fashionably correct way of wearing clothing – how garments looked on the body, how they were padded, how they were combined, accessorised or held', Reynolds argues that examining dress in portraiture enables the researcher to 'imagine how it would have felt to wear the clothes, and what noises they would have made […] the posture required and the rules of deportment to be obeyed'.[44] There is also the individual personalities of the sitters to be considered, whose tastes and concerns can be glimpsed through the clothing choices made in their portraits, hinting at the broader material worlds they inhabited.

---

[44] Anna Reynolds, *In Fine Style: The Art of Tudor and Stuart Fashion* (London: Royal Collection Trust, 2013), p. 23.

To perform this kind of visual analysis of portrayed dress successfully it is essential to cultivate an intimate understanding of physical dress form and construction through the first-hand study of extant garments. Linda Baumgarten, for example, has stressed that a 'thorough understanding of genuine period clothing' enables the researcher to 'differentiate between painterly convention and actual clothing.'[45] In other words, possessing a tangible knowledge of historic dress construction trains the eye to recognise when portrayed dress strays into the realm of invention, thereby creating an imagined reality of a garment. However, this ability to differentiate imagined from real dress in prints and paintings must also be tempered by a thorough understanding of the portraiture traditions and cultural conventions of the period and the place under consideration, as well as the individual style of the artist in question.[46] As emphasised by Claudia Brush Kidwell, when the social historian attempts to analyse the meaning of dress through the study of visual culture 'without expertise in either art history or costume history', misunderstandings – such as the misidentification of dress fabrics and styles – can easily cloud the true significance of what has been depicted on the canvas.[47]

In order to gauge how dress was employed in the visual representation of one's patriotic self, this thesis will analyse professional portraiture commissioned during periods of political upheaval. It shall be assumed that portraits acted as significant sites of self-fashioning for their owners, not only through their commission but also through their display and reception. As discussed by Robert Tittler, as material objects the 'decorative and emotive functions' of portraiture 'required that they be displayed in particular spaces and with particular viewing audiences in mind.'[48] In

---

[45] Linda Baumgarten, *What Clothes Reveal: The Language of Clothing in Colonial and Federal America* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 22.

[46] Lou Taylor, *The Study of Dress History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 118.

[47] Claudia Brush Kidwell, 'Are Those Clothes Real? Transforming the Way Eighteenth-Century Portraits are Studied', *Dress* 24:1 (1997), p. 4. See also: Aileen Ribeiro, *The Art of Dress: Fashion in England and France, 1750-1820* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1995).

[48] Robert Tittler, 'Faces and Spaces: Displaying the Civic Portrait in Early Modern England' in *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and its Meanings*, eds., Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2010), p. 179. See also: Marcia Pointon, *Hanging the Head: Portraiture and Social Formation in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1993).

other words, they were seldom commissioned solely for private or individual enjoyment and relied on the appraising eyes of others to engender meaning. T.H. Breen, for example, has argued that 'the central element' in mid-eighteenth-century American portraiture 'may have been the sitter's clothes, the character and quality of the fabric', rather than the posture of the depicted body or the details of the face.[49] Breen's thesis positions the display of British Atlantic commercial goods at the heart of colonial self-fashioning, both physically in the lived space and representationally through the medium of the portrait. Approaching portraiture in this manner, in consultation with complementary source types, enables the researcher to draw informed conclusions on how the choice of dress and the manner in which it is incorporated into the composition of a painting may be imbued with political symbolism. This approach also aligns with the cross-disciplinary work of scholars such as Beth Faulks Tobin, who has championed the combined analysis of portraiture and archival documents as essential to the understanding of colonial practices and ideologies during the eighteenth century, characterising visual culture as a site of mediation in the construction of Imperial identities on the periphery of British society: 'Drawings and paintings are sites where the tensions and contradictions of colonialist doctrines and practices were negotiated, more or less successfully, on an aesthetic level […] they participate in the production of meaning, the dynamic construction of identities, and in the structuring within discursive fields of particular positionalities.'[50]

While portraiture is approached in this thesis as a means of analysing visual and material methods of patriotic self-fashioning through the study of portrayed dress and adornment, prints are used to interpret popular practices of social, cultural, and political *othering*. By interrogating popular prints – namely graphic satires – this thesis will demonstrate how the iconographic power of dress could be harnessed to stigmatise rebellious persons in the national consciousness.[51] Locating this visual

---

[49] T.H. Breen, 'The Meaning of "Likeness"' in *The Portrait in Eighteenth-Century America*, ed., Ellen G. Miles (Newark: The University of Delaware Press, 1993), p. 39.

[50] Beth Fowkes Tobin, *Picturing Imperial Power: Colonial Subjects in Eighteenth-century British Painting* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1999), p. 1.

[51] For useful approaches to analysing the form and function of graphic satire in eighteenth-century society, see: Diana Donald, *The Age of Caricature: Satirical Prints in the Reign of George III* (New

method of othering – the process by which the patriotic emblems of contested nationhood blurred into rebellious symbols in the public eye both during and after episodes of conflict – will be aided by the analysis of printed documentary sources, such as newspapers, trial literature, and contemporary histories.

Thesis Structure and Aims

Part One: Jacobitism in Britain

Part One of this thesis will examine the role of emblematic dress culture in displays of Jacobite resistance to Hanoverian rule in Britain during the mid-to-late eighteenth century, focusing on the final Jacobite rising of 1745-6 and its outcome.

The Jacobite rising of 1745-6 was the final military endeavour engaged in by supporters of the House of Stuart to regain the British throne for the exiled James Francis Edward Stuart and his sons Charles Edward and Henry Benedict, the descendants of James VII/II who had been obliged to abdicate by the Glorious Revolution of 1688-9. By the early eighteenth century, the Jacobite movement had become both a military and a popular one, drawing together adherents from across Britain and parts of Europe in a show of resistance to the Hanoverian succession of George I, which followed the death of the last Stuart monarch, Queen Anne, in 1714. Risings in support of the Stuart claim to the British throne occurred sporadically throughout the first half of the eighteenth century, the most notable being the unsuccessful 1715 and 1745-6 campaigns, with the latter ending in the defeat of the Jacobite army under Charles Edward Stuart at Culloden Moor in the Scottish Highlands on 16 April 1746. For the remainder of the century Jacobite support retained a spectral presence within British society, though whether the movement

---

Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1996); Cindy McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze: Prints of Women in Late Eighteenth-century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004). Significant approaches in analysing the 'othering' of national characteristics through visual satire include: John Richard Moores, *Representations of France in English Satirical Prints, 1740-1832* (London & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Gordon Pentland, '"We speak for the ready": Images of Scots in Political Prints, 1707-1832', *Scottish Historical Review*, 90 (2011), pp. 64-95.

continued to constitute a realistic military threat to Hanoverian rule is highly dubious.[52]

While some historians have argued that the impact of Jacobitism on British social, cultural and political life was negligible, the rise of Jacobite scholarship as a distinct area of academic enquiry has seen that notion questioned. The integration of Jacobite ideology into the material, visual, and ritualistic landscapes of Hanoverian Britain is now regarded as an essential aspect of its endurance in the national psyche, both during and in the aftermath of its military conflicts.[53] The movement made periodic appearances in popular politics throughout the eighteenth century, with Jacobite adherents maintaining a disruptive presence in the public space in open opposition to Hanoverian supporters, with emblematic culture – especially dress and personal adornments – providing tangible rallying points for collective identification and resistance. As was recently noted by Gabriel Glickman: 'Lit up by its portraits, medals and pageantry, the cause of the exiled Stuarts melded patriotic slogans with a culture of joyfully subversive revelry.'[54]

The study of Jacobite material culture is a relatively small but rapidly expanding strand within the field of Jacobite scholarship. As discussed by Daniel Szechi, since the rise of cultural history as a separate discipline in the late 1980s, a steadily growing body of 'pathbreaking work' has begun to make sense of the complex world of Jacobite goods procured by supporters of the exiled Stuart Cause to communicate

---

[52] See in particular: Murray Pittock, *Jacobitism* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998); Doron Zimmerman, *The Jacobite Movement in Scotland and in Exile, 1746-1759* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Daniel Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2006); Jacqueline Riding, *Jacobites: A New History of the '45 Rebellion* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016).

[53] Allan I. Macinnes, Kieran German, and Lesley Graham, eds., *Living with Jacobitism, 1690-1788: The Three Kingdoms and Beyond* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2014); Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi, eds., *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

[54] Gabriel Glickman, 'Jacobitism and the Hanoverian Monarchy', in *The Hanoverian Succession: Dynastic Politics and Monarchical Culture*, eds., Andreas Gestrich and Michael Schaich (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2016), p. 232.

their loyalty to the absent dynasty.[55] However, the surviving material record of Jacobitism has proven as difficult to systematically categorise and define as the concept of Jacobite identity itself.[56] Within the past decade, scholars such as Murray Pittock, Neil Guthrie, and Jennifer Novotny have published authoritative surveys of Jacobite material culture, drawing on the contents of multiple public and private collections.[57] As recently as 2017, a major exhibition at the National Museum of Scotland showcased an impressive array of objects and artworks related to the cause of the Stuart monarchy in exile, casting a material lens over the Jacobite fight and highlighting its international network of supporters.[58]

Until recently, the study of Jacobite dress culture has been dominated by discussions of tartan, Highland dress, and their relationship with the 1745-6 rising.[59] This

---

[55] Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788*, 2nd edn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019), pp. 8-9. This earlier work was mainly concentrated on studying specific object categories, such as glassware and medals: Noel Woolf, *The Medallic Record of the Jacobite Movement* (London: Spink, 1988); Richard Sharp, *The Engraved Record of the Jacobite Movement* (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1996); Geoffrey B. Seddon, *The Jacobites and their Drinking Glasses* (Woodbridge: Antique Collector's Club, 1995). See also, for an early survey of Jacobite material culture: Hugh Cheape, 'The Culture and Material Culture of Jacobitism' in *Jacobitism and the '45*, ed., Michael Lynch (London: The Historical Association, 1995), pp. 32-48.

[56] The complex make-up of the support base for the Stuart Cause in Britain at the time of the '45 campaign has been most recently and thoroughly surveyed by Darren Layne, see: Darren Scott Layne, 'Spines of the Thistle: The Popular Constituency of the Jacobite Rising in 1745-6' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St Andrews, 2016).

[57] See: Neil Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Jennifer L. Novotny, 'Sedition at the supper table: the material culture of the Jacobite wars, 1688-1760' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Glasgow, 2013); Murray Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1760: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

[58] See in particular: Viccy Coltman, 'Material Matters: An Introduction to Jacobite Material Culture' in *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites*, ed., David Forsyth (Edinburgh: NMSE Ltd, 2017), pp. 179-192.

[59] It should be noted that while the historiographies of tartan and Highland dress are inclusive of Jacobite dress culture, they are not dominated by it. Rather, Jacobite dress culture is most often treated as a pivotal episode within a broader chronology. See in particular: John Telfer Dunbar, *A History of Highland Dress* (Edinburgh & London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962), pp. 67-90 and Hugh Cheape, *Tartan: The Highland Habit*, 3rd edn (Edinburgh: NMSE Ltd, 2006), pp. 27-51.

preoccupation among scholars is unsurprising when one considers how extensively Charles Edward Stuart and his followers utilised the garb during the '45 campaign, the dress acting as a signifier of the Stuart claim to the British throne by emphasising the dynasty's Scottish roots.[60] However, as has been argued most persuasively by Pittock, the relationship between tartan and supporters of the Stuart Cause did have a much longer pedigree than the '45, the fabric originating as the 'patriot cloth' of the House of Stuart most notably during the closing decades of the seventeenth century. According to Pittock, it was the Exclusion Crisis of 1679-82 which first saw tartan widely celebrated as the cloth of Stuart legitimacy, when it was worn at the temporary court of James VII/II (then Duke of York and Albany) at Holyrood House in Edinburgh. It was his abdication in 1688-9 and the subsequent birth of the Jacobite movement that elevated tartan to the status of a pro-Stuart and (after 1707) anti-Union sartorial signifier for many dissatisfied Scots resident in Hanoverian Britain.[61]

No doubt because of its regional origin, tartan has customarily been considered a predominantly Scottish strand of sartorial Jacobitism. However, it has been shown that by the mid-eighteenth century the fabric had become a rallying symbol for various supporters of the Stuart Cause scattered across Britain. Pittock, for instance, has demonstrated the associational nature of tartan by noting its use by soldiers of different geographical backgrounds who served in the Jacobite armies of the 1715 and 1745-6 risings.[62] Similarly, Paul Monod has noted the ideological importance of 'tartan masquerades' for elite English Jacobites, especially in the wake of the 1746 defeat. Their use of the dress, argues Monod, was just one performative element of an elaborate 'sub-culture' of Jacobite sociability that was practiced by landed gentry in England as a way of maintaining support for the Stuarts in their increasingly

---

[60] On the use of tartan symbolism by Charles Edward Stuart and his civilian supporters, see in particular: Robin Nicholson, 'The tartan portraits of Prince Charles Edward Stuart: identity and iconography', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 12: 2 (1998), pp. 145-60; Robin Nicholson, 'From Ramsay's *Flora MacDonald* to Raeburn's *MacNab*: The Use of Tartan as a Symbol of Identity', *Textile* History, 32: 2 (2005), pp. 145-67.

[61] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1760* (2013), p. 85; Pittock, *Jacobitism* (1998), p. 74.

[62] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1760* (2013), pp.83-4; Murray Pittock, *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans*: *The Jacobite Army in 1745,* 2nd edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), pp. 83-4.

prolonged exile.[63] Additionally, according to Nicholas Rogers, tartan gained a party-political dimension when adopted by English Tories at hunts and hustings in the years immediately following the '45, especially in Lancashire and the West Midlands which were important hotbeds of Jacobite support during the last rising.[64] Finally, it should be noted that such observations on the multi-regional appeal of tartan within British Jacobitism are supported by the material record. For example, one of the few surviving suits of Highland dress which can be reliably associated with a Jacobite adherent was worn by an English Tory MP, not by a Scot **[Fig: 1.3]**.[65] Currently in the collection of National Museums Scotland, the tartan jacket, trews, and plaid once belonging to Sir John Hynde Cotton of Madingley Hall, Cambridgeshire, were acquired by him in Edinburgh in 1744. This conspicuous purchase came just a few short years after the Stuart princes, Charles Edward and Henry Benedict, made their first calculated appearance in the cloth at the Pamphilia Palace in Rome, in full view of their admirers and political supporters as a statement of their Scottish ancestry.[66] The survival of his suit, argues Glickman, is evidence that 'the echoes of the Jacobite movement were present in Cotton's cultural life.'[67] As such, while undisputedly a Scottish textile imbued with regional significance, the shared patriotic language of Jacobitised tartan identified supporters of the Stuarts to one another on a national level.

The material turn within Jacobite scholarship has significantly broadened our understanding of Jacobite dress culture, shifting focus away from the sole

---

[63] Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 306-7.

[64] Nicholas Rogers, *Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 46-7.

[65] *NMS* K.2005.16.1-3 (Jacket, trews, and plaid, taken from a suit of fine, hard tartan faced with green silk, acquired by English Jacobite Sir John Hynde Cotton during a visit to Edinburgh in 1744). On building an object biography for the suit, which lends credibility to its dating and ownership, see: Helen Bennet, 'Sir John Hynde Cotton's Highland Suit', *Costume*, 14 (1980), pp. 95-109.

[66] The significance of this event is outlined more fully in Chapter One of this thesis. See also: Robin Nicholson, *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Making of a Myth: A Study in Portraiture, 1720-1892* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2002), p. 62-3.

[67] Gabriel Glickman, 'The career of Sir John Hynde Cotton (1688-1752)', *The Historical Journal*, 46, 4 (2003), p. 831.

interrogation of the symbolism of tartan and towards an appreciation for the diverse array of personal accessories invested with Jacobite sentiment.[68] In contrast to the overtness of tartan display, personal accessories fit comfortably alongside an individual's daily life and activities, spanning an extensive cross-section of objects from jewellery (portable, discrete, bespoke) to white ribbon cockades (inexpensive, easy to make, and unifying in their simplistic visual language). With this new focus on the wider spectrum of Jacobitised ephemera – spearheaded most recently in those surveys conducted by Guthrie and Novotny – there is ample opportunity to engage with female consumers of Jacobite dress culture and to interrogate how such women interacted with the controversial material world of Jacobite support. Numerous Jacobite women, as stressed in the work of Sally Tuckett, engaged in tartan fashion to perform high-profile spectacles of resistance in the public spaces of Edinburgh and Manchester, particularly in the immediate aftermath of the '45 campaign.[69] However, their use of other, less-recognisable forms of Jacobite symbolism in articles of personal dress – as well as their agency in shaping the commercial application of such symbolism – is far less understood.

Another underexplored strand within the growing discipline of Jacobite material culture studies is the concurrent rise of conflicting pro-Jacobite and pro-Hanoverian material cultures in Britain.[70] This is particularly true in regard to the performative role occupied by patriotic dress and domestic décor in constructing contradictory popular memories of the last Jacobite rising in the national consciousness. While

---

[68] This is particularly apparent in the work of Guthrie and Novotny, whose surveys engage strongly with the minutiae of everyday political things.

[69] Sally Tuckett, 'National Dress, Gender and Scotland: 1745-1822', *Textile History*, 40: 2 (2009), pp. 144-5.

[70] This may be explored in relation to the rise of the 'theatre of politics', articulated most clearly in the work of Nicholas Rogers, historian of popular politics and crowd culture. Rogers has discussed its rise to prominence in popular political performance in Britain during the early eighteenth century, charting its emergence in particular from the accession of George I and the ascendancy of the Whig party in opposition to the Tories. Other historians of crowd and popular political culture have traced the political use of spectacle within organised demonstrations and disturbances throughout the long eighteenth century, influenced in no small part by the work of Rogers, though dress and adornment are not major aspects of such works. See in particular: Rogers, *Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain* (1998).

scholars such as Danielle Thom have directly addressed how a pro-Hanoverian counter-culture to Jacobitism emerged in British society around the figure of Prince William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, during and immediately after the '45 campaign, her study remains in the minority.[71] By adopting a close and comparative approach to the broad range of surviving dress objects in museum collections, this thesis aims to deepen understanding of how a warring of dynastic iconographies manifested itself across the public and private spaces of mid-to-late eighteenth-century Britain.[72]

Part One: Chapter Aims

Chapter One will explore how tartan, Highland dress and the white cockade became emblematic of popular support for the Stuart Cause in Britain due to their widespread adoption by various actors during the last Jacobite rising of 1745-6. The discussion centres on the use of these sartorial emblems by the Stuart heir Charles Edward Stuart over the course of the '45 campaign, firstly in the refashioning of his own patriotic self-image in an attempt to emphasise his Scottish claim to the British throne and secondly in that of the Jacobite army and civilian supporters that rallied behind him. It shall be shown how, following the defeat of that army at the Battle of Culloden, dress became a key identifier of participation in the rising when it was repeatedly cited in evidence against Jacobite prisoners at the treason trials of 1746-7. Through a combination of dynastic and military display, public censure, and judicial action, tartan, Highland dress and the white cockade emerged as potent sartorial symbols of rebellious nationhood in Britain against the entrenched line of Hanoverian succession, which went on to significantly shape the material memory of the last Jacobite rising for people on either side of the conflict.

Building on the conclusions of Chapter One regarding the popular association made between Jacobite displays of resistance and tartan clothing, Chapter Two surveys the

---

[71] Danielle Thom, "William, the Princely Youth': The Duke of Cumberland and Anti-Jacobite Visual Strategy, 1745-6', *Visual Culture in Britain*, 16: 3 (2015), pp. 254-5.

[72] This interpretation of the material record of Jacobitism, as being counter-cultural to pro-Hanoverian support in Britain, builds on the framework outlined in Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1760* (2013), which categorises such objects as 'treacherous' and 'secretive', running in direct opposition to the established cultural mores of mid-to-late eighteenth-century British society.

legacy of the 1746 Disarming Act from its inception in Parliament to its repeal in 1782. The aim of this piece of legislation was to suppress the use of Highland dress in Scotland by all civilian men of fighting age, in recognition of the garb's rallying power during times of Jacobite unrest and, in particular, during the 1745-6 rising. It shall be demonstrated that the proscriptive intention of the Act was consistently undercut by sustained issues of misinterpretation and enforcement, as well as by the continued use of the dress by certain groups of Jacobite supporters who remained active both within and without Scotland in the years immediately following the rising. Such individuals included condemned Jacobite prisoners, English Jacobites, and Jacobite women, who were not specifically targeted by the wording of the Act. This chapter concludes by examining how – as the immediacy of the Jacobite threat receded with the passage of time – Highland dress and the associated tartan underwent a period of patriotic rehabilitation closely linked to the military and commercial interests of Scotland within the Union. Removed from the active context of Jacobite displays of resistance, the garb had effectively lost its rebellious connotations by the time of the Disarming Act's repeal in 1782, almost forty years since the defeat of the final Jacobite rising.

Chapter Three shifts focus away from examining the largely male uses of Jacobite dress culture outlined in Chapters One and Two, such as its association with the princely body and the military side of the Stuart Cause. In contrast, the aim of this chapter is to explore how Jacobite women employed feminine aspects of dress culture to express their loyalties to the House of Stuart. Using a combination of visual culture, manuscripts, and objects, it shall be shown how the world of Jacobite goods commercially available to women was repeatedly refashioned by the fluctuating fortunes of the movement, most markedly via the transformation of its iconographic elements throughout the mid-to-late eighteenth century. With the defeat of military Jacobitism at Culloden Moor and the advent of the post-'46 period of governmental reprisal, the objects employed by women to communicate their loyalty to the House of Stuart became closely tied to processes of reputation management within the Jacobite movement. Pincushions, for example, were turned into active sights of remembrance for those Jacobite prisoners executed following the treason trials of 1746-7, while the designs of ladies' fans glorified the image of Charles Edward Stuart as a viable leader for the Stuart Cause even from his continued state

of exile. Finally, this chapter will demonstrate how the material memory of the 1745-6 rising was being actively formed in the national consciousness by a more dominant counter-culture of patriotic objects marketed towards Hanoverian women, which represented the last gasp of the Stuart Cause in Britain as a quickly supressed, rebellious episode in the country's recent past as opposed to an enduring threat to Hanoverian authority.

Part Two: The American Revolution

Part Two of this thesis will explore the relationship between dress, domestic décor, and the complexities of emergent statehood in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century America, focusing on the War of Independence and its aftermath.

The near constant flow of goods and ideas via an entrenched system of transatlantic trade had ensured the cultural interconnectedness of Britain and her American colonies throughout much of the eighteenth century.[73] Built on a shared material and ideological culture, this shared sense of Britishness was brought sharply into question by the outbreak of the Revolutionary War and the fraught Imperial Crises which preceded it. As tensions flared throughout the 1760s and early 1770s over the level of parliamentary control exerted across the thirteen colonies, without adequate colonial input, taxed commodities – their production, consumption, and the physical pathways through which they were traded – became contentious ground for all American colonists, irrespective of whether they personally supported the aims of the Patriot Cause or not.[74] Alongside other imported luxuries such as tea and sugar, textiles quickly emerged as one of the most contentious strands of Anglo-American exchange during the period of the Imperial Crises. At the height of the Non-Importation movement of the 1760s-70s, spearheaded by colonial pressure groups such as the Sons of Liberty, edicts of non-consumption were applied to the purchase of all sorts of British mercantile wares, including fabrics and fripperies which were

---

[73] Jon Butler, *Becoming America: The Revolution Before 1776* (Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 2000).

[74] See in particular: T. H. Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, 'Political Protest and the World of Goods', in *The Oxford Handbook of the American Revolution*, eds., Edward G. Gray and Jane Kamensky (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 64-84.

staples of fashionable dress. In this highly pressured climate, when communicating one's political allegiance was paramount to maintaining social standing, the wearing of American-made homespun or 'liberty cloth' became sartorial short-hand for the support of colonial self-sufficiency and a show of resistance to British parliamentary authority **[Fig: 4.10]**.[75]

Well before its amalgamation with the political rhetoric of the Revolutionary era, homespun cloth was a mainstay of working dress and of the limited commercial textile industry of the British North American colonies. In relation to early American dress, 'homespun' clothing can be defined as home-manufactured or locally-produced linens, cottons and woollens most often used to create the serviceable, everyday apparel of American colonists, as well as of the labouring population of slaves and indentured servants not clothed by hand-me-downs or cheaper varieties of imported British merchant cloth. Either bleached or coloured using locally sourced natural dyestuffs, such as butternut bark or indigo, homespun attire was usually treated as distinct from an individual's 'best' or Sunday dress and would most often be reserved for the undertaking of menial tasks and outdoor work.[76]

According to American textile historians Kathleen Staples and Madelyn Shaw, characterising cloth as 'homespun' within the colonial marketplace was a method of denoting geographical origin in the mind of the consumer and therefore aided them in determining issues such as price and appropriate applications for the fabric. It did not always indicate a material deficiency between American-made cloth and those linens, woollens, cottons, and printed calicos being imported into the colonies from merchants operating out of Britain and Asia:

> All fabric of colonial production, whether made by an amateur at
> home for domestic use or by someone in the trades for resale, was
> considered homespun. The term did not necessarily connote a
> fabric of lesser quality than imports; skilled workers on both sides

---

[75] *CWF* 1964-174,A (Coat, cotton and wool Virginia cloth, *c.* 1780). This coat is discussed in more detail in Chapter Four of this thesis.

[76] Meredith Wright, *Everyday Dress of Rural America, 1783-1800* (New York: Dover Publications, 1992), p. 12.

of the Atlantic were essentially using the same equipment to
produce cloth.[77]

In its broad commercial and practical contexts, the descriptor of 'homespun' was used to describe those textile goods manufactured and traded within the confines of the American colonies, usually for domestic consumption within a weaver's immediate locality. For much of the eighteenth century, American-made textiles were not produced in large enough quantities to merit international export and so did not lose the 'homespun' descriptor. While this state of affairs would change dramatically with the advent of mechanised weaving in the US during the early nineteenth century, on the eve of Independence the production and trade of colonial homespun was a decidedly localised, informal affair participated in by a smattering of professional weavers and amateur homebodies. By incorporating homespun into the protest culture of the Patriot Cause, members of the Revolutionary generation were making a potent political statement that had a tangible impact on their day-to-day lives. By making the economic choice to support local industry or turn their own hand to the spinning wheel, the colonists were sending a resounding message to the mother country that they could survive and thrive without its oversight or support.

Despite their multifaceted historical contexts, surviving specimens of early American homespun are not often discussed in terms of their controversial political and commercial origins, but rather of the heritage of amateur female industry they appear to represent.[78] Extant examples of American homespun are often positioned as being the antithesis of the conspicuous consumption of professionally-woven fashionable silks, superfine broadcloths and printed cotton calicoes imported wholesale into the American colonies by the merchant class of the British Isles, notwithstanding the fact that the colonies did contain professional weavers capable of producing cloth of comparable quality. In the bequeathing of historic specimens of homespun to American museums and historical societies, donors invariably demonstrate pride in the (often spurious) notion that the material was crafted through the individual industry of a Revolutionary female ancestor, whom they envision bent over a

---

[77] Kathleen A. Staples and Madelyn Shaw, *Clothing Through American History: The British Colonial Era* (Santa Barbara: Greenwood, 2013), p. 142.

[78] Most notable exception: Michael Zakim, *Ready-Made Democracy: A History of Men's Dress in the American Republic, 1760-1860* (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003).

28

spinning wheel as war raged on the doorstep **[Fig: 4.4]**.[79] By exclusively characterising specimens of historic homespun in this manner, the donor often comes to ignore the commercial implications of early American homespun, placing it instead within the supposedly more wholesome setting of the household interior or alongside the privations of a frontier homestead.[80] Speaking in regard to this modern misconception, Linda Baumgarten has observed that extant examples of American-made cloth manufactured during the Revolutionary period have come to represent 'a view of America that has become part of the nation's mythology: that the country was built by self-sufficient, hearty pioneers with native common sense, able to conquer the environment and live off the riches of the land.'[81]

This 'national mythology', as Baumgarten suggests, has been shaped in no small part by the numerous examples of ancestral homespun which have been donated by members of the general public to museum collections and historical societies across the United States of America and the rose-tinted stories of familial provenance which accompany them. However, this curated heritage of early American self-sufficiency – while extremely compelling as a source of further study and interrogation – does not strictly represent the fashionable tastes and consumer habits of the Revolutionary generation or, indeed, of the character of the new American Republic which emerged with the wresting of independence from Britain in 1783. Rather, most of these goods more closely represent the Republican ideal of domestic self-sufficiency as related to the advent of the Embargo Act of 1807 and the subsequent War of 1812, which reintroduced the rhetoric of homespun patriotism at a time when American artisanship was better able to meet the challenge posed by large-scale domestic manufacturing. While these objects might be related to Revolutionary homespun goods on an ideological level, the vast majority of surviving specimens of American homespun do not belong to the homespun culture of the original boycott movements perpetrated by colonial Patriots on the eve of their Independence during the period of the Imperial Crises, but rather by US citizens of the early nineteenth century fighting

---

[79] *DARM* 1116 (Flax tow, late eighteenth century. Raised by the Holden family in Griswold, VT). See wording on provenance note. For further discussion of this object see Chapter Four of this thesis.

[80] Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, *The Age of Homespun: Objects and Stories in the Creation of an American Myth* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001).

[81] Baumgarten, *What Clothes Reveal* (2002), pp. 74-5.

to retain their still vulnerable autonomy in the face of renewed encroachments by the imperial British state.

By entertaining the popular myth that Americans had proved themselves entirely self-sufficient through the homespun spectacles of the Imperial Crises of the 1760s-70s, we effectively imply that homespun culture was both widespread and universally championed among colonists on the eve of the American Revolution. Not only does such a narrative run contrary to surviving material and archival evidence, it also underestimates the sheer power of consumer choice and the size and influence of the British import market within the colonies at mid-century. This point has been argued most succinctly by T. H. Breen in his seminal work *The Marketplace of Revolution* (2004):

> The ground holds too many shards; the archives yield too many detailed lists. However much Americans during the run up to revolution may have advocated turning their backs on consumer opportunity, they knew firsthand how much the new goods had affected the character of their lives. […] The revolutionary generation's attempts to organise large scale consumer boycotts were so difficult precisely because earlier Americans had so enthusiastically endorsed British manufacture.[82]

Breen's observation highlights the problematic grey area which blurred the intersection of political conviction and established habits of colonial consumption during the Revolutionary period; for while an individual might believe strongly in colonial independence from Britain they might also see as their due a high level of quality in goods and services, on a par with what they had grown so accustomed to prior to the upheavals of Revolution. However, a high measure of quality in domestically manufactured goods was often difficult to achieve in the early decades of Independence due to a lack of resources or of local expertise, with the result being, quite reasonably, that 'most consumers had no more interest in "Coarse Cloth" than they had in coarse glass'.[83]

---

[82] Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution* (2004), p. 70.

[83] *Ibid.*

The provocative questions posed by the material record of homespun may be usefully integrated into questions regarding the growth of a distinctly Republican iconography in the visual and material landscapes of post-war America, an area of scholarship which in itself has seen rapid expansion in recent years.[84] Studies addressing the transformation of the civic space during the early national period have traced how the patriotic display culture of the new Republic was solemnised through the erection of government and commercial infrastructures, the advent of public rituals in celebration of the Founding, and the state-sanctioned codification of Revolutionary symbolism.[85] This approach to the external performance of civic patriotism has laid the groundwork for an analysis of the interior of the Independent American home and of the topical commodities which came to populate it.

The non-importation rhetoric, colonial consumer boycotts and homespun demonstrations of the Imperial Crises were extremely influential in providing a political foundation for the new nation in peacetime.[86] However, philosophies of non-importation and economic nationalism were not universally upheld or celebrated by members of the Revolutionary generation. This was particularly true of those whose livelihoods depended on cordial trading relationships with Britain, as well as those customers who had grown to rely on imported goods before the war and a certain standard of fashionable living.[87] During the conflict itself, it was somewhat easier for Americans to adhere to the rhetoric of self-sufficiency outlined by the

---

[84] Most recently: Catherine E. Kelly, *Republic of Taste: Art, Politics, and Everyday Life in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016).

[85] See in particular: Elinor Lander Horwitz, *The Bird, the Banner, and Uncle Sam: Images of America in Folk and Popular Art* (Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 1976); Barry Schwartz, *George Washington: The Making of an American Symbol* (New York: The Free Press, 1987); Simon P. Newman, *Parades and the Politics of the Street: Festive Culture in the Early American Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997); David Hackett Fletcher, *Liberty and Freedom: A Visual History of America's Founding Ideas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Sally Webster, *The Nation's First Monument and the Origins of the American Memorial Tradition: Liberty Enshrined* (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2015).

[86] Lawrence A. Peskin, *Manufacturing Revolution: The Intellectual Origins of Early American Industry* (Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).

[87] Katie Haulman, *The Politics of Fashion in Eighteenth-century America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011); Styles and Vickery, eds., *Gender, Taste, and Material Culture in Britain and North America, 1700-1830* (2006).

figureheads of the Patriot Cause. When independence was won, however, it proved problematic to incorporate the sartorial culture of colonial rebellion into the patriotic displays of new nationhood. Without conflict, what need was there to dress in unbecoming homespun cloth or purchase domestic ceramics, metalwork, or glassware of a perceived inferior quality?

The complicated space occupied by fashionable dress and domestic décor in a newly Independent America keen to distance itself from its colonial origins is an area rich in patriotic contradictions, in need of further academic scrutiny. For contemporaries of the Revolution, the lived experience of the conflict was a complex affair that extended well beyond the linear goal of colonists fighting for the attainment of independent statehood. It meant the refashioning of an entire way of life, an uneasy process of post-colonial economic, political, and cultural transition recently defined by Kariann Akewi Yokata as 'unbecoming British'.[88] As discussed by Gray and Komensky: 'Revolutions are waged among sometimes-reluctant patriots and often-ambivalent loyalists, with many neutrals occupying a spectrum of positions in between. The walls between the shifting sides are thin, even permeable. Many of the combatants emerge as hesitant creatures of empire rather than zealous progenitors of a nation.'[89] This 'spectrum' of uncertain citizenry outlined by Gray and Kamensky can be seen amply reflected in the material culture of the post-Revolutionary world.

Michael Shute has observed that the aesthetic features of some American-made furniture shows the determination of select artisans to create a colonial style recognisably distinct from imported British products, illuminating the ideological influence of the Patriot Cause on the physical interior of the American home on the

---

[88] Kariann Akemi Yokata, *Unbecoming British: How Revolutionary America Became a Postcolonial Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). See also: Joyce Appleby, *Inheriting the Revolution: The First Generation of Americans* (Cambridge, MA & London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000); Stephanie Kermes, *Creating an American Identity: New England, 1789-1825* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008); Jerry Bannister and Lam Riordan, eds., *The Loyal Atlantic: Remaking the British Atlantic in the Revolutionary Era* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012).

[89] Edward G. Gray and Jane Kamensky, 'Introduction: American Revolutions' in *The Oxford Handbook of the American Revolution* (2013), p. 2.

eve of Independence.[90] However, inlayed chests of drawers dedicated to the memory of British naval hero Horatio Nelson manufactured in Frederick, Maryland in the early 1800s complicate the notion of a fully-fledged Republican national culture in the immediate aftermath of Revolution. Rather, such objects indicate the presence of both manufacturers and consumers in the former colonies desirous of products tied to the familiar patriotic culture of the mother country from which they had only lately been severed.[91] How British manufactures of topical wares responded to the patriotic tensions within the Anglo-American marketplace is remarkably underexplored in current scholarship, though a transatlantic trade in popular 'commemoratives' is broadly acknowledged.[92]

It has been observed that performing one's patriotic identity during the early national period was a difficult undertaking for many US citizens, predicated on their individual abilities and willingness to navigate the material culture of a society in transition. Caught between a Royalist past and the promise of a Republican future, members of the Revolutionary generation frequently sought to exert their autonomy in this transformative process by engaging with an array of topical goods. However,

---

[90] Michael N. Shute, 'Furniture, the American Revolution and the Modern Antique', in *American Material Culture: The Shape of Things Around Us*, ed., Edith Mayo (Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1984), pp. 182-207.

[91] The chest of drawers is inlayed with fouled anchors and coronets surmounting calls to 'Death and Glory' and to 'The Immortal Lion Ad Ld Nelson'. *WM* 2015.0002 (Chest of drawers made by John Shearer. American, 1809). Many thanks to Nalleli Guillen and to the staff at Winterthur for allowing me to inspect this object while it was undergoing conservation. For more on the Nelson-inspired furniture manufactured by Shearer, a Scottish carpenter in Virginia during the late eighteenth/early nineteenth century, see: Elizabeth A. Davison, *The Furniture of John Shearer, 1790-1820: "A True North Britain" in the Southern Backcountry* (Plymouth: AltaMira Press, 2011), pp. 26-9. See also: Vanessa Habib, Jim Gray and Sheila Forbes, eds., *Making for America: Transatlantic Craftsmanship: Scotland and the Americas in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* (Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2013). See also: David Cannadine, ed., *Admiral Lord Nelson: His Context and Legacy* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

[92] Herbert Ridgeway Collins, *Threads of History: Americana Recorded on Cloth, 1775 to the Present* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1979). This categorisation, most often used in the context of museum displays or antiquarian collections of textiles and ceramics, is highly reductive. It characterises topical wares as passive reflections of current events, while also diminishing the socio-political environment of the domestic space and the agency of manufacturers and consumers.

what constituted an acceptable form of engagement depended on the national mood. During the period of the Revolution itself the consumption of luxury imports was considered antithetical to the Patriot Cause. As outlined in the work of Joanna Cohen, debates on what constituted a 'luxury' commodity were closely tied to the politics of the moment, making the term harder to define and therefore more difficult to reconcile in one's daily life.[93] As the Republican project advanced into the nineteenth century, argues Cohen, the Revolutionary generation found that 'the correct display' of luxury commodities 'could ensure access to networks of political and commercial power, prosperous alliances, and the enjoyments of genteel society.' However, what was considered 'correct display' was highly variable. When colonial elites wore imported French feathers after 1780 in support of the newly forged Franco-American alliance, for example, it was regarded as a 'powerful expression of patriotism' by some American women. The habitual purchase of such imported fripperies in the post-war era, however, came to represent a debt of indulgence that political leaders feared the fledgling nation would struggle to afford and which contravened the self-sufficiency rhetoric of the Founding.[94]

The spending habits of Revolutionary figureheads has provided scholars with compelling evidence of the material and ideological difficulties involved in transitioning between a colonial and independent status in one's everyday life, as well as how such difficulties fed directly into concerns of international reputation management.[95] Even for those espousing the national benefits of consuming domestic manufactures, such as George Washington and Benjamin Franklin, the desire to preserve a standard of living appropriate to one's social status and personal preferences tended to override. Representatives of the new nation state were forced to tread a narrow line between what was considered patriotically correct forms of

---

[93] Joanna Cohen, *Luxurious Citizens: The Politics of Consumption in Nineteenth-Century America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017), pp. 15-45.

[94] *Ibid.*, pp. 18-20.

[95] Robert F. Dalzell, Jr. and Lee Baldwin Dalzell, *George Washington's Mount Vernon: At Home in Revolutionary America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); G. S. Wilson, *Jefferson on Display: Attire, Etiquette, and the Art of Presentation* (Charlottesville & London: University of Virginia Press, 2018); Kimberly S. Alexander, *Treasures Afoot: Shoe Stories from the Georgian Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018).

display and what was expected of them as the highest-ranking members of a post-colonial society seeking global acceptance.

The work of Benjamin Irvin has demonstrated that such considerations were present from the very outset of the Revolutionary War, when the shifting power structures of colonial government needed to project an appearance of refinement so as not to be considered an uncivilised rabble. The desire to legitimise rebellious behaviour by adopting reputable dress is exemplified by the experience of Samuel Adams on the eve of the First Continental Congress in 1774, when he was pressed by the radical Sons of Liberty to set aside his revolutionary habit of 'humble homespun' in favour of the most fashionable suit of imported clothes that Boston's merchants could provide. As suggested by Irvin:

> Boston's Sons of Liberty apparently recognised that the
> Continental Congress was no place for Samuel Adams's
> notoriously threadbare wardrobe. This maltster-statesmen would
> have to present well, if he were to represent the people of
> Massachusetts. The Sons of Liberty had determined to send Adams
> off in style.[96]

Adams acquiesced to the requests of his compatriots to perform the part of a moneyed colonial gentleman, ready and willing to partake in the fruits of collaboration with the mother country. However, the Liberty Cap insignia embossed on every button of his new suit reminded all who saw Adams that his sartorial indulgence was in the aid of the Patriot Cause. While his use of luxury imported clothing was about exerting the persuasive power of civilised style in an unstable civic setting, it was also about purposefully refashioning elements of that style to make a targeted political statement of non-compliance with the British state.

Part Two: Chapter Aims

Chapter Four will focus on the advent of homespun politics in the American colonies on the eve of the War of Independence, charting how domestically-produced 'liberty cloth' became a symbol of popular resistance to Hanoverian authority in the British

---

[96] Benjamin H. Irvin, *Clothed in Robes of Sovereignty: The Continental Congress and the People Out of Doors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 25.

Atlantic region from the Imperial Crises of the 1760s–70s, through the Revolutionary War period, to the formative decades of the American Republic, *c.* 1783–1815. It shall be shown how the weaving and wearing of homespun products emerged as a sartorial marker of Republican principles on the eve of Independence, a tangible accompaniment to the maxim of 'no taxation without representation' espoused by colonial protesters. By examining extant dress and domestic textile objects against the personal papers and business accounts of consumers and manufacturers, this chapter traces how the self-sufficiency rhetoric of homespun politics became a fundamental aspect of the nascent patriotic display culture of the early United States of America.

Chapter Five follows the complex process of patriotic refashioning in the post-revolution American home, when citizen consumers of the new United States struggled to reconcile the ideology of homespun politics with the material realities of fledgling statehood. Operating at a commercial disadvantage to their European counterparts due to limited resources, expertise, and technology, textile printers of the Early Republic found it difficult to compete with the high-fashion British furnishing fabrics once again flooding into American ports. However, as this chapter shall demonstrate, American manufacturers and consumers did not lack agency in the transatlantic trade of luxury commodities following the advent of their independence. British textile printers could no longer boast an unrivalled monopoly in the region, facing competition from increasing numbers of domestic printers in the fledgling US and rival printing firms in Revolutionary France. To maintain their dominance as arbiters of taste in the new Republican marketplace, British textile printers introduced a genre of overtly patriotic 'Republican cottons' in an attempt to show support and tacit respect for American statehood, thereby cultivating goodwill and repeat custom. Conducting a survey of surviving patriotic cottons and their respective iconographies, this chapter argues that by purchasing British upholstery and drapery fabrics marked with the likenesses of Revolutionary figureheads such as George Washington or Benjamin Franklin, or Revolutionary allegories of Liberty, Justice and Commerce, the citizen consumers of the early United States of America could fully engage with the all-important process of patriotic refashioning without compromising on matters of sartorial quality and taste.

Chapter Six discusses the popular realisation of the 'homespun republic' occasioned by the feted visit of the Marquis de Lafayette to American shores in 1824–5, the last living Revolutionary war hero. This was a significant transitional moment for the relatively young nation, when American artisans and consumers were able to invest heavily in the domestic production of patriotic sartorial culture in a uniquely 'American style,' as opposed to purchasing their wares overwhelmingly from foreign manufacturers. This chapter conducts a survey of the numerous sartorial goods produced in the United States of America during this pivotal moment in the early national period, with the aim of exploring how such goods collectively represent the formalisation of the self-sufficiency rhetoric first championed by the Revolutionary generation during the later decades of the eighteenth century.

Chapter One

Fashioning Rebel Identity: Dressing Military Jacobitism, *c.* 1745–9

At noon on Wednesday, 4 June 1746, fourteen rebel colours captured during the Battle of Culloden were removed from where they had been lodged at Edinburgh Castle and taken to the Cross in the Grassmarket. The standard of James Francis Edward Stuart was carried by the common hangman, while the rest were borne ignominiously by local chimney-sweeps. The procession was accompanied by a detachment of 'Lee's regiment… [t]he Sheriffs, attended by the heralds, pursevants, trumpets, city-constables, &.c. and escorted by the city-guard'.[1] Upon reaching the Cross, the eldest of the heralds declared that the Jacobite colours were to be burned by the common hangman, by order of His Royal Highness William Augustus, the Duke of Cumberland. Beginning with the standard of the 'Pretender', all fourteen colours were put to the flame in turn, a herald proclaiming the allegiance of each colour to the assembled crowd as the trumpets sounded and the populace 'huzzahed'.[2]

The destruction of the Jacobite colours during the tumultuous summer of 1746 was a deliberate act of desecration performed by the British army and by the Hanoverian monarchy who retained them – an act which carried significant political and emotional weight for those who witnessed it. Historically, flags captured by an enemy force during battle would have been preserved as trophies of the conflict, serving as a tangible reminder of one's triumph in the field. Whilst admittedly being an act of theft and appropriation, the act of capturing and displaying an enemy's flag could also be considered a symbolic form of respect for one's opponent and recognition of the material loss contained within their defeat. By destroying the Jacobite colours in such an undignified and popular ceremony, not least in a place associated with public execution, the British army were openly disrespecting a long-standing military tradition.[3] Ideologically, the burning of the colours was an attempt

---

[1] *The Scots Magazine* (June 1746), pp. 288-9.

[2] *Ibid*. A fifteenth standard was reportedly treated likewise at Edinburgh in the days which followed, with a sixteenth being put to the flame in Glasgow on 25 June 1746.

[3] Raymond Firth, *Symbols: Public and Private* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge Revivals, 2011), p. 356; John Prebble, *Culloden* (London: Pimlico, 1961), pp. 201-2.

to strip the defeated Jacobite regiments of their due recognition as a worthy military force and signified to the British population at large that they should follow the example of the victors of the '45. However, despite the best intentions of the British army to suppress the military memory of the Jacobite forces in the national consciousness, a small number of rebel colours did survive the post-'46 period of reprisal. Instead of being condemned to the flames, these colours were safe-guarded by descendants of those soldiers who had served under the leadership of Charles Edward Stuart during his aborted effort to recapture the British throne for the House of Stuart in exile. A small number of these are now housed in private and museum collections in Scotland **[Fig: 1.1]**.[4]

The ceremonial destruction of the Jacobite colours at Edinburgh in June 1746 was just one of the methods employed by the Hanoverian monarchy in their attempt to dismantle the patriotic display culture of British Jacobites in the immediate aftermath of the failed Jacobite rising of 1745–6. Following the defeat of the Jacobite army at Culloden Moor on 16 April 1746, it was by no means assumed that another Jacobite uprising was not already on the horizon. As discussed by Daniel Szechi, supporting or dissuading the cause of Jacobitism had been abused by European powers as 'a tool of statecraft' for much of the first half of the eighteenth century, by actors as various as France, Spain, Sweden, Russia, Prussia, and the Papacy. The defeat of the Jacobite forces at Culloden in 1746 may appear resounding in retrospect, but in 1746 there was no guarantee that the Stuart Cause would not be resurrected again and funded by an external enemy of Britain.[5] As has been demonstrated most persuasively by the

---

[4] For example: *NMS* M.1931.299.1 (Appin Stewart regimental colour carried at Culloden, 1746); *NMS* H.LF 17 (Blue silk banner with a yellow saltire of the Stewarts of Ardsheal, said to have been carried at the Battle of Culloden, 1746).

[5] Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), pp. 85-125. For further scholarship on the Stuart Cause in the context of European diplomacy and on the politics of the 'Jacobite diaspora', which arguably allowed the Cause to linger upon the periphery of the British consciousness even with the successive defeats of the Jacobite campaigns during the first half of the eighteenth century, see also: Edward T. Corp, *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689-1718* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Edward T. Corp, *The Stuarts in Italy, 1719-1766: A Royal Court in Permanent Exile* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Lawrence Bartlam Smith, *Spain and Britain 1715-1719: The Jacobite Issue* (New York & London: Garland, 1987); Rebecca Wills, *The Jacobites and Russia, 1715-1750* (East

scholarship of Doron Zimmermann, the later 1740s and the 1750s were marked by plots 'that almost happened', such as the Elibank Conspiracy of 1749–54, and the abandoned Franco-Jacobite invasion plan of 1759.[6] Reprisals against those British subjects who had followed Charles Edward Stuart were swift, targeted, and the cause of much resentment among the Highland region of Scotland, where support for the '45 campaign was perceived to be most heavily concentrated.[7]

It was during this period of dynastic tension and popular unrest that the British government placed sanctions upon the sartorial culture of Jacobitism, chiefly by attacking the outward markers of Jacobite support seen most often upon the battlefield and in the public sphere throughout the '45 campaign: the white cockade **[Fig: 1.2]**[8] and the Highland habit **[Fig: 1.3]**.[9] These articles of emblematic attire were widely regarded by contemporaries as the visual and material unifiers of the Stuart Cause during the 1745–6 rising, noted for their ubiquitous use amongst the officer class and rank and file soldiery of the Jacobite forces, as well as on account of their adoption by civilian supporters of Jacobitism across Scotland and England. In the same spirit of suppression which had led to the burning of the Jacobite colours in

---

Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2002); Marsha Keith Schuchard, *Emanuel Swedenborg, Secret Agent on Earth and in Heaven: Jacobites, Jews, and Freemasons in Early Modern Sweden* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2012); Paul Monod, Murray Pittock and Daniel Szechi, eds., *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

[6] Doron Zimmermann, *The Jacobite Movement in Scotland and in Exile, 1746-1759* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003). See also: Jennifer Mori, *The Culture of Diplomacy: Britain in Europe, c. 1750-1830* (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2010), p. 29; Frank McLynn, *1759: The Year Britain Became Master of the World* (London: Vintage Books, 2008), pp. 54-89.

[7] For example, on the response of the British army to the continued threat of Jacobitism within Scotland (and British territories more widely) following the defeat of the '45 campaign, see in particular: Geoffrey Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the British Empire* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

[8] A surviving example of a white cockade: *NMS* H.NT 241.21 A & B (Two white cambric roses or cockades, worn by the artist Robert Strange in 1745).

[9] As discussed in the Introduction to this thesis: a surviving example of a 'Highland' suit, commissioned by English Jacobite Sir John Hynde Cotton while in Edinburgh on business during 1744: *NMS* K.2005.16.1-3 (Jacket, trews, and plaid, taken from a suit of fine, hard tartan faced with green silk. Scottish, *c.* 1744). See: Helen Bennet, 'Sir John Hynde Cotton's Highland Suit', *Costume*, 14 (1980), pp. 95-109.

June 1746, judicial and legislative action was taken by the British government under the direction of the Hanoverian monarchy to associate these sartorial emblems of Jacobite resistance with the base crime of high treason. However, just as colours survived the purge of '46, so too did the patriotic display culture of Jacobites refuse to disappear entirely in Britain during the post-'46 period of reprisal. Rather – as shall be demonstrated in this chapter and in Chapter Two – these emblems formed a subversive counterculture of Jacobite patriotism within British society for years to come.

The primary aim of this opening chapter is to foreground how the white cockade and the Highland habit both came to be embraced and utilised by supporters of the '45 campaign, before moving to examine the judicial attempt of the British government to suppress the display culture of military Jacobitism in the immediate aftermath of the Battle of Culloden.

It shall be argued that Charles Edward Stuart, popularly referred to as 'Bonnie Prince Charlie', was a major contributor to the construction of the sartorial culture of the Jacobite movement in Britain during the middle decades of the eighteenth century: firstly, through his concerted efforts to refashion his own patriotic self-image in order to stimulate popular support for the exiled House of Stuart in Scotland and England during the early months of the campaign; and secondly, through his attempts to instigate a uniform appearance across the disparate branches of the Jacobite army. The closing section of this chapter will then outline how the sartorial culture of military Jacobitism was systematically attacked and criminalised in the aftermath of the defeat of the Jacobite army in April 1746, by analysing the repeated citation of dress in evidence presented at the treason trials of Jacobite prisoners *c.* 1746–7. While this opening chapter ultimately concludes that such judicial attempts to curb the sartorial culture of the '45 were successful in the short term, it shall also be shown that the government response was thoroughly unsuccessful in preventing the material memory of military Jacobitism from resurfacing within Britain in the long term. This concluding theme shall then be carried forward and expanded upon in significantly more detail in Chapters Two and Three.

Creating an Image of Legitimacy: The Patriotic Refashioning of Charles Edward Stuart

Writing in March 1741, a British traveller described with fascination the spectacle of the 'Carnavalian farce' as it had proceeded up the Corso in Rome. The scene was alive with the 'universal metamorphosis of men, women, children, horses, asses, &c' and everybody, it seemed, was eager to adopt the most grotesque of costumes and to engage in the subversion of their natural identities. By the evening, the festivities had gravitated towards the performance of street theatre, opera, and the attendance of the gentry at a multitude of masquerade balls and assemblies up and down the full length of the Corso.[10] The grandest of these gatherings, according to the British spectator, was held at the Pamphilia Palace in the Piazza Navona:

> The Company consisted of the chief quality, who were all in masquerade: there was dancing in several apartments; but the prime nobility were all in the grand hall. The Chevalier's eldest son was dressed in a Scotch highlander's habit, with a bonnet, target, and broad sword; and adorned with jewels to the value of 100,000 Roman crowns. He opened the ball, and was seconded by his brother; they being both respected here as persons of the first rank. After the minuets, there were several English country-dances; in the performance of which, the Roman dames made but an indifferent figure by their heavy motions.[11]

Charles's performance at the Pamphilia Palace in 1741 is the first recorded incident of the Stuart prince wearing tartan dress before a crowd of keen-eyed spectators. As discussed extensively by art historian Robin Nicholson, the incident was likely a stage-managed affair orchestrated by Lord John Drummond and his brother James Drummond, 3rd Duke of Perth, both Jacobite supporters drawn from the Highland gentry. As noted by Nicholson, it was through James Drummond that Charles had acquired his 'Scotch highlander's habit', the inclination no doubt influenced by John

---

[10] James Russell, *Letters from a Young Painter Abroad to His Friends in England. Adorned with Copper Plates*, 2nd edn (London, 1750), I, p. 45-8.

[11] Russell, *Letters from a Young Painter Abroad* (London, 1750), I, p. 47.

Drummond, who was often seen attending the Stuart princes arrayed in Highland dress.[12]

While resident at the Stuart Court in Rome in 1739, the elder Drummond had commissioned Italian artist Domenico Duprà to paint him in his native garb. The resulting portrait was dominated by the sitter's adoption of a lustrous Scotch plaid and matching coat, the sett consisting of red, green and black check, detailed upon the closures with gold embroidery **[Fig: 1.4]**.[13] Drummond's choice to be depicted in this guise was not simply a symbolic declaration of his cultural identity as a Highland laird. It was also meant as a sartorial nod to his principles as a Jacobite supporter and ardent anti-Unionist. As is now well understood by historians in their discussion of the role of tartan as a fabric of Jacobite resistance in Hanoverian Britain, by the mid-eighteenth century the cloth had become thoroughly amalgamated with the performance of Scottish disdain for the Act of Union of 1707, and had been a prominent feature of Jacobite display culture since at least the later seventeenth century.[14] This sartorial symbol of contested nationhood would therefore have been well-known to the later branches of the Stuarts in exile, not least through its prominent adoption by Jacobite supporters and anti-Unionists such as the Drummonds, who regularly frequented the halls of the Palazzo del Re.

The Palazzo del Re was the residence gifted to James Francis Edward Stuart and his wife Maria Clementina Sobieski by Pope Clement XI in 1719 and it was to be the

---

[12] Robin Nicholson, *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Making of a Myth: A Study in Portraiture, 1720-1892* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2002), p. 62-3.

[13] *NGS* PG 1597 (Domenico Duprà, 'John Drummond, 4th titular Duke of Perth, 1714-1747. Jacobite', oil on canvas, 1739); Nicholson, *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Making of a Myth* (2002), p. 63.

[14] See in particular: Robin Nicholson, 'From Ramsay's *Flora MacDonald* to Raeburn's *MacNab*: The Use of Tartan as a Symbol of Identity', *Textile History*, 32: 2 (2005), pp. 146-67; Viccy Coltman, 'Party-Coloured Plaid? Portraits of Eighteenth-Century Scots in Tartan', *Textile History*, 41: 2 (2010), pp. 182-216; Ian Brown, ed., *From Tartan to Tartanry: Scottish Culture, History and Myth* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010). Murray Pittock places the emergence of tartan as a patriotic emblem linked to the Stuarts as early as 1596, when it formed part of the wedding attire worn by James VI/I on his marriage to Anne of Denmark. Later it would emerge as a partisan symbol during the Exclusion Crisis of the 1680s, worn by supporters of Charles II's brother James. See: Murray Pittock, *Jacobites* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998), p. 74.

home of the Stuart Court in exile until James's death in 1766.[15] Both Charles Edward Stuart (b. 1720) and his younger brother Henry Benedict Stuart (b. 1725) were born at the Palazzo del Re, growing up closeted within its walls under the watchful eye of a clan of exiled Jacobite adherents.[16] Unlike their grandfather, James II/VII, the Stuart princes did not grow up within the confines of the country that they one day wished to rule. Even their father, James Francis Edward Stuart, could not pretend to have much affinity with a place he had not resided in since infancy and which he had only visited briefly during the failed Jacobite rising of 1715.[17] This, in addition to constant financial uncertainty, proved to be the major concern of the House of Stuart in exile. The danger was that the longer the House of Stuart remained absent from British shores, the less likely their claim to legitimate sovereignty in Britain would prevail against an increasingly entrenched line of Hanoverian succession. As their years abroad progressed into decades, the increasing gulf of time and distance separating the ousted dynasty from their state and subjects threatened to push them into popular myth and political obscurity.[18] Presenting themselves as being in-touch with their Scottish lineage through their choice of dress and proving themselves accustomed to the popular culture of their English supporters through their choice of dance, the intension behind the public spectacle at the Pamphilia Palace in 1741 may therefore reasonably be regarded 'as a clear attempt to present the Stuarts as British.'[19]

---

[15] Until recently the palace was referred to most often as the Pallazo Muti, see: Corp, *The Stuarts in Italy, 1719-1766* (2011); Edward Corp, 'The Location of the Stuart Court in Rome: The Palazzo Del Re', in *Loyalty and Identity* (2010), pp. 180-205.

[16] In addition to the authoritative works on the lives of the Stuarts in exile by Edward Corp, see: Jacqueline Riding, *Jacobites: A New History of the '45 Rebellion* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), pp. 1-13.

[17] On the earlier 1715 Rebellion, see in particular: Daniel Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2006).

[18] On a recent study which details this struggle, for both the Hanoverians from their seat of inherited power in Britain and for the Stuarts in exile, see: Andreas Gestrich and Michael Schaich, eds., *The Hanoverian Succession: Dynastic Politics and Monarchical Culture* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2016).

[19] Riding, *Jacobites* (2016), p. 11.

In-keeping with this earlier context of sartorial propaganda, when Charles Edward Stuart made landfall in Scotland in July 1745, the Italianate youth immediately attempted to reinforce his ancestral legitimacy in the eyes of his followers through manipulating his dress and deportment. He achieved this by carefully choosing his words, his manners, and his attire in order to represent himself as the rightful and deserving heir to the British throne.[20] As described in *The Lockhart Papers*, this campaign of self-conscious refashioning began in the harbour of Lochnanuagh in Arisag on 20 July 1745, with no small degree of ceremony and intrigue. Upon the deck of the French ship which had carried him to the West Highlands, Charles erected a large pavilion and had it generously stocked with fine wines and spirits. Prospective supporters of the Stuart Cause gathered in the tent in anticipation of his appearance. The prince deliberately staggered his arrival, leaving his guests to talk amongst themselves for over four hours, before emerging clothed in the outfit of a humble clergyman:

> …there entered the tent a tall youth of a most agreeable aspect in a
> plain black coat with a plain shirt not very clean and a cambric
> stock fixed with a plain silver buckle, a fair round wig out of the
> buckle, a plain hatt with a canvas string haveing one end fixed to
> one of his coat buttons; he had black stockins and brass buckles in
> his shoes…

The chronicler of the event, Alexander MacDonald of Dalilea, declared that 'I found my heart swell in my very throat' at the sight of Charles in such a self-effacing disguise. He went on to further describe his delight when the prince sat beside him

---

[20] This aspect of Charles Edward Stuart's calculated behaviour during the early period of the '45 campaign has most recently been addressed by Jacqueline Riding in her discussion of the temporary Stuart Court at Holyrood during the rebel occupation of Edinburgh. Concurrent with the argument put forward in this chapter, Riding contextualises the prince's actions as being a reflection of his desire to be seen as both relatable and legitimate as a potential British monarch. See: Jacqueline Riding, ''His little hour of royalty': The Stuart Court at Holyroodhouse in 1745' in *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (2017), pp. 96-125. See also: Philip Mansel, *Dressed to Rule: Royal and Court Costume from Louis XIV to Elizabeth II* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2005), pp. 45-9.

and talked familiarly about the practicalities of wearing 'the highland garb', the pair ruminating long upon its suitability as fighting dress in the coming uprising.[21]

This early episode of purposeful masquerade is fairly typical of the Stuart heir's public performance of his British royal identity during the course of the '45 campaign. By staging his first meeting with his Scottish supporters in a place of organised ceremony, by insinuating himself into their midst disguised as a member of the party and by showing himself to be genuinely interested in the culture of those in attendance, Charles had succeeded from the outset in presenting himself as an approachable – yet suitably dignified – leader for the Jacobite army, with ancestral ties to the ground on which he stood. This strategy was later echoed upon the campaign trail itself, when Charles took refreshment, rode, or walked openly among the Jacobite soldiery without concern for order of precedence.[22] For example, as described in a letter dated 10 September 1745 from an Edinburgh merchant to a friend in York, printed in the *Derby Mercury*:

> He marches all the Day on Foot, and every River they have to cross
> he is the first Man that leaps into it. He dines with his Soldiers in the
> open Field, and sleeps on the Ground, wrapp'd up in his Plaid; and
> his Soldiers pay ready Money for what they take.[23]

By contrast, when appearing publicly in spaces of fashionable sociability, the prince discarded informality and championed royal protocol regarding his dress and behaviour. When entertaining at the temporary Stuart Court at the Palace of

---

[21] George Lockhart, *The Lockhart Papers: Containing Memoirs and Commentaries upon the Affairs of Scotland from 1702 to 1715, by George Lockhart, Esq. of Carnwath, His Secret Correspondence with the Son of King James the Second from 1718 to 1728, And his other Political Writings; Also, Journals and Memoirs of the Young Pretender's Expedition in 1745, by Highland Officers in his Army. Published from Original manuscripts in the Possession of Anthony Aufrere, Esq. of Hoveton, Norfolk*, 2 vols. (London, 1817), II, pp. 479-80; The significance of this affair has also been noted by Hugh Cheape in his history of tartan, see: Hugh Cheape, *Tartan: The Highland Habit*, 3rd edn (Edinburgh: NMSE Ltd, 2006), pp. 35-7.

[22] This assertion is based on printed and manuscript commentary, which could conceivably be viewed as a form of written propaganda with little basis in the realities of the campaign trail. However, that possibility in itself lends credence to the notion that Charles was keen to present himself as both honourable and approachable – even if just by way of report/reputation.

[23] *Derby Mercury* (20 September 1745).

Holyrood in Edinburgh, Charles deliberately alternated between sporting the 'English' and the 'Highland' style of court dress, thereby communicating his status while also appeasing the conflicting cultural tastes of the Highland, Lowland, and English visitors attending him. Samuel Boyse's account of these occasions, published in 1748, stresses the luxurious quality of the prince's attire in this most formal of settings, when it was important for him to temper his popularly accessible image with a veneer of sophisticated politeness, such as he had during his public performances in Rome alongside his father and brother. When in the company of his courtiers at Holyrood, whether dressed in the Lowland or Highland garb, Charles would use only the most expensive jewellery and fabrics as befitted his rank and ornamented his attire with insignia communicative of his royal station:

> Several Ladies of his Party furnished him with Plate, China, and
> Linen for his Apartments; and Balls and Assemblies were held, at
> which he appeared in the *English* Dress, with the *Blue Ribband*,
> *Star*, and other Ensigns of the *Garter*. At other Times he was seen
> in the *Highland Habit*, of fine *Silk Tartane*, *Crimson* Velvet
> Breeches, and a *Blue* Velvet Bonnet with Gold Lace, to which was
> appended a Jewel, with the Cross of St. Andrew.[24]

The surviving material record of the prince's wardrobe during the '45, scattered throughout museum and private collections in Britain, pays convincing testimony to this carefully constructed persona.[25] Two extant pieces purported to have belonged to Charles Edward Stuart were recently displayed side-by-side in the exhibition 'Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites' (National Museum of Scotland: 22 June – 12 November 2017): a hard tartan frock coat **[Fig: 1.5]** and a sleeved silk waistcoat **[Fig: 1.6]**.[26] When compared against a somewhat more dubious example of the

---

[24] Samuel Boyse, *An Impartial History of the Late Rebellion in 1745. From Authentic Memoirs; Particularly, The Journal of a General Officer, and Other Original Papers, yet unpublished. With the Characters of the Persons Principally concerned. To which is prefixed, By Way of Introduction, A Compendious Account of the Royal House of Stewart, from its Original to the Present Time* (Dublin, 1748), p. 83.

[25] Though the authenticity of these pieces must be judged on a case-by-case basis.

[26] *NMS* K.2002.1031 (Hard tartan frock coat of wool, velvet and linen, mid-18th century); *NMS* A.1906.337 (Sleeved silk waistcoat, *c.* 1727-60); See entries 177 & 178 in exhibition catalogue: David Forsyth, ed., *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (Edinburgh: NMSE Ltd, 2017), p. 235,

prince's wardrobe, held by the Inverness Museum and Art Gallery and comprising an embroidered silk waistcoat and embroidered wool dress coat **[Figs: 1.7 & 1.8]**, the sleeved waistcoat exhibited at the National Museum of Scotland is a reasonable representation of the European court style of the mid-eighteenth century.[27] Constructed of lush yellow silk, the sleeved waistcoat is ornamented with a floral design executed in silver and pink embroidery upon the collar, hem, and pockets. The fourteen buttons sewn upon the front and pocket closures are likewise covered with interweaving silver thread work, displaying the kind of workmanship appropriate for someone of the prince's station **[Fig: 1.6*a*]**.[28] The tartan frock coat, by comparison, is constructed of a hard wool tartan lined with crimson linen. The sett of the tartan is composed of at least five different colours and is fairly well-matched along the seams: blue, green, red, yellow, and white being the most dominant colours **[Fig: 1.5*a*]**. While the buttons of the coat are notably absent, the button-holes are finished with silver thread **[Fig: 1.5 *b*]**.[29] This detail, alongside the deep red velvet used to embellish the cuffs **[Fig: 1.5*c*]**, collar and front closures of the coat indicates the high status of the wearer, as does the profusion of red dye used in the finishing of the wool and linen components of the coat.[30]

---

p. 237. Note that further work is required to ascertain the precise date range for *NMS* K.2002.1031, which could potentially be ascribed to the later eighteenth century. Both the cut and construction bear a striking resemblance to *NMS* A.1987.216 (Man's jacket of hard tartan trimmed with red velvet, silver braid and gilt metal buttons. British, *c*. 1780 – 1800), which may well be a product of the tartan weaving company William Wilson and Sons of Bannockburn.

[27] See: *IMAG* INVMG.0000.0167 (Embroidered silk waistcoat, eighteenth century) and *IMAG* INVMG.0000.0168 (Embroidered wool dress coat, eighteenth century). While attributed to the ownership of Charles Edward Stuart, the style of these two garments and the materials from which they are constructed are more representative of later eighteenth-century court dress, such as was worn in France and England. For comparison, see: *VAM* CIRC.534-1927 (Court dress coat, embroidered silk. English or French, *c*.1780-1800).

[28] *NMS* A.1906.337 (Sleeved silk waistcoat, *c*. 1727-60).

[29] It is possible that the buttons were removed by relic hunters, if original ownership of the coat may indeed be ascribed to Charles Edward Stuart.

[30] *NMS* K.2002.1031 (Hard tartan frock coat of wool, velvet and linen, mid-18th century). On the importance of red, see: Elena Phipps, *Cochineal Red: The Art History of a Color* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2010). For research evidencing the preferred use of 'exotic'/commercial insect dyes (such as imported cochineal for bright red grounds) over native

In addition to the available material evidence, there are two surviving portraits of Charles Edward Stuart dating from the period of the '45 which provide a useful visual reference for the prince's preferred styles of ceremonial attire. As with the written and sartorial evidence outlined above, these visual sources may be regarded as attempts to reinforce the prince's ancestral legitimacy as a potential British sovereign in the eyes of the public. The first of these portraits was commissioned by the prince himself from Edinburgh-based artist Allan Ramsay in October 1745, while the Stuart Court was still resident at Holyrood and the Jacobite army camp remained stationed in nearby Duddingston **[Fig: 1.9]**.[31] Shown turned towards the viewer in a three-quarter length pose, Charles wears conventional European court dress typical of the period: a light purple coat of silk-velvet, with silver embroidery upon the closures, a cream silk waistcoat beneath, and a fine linen stock at his throat. A blue garter sash crosses his front, complementing the silver Star of the Garter at his breast and the princely crimson cloak trimmed with ermine which envelops his shoulders. As was recently noted by Lucinda Lax, the newly discovered Ramsay portrait is conspicuously free from 'all explicit indicators of Scottishness', implying that 'the portrait was in fact conceived primarily to represent Charles Edward as an English prince.'[32] When we consider, argues Lax, that the portrait was commissioned during the critical moment the prince was making his decision to leave Edinburgh and

---

vegetable dyestuffs in eighteenth-century tartan production, see in particular: Hugh Cheape and Anita Quye, 'Historical and analytical research of dyes in early Scottish tartan' in *The Scientific Analysis of Ancient and Historic Textiles*, eds. R. Janaway and P. Wyeth (London: Archetype Publications Ltd, 2005), pp. 202-7; Cheape, 'Gheibhte breacain charnaid ('Scarlet tartans would be got…'): the Re-Invention of Tradition' in *From Tartan to Tartanry: Scottish Culture, History and Myth* (2010), p. 26.

[31] *NGS* PG 3762 (Allan Ramsay, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788, Eldest Son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart', oil on canvas, *c*. 1745).

[32] Lucinda Lax, 'The Lost Portrait of Prince Charles Edward Stuart', in *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (2017), pp. 130-31; The portrait surfaced only recently in the public domain, having been acquired by the National Galleries of Scotland in 2016 due to the Acceptance in Lieu (AIL) of Tax scheme. It had previously been kept at the ancestral home of the Earl of Wemyss, Gosford House near Edinburgh, and was brought to public attention by the efforts of art historian Dr Bendor Grosvenor. See: Phil Miller, 'Historic 'lost' portrait of Bonnie Prince Charlie secured by National Galleries of Scotland'
<http://www.heraldscotland.com/news/14391862.Historic__lost__portrait_of_Bonnie_Prince_Charlie
_secured_by_National_Galleries_of_Scotland/> [accessed 11 April 2018].

advance towards London in October 1745, an English rather than a Scottish audience for the portrait does seem more likely and would also explain the absence of both the anti-Union tartan and the Order of the Thistle.[33] While it might appear a frivolous concern during such a pivotal period in the '45 campaign, the Ramsay commission tallies with the prince's notable anxiety with his public appearance and what it communicated to his followers about his claim to British sovereignty: '…artistic creation was absolutely central to the prince's ambition. It was a vital component in the long and sustained propaganda campaign waged by the Stuarts to assert their claim to be the legitimate monarchs of Scotland, England and Ireland.' Also, if we consider the small size of the portrait (26.8 x 21.8 cm) it would certainly have been a very portable image, easy to transport and easy to copy **[Fig: 1.10]**.[34]

The second portrait of Charles Edward Stuart, by comparison, was clearly intended for a primarily Scottish audience **[Fig: 1.11]**.[35] Painted by Aberdeen artist William Mosman, elements of the portrait echo Samuel Boyse's description of the prince's appearance at the Palace of Holyrood. Charles is shown wearing a Highland plaid and matching tartan coat of a rich red and black sett, festooned at the cuffs and closures with gold embroidery. As in the Ramsay portrait, a blue garter sash crosses his chest, against which is pinned the Star of the Garter. However, unlike the Ramsay portrait, Mosman's depiction contains overt symbols of Jacobite support. In addition to the obvious connotations of the tartan, atop his white periwig sits a Highland-style bonnet of crushed blue velvet laced with gold, upon which is sewn a white cockade constructed of silk ribbon. Finally, a golden heart can be seen attached to the leather of the prince's belt, a motif intended to symbolise the loyalty of British subjects to the ultimate realisation of the Stuart Cause. What is most important to note regarding the Mosman portrait is not its subject, *per se*, but the date and origin of its creation. While the Ramsay portrait represents an active element of Charles's propaganda campaign to win over the hearts and minds of his English subjects during the course

---

[33] Lax, 'The Lost Portrait of Prince Charles Edward Stuart' (2017), p. 131.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 136; Related to the Ramsay portrait is the better-known print version, engraved and distributed by Jacobite engraver Robert Strange: *NGS* SP IV 123.20 (Robert Strange, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788', line engraving on paper, *c.* 1745).

[35] *NGS* PG 1510 (William Mosman, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788. Eldest son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart', oil on canvas, *c.* 1750).

of the '45 itself, the Mosman portrait was produced well after the defeat of the Jacobite forces at Culloden. Dating from approximately 1750 and thought to have been commissioned by a Jacobite supporter resident in Aberdeen, the Mosman portrait is testament to the lingering power of Charles's 'Highland' persona within the shaping of Jacobite remembrance of the '45 and of the popular perception of him as the 'Bonnie' Scottish prince.[36] Through examining commissions such as the Mosman portrait and by noting the proliferation of domestic and sartorial objects bearing the 'Highland' image of Charles which circulated commercially during the post-'46 period of reprisal, it can be seen how the Stuart heir's calculated performance of a Highland persona through his choice of dress resonated with his followers in Scotland [Figs: 1.12].[37]

The resonance of the prince's 'Highland' image can also be gauged through an examination of the emergent culture of sartorial relics which accompanied Charles both during the '45 campaign itself and in its immediate aftermath. While textile tokens purportedly cut from the prince's so-called 'English' dress do survive [Fig:1.13 & 1.13 a], it is the tartan sartorial relics which are found in the greatest abundance.[38] Prominent among these tartan sartorial relics are pieces of the 'Moy Hall' plaid, gifted to Lady Anne Mackintosh by Charles Edward Stuart during his stay at her estate in 1746 [Fig: 1.14].[39] According to tradition, cuttings from the

---

[36] See: Nicholson, *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Making of a Myth* (2002), p. 75.

[37] For example, the 'Highland' image was incorporated into the designs of glassware, snuff boxes, men's and women's jewellery, and ladies' fans. As the post-'46 period of reprisal drew to a close the image became less obviously subversive, occasioning its appearance on more highly visible household commodities, such as this commercially-produced, painted stoneware jug: *VAM* C.40-1955 (Jug of salt-glazed stoneware painted with enamels and with a portrait of Charles Edward Stuart, probably made in Staffordshire, *c.* 1755-60). This theme shall be expanded on in more detail in Chapter Three, in specific reference to the sartorial culture and consumer habits of Jacobite women.

[38] *NMS* A.1995.564 (Brown wool, embroidered textile fragment). Similar to the Inverness Museum and Art Gallery examples of the prince's 'English' dress, this fragment appears not to be contemporary to the '45 and is arguably of a later style. For discussion of the disparity between surviving silk and surviving tartan relics associated with Charles Edward Stuart and what this communicates to the researcher about the Scottish character of Jacobite popular memory, see in particular: Novotny, 'Sedition at the supper table' (2013), pp. 193-6.

[39] *UAM* ABDUA: 63392 and ABDUA: 63394 (Gold pin and tartan of Charles Edward Stuart, gifted to Lady Anne Mackintosh at Moy Hall, 1746).

original plaid were circulated between British Jacobites in the aftermath of the '45, which seemingly would account for the large number of 'Moy Hall' pieces in existence today **[Fig: 1.15]**.[40] However, as discussed by tartan historian Peter Eslea MacDonald, these surviving cuttings are fraught with misattribution and it is incredibly unlikely that all are genuinely taken from the 'Moy Hall' plaid or, indeed, date from the eighteenth century at all.[41]

While the validity of extant relics may be hard to verify, there is no denying the talismanic quality the prince's clothing evoked amongst his lingering British supporters in the aftermath of the '45 and its pivotal role in the construction of material memories around the failed rising. Such sartorial relics embodied 'the politics of intimacy' – a tactile connection between the monarch and the subject – which took its most physical form within rituals of gift-exchange.[42] There is perhaps

---

[40] Other examples include: *NMS* A.1987.184 E (Fragment of red tartan, associated with Charles Edward Stuart); *NRS* RH19/36/2 (A piece of Bonnie Prince Charlie's plaid, 1746); *IMAG* INVMG.1981.153 (Fragment of Bonnie Prince Charlie's plaid, left at Moy Hall the day before the Battle of Culloden).

[41] In his investigation of the 'Moy Hall' tartan, MacDonald has unearthed sixteen fragments in museum and private collections. However, he has shown that a number of these are in fact nineteenth-century attempts to reconstruct the original sett of the 'Moy Hall' tartan during the later 'Highland Revival' period of the early nineteenth century, during which the Stuart Cause was heavily romanticised. This being said, MacDonald does consider the incident of the gifting of the plaid by Charles Edward Stuart to Lady Anne Mackintosh to be true and that a number of the fragments are genuine eighteenth-century examples. *UAM* ABDUA: 63394 and *NRS* RH19/36/2 are purportedly contemporary to the '45, while *IMAG* INVMG.1981.153 and *NMS* A.1987.184 E are more than likely nineteenth-century reconstructions. See: Peter Eslea MacDonald, 'A Plaid given to Lady MacKintosh by Prince Charles Edward Stuart' <https://www.scottishtartans.co.uk/Moy_Hall_Plaid.pdf> [accessed 11 April 2018].

[42] Another prime example of the politics of intimacy would be the practice of 'touching for the King's Evil' – or being administered the royal touch for scrofula – a ceremony that held particular significance for both the Stuarts in exile and for the newly-invested Hanoverians in Britain in determining public loyalty. While the former retained the practice as a marker of their continued legitimacy and heavenly favour in exile, the latter rejected it for its likeness to popish superstition. However, the Hanoverian disdain for the practice did not deter British sufferers of scrofula from travelling to Rome to receive the royal touch at the Stuart Court. Patients who were given the treatment would be gifted a touch-piece by the monarch (to be worn suspended about the neck, close to the skin) in exchange for an affirmation of loyalty from the recipient. This practice was still being

no better illustration of the ongoing significance of the prince's sartorial relics in the minds of his supporters following the defeat of the '45 than in the materiality of *The Lyon in Mourning,* a manuscript collection compiled by Bishop Robert Forbes, *c.* 1746–75. *The Lyon in Mourning* is composed of numerous testimonies delivered by eyewitnesses to the '45 campaign and to the post-'46 period of governmental reprisal and includes discussion of several textile relics associated with Charles Edward Stuart's famous escape from Scotland to France in the summer of 1746. These relics, delivered to Forbes by friends and correspondents who had aided the prince, include a scrap of tartan, a cutting of printed cotton calico, a piece of blue garter ribbon, a strip of red velvet, and an apron string – all taken from disguises donned by the prince, provided by his loyal travelling companions **[Figs: 1.16 & 3.4]**.[43]

Whatever criticisms might be made regarding Charles Edward Stuart's prowess as a military leader, one area in which he undoubtedly excelled was in employing sartorial patriotism to his advantage while on campaign in Scotland and Northern England. Before the fortunes of the '45 campaign turned decidedly in favor of the Hanoverian monarchy, Charles Edward Stuart had continually attempted to manipulate his modes of dress and behavior to suit whatever the situation most called for. By choosing his attire with due consideration at strategic moments during the rising, the prince actively sought to embody the spirit of the Jacobite movement across those military and civilian arenas in which it was most important to galvanise support.

---

performed by Charles Edward Stuart as late as 1765. See: Felicity Heal, *The Power of Gifts: Gift Exchange in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 210; Stephen Brogan, *The Royal Touch in Early Modern England: Politics, Medicine and Sin* (Woodbridge & Rochester: The Boydell Press, 2015), p. 183; *NMS* H.1950.722 (Silver touch-piece of Prince Charles (III), 1765).

[43] *NLS* Adv.MS.32.6.16-25 (Robert Forbes, *The Lyon in Mourning* manuscript collection compiled *c.* 1746-75). See textile relic attached to inside cover of third volume in series. For the printed version of Forbes' manuscript, see: Henry Paton, ed., *The Lyon in Mourning, or a Collection of Speeches, Letters, Journals, Etc., Relative to the Affairs of Prince Charles Edward Stuart. By the Rev. Robert Forbes, A. M. Bishop of Ross and Caithness, 1746-1775. Edited from his Manuscript, with a Preface by Henry Paton, M.A.*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1895-6). How the textile relics contained within Forbes' manuscript were utilised by supporters in commercial demonstrations of their continued loyalty to the Stuarts in exile will be discussed further in Chapter Three.

Crucially, Charles Edward Stuart sought to present himself as a national figurehead of multi-regional relevance, adapting his dress in order to appeal to both Scottish and English supporters of the House of Stuart in exile – alternating between the martial connotations of Highland tartan and the politeness of European silk as the situation required. This was especially true during the early months of the '45 campaign. Identifying when and where it was most appropriate to don the Highland dress over the Lowland dress, *or vice versa*, gave Charles Edward Stuart a diverse appeal among his British followers and helped to reduce his status as a Continental outlander.[44] Even in defeat, his gifting of pieces of his own clothing to those who sheltered him fostered an appreciation and respect among his followers which remained prevalent for decades to come. It is apparent from the continuous references to Charles Edward Stuart's attire and behavior circulated during and after the '45 campaign, that these self-conscious attempts to cement his sartorial image as the Stuart *heir apparent* in the public imagination did not go unnoticed. The public were duly fascinated, and, by extension, they were fascinated by the sartorial character of military Jacobitism which he had created.

Dressing the Military Jacobite: Highland Dress and the White Cockade

Charles Edward Stuart's use of sartorial patriotism in the refashioning of his public image translated into how he managed the appearance and behaviors of the Jacobite army during the '45 campaign. As much as was practically possible, the Stuart prince advocated for the Jacobite forces to appear as a natural extension of his own carefully constructed military persona: a 'Highland army' operating under his 'Highland laddie' leadership. This was irrespective of the fact that he himself was not a native-born Highlander and that his army was an amalgamation of men chiefly drawn from Scotland, England and France, who practiced different customs, held varying loyalties, and spoke contradictory languages.[45] It was felt by Charles Edward

---

[44] At least in the eyes of his followers.

[45] On Charles Edward Stuart and his appropriation of the 'Highland laddie' persona for propaganda purposes during the '45 campaign, sometimes to his detriment when the trope was exploited by anti-Jacobite propagandists, see: Murray Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 57-8; Carine Martin, ''Female Rebels': The Female Figure in Anti-Jacobite Propaganda' in *Living with Jacobitism, 1690-*

Stuart, as well as by several prominent commanders within his ranks, that the widespread adoption of tartan dress by recruits would lend the Jacobite army a much-needed veneer of visual and material uniformity, strengthening their national distinctiveness, reinforcing the ancestral ties of the House of Stuart to Scotland in the popular imagination, and projecting a sense of order among the disparate companies of the Jacobite rank and file.[46] During the early months of the '45 campaign, Charles Edward Stuart made a concerted effort to ensure that his forces were as uniformly attired as possible and practiced standard military maneuvers, such as parades and drills, in the hopes of fostering a sense of collective, martial identity and professional discipline among the Jacobite recruits. Additionally, he wanted to instill an awareness of the Jacobite army's credibility within British society more generally, to present them as a legitimate fighting force capable of standing in opposition to the well-organised and well-supplied ranks of the British army.[47] As discussed by Geoffrey Plank, the Stuart heir 'believed that he could succeed in battle and win the loyalty of the people of Britain only if he led a restrained, conventional military force.'[48] In other words, if the '45 succeeded in its objective he did not want his victory to be questioned due to the caliber and respectability of his recruits.

This initial move towards visual and material uniformity within the Jacobite rank and file appears to have been relatively successful in the short term, particularly during the autumn of 1745 when the Jacobite army held the capital city of Edinburgh (though not the Castle) and were able to use it as a central base for their supply and

1788, eds. Allan I. Macinnes, Kieran German and Lesley Graham (New York & London: Routledge, 2014), pp. 95-6; On the point that the so-called 'Highland army' was not predominantly 'Highland' in spite of popular perceptions to the contrary, see in particular: Murray Pittock, *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans: The Jacobite Army in* 1745, 2nd edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009).

[46] Stuart Reid, *The Scottish Jacobite Army, 1745-46* (Oxford & New York: Osprey Publishing, 2006), p. 58.

[47] Although, as shall be discussed below in reference to the uniforms of regular and irregular troops in the British army, the nation's fighting force were not dressed of a piece and suffered similar issues of military identification as the Jacobite army. However, greater financial stability and established methods of supply arguably made it easier for the British army to present themselves to the public and on the battlefield as a well-maintained, professional unit.

[48] Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery* (2006), p. 33.

rallying operations.[49] From within the city itself, the Jacobite army was able to make use of an existing mercantile supply network to obtain the semblance of a standard uniform from local weavers and clothiers.[50] For instance, during the occupation of the city, military recruiters had entered the city's cells and offered freedom to all those who had agreed to fight for Charles Edward Stuart; those who agreed were provided with a full uniform, implying that the acting quartermaster had access to a reasonably ready supply.[51] From their base of operations in Edinburgh, the Jacobite forces were also able to send out agents to the surrounding regions during the early period of the rising, with a view to levying supplies and encouraging recruitment before the army's move southward. The former often included calls to provide suitable clothing for the rank and file soldiery. When agents of the Jacobite army were sent to Glasgow in October 1745, for example, it was demanded that the town provide '12000 shirts 6000 clothcoats, 6000 pairs of shoes 6000 Bonnets & 6000 pairs of Tartan hose together with the Land Tax owing by the Town and arms & amunition.'[52] Likewise in Aberdeenshire in January 1746, Lord Lewis Gordon sent out a demand for each and every landowner and tenant in the county to recruit for the Jacobite army 'an able-bodied Man for his M------- K--- J----'s Service, with sufficient Highland Cloaths, Plaid and Arms, for each 100l. of their valued Rent, or the Sum of 5l. Sterling Money for each of the above Men' which, if refused, would result in the retaliatory destruction of 'Houses, Corn and Planting upon the foresaid Estates'.[53]

However, while it was certainly Charles Edward Stuart's intention for tartan uniforms to be a consistent feature of military Jacobitism from the outset of the '45 campaign, it was not without non-compliance, local deviation, or embellishment, the

---

[49] For the activities of the Jacobites in Edinburgh see: John Sibbald Gibson, *Edinburgh in the '45: Bonnie Prince Charlie at Holyrood* (Edinburgh: The Saltire Society, 1995).

[50] As shall be shown in Chapter Two, at least three tartan weavers (John Seton, James Ballie, and William Taylor) were operating commercially in Edinburgh's textile district at the time of the rising. It may be presumed that they were not the only ones.

[51] Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery* (2006), p. 42.

[52] 'Glasgow, St. Mungo's Cathedral: Conduct of the town during the rebellion of 1745': *BL* Add MS 33050, f.103v. This particular incident was also reported in the British press, see: *The Caledonian Mercury* (30 September 1745).

[53] *The Newcastle Courant* (4 January 1746).

result being that styles of military dress did vary across the numerous branches of the Jacobite army. The uniform of members of Lord Elcho's cavalry of Lifeguards, for example, was a 'blue coat faced with red and brass buttons, gold laced scarlet waistcoat, gold laced hat and shoulder belt mounted with tartan', while the soldiers of Lord Ogilvy's Forfarshire regiment appeared smartly outfitted in a 'kilt or a suit made in the black and red checked material of the Rob Roy tartan.' Additionally, deviation emanated from those French troops who joined the Jacobite forces from February 1746, with French soldiers under the command of Fitz-James regaled in a 'red coat turned up with royal blue, tin buttons, placed in pairs, yellow skin breeches, a black tricorn hat, laced with silver and beneath the coat, a breastplate only, of iron painted black.'[54] Also, as discussed most extensively by Bruce Seton, while the officer class and cavalry of the Jacobite army may have possessed both the money and the inclination to don the 'Highland habit' in accordance with the wishes of the Stuart heir or impose standards of attire within individual regiments, the majority of the rank and file infantry would have continued to wear the clothing that they had joined up in as a matter of necessity.[55] Seton's analysis of the articles of Jacobite dress mentioned in evidence during the Southwark treason trials concludes that 'unless it can be shown that this group of prisoners was exceptional and unrepresentative from the sartorial point of view, it is difficult to avoid the inference that wearing the 'Highland habit' was [...] a common practice among officers in the Lowland regiments.' However, Seton also observes that such a conclusion should not necessarily be applied to the dress of the Jacobite rank and file, who were not – broadly – the subject of the Southwark treason trials.[56] Rather, Seton suggests that both the practical and financial difficulties which dogged Charles Edward's campaign actively prevented the enforcement of a standard uniform across the common soldiery, with preference being given instead to outfitting the cavalry and officer classes; a far simpler feat, considering those branches of the Jacobite army were composed chiefly of country gentlemen, 'who could afford to pay for the

---

[54] Uniform descriptions drawn from: Alastair Livingstone, Christian W. H. Aikman and Betty Stuart Hart, eds., *No Quarter Given: The Muster Roll of Prince Charles Edward Stuart's Army, 1745-46* (Glasgow: Neil Wilson Publishing Ltd, 2001), p. 48, p. 91, p. 38.

[55] Bruce Seton, 'Dress of the Jacobite Army: The Highland Habit', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 25: 100 (1928), p. 271.

[56] *Ibid.*, pp. 274-5.

clothing of themselves and their mounted servants.'[57] This unfortunate disparity between official intention and practical implementation meant that the Jacobite army and its followers had to rely on other visual and material means to differentiate themselves from their opponents. This is where the white cockade came fully into its own as an explicit marker of Jacobite military identity above the tartan, a choice no doubt influenced by the established military use of cockades by the British army and militia.

Cockades and ribbons had long been recognised as both a practical and cost-effective method of communicating affiliations across the various branches of the British military. Within the context of the British regular army, the consistent emblem of Hanoverian loyalty was considered to be the black cockade, as it was only fitting that a nation's principal fighting force should derive the colour of its cockade from the official colours of the ruling monarch. The colour of the royal House of Hanover was black and so when the Hanoverians ascended the British throne in 1714 the British army altered their cockades in accordance with this significant shift in dynastic authority. Conversely, white denoted the royal House of Stuart and was therefore the go-to colour to use in badges of dynastic loyalty when the need arose for such emblems.[58]

On occasion, different sections of the British military would adopt their own distinctive cockades in order to indicate their membership of a certain regiment or region, or to distinguish themselves as regular or irregular soldiers.[59] As irregular recruits were not always provided with uniforms or their uniforms differed from the regimental redcoats worn by enlisted soldiers, the cockade acted as a useful signifier of their allegiance. This was especially true when irregulars were raised in response to a national crisis such as the '45, when finding the money and the time to provide

---

[57] *Ibid.*, pp. 270-1.

[58] Alexander Maxwell, *Patriots Against Fashion: Clothing and Nationalism in Europe's Age of Revolution* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p. 123.

[59] An example of this can be seen in irregular recruitment in London in 1746-7, with newspapers in South-East England reporting that new volunteers joining the First Regiment of Foot-Guards for deployment in the Netherlands were distinguished by their green (1746) and black/green cockades (1747). See: *The Stamford Mercury* (11 January 1746); *The Ipswich Journal* (24 January 1746); *The Stamford Mercury* (7 May 1747); *The Ipswich Journal* (9 May 1747).

volunteers with a consistent uniform seemed an inappropriate use of resources. In the absence of official regimentals, coloured cockades and ribbons gave volunteers an authority they might otherwise have lacked while also allowing local revenue to be invested in more practical avenues of defence.[60] This certainly appears to have been the case in Manchester, when the local militia was raised to defend the town from the advancing Jacobite army in late October 1745. The constables' accounts for the period show that while financial provision was made for the expense of mustering the local militia, which included paying for riders to travel out and obtain subscription money from local gentry and for the provision of coal and candles to light the Guard House, no mention was made of outfitting volunteers with a full uniform. Only one entry pertains to the militia's sartorial requirements: an expense of 4*s* was made out to one 'Ann Clegg' on 21 October 1745, for the making of cockades for the Manchester militia. No colour is mentioned for the cockades. However, it can certainly be inferred that the use of white ribbon would have been considered highly inadvisable.[61]

The wholesale adoption of the white cockade by the Jacobite army was not only advantageous for the visual and material unification of the differently dressed recruits within their own ranks. As noted by Cheape, given that many Scots loyal to the Hanoverian side of the conflict also wore tartan as a matter of course, its use as a uniform upon the battlefield did not help to 'distinguish friend from foe'.[62] Rather, it was the colour of one's cockade which might stay the hand of a would-be attacker. Such was the case following the Battle of Culloden, as demonstrated by the following account of Hanoverian volunteer James Ray. Describing his pursuit of 'a pretty young Highlander' in the retreat of the Jacobite forces across Culloden Moor, Ray was brought up short by the injured man who claimed he was of the loyal Clan Campbell:

> On which I asked him, where's your Bonnet? He reply'd,
> Somebody hath snatched it off my Head. I only mention this to

---

[60] Jonathan D. Oates, *The Jacobite Campaigns: The British State at War* (London & New York: Taylor & Francis, 2011), pp. 150-1.

[61] J. P. Earwaker, ed., *The Constables' Accounts of the Manor of Manchester: From the Year 1612 to the Year 1647, and from the Year 1743 to the Year 1776* (Manchester, 1892), III, pp. 19-21, p. 21.

[62] Cheape, *Tartan* (2006), pp. 53-4.

shew how we distinguished our loyal Clans from the Rebels; they

being dress'd and equipp'd all in one Way, except the Bonnet; our

having a Red or Yellow Cross of Cloth or Ribband; theirs a White

Cockade. He having neither of these Distinctions, I desired him, if

he was a *Campbell*, to follow me, and I would have him taken Care

of, being slightly wounded, which he promised; but on the first

Opportunity gave me the Slip.[63]

A similar episode is described in *The Lyon in Mourning*, regarding the capture of Major Donald MacDonald following the Jacobite victory at the Battle of Falkirk. Through a series of unfortunate missteps after the British army's retreat from the field, the Major had mistaken a group of men in the distance for a regiment of Jacobites. However, when he appeared in their midst asking "Gentleman, what are ye doing standing here? Why don't ye follow after the dogs and pursue them?" he was met with a cry of "Here is a rebel! Here is a rebel!" and to his dismay he realised that he had come amongst a regiment of loyal Hanoverian supporters. Though he tried in vain to claim that he was a Campbell – 'his white cockade being so dirty with the heavy rain that had fallen and with the smoke of the firing time of the action that there was no discovering the colour of it' – he was condemned by his speech and the blood on his sword.[64]

An added effect of the white cockade's military application during the course of the '45 was its wider adoption by civilian supporters of Jacobitism along the campaign trail who, while not being directly involved in the fighting, wished to show their support for the Stuart Cause through the making and wearing of the emblem. The extant cambric cockade believed to have belonged to the Jacobite engraver Robert Strange was, by tradition, stitched for him in 1745 by his future bride Isabella Lumisden, herself of an ardent Jacobite family **[Fig: 1.2]**.[65] The household accounts

---

[63] James Ray, *A Compleat History of the Rebellion from its First Rise, in 1745, to its Total Suppression, at the Glorious Battle of Culloden, in April 1746* (London, 1759), p. 337.

[64] Paton, ed., *The Lyon in Mourning* (1895), Vol. II, pp. 127-8.

[65] *NMS* H.NT 241.21 A & B (A white cambric rose or cockade, worn by the artist Robert Strange in 1745. Scotland, 1745); Isabella Lumisden was sister to ardent Jacobite supporter Andrew Lumisden, who was named under the Act of Attainder of 1746 and who was to serve as secretary to James Francis Edward Stuart and Charles Edward Stuart in exile until his dismal in 1768. The relationship between Robert Strange and Isabella and Andrew Lumisden, as well as an understanding of their

of Lady Anne Mackintosh of Inverness-shire, as highlighted by Pittock, indicate that she purchased a large quantity of white ribbon in 1746, presumably to make cockades for Jacobite soldiers or for the use of civilian supporters on her estate.[66] Elizabeth 'Beppy' Byrom of Manchester also participated in the fashioning of cockades, apparently with gleeful aplomb. During the short-lived occupation of the town in November 1745, Byrom noted in her diary that following the feted entry of Charles Edward Stuart into Manchester on the 29 November, which was accompanied by illuminations in the windows and mobs of supporters in the streets, she sat up into the early hours of the morning 'making St. Andrew's crosses' to wear the following day.[67] Elsewhere, recruit John Maclean noted as the Jacobite army trod the route from Ashbourne to Derby in late 1745 that citizens of several villages had adopted the cockade, as well as the colour white more generally, to herald their support of the Stuart prince:

> Wednesday the 4 December we marched from Ashburn & passed
> through Brilsford a Countrey Long Town and at several houses we
> saw White flags hanging out Such as Napkins and white Aprons,
> and in the Gavels of Some houses white Cockades fixed. And after
> that we passed ane other town Called Macwith and They had a
> Bonefire in the Middle of the town who were gathered about that
> fire Gave a huza and the men waving their hats.[68]

That the Jacobite army came to regard the white cockade as being the most explicit marker of their collective, military identity and recognised its power in the public space, can be seen in Charles Edward Stuart's attempts to preserve the martial

Jacobite sympathies, can be found in their memoirs and letters: James Dennistoun, ed., *Memoirs of Sir Robert Strange. Knt., Engraver, Member of Several Foreign Academics of Design; And of his Brother-in-Law Andrew Lumisden, Private Secretary to the Stuart princes, and Author of "The Antiquities of Rome"*, 2 vols. (London: Longman, 1855); A highly mythologised account of Isabella Lumisden's exploits during the '45 can be found recounted in Maggie Craig, *Damn' Rebel Bitches: The Women of the '45* (Edinburgh: Mainstream, 1997), p. 10, p. 36, p. 41, p. 173. Considerably more work needs to be done to uncover the scope and impact of her activities.

[66] Cited by: Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition* (2013), p. 75.

[67] Richard Parkinson, ed., *The Journal of Elizabeth Byrom in 1745* (Manchester: The Chetham Society, 1857), pp. 10-11.

[68] Quoted in: Iain Gordon Brown and Hugh Cheape, eds., *Witness to Rebellion: John Maclean's Journal of the 'Forty Five and the Penicuik Drawings* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1996), p. 27.

function of the cockade in October 1745, when he actively moved to restrict its use by Scottish civilians during the Jacobite occupation of Edinburgh. From his temporary court at Holyrood, Charles Edward Stuart used local newspapers, particularly the *Caledonian Mercury*, to communicate his intentions and wishes to the inhabitants of the city and its surrounding suburbs. Through his personal secretary, James Murray, proclamations were dictated and delivered to the paper for immediate distribution on an almost daily basis throughout the city's occupation by the rebels, which lasted almost six weeks. On 22 October 1745, the Stuart heir posted the following proclamation to the editors of the *Caledonian Mercury*, which was printed and distributed the following day:

> We hereby prohibite and discharge, under Our highest Displeasure,
> any Person or Persons to wear Cockades, unless they be join'd as
> said is, or belong to the Conductors of Our Baggage, Forage,
> Provisions, Household, or other Branch of Our Service. Given at
> Our Palace of Holyroodhouse the 22nd Day of October 1745.[69]

Charles's proclamation had been drafted in response to a spate of criminal activity which had occurred in the wake of the Jacobite occupation of the city, perpetrated for the most part by individuals who donned white cockades in order to steal goods and money with impunity from unsuspecting citizens. For instance, in late September 1745, an anonymous highwayman had travelled back and forth between the city of Edinburgh and the suburb of Leith wearing a white cockade and demanding contributions for the Jacobite army, 'though really belonging to no Corps.'[70] A known pilferer, James Ratcliff, was apprehended in Edinburgh's Grassmarket and committed to the Thief's Hole by the Jacobite army in mid-October 1745, charged with having 'gone about the Country since last he got out of Jail, and at the Head of a Gang of Villains in Highland and Lowland Dress, with White Cockades, imposed upon and robbed honest People.'[71] Similarly, a deserter from the British army, Robert Munro, was court marshalled and shot by the Jacobite army in October 1745, for erroneously claiming the title of rebel Captain and perpetrating misdeeds in the name of the occupying force. Munro had 'called himself a Captain and headed a

---

[69] *The Caledonian Mercury* (23 October 1745).

[70] *The Caledonian Mercury* (30 September 1745).

[71] *The Caledonian Mercury* (16 October 1745).

Company of Villains in Highland Dress and white Cockades, who had the Impudence to grant Protections, &c. and at the same time robbed the poor People who had been so unhappy as to accept of the same'.[72] Instances such as these had an adverse effect upon the precarious reputation of the Jacobite army, for though they were demonstrably harsh in their dealings with such criminals, ordinary citizens continued to regard the Jacobite soldiers as the primary instigators of unrest in the city, as demonstrated by a piece in *The Scots Magazine*, which noted the intent of the proclamation yet maintained with much chagrin: 'It is however certain, that several of the private men among the highlanders were likewise criminal.'[73]

However, Charles Edward Stuart's proclamation against felonious use of the white cockade was not only directed at common criminals such as highwaymen, robbers, and duplicitous deserters, who might use the emblem to molest unsuspecting civilians. The proclamation was also penned in an attempt to curtail the success of potential spies, who had been adopting the white cockade in the hope of infiltrating the Jacobite army's temporary camp at Duddingston, which was located on the outskirts of the city near the Palace of Holyrood. Neil Macvicar, for example, had been committed to prison by the Jacobite army in late September 1745, for coming into their camp without express leave and pinning a white cockade to his hat 'in order to disguise himself, the better to act the Spy, or perhaps perpetrate worse Things.'[74]

Judging by the various instances of civilian usage outlined above, it was evidently well understood by the citizens of Edinburgh that displaying a white cockade about one's person signified affiliation with or active support for the occupying force – or at the very least, a grudging tolerance for them. If a civilian chose to exploit the power of the white cockade, a certain martial authority appears to have been easily conveyed upon the wearer, such as upon those spies and criminals specifically targeted by Charles Edward Stuart's proclamation. It was not surprising that numerous unscrupulous types took advantage of such a golden opportunity to commit illegal acts under the guise of rebel activity, making hay while the sun shone.

---

[72] *The Caledonian Mercury* (16 October 1745).

[73] *The Scots Magazine* (September 1745), p. 442.

[74] *The Caledonian Mercury* (27 September 1745).

Notwithstanding these felonious uses of the white cockade, the emblem had also been adopted for less nefarious reasons by civilians during Edinburgh's occupation. Many civilians, particularly women and those unable to bear arms, wore them to show their support of the Jacobite army, as well as to avoid the less savoury aspects of the city's occupation, such as harassment by Jacobite soldiers. A letter printed in *The Caledonian Mercury* in late September 1745, for instance, described that 'there is nothing to be seen in Town or Country but People with white Cockades; and that even the Ladies have fixed them on their Head-dress.'[75] As well as being a marker of Jacobite support, the white cockade was worn to ensure safe passage when travelling about the city and the surrounding area, acting as a badge of loyalty which guarded against molestation or demands for contributions from roving agents of the Jacobite army. As reported in *The Newcastle Courant* and *The Derby Mercury* in late October 1745:

> They write from Edinburgh, that all Travellers are oblig'd to wear
> Cockades for Safety: One may walk Edinburgh through without
> seeing a person belonging to the City: All the Shops are shut up,
> there being no Traffick, unless Shoes making for the Highlanders,
> who do not stay in Town, but keep Watch, and lie about the Walls.
> Those wearing no Cockades are stripp'd, and the whole Country is
> impoverish'd, the Rebels sparing neither Cattle, Grain or Utensils.[76]

It is altogether possible that Charles Edward Stuart deliberately delayed issuing the proclamation banning civilian use of the cockade until late October, despite the criminal activity in and around Edinburgh recorded throughout September and in early October, in order to encourage these more positive uses of his army's most recognisable emblem. His proclamation appears only to have been issued when criminal activity had grown too detrimental to the reputation of the Jacobite forces for him to reasonably ignore. Once the Jacobite army had left Edinburgh in November and begun their move southwards, however, Charles Edward Stuart's

---

[75] *The Caledonian Mercury* (27 September 1745).

[76] *The Newcastle Courant* (26 October – 2 November 1745); *The Derby Mercury* (1 November – 8 November 1745). N.B. Once the rebels had left the city, the regional newspapers returned to reporting the activities of the Jacobite army as threatening and decidedly criminal, accounting for the appearance of the same story in *The Caledonian Mercury* in mid-November: *The Caledonian Mercury* (11 November 1745).

proclamation against civilian use of the white cockade does not appear to have held. This is understandable, for enforcing it outside of the realms of a city under prolonged occupation – and therefore subject to direct rebel control – would have been next to impossible. Moreover, trying to enforce the proclamation in each and every locality through which the Jacobite army passed would have been regarded as frivolous in the extreme, requiring resources and manpower that would have been better employed elsewhere.

Nevertheless, Charles Edward Stuart's proclamation serves to highlight just how important the white cockade had become in terms of communicating Jacobite military identity *en masse*. It was a constant marker of loyalty within an otherwise shifting and uncertain military landscape of contradictory affiliations. This was a fact which, as shall be discussed in the concluding section, ultimately proved detrimental to those Jacobite soldiers who were taken prisoner by government forces and who were tried for treason during the post-'46 period of reprisal. The unequivocal nature of the white cockade, once considered such an asset by the Jacobite army in terms of conveying unity within the fight for the Stuart Cause, proved the downfall of many when it was used in testimonies made against their characters.

Criminalising the Rebel Image: Evidencing Dress in the Treason Trials of Jacobite Prisoners

At the trial of George Seton, 5th Earl of Winton, who had been attained for his part in the Jacobite rising of 1715, the Attorney General asked William Calderwood, former quartermaster to the Jacobite army and witness for the King's Council: 'Had you any Distinction between the *Scotch* and the *English*, by Cockades?' To which Calderwood replied, 'Yes; the *Scotch* had Blue and White, and the *English* Red and White.' With this confirmation, the Attorney General desired to ascertain whether the Earl of Winton had participated in the provision of this sartorial marker of Jacobite identity, asking Calderwood, 'Did the noble Lord meddle with any Cockade?' Calderwood responded in the affirmative, asserting with absolute conviction that: 'Yes […] The Earl of *Wintoun* had a Cockade at *Hawick*, and took

several of them from my Hands, and gave them away as he saw fit.'[77] The Earl was condemned to a traitor's death on 19 March 1716, though was able to make a successful escape from the Tower of London before the sentence could be carried out. He was to die in exile in 1749, a valued but impoverished member of the Stuart Court in Rome.[78]

In the aftermath of the failure of the Jacobite rising of 1745–6, it was understood that those Jacobite soldiers who had been captured by government forces would not be treated formally as prisoners of war, but as common criminals guilty of high treason against George II. This meant that captured Jacobite soldiers were subject to a judicial rather than to a military legal process which, prior to the Act of Indemnity of 1747, essentially amounted to a succession of show trials and public punishments, including high-profile executions, prolonged incarcerations and transportation orders.[79] This decision aligned with the precedent set decades earlier by the government under George I in their response to the Jacobite rising of 1715, which had led to the mass incarceration and subsequent transportation of hundreds of plebeian Jacobites, as well as numerous show trials and the public executions of notable Jacobite peers in London.[80] However, as in the show trials which had

---

[77] *The Tryal of George Earl of Wintoun, Upon the Articles of Impeachment of High Treason Exhibited against him By the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses in Parliament Assembled, in the Name of Themselves and of all the Commons of Great Britain, In Westminster-Hall, on Thursday the 15th, Friday the 16th, and Monday the 19th Days of March 1716; on the last of which Days Judgement of High-Treason was given against him. Together with several Orders of the House of Peers in course of Time preparatory to the said Tryal* (London, 1716), p. 26.

[78] *The Tryal of George Earl of Winton* (1716), p. 69; Edward Corp makes repeated mention of Winton as a valued courtier at the Stuart Court in Rome, where he was provided with a pension, enjoyed membership of the Jacobite masonic lodge, and was painted by noted Jacobite portrait artist Cosmo Alexander, shortly before the sitter's death in 1749: Corp, *The Stuarts in Italy, 1719-1766* (2011), p. 200, p. 304, p. 317, p. 328, p. 377.

[79] As discussed by Frank McLynn in reference to the show trials of the Manchester regiment at Southwark and the trials of the Jacobite peers at Westminster, which provided 'the legal spectacle of the century.' See: Frank McLynn, *Crime and Punishment in Eighteenth-Century England* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 1989), pp. 158-9.

[80] Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (2006), pp. 200-9. According to Szechi, there were approximately forty executions in connection with the '15, in addition to over six hundred transportation orders (p. 208). See also: Margaret Sankey, *Jacobite Prisoners of the 1715 Rebellion:*

followed the '15, being subject to a judicial legal process meant that evidence had to be collected from eye-witnesses in order for the court to properly determine the culpability of accused individuals. This process, as in the case of the Earl of Winton in 1716, commonly took the form of witness testimonies, which were later transcribed, copied and circulated in pamphlet form as printed trial literature within the public sphere. Resorting to a judicial process in the treatment of captured Jacobites was arguably a major factor in the criminalisation of the sartorial character of military Jacobitism during the post-'46 period of reprisal. As detailed below – in relation to an analysis of printed trial literature issued following the trials of the commanding officers of the Manchester regiment at the courthouse at St. Margret's Hill, Southwark, and the trials of Jacobite peers at Westminster – descriptions of Jacobite dress were regarded as a key component in identifying those accused of involvement in the '45 campaign. Unsurprisingly, the Highland dress and (in particular) the white cockade were the articles of Jacobite attire most regularly cited by those eye-witnesses brought forward to testify on the nature of the accused's rebellious behaviour.[81] Just as the Earl of Winton was condemned for his 'meddling' with cockades during the '15, so too were the Jacobite prisoners of the '45

Preventing and Punishing Insurrection in Early Hanoverian Britain (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2005); Gwenda Morgan and Peter Rushton, *Banishment in the British Atlantic World: Convicts, Rebels and Slaves* (London & New York: Bloomsbury, 2013); David Lemmings, 'Negotiating Justice in the New Public Sphere: Crime, the Courts and the Press in Early Eighteenth-century Britain' in *Crime, Courtrooms and the Public Sphere in Britain, 1700-1850*, ed., David Lemmings (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2012), pp. 119-45.

[81] To satisfy the remit of this chapter only printed trial literature, popular prints, and newspaper accounts circulated during and in the immediate aftermath of the trials of Jacobite prisoners have been examined for references to rebel attire used in evidence. While arguably limiting in terms of analytical scope, this choice has been made for purposes of practicality. Following the recent example set by Darren Layne in his outstanding prosopographical thesis which reassesses the social record of popular Jacobitism during the '45, future postdoctoral work based upon the initial findings of this chapter shall make greater use of original manuscript material related to the rebel trials. Layne's work has uncovered multiple avenues of further enquiry: Darren Scott Layne, 'Spines of the Thistle: The Popular Constituency of the Jacobite Rising in 1745-6' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St Andrews, 2016). See in particular Chapter Five (pp. 172-226), which details the consequences of the rising for its participants and the gruelling process of collecting evidence for the subsequent trials.

condemned, in-part, because of their willful adoption of rebellious emblems during the campaign.[82]

The criminalisation of the dress of military Jacobites in the public space had begun well before the advent of the treason trials themselves, however. Importantly, a context for linking Jacobite dress with acts of criminality and rebelliousness had been fostered in both visual and print media during the '45 itself by public commentators upon the crisis. For example, a 'wanted poster' for Charles Edward Stuart showing the prince dressed in Highland attire was published in Edinburgh by resident engraver Richard Cooper as early as August 1745, prior to the city's occupation by the Jacobite forces **[Fig: 1.17]**.[83] The hand-coloured print depicts the Stuart heir in a green, blue and red sett tartan coat and breeches, tartan stockings, buckled brogues, dirk, basket sword and sporran. The pattern of the coat and breeches is not at all dissimilar to that of the 'Culloden' coat, now housed in the collection of the Glasgow Museum, and thought to be contemporary to the '45, discussed in further detail in Chapter Two **[Fig: 2.2]**.[84] The prince also wears an inexpertly draped plaid, the ineptitude of the folds perhaps meant as a pointed criticism by Cooper of the appropriation of the Scottish garment by the Italianate youth for the purpose of rallying Jacobite supporters to his standard. The inscription: 'A likeness notwithstanding the Disguise that any Person who Secures the Son of the Pretender is Intitled to a Reward of 30.000 £', as well as offering a substantial reward for the prince's capture also suggests that Cooper regarded Charles's use of Highland attire as being more akin to an actor in costume than to a warrior in

---

[82] It should be noted that the Earl of Winton was not the only precedent for Jacobite dress being used as evidence before the treason trials of 1746-7. For instance, during the treason trial of James Hume at Southward on 8 May 1716, the sight of a cockade about his person during the '15 campaign was posited as evidence in witness testimony: 'That for the most part he wore a Knot of Ribands, or a Cockade, in his Hat; a Mark of Distinction generally us'd by the Chiefs of the Rebels.' See: *The Historical Register, Containing an Impartial Relation of all Transactions, Foreign and Domestick. Volume II. For the Year 1717. Publish'd at the Expense of the Sun Fire Office* (London, 1718), p. 7.

[83] *NGS* SP IV 123.49 (Richard Cooper, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788. Eldest Son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart ('Wanted Poster')', hand-coloured etching on paper, 1745).

[84] *Glasgow Museums* E.1990.59.1 (Woollen, twill-weave hard tartan man's coat. Scottish, c.1740-50).

fighting dress. To complete the Jacobite ensemble, Cooper included a white cockade fixed prominently to the brim of the prince's feathered bonnet.[85]

As well as visual propaganda such as Cooper's 'wanted poster' circulating in the public forum during and immediately following the conflict, British newspapers also played their part in associating the dress of the Jacobite army with acts of plundering and dissidence throughout the '45 campaign. For example, it was reported by *The Daily Advertiser* that among the Jacobite party which had waylaid the Inverness Post in September 1745 was a clergyman, described as having worn 'a white Cockade in his Hat'. It was stated that the clergyman had threatened the messenger with violence should he not immediately surrender the letters from Inverness for inspection by the prince's men, bidding him remove his shoes and loosen his coat in case letters were concealed about his person. Meanwhile, a band of 'Highlanders' ominously 'offer'd to strip him' lest the messenger refuse to comply with the clergyman's demands.[86] Later in the campaign, a letter penned by a Derbyshire gentleman in December 1745 appeared in *The Derby Mercury*, describing with distaste the conduct of a marauding 'Sett of Banditti' who had forcefully billeted themselves at the author's residence overnight:

> Most of these Men after their Entrance into my House, (I tho't)
> look'd like so many Fiends turn'd out of Hell, to ravage the
> Kingdom and cut Throats; and under their Plaids nothing but a
> various sort of Butchering Weapons were to be seen. The sight at
> first must be thought (as it really was) very shocking and terrible.[87]

Therefore, before the treason trials had even begun, there was already a distinctive sartorial image associated with the conduct of the Jacobite soldier from which to base witness testimony. Furthermore, it was an image which actively sought to

---

[85] The Cooper print has been analysed by a number of scholars, though the link between the Prince's use of tartan and the active criminalisation of Jacobite dress has seldom been explored: Robin Nicholson, 'The tartan portraits of Prince Charles Edward Stuart: identity and iconography', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 12: 2 (1998), p. 149; Nicholson, *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Making of a Myth* (2002), pp. 65-6; Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition* (2013), pp. 87-8; Riding, ''His little hour of royalty'' (2017), pp. 97-8.

[86] *The Daily Advertiser* (12 September 1745).

[87] *The Derby Mercury* (29 November – 13 December 1745).

amalgamate the Jacobite emblems of the Highland tartan and of the white cockade with base acts of criminality and disorder in the public consciousness.

Of those eye-witnesses brought forward to testify against the various commanding officers and rank and file soldiery of the Jacobite army in July and October 1746, none was more preoccupied with the import of emblematic dress than Samuel Maddock.[88] Himself a former ensign in the Jacobite army and seeking to secure a pardon, Maddock was called upon at a number of the trials which took place in the courthouse at St. Margret's Hill, Southwark, including those of Francis Townley, George Fletcher, Thomas Chadwick, William Brittough, Walter Mitchel, and Thomas Deacon. During each deposition Maddock cited dress as a means of distinguishing the treasonous characters of the arraigned Manchester rebels. Townley, accused of accepting the commission of Colonel from the Stuart heir and of wearing 'a white Cockade, and a Plaid sash, as a Mark of his Authority and the Party he sided with', Maddock concurred with the King's Council, saying that he had indeed observed Townley 'with a White Cockade in his Hat' at Manchester.[89] Fletcher, meanwhile, had been seen by Maddock with 'a Sword by his Side, and

---

[88] By 'turning King's Evidence' Samuel Maddock was successful in saving himself. He is referred to most-often as 'Maddox' in the trial literature. For the fate of Maddock, and of the other prisoners listed below, see: Bruce Gordon Seton and Jean Gordon Arnot, eds., *The Prisoners of the '45. Edited from the State Papers* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1928), Vol. I. The following testimonies compiled from: W. Wilkinson, *A Compleat History of the Trials of the Rebel Lords in Westminster Hall; and the Rebel Officers and Others Concerned in the Rebellion in the Year 1745, at St. Margaret's Hill, Southwark, and at Carlisle and York. With the Lives, Behaviour, and Dying Speeches of those Executed Pursuant to their Sentences* (London, 1746). For a summarised account of the same trials in pamphlet form, containing corroborating descriptions of the Jacobite's attire and use of cockades, see also: J. Nicholson, *A Genuine Account of the Behaviour, Confession, and Dying Words, of Francis Townly (Nominal) Colonel of the Manchester Regiment, Thomas Deacon, James Dawson, John Barwick, George Fletcher, and Andrew Blood, Captains in the Manchester Regiment; Thomas Chadwick, Lieutenant, Thomas Sydall, Adjunct in the Same, and Counsellor David Morgan, a Volunteer in the Pretender's Army. Who were Executed the 30th Day of July, 1746, at Kennington Common for High Treason, In levying War against his most Sacred Majesty King George the Second* (London, 1746).

[89] Wilkinson, *A Compleat History of the Trials* (1746), pp. 105-6, p. 108. Francis Townley: Guilty, executed 30 July 1746.

appeared in his Regimentals, as Captain, with a white Cockade, and a Plaid Sash.'[90] When asked during the joint trial of Chadwick and Brittough whether they had appeared in the guise of the officer class, Maddock claimed that Chadwick 'wore a lac'd Hat, with a white Cockade in it' and that Brittough had marched from Manchester sporting 'a *Scotch* Plaid Sash, lined with a white Ribband.'[91] Mitchel had been noted by Maddock as among the mounted guard at Carlisle, 'as an Officer in the Duke of *Perth*'s Regiment, with a sword by his Side, a Plaid Waistcoat, a Plaid Sash, with a blue Bonnet, and a white cockade, at the Time that the Castle was besieg'd.'[92] Finally, according to Maddock's most verbose testimony, Deacon was guilty not only of wearing the cockade openly in the streets of Manchester but also of fashioning cockades for the use of the Jacobite rank and file during their enlistment:

> I saw him at the *Bull Head* at *Manchester*, where he sat at a Table,
> writing down the Names of such as enlisted in the Pretender's
> Service; for which he was paid for every name enlisted, One
> Shilling. There were several blue and white Ribbands lying before
> him, which, when he was not writing, he made up into Favours, and
> gave them to the Men enlisted. I saw him march from *Manchester*
> to *Wilmslow* as an Officer, wearing a Plaid Waistcoat, with laced
> Loops, a broad Sword by his Side, a Brace of Pistols stuck in his
> Girdle, and a Cockade in his Hat.[93]

Corroborating testimonies were given against Townley, Fletcher, and Chadwick by a number of other eye-witnesses, proving that Maddock was not an outlier in proceedings in his citing of dress as evidence of rebel intent or activity. Captain Vere, late of Cumberland's army, said that he had also observed Townley wearing a white cockade while stationed at Carlisle.[94] Ronald MacDonald, too, claimed to have seen Townley in both a white cockade and a 'Plaid Sash' during the Jacobite army's march through Lancashire.[95] Ormsby McCormack testified that he had known

---

[90] *Ibid.,* p. 128. George Fletcher: Guilty, executed 30 July 1746.

[91] *Ibid.*, p. 136. Thomas Chadwick: Guilty, executed 30 July 1746. William Brittough: Convicted, transported for life.

[92] *Ibid.*, p. 204. Walter Mitchel: Pardoned, transported for life.

[93] *Ibid.*, pp. 143-4. Thomas Deacon: Guilty, executed 30 July 1746.

[94] *Ibid.*, p. 114.

[95] *Ibid.*, p. 107.

Fletcher to be among the commanding officers of the Manchester Regiment because he had seen him marching at the head of the Jacobite soldiery with 'a white Cockade in his Hat'.[96] Like Maddock, witness Thomas Craig had seen Chadwick wearing the cockade, while Austin Coleman had noted the appearance of Chadwick in Manchester where he had looked 'as an Officer with a Plaid Sash, and a laced Hat, with a white Cockade in it'.[97]

The link between Jacobite dress and the classification of what constituted rebel activity was not contained to those instances identified by Maddock, *et al*.[98] For example, Andrew Wood had been seen by John Faulkner beating up for volunteers 'with a Cockade in his Bonnet', before marching with the Jacobite forces upon St Ninian's near Stirling.[99] Alexander Russel gave evidence against Alexander MacLauchlan regarding the latter's presence in the city of Edinburgh, at the Jacobite camp at Duddingston and later at the temporary Stuart Court at Holyrood 'in a Highland Dress, arm'd with a Broad Sword and Pistols, and a White Cockade in his Bonnet'.[100] John Lindsay, a shoe maker from Perth, was seen by both Ronald MacDonald and Andrew Jackson 'in a Highland Dress, arm'd, and a white Cockade in his Bonnet' upon which was writ the national motto of Scotland: '*Nemo me impune lacessit* / Nobody provokes me unpunish'd.'[101] James Gordon, meanwhile, had been observed bearing both cockade and pistol, walking about the castle walls in Carlisle.[102] Charles Kinloch, testified against by Andrew Robinson, was distinguished as wearing the Highland dress and as such 'was greatly caress'd by the Highlanders' under his command.[103]

Finally, it should be noted that an individual could also be condemned simply for wearing the emblems of Jacobite soldiery while taking no direct part in the military

---

[96] *Ibid.*, p. 124.

[97] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

[98] What follows is a selective sampling. Many more examples exist than those listed and could certainly form the basis of a much larger, more detailed study.

[99] Wilkinson, *A Compleat History of the Trials* (1746), pp. 220-1; Andrew Wood: Guilty, executed 28 November 1746.

[100] *Ibid.*, p. 235. Alexander MacLauchlan: Pardoned, transported for life.

[101] *Ibid.*, p. 216. James Lindsay: Pardoned, transported for life.

[102] *Ibid.*, p. 203. James Gordon: Guilty, executed 10 November 1746.

[103] *Ibid.*, p. 219. Charles Kinloch: Convicted, transported for life.

action of the campaign. Merely associating oneself with the Jacobite dress and mixing with those who wore it openly in the public space appears to have been enough evidence to infer complicity in the '45, and thereby define oneself as a rebel. For instance, in the testimony against Alexander Erskine, the 5th Earl of Kellie, witness Lieutenant Charles Campbell maintained that Erskine had been 'frequently seen in Edinburgh with his broadsword, cockade, and highland dress' during September and October 1745, that Erskine had been thought to dine with Charles Edward Stuart during Edinburgh's occupation, but that Campbell himself had never witnessed Erskine 'march with any body of men.' When asked what he thought the white cockade signified in the context of occupied Edinburgh, Campbell replied: 'We thought every man who wore it had joined the rebels.' Surgeon William Hastie stated that he had also seen Erskine in Edinburgh that autumn, though he did not believe that the Earl had played an active military role in the Jacobite army: 'I saw a person so called at Edinburgh, but not in the rebel army. He did not come into England. He was at Edinburgh in the ordinary dress, but with a white cockade.' While Hastie said that he had not seen Erskine undertake 'any hostile act', he conceded that: 'I don't know that any wear cockades but rebels.' John Gray had noted Erskine 'drunk in the streets of Perth, a great many highland-men by him', but also could not pledge to have seen him perform any hostile act. Likewise, James Logie had witnessed Erskine in company with known Jacobites at Aberdeen and while he 'was not in highland dress', Logie had to concur with his fellow witnesses that: 'I never saw any but rebels wear white cockades.'[104] While Erskine was not sentenced to execution or to transportation for his actions, like all trialled Jacobites mentioned thus far, the evidence against him was substantial enough to ensure his prolonged incarceration at the Edinburgh Tolbooth until 11 October 1749, at which point he was released due to the waning governmental desire to proceed with the persecution of the remaining Jacobite prisoners.[105]

By elevating the act of wearing the white cockade and the Highland dress to the status of official evidence within the formal context of a treason trial, the British government had succeeded in solemnising the rebel nature of these articles of

---

[104] James Allardyce, ed., *Historical Papers Relating to the Jacobite Period, 1699-1750* (Aberdeen: The New Spalding Club, 1886), II, pp. 339-40.

[105] Seton and Arnot, eds., *The Prisoners of the '45* (1928), I, pp. 70-1, p. 142.

Jacobite attire in the public imagination. However, while clearly fulfilling a useful evidentiary role when presented within the confines of a high court, the judicial pressure placed upon the sartorial character of military Jacobitism proved to be effective only in the short term. This status of criminality proved to be wholly reliant upon the actively rebellious context of the '45 campaign itself. As shall be expanded upon in Chapter Two, it was a status which did not easily translate into the nebulous arena of public disobedience which characterised the persistence of popular Jacobitism during the post-'46 period of reprisal. That being said, the judicial process which publicly condemned the activities and appearances of those Jacobites who had been directly involved in the '45 campaign was by no means insignificant in the long term. Rather, as shall be expanded upon in Chapters Two and Three, officially treating these articles of dress as outward trappings of resistance to Hanoverian authority ensured their continued symbolic importance within the patriotic display culture of British Jacobitism in the years that immediately followed the rising.

Conclusion

At 11 o'clock on the morning of 9 June 1748, Bishop Robert Forbes accompanied his friend Bishop Keith to the new Stage-Coach office in Edinburgh, there to meet Mr Gib, former Master-Householder to Charles Edward Stuart during the '45. Forbes was anxious to meet Gib, as in his possession was a pocketbook containing the accounts accrued by the Stuart heir over the course of the campaign, which Forbes believed would provide some much-needed clarity in his chronicling of the rising for *The Lyon in Mourning*:

> After conversing with him a little, I told him I was much pleased to
> hear that he had preserved his pocket-book, and then I begged to
> know if I might see it. Mr. Gib said the pocket-book was in his
> room, and he would immediately go and fetch it, which he did. He
> brought it to me wrapt about with his white cockade, the end of
> which was well fixed with two seals, so that the book could not be
> opened without breaking the seals or cutting the ribband. He broke
> the seals, and taking away the white ribband, he delivered the book
> to me.[106]

---

[106] Paton, ed., *The Lyon in Mourning* (1895), I, pp. 152-3.

The white cockade was of special importance to Gib, for it was the same cockade he had worn following his hasty retreat from Culloden Moor on 16 April 1746 and he had worn it during his final, dismal moments in the prince's company. Shortly before he was captured in the town of Leven on 16 May 1746, while fearing for his own safety and the safety of the accounts, Gib had given the pocket-book over to the care of William Burnet near Kirktown, sealing it closed with the ribbon of his white cockade so as to better preserve the unique record of Charles Edward Stuart's activities while in Britain. It had not been opened since, and Gib had relinquished the seal only to be of use to Forbes in his endeavour to provide a truthful account of the campaign. It is clear that the cockade, as well as the pocketbook itself, occupied a place of singular significance in Gib's material memory of the '45 rising. While the unmistakable emblem of his loyalty to the Stuart Cause provided him with a tangible reminder of his time as a Jacobite soldier and of his personal relationship to the Stuart heir, it also spoke of how the campaign had ended in disarray and tragedy, with Gib fleeing for his life across the rugged Highland landscape beside so many others of the defeated Jacobite forces.[107]

This chapter has sought to foreground the active role played by Charles Edward Stuart in the refashioning of the patriotic dress of British Jacobites during the '45 campaign, and the lasting impact the resulting image had upon those who followed him and those who observed the fluctuating fortunes of the Cause. The prince achieved this feat primarily by acknowledging the fundamental issue faced by the Stuart monarchy in exile – their cultural otherness – and constructively addressing that problem by building an accessible public persona that his supporters across Scotland and England could both relate to and take pride in.

From the outset of the campaign, the prince manipulated his dress and his demeanour in order to emphasise the legitimacy of the Stuart claim to occupy the British throne through their ancestral links with Scotland, in spite of their prolonged absence in France and Italy. By extending this legitimising sartorial strategy to encompass the maintenance of the Jacobite army, the Stuart heir succeeded in creating a set of recognisable emblems for the communication of Jacobite patriotism during the rising. The concerted campaign of sartorial patriotism in which Charles Edward

---

[107] *Ibid.*, pp. 161-2.

Stuart and his followers engaged ensured the emblematic white cockade and the Highland habit became fundamental to how the uprising was remembered, as epitomised by the actions of former Jacobites such as Gib who regarded trappings of the Jacobite army like relics to be treasured and eyewitnesses in the treason trials of 1746-7, who saw these badges of loyalty as vestments to be feared.

As shall be shown in Chapter Two, through the persistence of political actors as various as condemned Jacobite prisoners, Jacobite women, and English Jacobites, the patriotic dress culture of the Stuart Cause remained a poignant symbol of resistance to Hanoverian authority in Britain throughout the later 1740s and early 1750s, even in the face of severe government censure.

'the Regimentals of our Dearly Beloved': The Disarming Act and the Suppression of Sartorial Jacobitism, *c.* 1746-82

> That from and after the first day of August, One thousand and
> seven hundred and forty-seven, no man or boy within that part of
> Great Britain called Scotland shall, on any pretext whatever, wear
> or put on the Clothes commonly called Highland clothes (that is to
> say) the Plaid, Philibeg, or little Kilt, Trowse, Shoulder Belts, or
> any Part whatsoever of what peculiarly belongs to the Highland
> Garb; and that no Tartan, or party-coloured Plaid or Stuff shall be
> used for Great Coats, or for Upper Coats, and if any such person
> shall presume after the said first day of August, to wear or put on
> the aforesaid garment or any part of them, every such person so
> offending… For the first offence, shall be liable to be imprisoned
> for 6 months, and on the second offence, to be transported to any of
> His Majesty's plantations beyond the seas, there to remain for the
> space of seven years.[1]
>
> Extract from the Disarming Act (1746),
>
> detailing the restrictions placed on Highland dress in Scotland

The Disarming Act was penned only a few short months after the quashing of the '45 rising. At the time the Act was proposed, the Stuart heir – Charles Edward Stuart – was thought to be hiding somewhere in the Scottish Highlands, in pitiful shape yet still aided and abetted by his remaining supporters. Meanwhile, the treason trials of captured Jacobite soldiers were well underway across Britain. As late as September 1746, the *London Evening Post* was reporting that 'there are Letters in Town from the *Highlands* of *Scotland*, which speak of the Pretender as still *lurking* there,

---

[1] Disarming Act, 1746 [19 George II, c. 39].

notwithstanding the *Foreign Papers* have so positively landed him safe in *France*.'[2] Though the defeat of the Jacobite army at Culloden had been quick, bloody, and widely reported, and while the victorious William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, and his army continued to mete out devastating reprisals across the Scottish Highlands, it was by no means felt that another Jacobite uprising was unlikely in the closing months of 1746.[3] The swift introduction of the Disarming Act can therefore be regarded as a deliberate attempt made by the British government to curtail the lingering threat posed by military Jacobitism to the continued stability of the Hanoverian succession, much in the same way that the Disarming Acts of 1716 and 1725 had been introduced in direct response to unrest in Scotland caused by the failed Jacobite rising of 1715. However, while the Disarming Act may have entered the statutes in 1746, it was amended twice in subsequent parliamentary sessions.[4] Successively amending the original Act pushed back the date of its full enforcement until 1748–9. In spite of this delay, the restrictive influence of the Act was still felt during that two-year period of postponement.

The wearing of 'the Highland Garb' and the carrying or concealment of weapons became illegal following the official enforcement of the Act, upon penalty of imprisonment or transportation overseas to a British colony. Aimed primarily at Scottish civilian men (and boys deemed to be of fighting age), one of the more controversial concerns of the new legislation was the *clothing clause*, which prohibited the ownership and display of martial Highland dress and weaponry in Scotland. The clothing clause was universally applied, and as a result no distinction was made between Scottish civilian men who had remained loyal to the Hanoverian monarchy and those who had fought on the side of the Stuarts during the '45

---

[2] *The London Evening Post* (23-25 September 1746). In the same issue of the paper there can be found a report of the treason trial of Thomas Cappoch, 'the rebel bishop of Carlisle', who was sentenced to a traitor's death and executed 18 October 1746.

[3] As per the reasons discussed in the introductory section of this chapter. On the controversy of the Duke of Cumberland's actions following Culloden, see: Jonathan Oates, *Sweet William or the Butcher? The Duke of Cumberland and the '45* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword, 2008).

[4] Amendments to the 1746 Act: Disarming Act, 1747 [20 George II, c. 51]; Disarming Act, 1748 [21 George II, c. 34]. For an in-depth discussion of the legislative history and impact of the Disarming Acts in Scotland (1716-48), see in particular: John G. Gibson, *Traditional Gaelic Bagpiping, 1745-1945* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998), pp. 25-8.

campaign. The intention was that all would be disarmed and disclothed in equal measure.[5]

As had been the norm before the '45 campaign, Scotsmen enlisted in the British army were given privilege to wear aspects of Highland dress as part of their regimental uniform. Their willingness to fight under the banner of George II served as adequate proof of their loyalty to the Hanoverian succession and, thereby, their suitability for exemption from the restrictions of the Act **[Fig: 2.1]**.[6] Additionally, neither Scottish civilian women nor British civilians living outside of Scotland were directly implicated by the terms of the Act. Their notable absence from the official wording of the Act left them free to don tartan clothing with relative impunity in the public space. However, this exemption did not entirely relieve them of the social and political stigmas implicit within the terms of the Act, particularly during the earliest years of the Act's most rigorous enforcement, when fear of a resurgence of military Jacobitism remained prevalent. The Disarming Act, variously referred to as the 'Act of Proscription', the 'Dress Act', and the 'Disclothing Act', would not be officially repealed until 1782, following a successful campaign by Scottish political elites at Westminster, most notably by members of the Highland Society of London.[7]

---

[5] On the topic of Scottish civilian men who had remained loyal to the Hanoverians being prohibited from wearing the Highland dress, see in particular: Cheape, 'Gheibhte breacain charnaid ('Scarlet tartans would be got…')' in *From Tartan to Tartanry: Scottish Culture, History and Myth* (2010), p. 13, pp. 17-20.

[6] See: Victoria Henshaw, *Scotland and the British Army, 1700-1750: Defending the Union* (London & New York: Bloomsbury, 2014), p. 44; For discussion of how the exemption of the Highland military from the Disarming Act of 1746 'effectively gave the region's material culture overtly military connotations', see also: Matthew P. Dziennik, 'Whig Tartan: Material Culture and its Use in the Scottish Highlands, 1746-1815', *Past and Present*, 217: 1 (2012), pp. 117-47. For a depiction of the uniform of the Highland regiments, noting the black cockade of Hanoverian affiliation, see: *NGS* SP IV 270.1 (S. Hooper, 'An officer and sergeant of a Highland Regiments', line engraving on paper, *c.* 1786).

[7] On the activities of the Highland Society of London in relation to the restoration of Highland dress following the 1782 repeal, see in particular: Anon., *Rules of the Highland Society of London. February 1st, 1783* (London, 1783) and Sir John Sinclair of Ulbster, *An Account of the Highland Society of London, From its Establishment in May 1778, to the Commencement of the Year 1813* (London, 1813).

In terms of symbolic resonance, the clothing clause of the Disarming Act succeeded in creating a long-lasting stigma around the wearing of Highland dress. However, this symbolic resonance was impeded by practical issues of enforcement, longevity, and enthusiasm. Without downplaying the serious implications of the Act upon the cultural autonomy of the Scottish Highlands following the failure of the '45 campaign, the clothing clause of the Act was nevertheless much harder to enforce than was expected by lawmakers. While there were multiple convictions under the Act during the active period of proscription – most notably during the later 1740s and early 1750s – the clothing clause proved an impractical and unrealistic legislative endeavor on the part of the British government in their efforts to curtail the vestiges of sartorial Jacobitism in Scotland. As shall be demonstrated in this chapter, this fact is best observed by examining the administrative difficulties experienced by the Act's enforcers in Scotland during the first decade of active proscription, as well as by appreciating the continued use of tartan clothing by Jacobite men and women in displays of sartorial resistance to Hanoverian rule after August 1746, performed in flagrant disregard of the Act's intention. Also, as the concluding sections of this chapter shall reveal, a commercial context for the manufacture and consumption of tartan by the public and by Scottish soldiers ensured that the cloth remained a valued, popular commodity in Scotland even during the early period of active proscription (*c.* 1746–65), the fabric's rebellious Jacobite connotations waning significantly by the later eighteenth century in conjunction with the dwindling fortunes of the Stuart Cause.

Misinterpretation and Issues of Enforcement

That the Disarming Act banned the general use of tartan in Scotland between 1746 and its repeal in 1782 remains a common misconception, which dates back to the mid-eighteenth century.[8] As early as 1751, defenders of the Act in the British press

---

[8] Fashion historian Jonathan Faiers, for example, fails to recognise that the wording of the Act proscribed Highland dress and not tartan cloth. While Faires' work does appreciate the complex socio-political impact of the Act in Scotland and explores the role of tartan in Jacobite display culture during the long eighteenth century, this misinterpretation of the Act perpetuates the mythology of a 'tartan ban' in academic scholarship. See: Jonathan Faiers, 'Tartan: sett and setting', in *Networks of Design: Proceedings of the 2008 Annual International Conference of the Design History Society (UK)*

were attempting to dispel this notion, noting that a return to '[t]he words of the act of parliament will set this matter to rights'.[9] Indeed, the wording of the Act itself does not pertain to tartan specifically, but to specific articles of clothing fashioned from tartan fabric. To quote the Act directly, in its definition of what constituted the offending 'Highland Clothes' to be proscribed, it refers to:

> 'the Plaid, Philibeg, or little Kilt, Trowse, Shoulder Belts, or any
> Part whatsoever of what peculiarly belongs to the Highland Garb;
> and that <u>no Tartan, or party-coloured Plaid or Stuff shall be used for
> Great Coats, or for Upper Coats</u>.'[10]

The major aim of the clothing clause of the 1746 Act was therefore the suppression of the uniform of military Jacobitism in Scotland – namely, 'the Clothes commonly called Highland Clothes' – and not of tartan in general. It would be more accurate to say that tartan, by its association with Highland clothing and with Jacobite display culture more broadly, 'entered a period of controversy' in the wake of the Act.[11] It is a subtle but important distinction, which must be addressed when attempting to discuss the intention behind and enforcement of the clothing clause of the Disarming Act in the immediate aftermath of the failed rising. By highlighting 'Great Coats' and 'Upper Coats' made from tartan cloth as proscribed articles, the Act acknowledged the symbolic power of tartan in the context of Jacobite patriotic display while also seeking to curtail its use in forms of male outerwear readily associated with outdoor military activity, such as marching or rallying for

---

University College Falmouth 3-6 September, eds. Jonathan Glynne, Fiona Hackney and Viv Minton (Boca Raton, FL: Universal Publishers, 2009), p. 161. In addition to such instances of academic misinterpretation, there is the prevalence of the myth in modern-day popular culture. Most recently, the topic has resurfaced due to the *Outlander* phenomenon associated with the Jacobite-centred historical fictions of Diana Gabaldon, as well as the ten-year anniversary of Alexander McQueen's iconic ready-to-wear fashion collection 'Widows of Culloden' (Fall, 2006).

[9] *The Scots Magazine* (August, 1751), p. 188.

[10] <u>My emphasis</u>.

[11] This is the position adopted by Anne MacLeod in her interpretation of the 1746 Disarming Act, with which this thesis agrees: Anne MacLeod, *From an Antique Land: Visual Representations of the Highlands and Islands, 1700-1880* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2012), p. 69.

volunteers.[12] For example, this man's tartan short coat dating from the 1740s would have fallen well within the definition and intention of the Act. The practical features of its construction, such as the epaulettes for fixing a shoulder belt or plaid across the body, the large front pockets allowing for ease of access to personal items, and the warm, waterproof quality of the twill-weave hard tartan, would have made the garment suitable outerwear for riding or walking long distances **[Fig. 2.2]**.[13]

From the outset, misinterpretation of the 1746 Disarming Act and confusion regarding the clothing definitions contained within it complicated the efforts of those charged with enforcing it. As mentioned above, a significant aspect of this confusion stemmed from amendments to the Act made in 1747 and 1748. The original text of the Disarming Act as laid down in 1746 allowed for a grace period prior to its enforcement, so that Scottish civilians in possession of the prohibited weapons and dress could dispose of them in an orderly and documented fashion. In theory, this meant that the prohibitions made against the Highland dress as outlined in the 1746 Act were not scheduled to come into full effect until 1 August 1747. The proroguing of the clothing clause of the Act in subsequent parliamentary amendments in 1747 and 1748 meant, in practice, that the date of full enforcement was pushed back until 1 August 1749. However, the final 1748 amendment to the Act contained a provision whereby the clothing clause pertaining to the suppression of Highland dress would be brought forward to 25 December 1748.[14] This final provision was likely included in an attempt to avoid further delays to the full enforcement of the original 1746 Act, as well as to curtail the worry that civil and administrative negligence was mounting on the issue.

---

[12] As noted in Chapter One, Highland garb (including plaids and tartan sashes) were regularly cited in witness testimonies given in evidence at the treason trials of 1746-7, in which they were described as common articles worn by Jacobite soldiers engaged in outdoor military activities (i.e., marching, rallying, fighting).

[13] *Glasgow Museums* E.1990.59.1 (Woollen, twill-weave hard tartan coat. Scottish, *c.* 1740-50). Described as once belonging to a rider in Charles Edward Stuart's army.

[14] See the different versions of the Act as they were entered into the statutes, as referenced above. See also an account of the final amendment to the Act published in the June 1748 edition of *The Scots Magazine*. This press account also details the widening of the exclusions to 'landed men', as well as reinforcing that men could still wear the garb in the service of the British army: *The Scots Magazine* (June 1748), pp. 262-5.

From his command post in Edinburgh in mid-November 1748, Lieutenant General Humphrey Bland, then Commander-in-Chief for Scotland, wrote to the Under-Secretary of State, John Potter, in London, to communicate his fears that the clothing clause of the Disarming Act would have no significant impact upon the general use of Highland dress in Scottish life:

> I don't hear [the Act] mention'd here, even in Common
> Conversation, I am apprehensive they look upon it in the Same
> light of many others that have never been Executed: nor will this,
> unless His Majesty's Ministers Send down Strong injunctions both
> to the Civil and Military to have it Punctually obey'd, and the Law
> put in full Force against all who shall [Presume] to act contrary to
> the true meaning and intent of the Said Act, Prohibiting the wear, or
> use of the Highland Dress.[15]

Bland's apprehensions were by no means groundless. Predecessors to the 1746 Act, namely the Disarming Acts of 1716 and 1725, had proved similarly difficult to enforce due to poor management and native defiance. These earlier Acts did not pertain to the proscription of Highland dress, but to the confiscation of weapons and to the establishment of a British military infrastructure across the Highlands. The 1725 Act was particularly contentious in this regard, as it resulted in an increase in the number of British soldiers patrolling the Highland region and had enlarged efforts to build a military network of forts, bridges and roadways controlled by the British army. While the move towards creating a military infrastructure had progressed apace in the wake of the 1725 Act, the edict to disarm had been treated with contempt by Scottish fighting men in the aftermath of the 1715 Jacobite rising. In December 1724, General George Wade, then Commander-in-Chief for Scotland, had reported to parliament that in spite of the penalties laid down within the 1716 Act, those who remained disloyal to the British government after the '15 had disobeyed the government's injunction to disarm. It was thought that clans loyal to the government had generally complied with the Act, while disloyal clans were believed to have hidden weapons of high caliber and surrendered only old and useless weapons instead. The 1725 Act, championed by General Wade, therefore aimed to address this issue of noncompliance with harsher reprisals and an increased

---

[15] 'Lt. Gen. Humphrey Bland to John Potter' (17 November 1748): *TNA*, SP 54/39 f.278r.

military presence in Scotland. From November 1725, those men who had failed to comply with disarmament were subject to forcible enlistment for military service in the colonies, while any woman known to have concealed arms would be liable to two years imprisonment and a fine of up to 100*l*. However, peers and their sons, as well as commoners qualified to vote for or sit as MPs, were exempt from the Act. Both the 1716 and the 1725 Acts were deeply resented in Scotland, perceived as checks upon the region's domestic autonomy, and the 1746 Act was perceived much in the same manner.[16]

Without doubt, it can be shown that those punishments outlined by the 1746 Act were imposed during the active period of proscription. On 30 August 1751, for example, a man by the name of Donald McDonald from Glenshee was imprisoned at Aberdeen for wearing what was termed the 'highland habit', which included the 'Philabeg, Tartan Coat, and Highland Plaid.'[17] However, for the most part, the clothing clause of the 1746 Act was plagued by issues of inconsistency and misinterpretation.[18] Most of the difficulties experienced by its enforcers lay within their marked inability to properly define what articles of dress constituted 'Highland clothes', a problem which was further exacerbated by a varying willingness among officials of different regions to fully adhere to the edicts of the Act. For example, in late December 1748, British army officer Major William Rufane contacted Lt. Gen. Bland regarding an incident which had recently occurred within the county of Aberdeenshire. Three individuals had been apprehended near Aberdeen upon suspicion of wearing the Highland dress.[19] In accordance with orders previously circulated by Bland to all commanding officers across the Highlands on 22

---

[16] On the doubtful efficacy and various purposes of the earlier Disarming Acts, as well as the role of General Wade in their application, see: John L. Roberts, *The Jacobite Wars: Scotland and the Military Campaigns of 1715 and 1745* (Edinburgh: Polygon, 2002), pp. 65-8; Caroline Bingham, *Beyond the Highland Line: Highland History and Culture* (London: Constable, 1991), p. 142; William Taylor, *The Military Roads in Scotland*, 2nd edn (Colonsay: House of Lochar, 1996), pp. 16-27.

[17] *The Aberdeen Journal* (3 September 1751); *The Scots Magazine* (August 1751), p. 405.

[18] In addition to the arrest and imprisonment of Donald McDonald at Aberdeen in August 1751, outlined above, see other instances identified in Inverness and Kinlochrannoch: Cheape, *Tartan* (2006), pp. 39-41.

[19] '(Copy) Maj. William Rufane to Lt. Gen. Humphrey Bland' (29 December 1748): *TNA*, SP 54/40 ff.9-10.

December 1748, the accused were immediately brought before two civil magistrates so that their attire could be inspected and judgement passed.[20] The difficulty in this case, claimed Rufane, was that the civil magistrates in question, a Mr. Forbes (Sheriff-substitute for Aberdeenshire) and a Mr. Duff, could not say with absolute certainty whether the attire of the accused conformed to the criminal definition of Highland dress as laid out in the amended 1748 Act, which by that point had been well-circulated throughout Scotland. In particular, Forbes and Duff could not settle on whether the dress of the accused could 'so properly be the Plaid', insisting instead that the offending garments were nothing more than 'what the Herdsmen Customarily wear in this Country'.[21]

When it came to the definition of what constituted a 'plaid' in the eyes of the law, the disagreement between Rufane and Forbes appears to be one based upon *use* versus *appearance*. In his report of the incident to Bland, Rufane asserted that: 'If a Particular Colour is to Denominate the Plaid, that indeed may make an Exception in this Case, as they were something of the Blanket kind, tho' with some Mixture of Red & Blue in them; but as to the Use, must in my Judgement be Deemed a Plaid to all Intents & Purposes.'[22] By 'use', Rufane is likely referring to the innate practicality of the plaid as an article of dress suited to traversing difficult Highland terrain. At once fitting for a herdsman going about his daily work, needing warmth and flexibility of movement in a harsh landscape, the plaid could also be used criminally if said herdsmen turned rebel soldier and was required to march, hide, or bed-down on the Scottish moorlands. Or, as in the case of Jacobite prisoner and former cattle drover Donald McLaren:

> …on the Road to Carlisle to take his Trial, he gave his Horse to one
> of the Guard, till he should retire a little at Eatrick Brae-Head, on
> the Road to Moffat, where having swaddled himself in his Plaid, he
> rolled down with such Rapidity, that he escaped the Pursuit, both of

---

[20] '(Copy) Lt. Gen. Humphrey Bland to the commanding officers in or near the Highlands' (22 December 1748): *TNA*, SP 54/39 ff.304-5; 'Secretary Newcastle to Lt. Gen. Humphrey Bland' (17 December 1748): *TNA*, SP 54/39 ff.298-9.

[21] '(Copy) Maj. William Rufane to Lt. Gen. Humphrey Bland' (29 December 1748): *TNA*, SP 54/40 f.9r.

[22] *TNA*, SP 54/40 f.9r-v.

the Bullets sent after him, and the men who endeavoured to seize him.[23]

In contrast to Rufane's observation regarding the potentially illicit uses of the plaid, in a letter to Mr. David Dalrymple, Sheriff of Aberdeenshire, Forbes explained that his inclination towards the dismissal of the case was based more upon the pattern and style of the offending garments as opposed to the practical context in which they had been worn:

> After looking at the Plaids, I told the Major that none of them were such as were Commonly understood to be Tartan or Highland Plaids; but as this was a New & Extraordinary case, I told the Major that I inclined to take the Opinion of Mr Duff [...] His Opinion was, that they were not Tartan, nor within the meaning of the Law. [...] I told the Major I would [...] send you a sample of each of the Plaids & Faiks, that the Lord Justice Clerk & General, if it [was] thought necessary might see, & so be better able to Judge of them whether they were Comprehended under the meaning of the Act of Parliament. I have accordingly enclosed Samples to shew the Colours of the Plaids & Faiks, which Herds do often wear in this Country. [...] The Samples sent, shew all the Colours of the Plaids or Faiks. The Decision of this Question will make the Affair as to Plaids very easy, for if those Seized are understood Plaids in the Sense of the Law, every Blanket that has [?] Colours may be esteemed a Highland Plaid.[24]

Rufane's correspondence with Bland was probably motivated both by a need for clarity in the Aberdeenshire case, as well as a desire to demonstrate due diligence in the performance of his duties. Whatever the shortcomings of his fellow prosecutors, Rufane clearly did not wish to be tarred with the same brush of negligence in the eyes of his superior. Similarly, Forbes's letter to Dalrymple and the appending of a

---

[23] *The Westminster Journal* (27 September 1746).

[24] Appended to Rufane's correspondence with Bland: '(Copy) Charles Forbes to David Dalrymple' (29 December 1748): *TNA*, SP 54/40 ff.9v-10r. Note that the word 'faik' is a regional term for a plaid, see definition: Alexander Warrack, *A Scot's Dialect Dictionary, Comprising the Words in Use From the Latter Part of the Seventeenth Century to the Present Day [...] With an Introduction and a Dialect Map by William Grant* (Edinburgh, 1911), p. 162.

copy of that letter to Rufane's correspondence with Bland is an indication that Forbes also did not wish to be seen as lacking in his handling of the case. Forbes was later named as a person of special interest in Charles Arskine's report to the Earl of Holderness in 1752, suspected of being 'of the Episcopal persuasion' and potentially a non-juror. As detailed in Arskine's report, Dalrymple vouched for Forbes on this occasion, claiming 'the facts charged upon him [Forbes] are aver'd to be false and groundless', maintaining that Forbes had always performed well in the discharge of his duties.[25]

The incident in Aberdeenshire was by no means the only moment of indecision or perplexity on the part of the Act's enforcers *c.* 1748–9. For instance, as noted by Cheape, when Captain George Sempill noticed that men in Morar were wearing 'stuff [plaid] trousers' in 1749, he was uncertain whether to 'take notice of such people as offenders against the law.'[26] Also, as discussed in detail by Plank, when General James Wolfe arrived in Scotland in 1748, his firm intension being to uphold the law to the fullest extent, he found that those whom he had arrested were regularly able to protest that their dress was nothing like the traditional 'Highland garb' prohibited by the wording of the Act:

> One Highlander arrested for wearing a kilt protested that the loose-fitting plaid garment he was wearing was a tunic and therefore not covered by the statute. Exhibiting an impressive familiarity with criminal procedure, he insisted that penal statutes had to be strictly construed. Another adopted a similar but even more daring stance, protesting that the garment he was wearing was a "woman's petticoat." One man said that he had been arrested wearing a blanket.[27]

---

[25] 'Lord Justice-Clerk's Report to the Earl of Holderness, His Majesty's Secretary of State - November, 1752' in, *Jacobite Correspondence of the Atholl Family, During the Rebellion, M.DCC.XLV- M.DCC.XLVI. From the Originals in the Possession of James Erskine of Aberdona, Esq*, John Hill Burton and David Laing, eds. (Edinburgh: The Abbotsford Club, 1840), p. 244, p. 250.

[26] Cited in: Cheape, *Tartan* (2006), p. 40.

[27] Cited in: Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery* (2006), pp. 116-7.

Jacobite Non-Compliance

Underlining the practical and interpretative issues of enforcement discussed above, the 1746 Disarming Act appears to have done little to actively dissuade fully-fledged Jacobites in Britain from using Highland dress – and the associated tartan – in the public space as a means of sartorial resistance to Hanoverian authority. In fact, it rather achieved the opposite. Following the circulation of the text of the 1746 Disarming Act, Jacobite adherents and sympathisers across Britain persisted in using tartan clothing as a means of publicly undermining the Hanoverian monarchy, with some willfully skirting or outright breaking the prohibitions set out by the clothing clause. By putting sanctions in place against the Highland dress, and thereby creating a popularly recognised stigma around it and its associated accoutrements, parliament had invested tartan garb with more rebellious sentiment than perhaps even those Jacobite soldiers who had originally worn it during the '45 campaign. In their attempt to officially curb the sartorial culture of military Jacobitism, Westminster had unwittingly created a tangible rallying point around which lingering Jacobite support could concentrate. The championing of tartan as an emblem of continued Jacobite resistance following the defeat of the '45 rising can be seen particularly in the activities of condemned military Jacobites, English Jacobites, and Jacobite women in Scotland in the later 1740s.

For those military Jacobites already condemned for their participation in the '45 campaign, tartan dress – and by extension those partisan ribbons and cockades which had been used in evidence against them – became richly symbolic of their continued loyalty to the House of Stuart when worn to face the harsh reality of their punishments, namely death or transportation. Lord Balmerino, a high-ranking Jacobite leader, went to his execution in August 1746 attired in the same regimentals he had worn during the Battle of Culloden, 'a blue coat turned up with red, with brass buttons, and a tie wig', though he set these articles aside as part of his payment to the acting executioner. Before stepping up to the block, Balmerino reportedly put on a flannel waistcoat and a plaid cap, specially tailored for the occasion,

proclaiming as he did so that he was determined to die 'a Scotsman.'[28] Likewise in August 1746, Donald Macdonald and James Nicholson travelled to their executions defiantly attired in 'Highland Dress', while their companion, Walter Ogilvy, chose to spend his final moments sporting a more subdued 'Suit of Cloth'. All three were interred within a single grave at a new burying ground at St. George's church in Bloomsbury.[29] Sergeant Alexander Smith, who had deserted the British army in order to serve with the French contingent of the Jacobite army, was court-martialed and executed in December 1747. He went to his death dressed in the regimental red coat of the British army, white waistcoat and matching breeches, 'which were tied at the knees with plaid-coloured ribbands.'[30] Another British army deserter turned rebel soldier, James Davidson, who was executed in Aberdeen in July 1748, stepped up to the hangman's noose 'drest in Tartan Vest and Breeches, white Stockings tied with blue Silk Garters, clean Shirt, white Gloves, and white Cap tied with blue Ribbon.' Escorting Davidson to his execution were a complement of St George's Dragoons, who were 'all in their best Dress, with Orange Cockades in their Hats', a sartorial gesture commemorating the victory of William of Orange over the Jacobites at the Battle of the Boyne.[31] Finally, in January 1749, eight rebel prisoners of the Manchester regiment were conveyed to the Tooley Street watergate in London, where they were put aboard a passenger yacht to Gravesend, from thence to be transferred onto a ship that would take them to a life of penal servitude in a British colony. Exiled for life, some of them 'went off with White, and others with Blue ribbands in their Hats', thereby demonstrating to onlookers that they would remain loyal to the cause of British Jacobitism even in foreign lands.[32]

Not being subject to the prohibitions of the Act, English Jacobites and Jacobite women in Scotland were able to wear controversial articles of tartan dress without being forced to suffer serious consequences for their actions, excepting some social

---

[28] F. Douglas and W. Murray, *The History of the Rebellion in 1745 and 1746, Extracted from the Scots Magazine: With an Appendix, Containing An Account of the Trials of the Rebels; the Pretender and His Son's Declarations, &c.* (Aberdeen, 1755), pp. 328-9.

[29] *The Newcastle Courant* (30 August – 6 September 1746).

[30] *The Caledonian Mercury* (17 December 1747); *The Scots Magazine* (December 1747), pp. 601-2.

[31] *The Aberdeen Journal* (5 July 1748).

[32] *The Caledonian Mercury* (17 January 1749).

stigmatisation and public censure from Hanoverian supporters within their own communities. For Jacobite women in Scotland, the chief benefit they drew from being excluded from the clothing clause of the Act was their relative freedom to don tartan dress at significant times of the Stuart patriotic calendar.[33] As recorded in Bishop Robert Forbes' manuscript, a number of women in Edinburgh did just this on 20 December 1746, in a bid to solemnise the birthday of Charles Edward Stuart.[34] Though the Act was not yet officially enforced, it had been publicised in Scotland though British newspapers and periodicals, such as in the *Caledonian Mercury* and the *Scots Magazine*.[35] Forbes's account of the women's actions details the incident thus:

> Upon Saturday, December 20th, 1746, there was a strict search made throughout the Canongate, Leith, and the other suburbs of Edinburgh, for ladies and other women dressed in tartan gowns and white ribbands, with express orders both from the Justice Clerk and from Lord Albermarle, at that time Commander-in-chief in Scotland, if any such were found to seize them and make them prisoners, and to bring them before the Justice Clerk and Lord Albemarle, that so they might be questioned about that rebellious dress.[36]

Forbes states in the account that it had been previously intimated to the Justice Clerk that:

> …several persons, particularly of the female sex, disaffected to his majesty's person and government, have formed a design, as an insult upon the government, to solemnise the twentieth day of December as the birthday of the Young Pretender, and for that end are resolved to be dressed in tartan gowns and white ribbands, and

---

[33] Sally Tuckett, 'National Dress, Gender and Scotland: 1745-1822', *Textile History*, 40: 2 (2009), pp. 144-5.

[34] Paton, ed., *The Lyon in Mourning* (1895), II, pp. 110-12. Forbes notes that while the raids did take place the actions of the women involved were only rumoured, spread as a means of upsetting the Government and forcing them to patrol and make a nuisance of themselves. The accuracy of the story remains unclear as corroborating evidence is scarce.

[35] *The Scots Magazine* (August 1746), pp. 367-73; *The Caledonian Mercury* (2 September 1746).

[36] Paton, ed., *The Lyon in Mourning* (1895), Vol. II, p. 110.

to have a ball or dancing in the house of Widow Morison […] in
Leith.[37]

To prevent 'any such riotous meeting', officers stationed in the city were provided
with a list of women suspected of taking part in the spectacle before being ordered to
raid their houses. However, according to Forbes's account of the 'raid', only one
woman, a Mrs Jean Rollo, was taken prisoner and upon being 'brought before the
Justice Clerk and Lord Albemarle, and after some very silly trifling questions being
asked about her tartan gown [-] she was dismissed.'[38]

Most notable among the public displays of sartorial resistance undertaken by English
Jacobites during the post-'46 period of reprisal was the high-profile spectacle
performed at Litchfield in September 1747. As was widely reported in British
newspapers and portrayed in satirical prints, following a general election in which
numerous Tory MPs had lost their seats, a stag hunt was organized at the Litchfield
races attended by 'several Peers, upwards of twenty members of parliament, and
several thousand horsemen' who appeared 'remarkably dressed, in plaid waistcoats
and hatbands, and […] white cockades' **[Fig: 2.3]**.[39] This act of mobilised sartorial
defiance against the reigning Whigs was echoed in later years by Sir Thomas Gresley
who, following the Lichfield by-election in 1753, rode into town as a returning MP
'attended by 200 gentlemen and 500 freemen wearing blue [Tory] and white
[Jacobite] ribbons.'[40] Though English women are not officially mentioned in
accounts of these particular disturbances, a passage regarding the incident at the
Lichfield races in 1747 penned by satirist Henry Fielding does speculate upon their
involvement. Appearing in the Whig periodical *The Jacobite's Journal*, Fielding
writes in the guise of hot-headed Jacobite sympathiser Humphrey Trottplaid:

> Whatever may be your Opinion of the desperate Situation of our
> Cause, I promise you we shall not give it up yet; of this you will be
> convinced, if you dare shew your Face at our ensuing Horse-Races,

---

[37] *Ibid.*

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 111.

[39] *The Scots Magazine* (October 1747), p 494; *The Caledonian Mercury* (12 October 1747); *BM*
1868,0808.3861 (Anon. 'Great Britain's Union; Or Litchfield Races Transpos'd', line engraving on
paper broadside, c. 1747).

[40] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (1989), p. 199.

when we intend to march a very large Body of Forces into the

Field, all drest in Plaid, which is, you know, the Regimentals of our

Dearly Beloved. For this Purpose all the Taylors in this Country are

very busily employed in making up Plaid Waistcoats and Breeches;

nay, one Troop of us intend to appear in Plaid Boots. The Women's

Taylors are likewise hard at work, and we are to be reinforced with

a considerable Body of Amazons in Plaid Jackets, every one of

whom is able to fight, ay, and to drink too, with any He-Whig in the

Kingdom.[41]

Meanwhile the town of Manchester, whose citizens had featured so prominently during the treason trials of 1746–7, emerged as a hotbed of lingering Jacobite support in the wake of the '45.[42] Several Manchester ladies were noted to 'wear Plaid Petticoats to distinguish themselves' from their pro-Hanoverian neighbours in August 1747, while a whole family attended an infant's christening at the local church 'dress'd in Plaid' the following October.[43] Jacobite processions and disturbances also abounded in England after the defeat of April 1746. For instance, 'several disaffected Persons, dressed in Plaid Cockades, assembled together and paraded through the Town' of Easingstoke, Staffordshire in November 1748, 'preceeded by all the Fiddlers &c. this and the neighbouring Towns could produce, playing; *The King shall enjoy his own again.*'[44]

However, the incorporation of the tartan (and the white cockade) into exhibitions of sartorial resistance following the failure of the '45 rising was not the only action taken by Jacobite adherents seeking to subvert the suppressive intentions of the Disarming Act's clothing clause. In addition to direct opposition performed through public displays of disaffection, more subtler methods of skirting the prohibitions were employed within Jacobite visual and material culture during the post-'46 period of reprisal. This subtler trend of rebellious nationhood was especially prevalent within painted portraiture commissioned by wealthier Jacobites, who sought to depict themselves or significant figures of the '45 provocatively sporting the richly

---

[41] W. B. Coley, ed., *Henry Fielding: The Jacobite Journal and Related Writings* (Oxford, 1974), p. 369.

[42] Rogers, *Crowds Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain* (1998), pp. 45-6.

[43] *The Caledonian Mercury* (6 August 1747); *The Caledonian Mercury* (12 October 1747).

[44] *The Caledonian Mercury* (21 November 1748).

symbolic tartan garb as expressions of their continued loyalty to the Stuarts in exile. As put forward by Jonathan Faiers in his fashion history of tartan:

> …it is as if those in positions of power and influence felt compelled to represent themselves as above this new law, and to display their continuing allegiance to the Jacobite cause, if only in private or as painted images seen by family and friends.[45]

Painted portraiture of Jacobite men and women wearing outfits of rebellious tartan – or 'party-coloured plaid' – subsequently abounded during the active period of proscription, seemingly without significant censure from the British government.[46] Given that the clothing clause of the Disarming Act only explicitly pertained to the textile material culture of sartorial Jacobitism, defying the ethos of the Act through artistic expression was relatively free from legal risk, though, as discussed by Pittock, possessing a tartan image (or otherwise) of Charles Edward Stuart could still potentially lead to legal trouble up until at least 1760 **[Fig: 2.4]**.[47] It can therefore not be regarded as a coincidence that one of the better-known portraits of the most famous of Jacobite heroines, Flora MacDonald, depicts her in a vivid tartan check, 'bedecked down the bodice and at the sleeve with the white roses of the Jacobites' **[Fig: 2.5]**.[48] Commissioned by Flora herself from oil painter Richard Wilson, the image was created shortly after her release from the Tower of London in 1747, where she had been imprisoned for her part in helping Charles Edward Stuart escape

---

[45] Jonathan Faiers, *Tartan* (Oxford & New York: Bloomsbury, 2008), p. 42.

[46] See in particular: Coltman, 'Party-Coloured Plaid? Portraits of Eighteenth-Century Scots in Tartan' (2010), pp. 182-216.

[47] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition* (2013)*,* p. 45; On the shifting legalities pertaining to the production and possession of Jacobite material culture, and on Jacobite portraiture in particular, see also: Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (2013), pp. 18-40, pp. 46-51; *NMS* H.NF 40 (Glazed oval pendant of copper with waist-length portrait of Prince Charles Edward Stuart in Highland dress, eighteenth century).

[48] *NGS* PG 1162 (Richard Wilson, 'Flora Macdonald [Fionnghal nighean Ragnaill 'ic Aonghasis Òig], 1722-1790. Jacobite heroine', oil on canvas, *c.* 1747); Faiers, *Tartan* (2008), pp. 86-7. It should be noted that Faiers does not think the gown modelled by MacDonald in the Wilson portrait is representative of an actual garment, stating 'these portraits act as allegories of the sitters' political allegiance rather than as any accurate depiction of the women's attire.' (p. 87).

after the Battle of Culloden.[49] By the time of her release under the 1747 Act of Indemnity, discussion of the Disarming Act had been active for some months. Her decision to be depicted by Wilson in a tartan gown, or for Wilson to choose to depict the Jacobite heroine thus, is therefore telling of their keen awareness of the subversive implications of the fabric in the public imagination. With the high society of London fascinated by Flora MacDonald's controversial role in the '45 rising, it would have made perfect sense both artistically and patriotically for Wilson to dress MacDonald in the colours of noble *Scotia*.[50]

Exceptions

By the terms of the Disarming Act, Highland soldiers serving in the British army were given explicit permission to wear tartan in a military capacity.[51] As discussed by military historian Victoria Henshaw, this decision was in-keeping with British military policy prior to the '45, which had allowed Scottish soldiers a degree of autonomy in their uniform choices, including the wearing of tartan and the use of the thistle insignia over the badge of the Hanoverian white horse. However, this pre-'45 distinctiveness in Scottish military dress was arguably more to do with supply shortages and a lack of cohesive policy across the various branches of the British army than with the desire of Highland recruits to sartorially perform their national identity within a Union setting. Although, as further suggested by Henshaw, being

---

[49] MacDonald's fame as the virtuous female saviour of Charles Edward Stuart transformed her, as well as the tartan she was so often depicted as wearing, into an emblem for continued Jacobite support during the post-'46 period of reprisal. That her actions were born out of necessity, rather than political allegiance, were of little consequence. Ironically, in later life she become a prominent figure on the side of the Hanoverian loyalists during the American Revolutionary War.

[50] MacDonald was the subject of a veritable avalanche of prints and paintings following her release from the Tower of London in 1747, in which she was invariably shown sporting either a tartan gown or a plaid shawl. Aside from Wilson's depiction, Allan Ramsay also produced a portrait of the Jacobite heroine in 1749, currently in the collection of the Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology in Oxford (WA1960.76). For MacDonald's comparison to 'Scotia' in the visual culture of Jacobitism, see: Nicholson, 'From Ramsay's *Flora MacDonald* to Raeburn's *MacNab*: The Use of Tartan as a Symbol of Identity' (2005), pp. 146-67.

[51] Exact wording: '…no Man or Boy, within that Part of Great Britain called Scotland, other than such as should be employed as Officers and Soldiers in his Majesty's Forces, should, on any Pretence whatsoever, wear or put on the Clothes, commonly called Highland Clothes…'

allowed to don tartan clothing for martial purposes was arguably a recruitment draw for Highland men in the aftermath of the '45, when it was felt that they could no longer wear the fabric with impunity under the terms of the Disarming Act, particularly during the early years of the Act's most vigorous enforcement.[52] As demonstrated above, a lack of clarity among its enforcers regarding what exactly constituted 'Highland' clothing did cause the Act to be applied illiberally on many occasions to the detriment of the wearer.[53] This exemption clause was important in the rehabilitation of tartan and the eventual repeal of the Act, as it ensured that the fabric would only be employed in an overtly military context when worn in the service of the Hanoverian monarch and the British state.

The introduction of a black and green 'Government sett' – or 'Whig' tartan – in the uniforms of those Highland regiments stationed at home and abroad during the post-'46 period of reprisal arguably did much to remove the negative connotations which had previously associated tartan dress with displays of military and popular Jacobitism in the aftermath of the failed rebellion.[54] The black and green sett became an iconic sartorial feature of Scotland's martial identity within British popular culture, emerging as emblematic of the region's wider military role in the safe-guarding of the far-flung territories of the rapidly expanding British Empire.[55] This was especially the case in the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when Highland soldiers served in colonial territories and during major conflicts such as the Seven Years War, the American Revolution and, later, the Napoleonic Wars in

---

[52] Henshaw, *Scotland and the British Army, 1700-1750* (2014), pp. 44-6. See also: Allan Carswell, 'Scottish Military Dress' in *A Military History of Scotland*, eds. Edward M. Spiers, Jeremy A. Crang and Matthew J. Strickland (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012), pp. 632-4.

[53] Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery* (2009), pp. 116-17.

[54] See in particular: Robert Clyde, *From Rebel to Hero: The Image of the Highlander, 1745-1830* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1998); Dziennik, 'Whig Tartan: Material Culture and its Use in the Scottish Highlands, 1746-1815' (2012), pp. 117-47.

[55] See: Matthew P. Dziennik, *The Fatal Land: War, Empire, and the Highland Soldier in British America* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2015); Heather Streets, 'Identity in the Highland Regiments in the Nineteenth Century: Soldier, Region, Nation' in *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience, c. 1550-1900*, Steve Murdoch and A. Mackillop, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 213-60. For a museum-orientated approach to this topic of the Highland soldier in the British Empire, see: Stuart Allan and Allan Carswell, *The Thin Red Line: War, Empire and Visions of Scotland* (Edinburgh: NMSE Ltd, 2004).

Europe. Through the examination of surviving examples of the regimental paraphernalia of Highland soldiers, alongside conducting an analysis of the representations of these dress objects in portraiture, documentary and satirical print media **[Figs: 2.6 & 2.7]**, representative material culture **[Fig: 2.8]**, and written accounts of the period, historians and museum curators have gained valuable insight into how Scotland's Highland military identity was communicated around the world by the sartorial culture of its rank and file soldiery.[56]

An early Highland 'volunteer' portrait of James Gorry, who served as Captain of the 87th Regiment of Foot from 1759–63, provides an indication of how the approved black and green sett of the Government tartan made a distinctive contrast with the characteristic red coat and gold fringe of British regimentals, effectively aligning the subversive fabric of the Jacobite soldier with the ostensibly honourable, military masculinity of the British officer classes **[Fig: 2.9]**.[57] However, as seen in this romantic portrait of John Murray, 4th Earl of Dunmore, painted by Sir Joshua Reynolds in 1765, the approved black and green Government sett could also be paired with more popularly accessible fashion tartans of a richer, scarlet colour. Worn alongside the traditional bonnet, buckled brogues and sporran associated with the formal style of Highland dress culture perpetuated by Charles Edward Stuart and his followers during the '45, the vivid red, black and green sett of John Murray's tailored waistcoat and upper coat in Reynold's portrait, as well as the fine lace cuffs visible at his wrists, communicate the social status and the sartorial taste of this gentleman soldier of the Highland regiments. Rather than adopting the characteristic

---

[56] As well as being explored by the aforementioned secondary literature, this theme is central to the arrangement of the permanent displays of the National War Museum (a branch of Nation Museums Scotland), which collectively cover the chronology of the Highland regiments and their various campaigns abroad during the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries; *NMS* M.1966.109 (I.S. Muller, 'A Highland Piper / A Highlander in his Regimentals / A Highland Drummer', etching, published by John Bowles, mid-eighteenth century); *NMS* M.1989.112 (Unknown artist, 'Le Repas du Chat', coloured engraving, published by Boedlieu in Paris, 1815); *NMS* H.NQ 616 (Highlander shop figure taking snuff, late eighteenth or early nineteenth century).

[57] *National Army Museum* 1962-06-13-1 (Unknown artist, 'Captain James Gorry, 87th Regiment of Foot, or Highland Volunteers, 1760', oil on canvas, 1760). See also: Rosalind Carr, 'The Gentleman and the Soldier: Patriotic Masculinities in Eighteenth-Century Scotland', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 28: 2 (2008), pp. 102-21.

red coat of British regimentals, Murray's allegiance to the Hanoverian crown is indicated by the black cockade attached to the brim of his Highland bonnet, while his tartan attire speaks to his regional affiliation with pro-Union Scotland **[Fig: 2.10]**.[58]

The Commercial Politics of Proscription: Tartan Consumption in Scotland, *c.* 1746-65

A notable hindrance to the study of mid-century tartan dress is its relative scarcity in modern museum collections. However, as this final section will explore, a lack of material evidence does not necessarily translate into the widespread removal of tartan from the sartorial culture of Scottish society during the era of the Disarming Act.

By analysing information drawn from commercial advertisements and public notices in newspapers from Scotland and Northern England for the period *c.* 1746–65, this section shall assert that tartan remained both a valued fashionable commodity and an everyday, earthly necessity for many Scottish consumers during the earlier period of active proscription, outside of those who served in the British military. It would appear that when tartan dress was divorced from the overt performance of Jacobite identity in the public space it was acceptable for Scottish consumers to indulge in tartan and the proscribed plaid for a multiplicity of uses, arguably furthering the garb's transition from sartorial icon of rebellious Jacobitism at mid-century to a prized material product of Scottish industry and artisanship by the later eighteenth century.[59] This was true even during the later 1740s and 1750s, when another Jacobite rebellion did not seem to be out of the realms of possibility and the sartorial culture of military Jacobitism was subject to severe sanctions. By observing the minute details of tartan consumption in the years following the defeat of the '45 and the instigation of the Disarming Act, a better understanding of the lived experience of the consumers and manufactures of tartan goods, as well as the emergent status of tartan as a patriotic pan-Scottish commodity within late eighteenth- and early

---

[58] *NGS* PG 2895 (Sir Joshua Reynolds, 'John Murray, 4th Earl of Dunmore', oil on canvas, 1765).

[59] See in particular: Sally Tuckett, 'Reassessing the Romance: Tartan as a Popular Commodity, c. 1770-1830', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 95: 2 (2016), pp. 182-202.

nineteenth-century Britain, may be more thoroughly judged and the merits of alterative primary sources considered.

Newspapers were not common in Scotland until the early-to-mid eighteenth century, and when titles did emerge on a significant scale their publication and readership were mainly concentrated within Scotland's urbanised commercial centres. Naturally, Edinburgh was a major focal point for such endeavours. The earliest Scottish newspapers originated within the city of Edinburgh during the first three decades of the eighteenth century; the *Edinburgh Evening Courant*, the *Caledonian Mercury* and the *Scots Magazine* being the most popular and widely distributed titles.[60] A small number of provincial newspapers had begun circulation in Mid and Lowland Scotland by mid-century, such as the *Glasgow Courant* and the *Aberdeen Journal*. However, regional newspapers such as these did not proliferate to the point of being capable of competing with Edinburgh-based publications until at least the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, so their readership was comparatively limited. Being so far removed from the heartland of urban Scotland, where the business of printing was more financially viable, newspaper publishing did not make inroads into documenting the everyday culture of the Scottish Highlands until the early nineteenth century, with the establishment of local titles such as the *Inverness Courier*.

The following discussion analyses the 'advertisements' and 'domestic news/general notices' segments of two Scottish newspapers and one English newspaper over roughly a twenty-year period (*c.* 1746–1765), these being the *Caledonian Mercury*, the *Aberdeen Journal* and the *Newcastle Courant*.[61] With the concentration of

---

[60] Ian D. Whyte, *Scotland Before the Industrial Revolution: An Economic and Social History c. 1050-c.1750* (Abingdon & New York: Longman, 1995), p. 317. There is an argument to be made that the *Mercurius Caledonius* (1660-1) was the original Scottish newspaper, given that it covered Scottish domestic news, news from abroad, as well as reprinting extracts from the major London papers. The paper ran for approximately twelve issues on a weekly basis, before being suppressed in March 1661. See: Julia M. Buckroyd, 'Mercurius Caledonius and its immediate successors, 1661', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 54: 157 (1975), pp. 11-21.

[61] These titles have been selected based on their availability on *The British Newspaper Archive*, which contains the fullest digitised runs of all three of these titles. It is understood that while these titles were not predominant in terms of circulation and readership in Scotland and Northern England during the period, they are suitable for the purposes of this analysis. Future postdoctoral studies based around

Scotland's major newspapers being in Edinburgh at this time, the newspaper titles under discussion have been chosen in order to represent a broader geographical scope that extends beyond the influence of Scotland's capital. The *Caledonian Mercury* represents the lived experience of one of the most urbanised regions of Lowland Scotland, the Lothians, drawing its content mainly from areas in and around Edinburgh, whereas the *Aberdeen Journal* represents the daily life of a major town bordering, and therefore being more intimately connected with, the Scottish Highlands and its people. Meanwhile, the *Newcastle Courant* has been used to gauge crossovers of production and trade in plaid and tartan sartorial goods with towns on the border between Scotland and England. The aforementioned timescale has been adopted to examine and contrast evidence of tartan consumption derived from newspaper content covering the immediate aftermath of the '45 and the early decades of active proscription, which followed the announcement and official implementation of the Disarming Act in Scotland.

The classification of 'advertisements' here applies to the segments most commonly relegated towards the final pages or final columns of the *Caledonian Mercury*, *Aberdeen Journal*, and *Newcastle Courant*, in which are contained an assortment of classified advertisements and public notices paid for by private individuals. These segments are almost wholly devoted to the advertisement of mercantile or recently imported goods into the vicinities of Edinburgh, Aberdeenshire, and Northumberland, these being for sale either in an established shop by a resident proprietor, by public auction at a designated time, place and date, or else at occasional fairs or regional markets. These 'advertisements' also contain notices of absconded or criminal individuals, such as missing spouses, wayward children, runaway servants, apprentices, slaves, and deserters from the British army. To aid in identification of absconded or criminal individuals, these notices often contain minutely detailed descriptions of the attire of the wanted individuals, or descriptions of the goods that they might have fled with. Similarly, these segments also contain notices of lost or stolen goods, sometimes lost or stolen from a private house or else lifted from a merchant's shop or market stall by opportunistic thieves.

---

this topic of enquiry will make greater and more complex use of additional titles, which are currently not available to the writer of this thesis.

'Domestic news' and 'general notices' is a less easily defined segment within the chosen titles, as there is some thematic overlap with the kinds of advertisements and public notices commonly found within the 'advertisements' of the *Caledonian Mercury*, *Aberdeen Journal* and *Newcastle Courant*. Rather than focusing mainly on mercantile activity, however, 'domestic news/general notices' columns contain reports of missing, deceased or criminal individuals, or reports of criminal behaviour such as thievery, destruction of property, or violent acts such as rape or murder. Unlike the information contained within 'advertisements', the category of 'domestic news' is often confined to events which have already happened and will sometimes contain indications of public opinion. In the *Caledonian Mercury*, what would be classified as domestic news (i.e. Scottish) is often confined within the 'Edinburgh' column or page of the newspaper, following or preceding extracts taken from the major London newspapers. However, in the *Aberdeen Journal*, regional news is given its own column under 'Domestic Occurrences' and Scottish news (predominantly lifted from the Edinburgh papers) sits alongside extracts taken from the major London newspapers. This peculiarity in the *Aberdeen Journal* allows us an excellent insight into news emanating from the immediate locality of Aberdeenshire, including glimpses of Highland news and observations on Highland culture.

The following analysis of the 'advertisements' and 'domestic news' sections of the *Caledonian Mercury* and the *Aberdeen Journal* for the period *c*. 1746–65 reveals that the manufacture, sale and wear of plaid and tartan sartorial goods remained common practice in Lowland Scotland and on the border of the Scottish Highlands during the later 1740s and throughout the 1750s. In spite of the political stigma and legislative restrictions associated with wearing formal and military styles of Highland dress (as per the official wording of the Disarming Act), Scottish civilians located in the Lothians and in Aberdeenshire appear to have enjoyed access to plaids and tartan dress during the early period of active proscription, which followed in the immediate aftermath of the '45. While it would be a gross oversimplification to suggest that these findings from the Lothians and Aberdeenshire should be applied to the entirety of Scottish society from the later 1740s and throughout the 1750s, these findings certainly indicate regional participation in (or at least a tolerance for) the manufacture, sale and public display of tartan during the earlier period of active proscription, as long as such necessary or fashionable consumption was not

accompanied by overtly Jacobite behaviours, such as those outlined by Chapter One and earlier in Chapter Two. Furthermore, evidence derived from the *Newcastle Courant* during the 1750s and early 1760s indicates that English textile workers and sellers, such as those involved in weaving, dyeing, washing and peddling wares in the region of Northumberland, worked readily with tartan commodities for the benefit of nearby Scottish consumers.

Beginning with advertisements taken from the *Caledonian Mercury*, it can be seen that plaids and tartan articles of dress were in good supply in the commercial centre of Edinburgh both before and after the '45 rebellion.[62] A number of the city's merchants, weavers, and auctioneers regularly rented space in the paper to advertise the sale and production of such wares, with some individuals advertising during the '45 itself and continuing to do so well after the introduction and implementation of the Disarming Act, *c.* 1746–9. However, particularly in the case of manufacturers, not all of these individuals continued to advertise openly once the clothing clause of the Disarming Act had been formally enforced in Scotland from 25 December 1748. With little exception, the individuals discussed below operated their businesses in and around the Lawnmarket and Luckenbooths area of Edinburgh, in the immediate vicinity of the Tolbooth, the Exchange, and Parliament Close.[63]

Merchant advertisements placed by John Seton, William Taylor and James Baillie *c.* 1742–9 emphasise their skills as manufacturers, as well as traders, of tartan and plaid sartorial goods. These advertisements, except for those placed by John Seton, appear before and after the rebellion. John Seton's advertisements do not appear to extend beyond 1742, James Baillie's cover the period 1742–8, and William Taylor's extend from 1742–9, the latter years in partnership with fellow merchant Thomas Gairdner.

John Seton, whose workshop was located opposite to the upper-end of the Luckenbooths, advertised himself as a specialist in weaving and tailoring tartan into

---

[62] The timeframe of this section has been extended in regard to tartan weavers only, in order to compare how the manufacturing habits of the tartan weavers of Edinburgh differed pre-'45 and post-'45. In this way the commercial impact of the Disarming Act upon weavers, in particular, may be more thoroughly judged.

[63] *NLS* EMS.s.786 (William Edgar, 'Plan of the city and castle of Edinburgh', 1765). See: https://maps.nls.uk/towns/rec/2706 [Accessed 27 April 2018]. As can be seen in Edgar's map of 1765, these areas were in very close proximity to each other denoting the city's textile district.

'proper Habits' worn by the Honourable Company of Archers, as well as by the Edinburgh gentry and mercantile elite.[64] In his notice for May 1742, Seton advised 'all Noblemen and Gentlemen that are unprovided in Habits, may be furnished by him at a much cheaper Rate than by any other', and on a more general note indicated that '[t]here is always kept at the same Place a Variety of new Patterns of Tartan Plaids and Scots Carpets than any where else in Town, and sold at the lowest Prices.'[65] From this, it is evident that Seton catered to a predominantly male, upper-class clientele, a demographic similar to the primary readership of the *Caledonian Mercury*.[66] Advertisements from Seton do not appear in the *Caledonian Mercury* during the active period of proscription, however it is not clear whether this is as a direct result of the anti-male and anti-martial wording of the Disarming Act, or due to some unrelated reason altogether. Out of those merchants discussed in this section, Seton is the only one who appears to have catered almost exclusively to a male clientele, the only category of individual the Act explicitly disallowed from wearing Highland dress and tartan outerwear. In particular, the Act disallowed the use of tartan in the manufacture of great coat and upper coats, or Seton's major stock in trade: 'Habits'.[67]

Of those merchants discussed, James Baillie made the most use of the *Caledonian Mercury* as a source of commercial promotion. The bulk of his advertisements were published between 1742 and 1748, with notices ceasing altogether in late November 1748.[68] It is very possible that as a tartan weaver and trader, Baillie did not wish to

---

[64] *NMS* A.1993.62 A, B (Coat and breeches from a Royal Company of Archers uniform or a hard twill weave wool tartan, lined in fustian with napped surface, c. 1750).

[65] *The Caledonian Mercury* (4 May 1742).

[66] On readership of *The Caledonian Mercury*, which 'came from the same sector of the population that participated most fully in Enlightenment urban culture, namely, the gentry, professionals, and merchants.' See: Rosalind Carr, *Gender and Enlightenment Culture in Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014), p. 67. Also: Stephen W. Brown, 'Newspapers and Magazines' in *The Edinburgh History of the Book in Scotland. Volume II: Enlightenment and Expansion, 1707-1800*, eds. Stephen W. Brown and Warren McDougall (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012), p. 355.

[67] Exact wording of the Disarming Act: '…that no tartan or party-coloured plaid or stuff shall be used for Great Coats or upper coats…'

[68] With a lull between the years 1744–6, potentially as a result of the unrest caused by the '45.

continue publicly advertising his services, knowing that the Disarming Act was to come into full-effect the following month. Located in the area of the Lawnmarket, at the Sign of the Archer opposite the Tolbooth, Baillie manufactured and sold 'all sorts of Worsted, Silk and Worsted and Flowered Tartan Plaids, and all Scarlet Plaids' (1742), 'all sorts of TARTANS, Scarlet Worsted Plaids, Scots and Foreign Carpets, Transe-Cloths of different kinds' (1743), and 'all Kinds of TARTANS for Gowns, Plaids, &c. also Scarlet Worsted Plaids and Carpets' (1747).[69] His final advertisement, placed 23 November 1748, does not advertise his skills as a tartan weaver or seller of plaids, though he does note that a 'great Variety of the newest Patterns of TARTANS' are still available at his shop for wholesale and retail. Prior to this final advertisement Baillie had often referred to himself as the 'maker' or 'manufacturer' of the plaids and tartan goods on offer at his shop, especially in those advertisements placed in 1747.[70] A notice advertising the closure of his shop and the sale of its remaining inventory does not appear in the *Caledonian Mercury*, which is unusual considering how regularly Baillie utilised the paper up until the final months of 1748. This may suggest that Baillie's business was still active, but that his ability or desire to openly advertise as a tartan weaver was compromised by the ethos of the Act.[71]

William Taylor, located in a shop near Liberton's Wynd in the area of the Lawnmarket, beginning in 1742 manufactured for wholesale and retail 'all sorts of TARTANS, Worsted, Silk and Worsted, and Flowered', as well as 'SCARLET PLAIDS' and 'Silk Plaids' alongside 'other Scots Goods'. Taylor also dealt in other dress fabrics and accessories, such as broadcloth, hats and stockings, 'all at most reasonable Rates.'[72] Manufacturing for wholesale and retail would have allowed Baillie and Taylor to supply both the lay shopper as well as their fellow Edinburgh merchants, who would have purchased their manufactured goods in bulk to sell

---

[69] *The Caledonian Mercury* (25 May 1742); *The Caledonian Mercury* (16 May 1743); *The Caledonian Mercury* (22 June 1747); *The Caledonian Mercury* (23 June 1747).

[70] For instance, in his advertisements for the year 1747: *The Caledonian Mercury* (22 June 1747); *The Caledonian Mercury* (23 June 1747); *The Caledonian Mercury* (12 November 1747); *The Caledonian Mercury* (23 November 1747).

[71] Also, as shall be seen in the discussion of other merchant enterprises below, 'closing down' advertisements were relatively common practice among those in the trade.

[72] *The Caledonian Mercury* (03 June 1742).

onward or else turn to stock within their own shops. Unlike Seton, Baillie and Taylor appear to have manufactured and sold plaid and tartan sartorial goods for a primarily female clientele, though the inclusion of broadcloth, hats and stockings in Taylor's advertisements suggests he also peddled a male-oriented side-line of fashionable commodities. Like Seton, Baillie and Taylor's clientele would likely have been of a middling to upper-class variety, given their trade in silks and scarlet fabrics, the latter probably coloured using cochineal, an expensive natural dyestuff imported into Britain.[73]

By December 1744, Taylor had entered into a partnership with fellow merchant Thomas Gairdner. Remaining in the area of the Lawnmarket, the partnership had a warehouse at the Sign of the Golden Key, opposite Forrester's Wynd, from which they manufactured and traded 'all Sorts of *Scots Cloths*; from the lowest to best Superfines', tailored liveries 'of any Colour, or Quality, upon giving two Months Notice' and produced for wholesale and retail 'all Sorts of *Worsted Silk* and *Worsted*, and *brocaded Tartans*'.[74] The latter goods – fine worsted, worsted silks, and brocaded tartans – would have been suitable wear for the capital's gentry and mercantile elite, particularly for the making of ladies gowns. In September 1745, on the eve of Edinburgh's occupation by the Jacobite army, the partnership's stock in trade had not altered much, though their emphasis had shifted decidedly towards promoting Scottish textile production. They advertised that they 'continue to sell, in Wholesale and Retail, at lowest prices, all Sorts of WOOLLEN, NARROW and BROAD CLOTHS of the Manufacture of Scotland' as well as a 'great Choice of TARTANS, the newest Patterns, Cotton Checks and Sarges, of which they are also *Makers*; and Variety of Scots Carpets, Hats, Stockings, &c.'[75] In both their

---

[73] For research evidencing the preferred use of 'exotic' commercial insect dyes (such as imported cochineal for bright red grounds) over native vegetable dyestuffs in eighteenth-century tartan production, see in particular: Hugh Cheape and Anita Quye, 'Historical and analytical research of dyes in early Scottish tartan' in *The Scientific Analysis of Ancient and Historic Textiles*, eds. R. Janaway and P. Wyeth (London: Archetype Publications Ltd, 2005), pp. 202-7; Cheape, 'Gheibhte breacain charnaid ('Scarlet tartans would be got…'): the Re-Invention of Tradition' in *From Tartan to Tartanry* (2010), p. 26.

[74] *The Caledonian Mercury* (13 December 1744).

[75] *The Caledonian Mercury* (3 September 1745). Taylor and Gairdner's advertisements continued to appear during the rebel occupation of Edinburgh: *The Caledonian Mercury* (4 October 1745).

advertisements for 1744 and 1745, Taylor and Gairdner gave notice to their fellow clothiers in Scotland that they were proposing to take in Scottish cloth of good quality in exchange for '*Spanish* or other Wools and Instruments, to the Value of a third of the Cloths bought [...] and ready Money for the Remainder, by which this Branch of Manufacture may be greatly increased, and the Poor employ'd.' They encouraged other merchants in Edinburgh to do the same, claiming that such tokens of economic patriotism had the potential to stimulate success and generate prestige for Scottish textile production within the British empire.[76] However, by the spring of 1749 the partnership advertised in the *Caledonian Mercury* their intention to dissolve the business, with the aim of beginning individual enterprises. However, it is very unlikely that it was the Disarming Act which caused them to cease manufacturing and trading tartan or plaids, given that their final advertisement declared that each would 'carry on separately the same Business as when they were in Company, viz. Manufacturing and selling Broad Cloths, Tartans, &c.'[77]

As well as those merchant weavers advertising their wares in the fashionable, commercial centre of Edinburgh, plaid and tartan sartorial goods also appeared in advertisements for auctions and regional markets throughout the 1750s and early 1760s, across the Lothians, Aberdeenshire, and in towns in the North-East of England – the latter benefiting from trade relationships across the Scottish border. Such public sales were the result of a number of different circumstances. They mainly resulted from the redistribution of old stock upon a shop's closure or from the movement of a business from one part of a town to another. They may also have been organised to correspond with the special delivery of a parcel of goods hailing from outside of the seller's commercial purview, such as from London or from other

---

Whether this indicates partisanship towards the Jacobites is debatable, however. They may simply have already paid for the advertisements to be inserted in *The Caledonian Mercury* before the city was threatened with occupation. That *The Caledonian Mercury* was considered Edinburgh's most pro-Jacobite press has been discussed elsewhere, see: Alasdair Mann, 'The press and military conflict in early modern Scotland' in *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience, c. 1550-1900* (2002), p. 279.

[76] *The Caledonian Mercury* (13 December 1744); *The Caledonian Mercury* (3 September 1745).

[77] *The Caledonian Mercury* (18 April 1749); *The Caledonian Mercury* (20 April 1749).

Scottish manufacturing towns.[78] While such auctions, sometimes referred to as 'sales by roup', tended to take place in a specific merchant's shop, others would take place in auction houses built for the purpose and so employed auctioneers-by-trade who acted as middlemen. James Miller, for example, 'auctions all Sorts of Goods or Furniture for any Person or Persons who please to employ him' and operated his sales from the auction house in the Old Bank Close, in the area of the Lawnmarket in Edinburgh. In November 1753, Miller advertised the sale of three parcels of merchant goods, two of sartorial wares and one of ceramics. While the latter included such tasteful commodities as punch bowls, ribbed slab bowls, teapots, and chocolate cups, the former two bundles contained a large variety of high-quality dress and domestic fabrics, including 'Tartans and Checks' and 'Scarlet Worsted Plaids'.[79]

However, such sales were not always advertised under a particular individual's name, though a location for the sale was usually specified, such as a shop, house, market place or seasonal fair. For instance, anonymous sales in Edinburgh were advertised in August and November 1755, both ostensibly organised by the same seller given the similarities in the wording of the posted notices. Trading from 'the second Shop above the Head of Forrester's Wynd', the anonymous dealer advertised the auction of a diverse selection of sartorial goods, of both Scottish and English manufacture. As well as Scots 'Plaiding' of the type worn for travelling, the dealer also exposed to sale cotton and linen checks, hollands, fustians, camblets, calamancoes, and 'Broad Worsted Stuffs for Beds, both stamp'd and watered.' The sale was to be at prime cost, continuing until all articles were disposed of.[80] Moving further north, a seasonal market was established in Oldmeldrum, Aberdeenshire, in May 1751, referred to as 'St. Johns Fair'. The market was advertised 'to continue for two Days and yearly thereafter', with 'proper encouragement' promised to all those sellers wishing to hawk their wares. While the remit of the market was to stimulate local trade chiefly in 'Country Commodities', such as livestock and farming

---

[78] Such as the open sale of a 'Parcel of Fresh MERCHANT-GOODS', including London and Yorkshire textiles, sold in a shop below Mary King's Close in Edinburgh in March 1742: *The Caledonian Mercury* (22 March 1742).

[79] *The Caledonian Mercury* (13 November 1753).

[80] *The Caledonian Mercury* (21 August 1755); *The Caledonian Mercury* (25 November 1755).

equipment, sellers were also encouraged to auction off locally made textile goods suitable for outdoor laborers and drovers. These included sundries, such as men's stockings, and 'Plaiding' material of the kind which had caused such considerable controversy between Major William Rufane and Charles Forbes in Aberdeenshire on the eve of the Disarming Act's full enforcement in December 1748, just three years prior.[81]

Alongside the ordinary rhythms of production and sale, auctions also occurred as the result of a death, usually of a local merchant or itinerant journeyman, with the sale of their remaining inventories going towards the settling of any outstanding debts. Such was the case with peddler and journeyman Thomas Cavers, late of the town of Hexham in North-East England. During the course of his career, Cavers evidently travelled back and forth across the Scottish border, for the auction of his remaining inventory in March 1752, which took place at the Globe in Hexham, Northumberland, overseen by one Mr. Turner, included 'Scotch Plaids and Handkerchiefs of every Kind' and 'Scotch Threads' alongside the more usual hollands, muslins, lawns, chintzes, cottons, camblets, flannels, and worsted stockings.[82] In early October 1756, Mary Roe, widower of George Roe of Sandhill, Newcastle, placed an advertisement in the *Newcastle Courant*, which detailed the upcoming sale of her late husband's remaining inventory of 'MERCERY and LINEN-DRAPERY GOODS', all to be auctioned off at prime cost. An entry for 'Scots Plaids' was noted within a long and diverse list of fashionable fabrics and accessories, which included damasks, satins, tabbies, poplins, cambrics, fustians, cottons, superfine muslins and calicoes, Irish stuffs, and Irish, Swiss and German linens, handkerchiefs, plain and figured ribbons, hosiery and ladies fans.[83]

The posthumous sale of Carver's and Roe's inventories are not the only instances of residents in North-East England dealing in plaid and tartan sartorial goods during the 1750s and early 1760s. Textile workers, such as weavers, dyers, and finishers, alongside local merchants, also dealt in the fabric. Mary Pearson, for example, a dyer based in Newcastle, advertised herself primarily as a specialist in silk-dyeing,

---

[81] *The Aberdeen Journal* (16 April 1751). See discussion of the incident in Chapter One.

[82] *The Newcastle Courant* (18 April 1752).

[83] *The Newcastle Courant* (9 October 1756); *The Newcastle Courant* (16 October 1756).

calendaring and washing. However, she also professed skills in dyeing and washing linen, velvet, wool, worsted, skeins of yarn, and 'Scarlet Cloaks and Plaids'. Placing advertisements in the *Caledonian Mercury* for January and October 1755, Pearson included a detailed list of all those merchants, clothiers, carders and dyers in Lowland Scotland and the North-East of England whom were charged with taking-in and delivering commissions on her behalf. Locations connected with her business included Glasgow, Edinburgh, Dumfries, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Carlisle, Hexham, Sunderland, Durham, Morpeth, Darlington, Northallerton, Stockton, Bradford, Richmond, Ripon, Halifax, Leeds and York.[84] Later, in mid-February 1760, a manufactory-house operating out of the market town of Morpeth, Northumberland, advertised the closure of the business and the impending auction of their remaining stock and equipment. Such equipment consisted of looms, twisting mills, wheels, water tubs, spouts, coppers, leads, pewters, pots and dyestuffs, while the inventory of ready-textiles included mention of both plain cottons and 'Plaids' for Scottish consumption.[85] Finally, Jacob Ainsley, a draper from Newcastle, advertised in May 1763 the arrival at his shop in Castle-Garth of a large assortment of sartorial goods 'from the best Manufacturers' at home and abroad. Among this new inventory was listed the acquisition of a variety of regional textiles, such as 'German Serges', 'London Stuffs and Callimancoes', 'Kendal Stuffs, Stript Flannels and Jerseys' and 'Tartan and Scots Camblets.' It can be presumed that Ainsley dealt with a predominantly male clientele, given his emphasis upon advertising 'Men's Velvets' and 'all Sorts of Trimmings for Men's Cloaths', however no definitive indication is given as to the gender of the intended purchasers of his stock of tartan cloth.[86]

The information we can glean from the commercial advertisements of merchants, manufacturers, auctioneers and traders outlined above gives us a fair indication of the value placed on tartan goods and plaids as popularly desired, tradable commodities during the earlier period of active proscription, particularly in the Lowland region of Scotland where the stigma ascribed to these articles of dress was arguably less pronounced than in the Highlands. Also, by unearthing instances of

---

[84] *The Caledonian Mercury* (23 January 1755); *The Caledonian Mercury* (18 October 1755); *The Caledonian Mercury* (25 October 1755).

[85] *The Newcastle Courant* (17 February 1760).

[86] *The Newcastle Courant* (7 May 1763).

tartan trade in North-East England, it can be observed that tartans and plaids were an active part of the commercial activities of peddlers, textile finishers, and merchants operating along the bordering regions of Lowland Scotland during the 1750s and early 1760s. Such evidence of active manufacture and consumer demand, particularly when contrasted against the continued use of tartan dress by the Highland regiments of the British army during the same period, effectively dispels any notion of a 'tartan ban' operating in the region.

Furthermore, by highlighting the inclusion of plaids and tartans alongside the sale of fashionable commodities such as fine ceramics, exotic consumables, and quality woven and printed dress fabrics, the social value of these articles of dress during the earlier period of active proscription may be more thoroughly appreciated. In May 1746, for example, city merchant James Stirling proclaimed his intention to sell imported teas, sourced from the British East India Company and transported to his shop in Edinburgh direct from London. Acknowledging the recent alterations made to duties on imported tea by an Act of Parliament, Stirling implied his stock of teas would be a fairer price and of much better quality than any tea hawked by unscrupulous smugglers. However, perhaps as an insurance against any losses accrued as a result of the new duties, Stirling also advertised his investment in a sartorial side-line. As well as selling off parcels of 'Fine, Plain, Green, Hyson, and Bohea TEAS', Stirling also toted a stock of quality dress and domestic fabrics, including 'all Sorts of Broad CLOTHS, Undrest DAMASKS, Plain SILKS of different kinds, great Variety of Silk PLAIDS, several Sizes of English BLANKETS, Scots and English CARPETS or Floor-covers, Damask and Diaper TABLE-LINNEN manufactured in Edinburgh, with Variety of other Goods.'[87] By 1752–3, Stirling was still selling copious yards of variously coloured superfines, velvets and silks from his premises in the Luckenbooths, as well as accessory items such as stockings, lace, and silver, gold and gilt coat buttons. He also sold cloth cut into garment templates and bolts of velvet, rosetta, satin and tartan silk for ladies' plaids.[88] Meanwhile, Robert Arbuthnott, who traded at the Sign of the Golden Fleece and Silk Worm during the late 1740s and early 1750s, advertised that he carried a multitude of dress fabrics,

---

[87] *The Caledonian Mercury* (26 May 1746).

[88] *The Caledonian Mercury* (21 December 1752); *The Caledonian Mercury* (28 December 1752); *The Caledonian Mercury* (15 February 1753).

including 'SCOTS LINEN, fine and coarse, manufactured by the best Hands in the Country', accessories such as hats, stockings and lace, as well as an array of 'Velvets, Sattins, Rosetta and Tartan Silk Plaids, and all Kinds of Silks fit for Plaids.'[89] Between November 1749 and January 1750, Arbuthnott advertised the closure of his shop near Parliament Close and listed his entire stock for general sale. As in his first advertisement of July 1746, Arbuthnott's array of goods had been assembled with the tastes of Edinburgh's upper-classes in mind. As well as 'Silks of all sorts for Plaids', Arbuthnott's inventory shows that he also dealt in 'Rich Brocades', 'Ladies Beaver Hats' and a varied assortment of dress silks bought directly from weavers in Spitalfields, London.[90]

However, commercial advertisements such as those outlined above are by no means the only form of newspaper evidence which supports the idea that tartan continued to be a readily traded and valued commodity in Scotland during the earlier period of active proscription. By delving into local notices of criminal activity, such as occurred in the Lothians and Aberdeenshire during the 1750s, it can be observed that articles of tartan dress were often noted among lists of missing or stolen goods, usually taken out of the home or from the shop of the victim. As with the commercial advertisements, the tartan dress described predominantly pertains to the dress of Scottish women. However, the social class of the women mentioned varies more widely. This is to be expected in the context of local notices pertaining to theft or loss, when the onus to buy goods was removed and the details of everyday ownership are more prominently foregrounded.

There were two instances of tartan theft reported in Aberdeenshire in 1750, both occurring within the domestic setting of the Scottish home. The first was perpetrated by an anonymous 'Rouge', who had entered a home in the parish of Foveran in October and stolen 'a Gown of green and white, and a Tartain Plaid Marked I. W.', for which the owner was seeking remittance.[91] In May later that year, a 'Highland woman' claiming to have sore eyes begged entry into a farmer's house in the Deeside area of Aberdeen and 'made off with two blue Gowns, a green quilt

---

[89] *The Caledonian Mercury* (22 July 1746).

[90] *The Caledonian Mercury* (28 November 1749); *The Caledonian Mercury* (02 January 1750); *The Caledonian Mercury* (16 January 1750).

[91] *The Aberdeen Journal* (16 October 1750).

Petticoat, a Tartan Plaid, six Aprons, and several other Things of her Landlady's' before the break of the following day.[92] Likewise, on 7 September 1755, labourer Peter Rattray was accused of breaking into the house of William Grierson of Gifford Hall near Edinburgh and of stealing 'a large Parcel of CLOATHS, viz. several Shirts, a big Coat, two Plaids, a Gown, Aprons and Caps, and several other Things.'[93] In a similar fashion to the duplicitous 'Highland woman' of Aberdeen, in July 1758 George Osward wrote to the *Caledonian Mercury*, accusing an itinerant woman who called herself Clementina Farquharson of insinuating herself into his home through the good auspices of his wife. During her stay with Oswald, Farquharson pilfered numerous pieces from his wife's wardrobe, including a 'new Tartan Plaid, marked with M. O. 1755, both in one Corner o[n] the Plaid', as well as an array of expensive jewellery, gowns, petticoats, lawn aprons, napkins, linen shirts and calico skirts.[94]

In September 1752, a band of men broke into the shop of merchants William Mill and George Leggat of Ellon, Aberdeenshire, and ransacked everything of value. The theft, which was substantial, included many diverse textiles and dress accessories, including a silver watch, ruffles, ribbons, patterned lawns, cambrics, paisleys, worsteds, and ladies' gowns of chintz, damask and linen. Listed prominently in the notice, which appeared in the *Aberdeen Journal*, were 'two fine Tartan Plaids, yellow sett, one Do. coarse, red, green and black […] one pair barr'd Plaids.'[95] Meanwhile, the trial of Patrick Fischer, reported in the *Caledonian Mercury* in May 1752, indicates that manufacturers as well as merchants and homeowners were the victims of tartan theft during the earlier period of active proscription. Fischer 'petitioned the court for Banishment' for the crime of 'stealing and cutting a Tartan Plaid out of a Loom' from the premises of a tartan weaver in Edinburgh. Found guilty of the theft, he 'was ordered to be transported to the Plantations for Life.'[96]

Other thieves proved to be more opportunistic in their pilfering. Rather than engaging in housebreaking, wilful deception, or the raiding of commercial enterprises, they would commit acts of tartan theft in the public street, taking items

[92] *The Aberdeen Journal* (22 May 1750).

[93] *The Caledonian Mercury* (13 September 1755).

[94] *The Caledonian Mercury* (13 September 1755).

[95] *The Aberdeen Journal* (19 September 1752).

[96] *The Caledonian Mercury* (11 May 1752).

from stalls and from the luggage racks of carriages. When Mary Duncan, a vagrant from Clackmannanshire, was admitted to the workhouse in Stirling in August 1754 she admitted that the 'several Pieces of WOMENS CLOATHS, such as Gowns, Petticoats, Aprons, Plaids, Napkins, Shirts, and Remants of Linen, Sarge and other Cloth' in her possession were the result of various 'Acts of Pickery' she had undertaken in and around Falkirk.[97] By comparison, four years earlier in the shire of Linlithgow, an anonymous individual had stolen a trunk from behind a chaise between Bathgate and Houston, which had been packed with the wardrobe of a travelling gentlewoman. Alongside a fine assemblage of jewels, wigs, and a number of silk and poplin ensembles, there was described 'a Tartan with a Pink Satin Stripe and brocaded Flower' and 'a Red Silk Plaid' as being among the missing articles. It was noted by the advertiser that: 'If any of the above Particulars are offered to Sale, they are desired to be stopt; and whoever can give Notice of them, to Mr. Bell Stabler, at the Head of the Cowgate [Edinburgh], shall be sufficiently rewarded.' This reward was posted in issues of both the *Caledonian Mercury* and the *Edinburgh Courant* for 23 October 1750, testifying to the high value placed by its owner upon the contents of the pilfered trunk.[98]

As well as instances of tartan theft, the perpetrators of criminal activity (or their victims) are also noted in newspaper notices as wearing tartan dress or plaids during the early period of active proscription. In January 1754, for example, a woman was reportedly accosted in the Luckenbooths area of Edinburgh 'by five Fellows, who cut her Plaid and Gown with a Knife' before 'cruelly using her'.[99] This incident, while primarily being an assault on her person, was also brought to the public attention because of the wilful destruction of her sartorial property. Meanwhile, highwaymen, petty thieves and military deserters were frequently described as wearing tartan in reports of their illegal activities. A wealthy traveller who was accosted by a highwayman while he was passing through Aberdeenshire in July 1759, for example, described the man who had taken his purse as wearing 'a short black grey coat, with tartan hose, and busy black hair'.[100] While in October 1758, inn-keeper James Smith

---

[97] *The Caledonian Mercury* (12 August 1754).

[98] *The Caledonian Mercury* (23 October 1750); *The Edinburgh Courant* (23 October 1750).

[99] *The Caledonian Mercury* (24 January 1754).

[100] *The Aberdeen Journal* (3 July 1759).

of Auchleuchries in the parish of Cruden offered a reward for the safe return of a black horse stolen by 'a young man, about 5 foot 9 inches high, fair hair'd, fair complexion'd [in] a bonnet, short blue coat, clear buttons, and tartan breeches' who had stayed at Smith's inn overnight. The youth was further accused of not paying his bill and for stealing halters and blankets as well as the valuable mare.[101]

The dress of criminals and their victims is not the sole context in which tartan dress can be seen as falling within the purview of the lower social classes of Scottish society. As evidenced by the following, tartan dress and plaids were clearly not just for the exclusive consumption of the middling and upper classes who, as observed in the case of merchant advertisements, enjoyed access to silk, scarlet, and flowered tartans in the fashion capital of Edinburgh during the later 1740s and 1750s. Notices of missing and deceased individuals from the earlier period of active proscription show that the dress was well within the reach of the less wealthy, albeit of a meaner quality. In fact, itinerant labourers or absconded persons, most often women, were not infrequently described as sporting the plaid as a matter of everyday, earthly necessity.

When Janet Somers, a married woman of Borrowstowness, ran away from her husband and children with a local blacksmith, James Haldale, it was noted in the report of her behaviour in the *Caledonian Mercury* in May 1758, that she had absconded with items of considerable value to the family, including 'a Tartan gown, a Check ditto, and a Calico ditto, with a blue Cloke, and two Plaids, and a Tea Kettle […] not leaving her Husband a Farthing, but some Debt.'[102] Further, two unmarried women reported missing in Aberdeenshire in 1748 and 1759 were noted for wearing plaids of varying styles and colours. An anonymous woman, accused by her neighbours of 'being with Child in Uncleanness' and examined before the Kirk sessions in Keith, absconded from the town with a bundle of warm clothing, wrapped in 'a white Plaid marked, E. S.'[103] Later, when Helen Smith absconded from her father's home in Banchory Ternan in February 1759, also suspected of being pregnant and capable of 'evil Intent' against her unborn child, the *Aberdeen Journal*

---

[101] *The Aberdeen Journal* (24 October 1758).

[102] *The Caledonian Mercury* (11 May 1758).

[103] *The Aberdeen Journal* (15 November 1748).

described her as being 'a little above the middle Stature, and has black Hair and Complexion, had on a light-blue Gown, black Petticoat and narrow barr'd Plaid' for travelling.[104] By contrast, when a woman was known to have absconded without her plaid it was a matter of consternation. For instance, when Margaret Taylor, a farmer's wife from the parish of Foveran, Aberdeenshire, fled her home in May 1749 improperly dressed for the season it was cause for concern among her family and friends:

> …she went off without a Plaid, wearing a half worn out blue Gown,
> and a green Cloth Petticoat. These are intreating that whoever may
> have Account of her, or into whose House she may happen to
> come, that they use her well, and send an Express notifying where
> she is, either to Mr. James Gilchrist Minister at Foveran, or to
> James Taylor Merchant in Aberdeen, and they shall be well
> rewarded for their pains.[105]

When Taylor absconded for a second time in May 1751 she was noted as wearing 'two Petticoats, one green, the other Blue, a stript Jacket, and tartan Plaid.' While being better prepared for the inclement weather of a Highland spring, concern was raised regarding her considerable 'Disorder of Mind'.[106]

Descriptions of the deceased, particularly those found dead upon the roadside without any other form of identifying feature but for their luggage and attire, also provide evidence of tartan and plaid consumption during the earlier period of active proscription. For instance, in December 1748 the bodies of a labourer and his wife were found in the parish of Carnie, near Strathbogie in Aberdeenshire, having died after being overtaken by a snowstorm. It was assumed that the husband had left his wife on the road as he forged ahead to find their homestead in the blizzard but had perished in the search. Meanwhile, the woman had 'wrapped her self up in her Plaid' to wait for her husband's return but had died of exposure during the night.[107] Likewise, the bodies of a woman and child were found in a plantation of firs west of the village of Muthill, Perthshire, in early September 1749. It was thought by local

---

[104] *The Aberdeen Journal* (6 March 1759).

[105] *The Aberdeen Journal* (23 May 1749).

[106] *The Aberdeen Journal* (14 May 1751).

[107] *The Aberdeen Journal* (20 December 1748).

authorities that the woman had been travelling towards the Lothians in search of seasonal work, likely sheep shearing as a shearing-hook was found beside the pair's remains. A report of the discovery was printed in the *Aberdeen Journal*, noting that: 'Their cloaths were as follows: The Woman a stript blue and white Gown, a blue and white Petty-Coat, a Check Apron and a Highland Plaid. The Child's a white plaiding Jacket and Petty-Coat, and a black and white Frock.' What remained of the woman and child were interred together in Muthill's churchyard and their clothing was given over into the care of the Beadle for any relatives to claim.[108]

As can be seen in a number of the instances outlined above, the tartan and plaid sartorial goods listed as stolen or belonging to various Scottish persons were not infrequently described as being marked with initials of ownership and (occasionally) with the dates of their manufacture. As well as providing a useful date-stamp for the manufacture and purchase of these tartan goods in Scotland, thereby verifying their fall within the earlier period of active proscription, the historic practice of marking plaids imparts to the researcher a sense of the material value ascribed to these items by their owners. Practically speaking, the presence of stitched initials upon plaids was useful for their owners during processes of washing and conveyance. However, the practice also communicates the status of these objects within the lived experience of their owners and can be observed on a number of surviving examples of the period.[109] Also, by investing the time and the money into placing advertisements in local newspapers for the quick discovery and return of tartan dress and plaids, usually with the incentive of a reward, we can see that the average Scottish consumer was not dissuaded from indulging in the distinctive textile products of the nation by the restrictive ethos of the Disarming Act. Both as earthly necessities and as fashionable commodities, these textiles evidently held personal and material significance to those who wore them and, if lost or stolen, they wanted them to be returned.

This assertion is born out in the visual, as well as the documentary, record. For example, take the bridal portrait of Mary Chichester (née MacDonald) currently on

---

[108] *The Aberdeen Journal* (19 September 1749).

[109] *WHM* 63 (Eighteenth-century belted plaid made of tartan in green, blue and white stripes on red ground in a twill weave with hemmed edges. Embroidered in one corner are the initials 'I F' with a star stitch).

display at Arlington Court in Devon. The artist has placed the sitter's Scottish national identity at the forefront of her depiction. Executed by Edinburgh-based artist and former student of Allan Ramsay, Sir George Chalmers in 1780, several aspects of the painting pay homage to MacDonald's Highland birthplace of Inverness: the overcast moorland and open water detailed in the background of the composition, the bush of white heather from which she picks buds for the posy in her lap and, most importantly, the colourful plaid of fancy tartan draped about her shoulders [**Fig. 2.11**].[110] Complementing the twisted blue and yellow sash at her waist, from which hangs a red, heart-shaped pouch decorated with gold filigree, the shawl that envelopes MacDonald consists of a large sett of red, blue, and green. The lustrous finish of the shawl suggests that it, like the opalescent silk-satin fabric of MacDonald's gown, has been woven using silk threads. This kind of fine, sartorial quality is in-keeping with the luxurious tone of the rest of MacDonald's ensemble, which includes a profusion of white lace cuffs and trimmings, a gauze veil detailed with gold stripes, ropes of seed pearls twisted into the folds of her dress and hair, and a gold locket pinned at her breast. In the context of MacDonald's bridal portrait, painted just two short years prior to the repeal of the Disarming Act, the plaid is both an icon of her Scottish nationhood and an object of fashionable consumption [**Figs: 2.12 - & 3.40***d*].[111]

When taken individually, these disparate instances of tartan manufacture, provision, everyday and occasion wear indicate the personal experience of tartan consumption

[110] *NT* 987423 (Sir George Chalmers, 'Mary Macdonald, Mrs John Chichester (1738-1815), oil on canvas, 1780).

[111] The national costume worn by allegorical female figures representative of Scotland had typically become the tartan shawl, plaid, or arisaid, by the final decades of the long eighteenth century, as shown in the 'Three Kingdoms of Great Britain' fan discussed further in Chapter Three [*NMS* H. 1994.1052], and in the early nineteenth-century watercolour study 'The Union'. See: *BM* 1907.1018.54 (Sir William Charles Ross, 'The Union', watercolour, strengthened with gum, over graphite on paper, c. 1790–1860). On the fashionability of silk tartan shawls among Scottish women by the later eighteenth century, see in particular: Stana Nenadic, *Lairds and Luxury: The Highland Gentry in Eighteenth-century Scotland* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2007), pp. 153-4. On the use of the garment as a signifier of national identity among Scottish women of the later eighteenth century period, as related to visual culture, see also: Stana Nenadic, 'Food and Clothing' in *A History of Everyday Life in Scotland, 1600 to 1800*, eds., Elizabeth Foyster and Christopher A. Whatley (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), pp. 142-3.

across a broad spectrum of Scottish citizens during the period of active proscription. While not being an exhaustive survey, when examined collectively these instances point to the continued commercial life of tartan goods in Scotland in the immediate aftermath of the '45, even during the earliest decades of the enforcement of the Disarming Act. It is clear that in instances when the fabric was removed from the actively rebellious contexts of civilian and military Jacobitism, its qualities as an attractive and commercially viable textile product of the Scottish nation were allowed to shine through uncontested.

Conclusion

Contemporary to the repeal of the Disarming Act was the wedding of Isabella MacTavish to Malcolm Fraser, both of Ruthven, Inverness-shire in 1785. The nuptials took place just three short years after the repeal of the act against Highland dress, a fact which may be partially responsible for MacTavish's decision to appear at the ceremony arrayed in a gown constructed of rich red, blue, and green tartan plaiding, lined with linen spun from materials thought to have been grown in the local area **[Fig: 2.13]**.[112] While it is tempting to argue that the wardrobe choices made during the Fraser-MacTavish union of 1785 amounted to a significant act of Jacobitised sartorial patriotism on the part of the Highland couple, it was in fact more than likely a choice steeped in familial custom, established habits of domestic textile recycling and reuse, as well as gendered, fashionable consumption.

This chapter has sought to demonstrate that in spite of the suppressive intentions behind the Disarming Act of 1746, Highland dress – and the associated tartan – remained a potent symbol of resistance for lingering Jacobite adherents in Britain during the late 1740s and 1750s. However, it was a symbol dependent upon the enthusiasm for and longevity of the Jacobite movement. With the progression of the middle decades of the eighteenth century and the continued absence of Charles

---

[112] *IMAG* L.INVMG.1984.026.a-b (Isabella Fraser's tartan wedding dress and plaid, worn in Inverness-shire for the Fraser-MacTavish union of 1785). This particular gown has a long and well-established line of provenance within the Fraser family, forming a traditional article of wedding attire still used by Fraser brides. It was last worn in 2005. See in particular: Emily Taylor, 'Personality in Fashion: Case Studies of Localism in Eighteenth-century Scotland', *Fashion Practice: The Journal of Design, Creative Process & the Fashion Industry*, 10: 2 (2018), pp. 217-23.

Edward Stuart, the fortunes of the exiled House of Stuart waned – as did the ardency with which people wielded their sartorial emblems of support.

As shall be expanded on further in Chapter Three, as the last Jacobite rising on British shores retreated into popular memory, the rebellious material culture which had underpinned it underwent a significant aesthetic and ideological transformation. In the case of tartan cloth, while it retained vestiges of its former meaning, it was gradually rehabilitated in the public imagination through its association with a Scottish military culture tied to the fortunes of the Hanoverian monarchy and by its habitual presence in the lives of Scottish manufacturers and consumers.

Fashioning Objects of Loyalty: The Sartorial Politics of Female Jacobitism

In the textile collection of National Museums Scotland there is a woman's dress and corresponding skirt of cream-coloured corded silk, embroidered upon the hem, cuffs, and bodice with silk and gilt metal thread. Recently featured in the exhibition 'Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites' (2017), the accompanying provenance ascribes original ownership of the gown to Jacobite sympathiser Margaret Oliphant of Gask, who allegedly wore the gown to a ball at the Palace of Holyrood during the Jacobite occupation of Edinburgh in 1745 **[Fig: 3.1]**.[1] The rococo-inspired embroidery sewn upon the cream silk of the gown incorporates various species of flora and fauna, including white roses worked into the fabric at hip level. 'With their multiple flat petals and a yellow stamen', comments dress historian Sally Tuckett, 'the embroidered roses are reminiscent of the stylised Jacobite white rose.'[2]

As was outlined by Chapters One and Two, the sartorial culture of military Jacobitism and its role in fashioning displays of sartorial resistance by civilian Jacobites in the aftermath of the '45 rising is well understood. The sartorial culture employed specifically by female Jacobites, by comparison, is notably lacking in contextual, object-based research. This is in spite of numerous female-orientated Jacobite artefacts currently held by museum and private collections in Britain.[3] The

---

[1] *NMS* A.1964.553 & A (Woman's dress and skirt of cream-coloured corded silk, said to have been worn by Margaret Oliphant of Gask at the Great Ball of Holyrood after the Battle of Prestonpans. British, *c.* 1745). See exhibition catalogue: Forsyth, ed., *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (2017), pp. 234-5.

[2] Sally Tuckett, 'Weaving the Nation: Scottish Clothing and Textile Cultures in the Long Eighteenth Century' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2011), p. 34. Tuckett also discusses the potential Jacobite significance of the Oliphant gown in her article: Tuckett, 'National Dress, Gender and Scotland' (2009), pp. 141-5.

[3] For example, the recent exhibition 'Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites' (NMS: 2017), chose not to significantly engage with the topic of gendered consumption and/or female manifestations of support for the Stuart Cause, even though the collections of National Museums Scotland feature multiple objects ripe for such interpretation. While a small number of female-orientated pieces did feature – including two gowns purportedly worn at the temporary Stuart Court at the Palace of Holyrood, a blue and white silk pincushion, and a fan – analysis was limited to characterising these

most recent scholarship to address the breadth and complexity of the material culture available to Jacobite consumers during the mid-eighteenth century, namely that published by Pittock, Guthrie, and Novotny, while acknowledging specific forms of female ownership and participation in the world of Jacobite goods, has not sought to reconstruct the controversial commercial contexts through which female consumers moved.[4] Furthermore, this most recent scholarship has not significantly concentrated on the transformative function of iconographic items used by Jacobite women in the public spaces of British society – such as patriotic fans. Instead, such scholarship has most often engaged with those sartorial objects associated with the intimate setting of the home or the hidden areas of the female body – chiefly pincushions and garter ribbons.[5] The main aim of this chapter, therefore, is to illuminate the lived experience of the female consumer as they navigated through the world of Jacobite goods, so as to better situate their soft power as purchasers within scholarly discussions of the post-rebellion pantheon of Jacobite patriotic display.

Forwarding the work of scholars such as Sally Tuckett in her analysis of the cream-coloured corded silk gown purportedly worn by Margaret Oliphant of Gask in 1745, the opening section of this chapter will interrogate the various sartorial guises adopted by Jacobite women in the public spaces of Hanoverian Britain. In particular, this section seeks to differentiate between the symbolic use of dress in painterly depictions of Jacobite women, as discussed in Chapter Two, from the commercial reality of Jacobite women's sartorial patriotism. This section will begin with an analysis of the symbolic importance of the tartan riding habit featured in Cosmo

---

objects as 'semi-private' expressions of Jacobite support. See: David Forsyth, 'Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites: Narrative of an Exhibition', in *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (2017), p. 16.

[4] As discussed in the Introduction to this thesis, see: Neil Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Jennifer L. Novotny, 'Sedition at the supper table: the material culture of the Jacobite wars, 1688-1760' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Glasgow, 2013); Murray Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1760: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

[5] As shall be outlined below, in reference to specific object categories.

Alexander's 'Portrait of a Jacobite Lady' (*c.* 1745) **[Fig: 3.2]**,[6] before discussing two further examples of emblematic dress worn by known Jacobite women in Britain *c.* 1745–8, as derived from manuscript sources and textile relics. These are: a blue and white gown purchased on the eve of Manchester's occupation by the Jacobite army in November 1745 by English Jacobite Elizabeth 'Beppy' Byrom,[7] and a calico gown fashioned in imitation of Charles Edward Stuart's 'Betty Burke' disguise **[Fig: 3.3]**, commissioned by the Burton family of York from Edinburgh-based tailor Stewart Carmichael in 1748 **[Fig. 3.4 & 3.4*a*]**.[8]

The remaining sections of this chapter will shift focus away from analysing the emblematic importance of full ensembles of Jacobite women's over-dress and move instead to consider those personal accessories manufactured for and purchased by Jacobite women during the mid-eighteenth century. This discussion shall concentrate on the commercial manufacture of garters, pincushions, and fans, which were produced by opportunistic artisans hoping to appeal to Jacobite purchasers during the post-'46 period of reprisal. In particular, the intriguing object-group known as the 'martyrs pincushions' shall be discussed in detail, with a view to promoting a better academic understanding of the controversial, commercial context of contested nationhood from which they emerged. Rather than discussing them in terms of Jacobite 'relic' culture, or as 'passive' reflections of the last gasp of popular

---

[6] *National Trust for Scotland, Culloden Battlefield & Visitor Centre* 207.132 (Cosmo Alexander, 'Portrait of a Jacobite lady', oil on canvas, *c.* 1745). This piece is on loan from the private art collection of the Drambuie Liqueur Company.

[7] The episode features in the diary of Elizabeth Byrom of Manchester (b. 1721-2, d. 1801), daughter of poet and inventor Dr John Byrom, which was found amongst papers at the family home of Kersall Cell, Salford. Two edited versions of Byrom's diary were issued during the later nineteenth century by Richard Parkinson in partnership with The Chetham Society in Manchester: Richard Parkinson, ed., *The Private Journal and Literary Remains of John Byrom: Vol. II – Part I* (Manchester: The Chetham Society, 1857), pp. 385-410; Richard Parkinson, ed., *The Journal of Elizabeth Byrom in 1745* (Manchester: The Chetham Society, 1857); This chapter uses the latter publication, which is a fuller account and contains a more substantial scholarly discussion of the journal in the editor's footnotes.

[8] *NGS* SP IV 123.23 (J. Williams, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788. Eldest son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart', mezzotint on paper, *c.* 1746); *NLS* Adv.MS.32.6.16-25 (Robert Forbes, *The Lyon in Mourning* manuscript collection compiled *c.* 1746-77). See textile relic attached to inside cover of third volume in series.

Jacobitism in the public space, this section will show that they formed an active, commercialised part of the Jacobite 'theatre of death', which actively sought to mythologise the memory of condemned Jacobites for public consumption in the years immediately following the failed rising **[Figs: 3.20 & 3.21]**.[9]

The culminating section of this chapter seeks to illustrate the changing patriotic symbolism in Jacobite and Hanoverian fan designs. By conducting a survey of surviving fans associated with the '45 period, the main aim of this section is to promote the interpretative possibilities presented by the close, analytical study of the iconographic elements of political fan designs. In order to provide a useful contrast to the commercial experience of Jacobite women, this section incorporates discussion of the counterculture of pro-Hanoverian 'battle fans' which emerged with the defeat of the Jacobite army in April 1746. Designed to capture the triumphal mood of Hanoverian supporters during the post-'46 period of reprisal, these 'battle fans' presented narrative scenes derived from the key military engagements of the '45 and, as such, acted as a form of material propaganda when wielded by women in the public space. This final section posits that the iconographic elements of Jacobite and Hanoverian fan designs significantly contributed to the refashioning of popular memories of the '45, with their designs alternatively casting the British army under the Duke of Cumberland and the Jacobite forces under Charles Edward Stuart as heroes or traitors depending on the dynastic sympathies of the manufacturers and consumers involved in the trade.

Reclaiming the Rebellious Riding Habit: Cosmo Alexander's 'Portrait of a Jacobite Lady', *c.* 1745

Undoubtedly, one of the most iconic visual depictions of a female Jacobite which can be reliably dated to the period of the '45 rising is a small, rectangular oil painting on canvas, currently on display at the Culloden Battlefield and Visitor Centre.

---

[9] *UAM* ABDUA 17969 (Pin cushion of plate-printed cream satin with blue tassels, *c.* 1746); *NMS* A.1987.258 (Pin cushion of plate-printed cream satin with blue tassels, *c.* 1746); On 'passive' vs 'active' support of Jacobitism (with specific reference to the 'martyrs pincushions', see: Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (2013), p. 133. On the Jacobite 'theatre of death', see: Daniel Szechi, 'The Jacobite Theatre of Death' in *The Jacobite Challenge*, eds., Eveline Cruickshanks and Jeremy Black (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988), pp. 57-73.

Attributed to the noted Jacobite portraitist, Cosmo Alexander, the 'Portrait of a Jacobite Lady' (*c.* 1745) **[Fig: 3.2]** depicts a young woman arrayed in a striking red and black tartan riding habit, complete with white silk lapels and cuffs trimmed with gold facings. The combination of white and gold ornamentation is echoed within the corresponding waistcoat and in the white silk ribbon plaited into the sitter's queue of dark brown hair. Softening the militarised femininity implied by the style of the overall ensemble, ornate white lace can be seen incorporated at the sitter's wrists and throat. Alongside the overt Jacobite symbolism of 'party-coloured plaid' used in the sitter's riding habit, Alexander's portrait boasts the prominent white rose of the House of Stuart and a Scottish thistle pinned to the white lace cap seen resting neatly atop the woman's head.

Cosmo Alexander and his father, John Alexander, both joined the rising on the side of Charles Edward Stuart in 1745. Described as 'Picture Drawers' in a list of wanted Jacobites published in May 1746, the younger was obliged to go into exile abroad in a bid to distance himself from the fallout of Culloden. It was in Rome that the young artist attached himself to the Stuart Court at the Palazzo del Re, where he stayed until 1751 and built for himself an impressive clientele.[10] Alexander's commissions from Jacobite families during his exile abroad and, later, upon his return to Britain, usually incorporate some form of visual shorthand to denote the dynastic loyalties of the sitter. Alexander's portrait of John Drummond, Duke of Perth (d. 1757), for example, includes an ornate cameo brooch used as the fastening for Drummond's military-style fur mantle **[Fig: 3.5]**.[11] The brooch bears the unmistakable likeness of James Francis Edward Stuart, and may be favourably compared to another cameo of the Stuart claimant contained within a man's gold and diamond finger ring in the collection of National Museums Scotland. The extant cameo is purported to have been a royal gift from James to his private secretary, Andrew Lumisden, while the

---

[10] Nicholson, *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Making of a Myth* (2002), p. 83. See also: Marion Amblard, 'English and Scottish Jacobite Painters in Eighteenth-Century Rome' in *Living with Jacobitism* (2014), pp. 139-52.

[11] *Traquair Charitable Trust* PCF20 (Cosmo Alexander, 'John Drummond, 5th Duke of Perth', oil on canvas, mid-eighteenth century). It was originally thought that the painting was the work of James Alexander, Cosmo Alexander's father.

latter attended him in Rome during the 1750s **[Fig: 3.6]**.[12] The prominence of the brooch within Drummond's portrait cements his political allegiance in the eyes of the viewer, leaving no doubt as to his true dynastic loyalties.[13] Alexander's depictions of Jacobite women were equally as littered with Jacobite symbolism, such as in his portrait of Lady Winifred Maxwell Constable (d. 1801) **[Fig: 3.7]**. Though only a child at the time of the '45 campaign, the continued loyalty of her family to the Jacobite Cause in exile is hinted at in Alexander's depiction of Maxwell Constable by the white rose of the House of Stuart she holds aloft for the attention of the viewer. Still further, an eye of providence and a full heart can be seen stitched prominently upon the silver stomacher of her indigo gown.[14]

Alexander's emblematic 'Portrait of a Jacobite Lady' (*c.* 1745) is notable for its incorporation of explicit symbols of military Jacobitism during the post-'46 period of reprisal, at a time when the overt, outward expression of Jacobite identity was under severe scrutiny by the British government **[Fig: 3.2]**. As discussed in Chapter One, both the tartan and the white cockade (embodied in Alexander's portrait by the white rose) were used as material evidence of individual complicity during the treason trials of 1746–7. Meanwhile, the implementation of the Disarming Act (*c.* 1746–9), as was outlined in Chapter Two, had succeeded in creating a notable stigma around the wearing of tartan in the public spaces of Hanoverian Britain in the immediate aftermath of the '45. However, the presence of these sartorial markers of military Jacobitism in Alexander's work are not the only aspects of the portrait worthy of analysis. The sex and supposed identity of the sitter, in combination with her rebellious ensemble, have clearly been employed by Alexander as visual shorthand

---

[12] There is some disagreement among scholars as to which Stuart claimant is represented in the cameo brooch (James Francis Edward Stuart or, alternatively, his father James II/VII), though its Jacobite connections are in no doubt: Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (2013), p. 46. p. 182 (n. 21). Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition* (2013), p. 42, p. 77; *NMS* X.2015.105.5.1 & 2 (Gold and diamond finger ring containing cameo of James Francis Edward Stuart. Gifted to Andrew Lumisden in Rome. Accompanied by original box, containing a written note of provenance. Mid-eighteenth century).

[13] Rosalind K. Marshall and George R. Dalgleish, eds., *The Art of Jewellery in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Scottish National Portrait Gallery, 1991), p. 50.

[14] *Traquair Charitable Trust* PCF75 (Cosmo Alexander, 'Lady Winifred Maxwell Constable', oil on canvas, late eighteenth century); Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition* (2013), pp. 42-3.

to represent the continued loyalty of Jacobite women in the wake of the failed campaign. The true identity of the sitter has never been conclusively proven and, as yet, there is no consensus as to whether the painting was executed during Alexander's period of exile among Jacobite adherents abroad during the later 1740s and early 1750s, or whether it was executed following his return to Britain in the 1750s, when he continued to fulfil commissions for Jacobite families. It shall therefore be speculated in this following section that the sitter in Alexander's portrait is in fact meant to symbolise an amalgamation of disparate individuals drawn from popular narratives of female military involvement in the '45, in which the riding habit was a key feature of their visual and literary representation.

The invention of 'masculine-inspired' riding clothes for women during the later seventeenth century had elicited disapproval from the outset, with certain commentators within British society hailing the fashion as 'offensively unfeminine' **[Fig: 3.8]**.[15] Though the fashion had become an established element of the upper-class ladies wardrobe by the early eighteenth century, incorporated into informal day wear and travelling attire as well as for use during riding and hunting activities, the style continued to have its critics despite its apparent popularity with female consumers. While ladies 'in Riding Habits or without a full Dress' were barred from admittance to royal events in London during the 1730s, an essay titled 'Of Fantastical Dresses, especially of Ladies' (1739) ridiculed those women who adopted masculine-style riding habits by terming them 'Hermaphroditical Riding Habits'; the pamphleteer warned the public at large that the wholesale adoption of the habit had encouraged unladylike behaviours such as gambling, fencing and swearing, and had already prevented such 'Amazons' from finding a suitable husband as they were too

---

[15] *VAM* T.12-1957 (Woman's riding jacket of blue camblet lined with blue silk. English, c. 1750-59). The cut of this particular habit is in the style of a man's coat, however it has been tailored in such a way as to fit over a woman's stays and petticoat. See: Aileen Ribeiro, *Dress and Morality*, 2nd edn (Oxford & New York: Berg, 2003), p. 114; Janet Arnold, 'Dashing Amazons: the development of women's riding dress, c. 1500-1900' in *Defining Dress: Dress as Object, Meaning, and* Identity, eds. Amy de la Haye and Elizabeth Wilson (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 1999), pp. 10-29. It should be noted that women did wear riding clothes prior to the later seventeenth century, but that riding habits which appropriated overtly masculine lines largely emerged during the first half of the eighteenth century.

often mistaken for men.[16] As discussed by Patricia Crown, the wider adoption of the riding habit by women during the eighteenth century blurred the lines which delineated acceptable pursuits for men and women in the public space, by dint of the physical freedom these garments afforded the wearer. During the second half of the century, in particular, the increased military style of the woman's riding habit 'permitted women to assume the poses and gestures of men, to swagger, stride, swing the arms, and put hands on hips. […] To wear these clothes was to suggest that women might be as fond of sport as men were, fond of exciting, even dangerous, pleasures and of strenuous exertion.'[17] It is not surprising, therefore, that a trope emerged within anti-Jacobite propaganda accusing female rebels of sporting the riding habit for unsuitable purposes during the '45 campaign, with the adoption of the garb often being contrasted against discussions of Jacobite women's apparent masculine behaviours, such as soldiering **[Fig. 3.9]** or rakishness **[Fig. 3.10]**.[18] The adoption of the habit was most often attributed to female figures who were reported to have assumed military roles during the '45, such as Jenny Cameron of Glendessary or Lady Anne Mackintosh, who were both famed as loyal 'Colonels' to Charles Edward Stuart.[19]

Mackintosh, who had raised a regiment of men on behalf of the Stuarts during the '45 campaign and who, later, sheltered the Prince on her estate at Moy Hall in 1746, was described by Sir Walter Scott as a 'gallant Amazon' sporting a man's blue

---

[16] *The Ipswich Journal* (20 June 1730); J. Brotherton, *Essays and Letters on Various Subjects* (London, 1739), pp. 128-37.

[17] Patricia Crown, 'Sporting with Clothes: John Collet's Prints in the 1770s', in *British Sporting Literature and Culture in the Long Eighteenth Century*, ed. Sharon Harrow (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2016), p. 60.

[18] Both of these accusations were levelled against the Jacobite 'adventuress' Jenny Cameron of Glendessary, as can be seen in two popular prints of the period. The first depicts Cameron in a full military habit, including trews, Highland bonnet, black brogues, and a brace of pistols. The second depicts Cameron in the guise of a rake in masculine riding clothes, bosom exposed and a dog's head in her lap. See: *NLS* Blaikie.SNPG.15.3 A (Anon., 'Miss Jenny Cameron in a Military Habit', etching on paper, mid-eighteenth-century); *NLS* Blaikie.SNPG.15.7 (Anon., 'Jenny Cameron, c. 1700-1790', mezzotint on paper, mid-eighteenth century).

[19] See in particular: F. Macdonald, *"Colonel Anne": Lady Anne MacKintosh, 1723-1784* (Edinburgh: Scotland's Cultural Heritage, 1987); Maggie Craig, *Damn' Rebel Bitches: The Women of the '45* (Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing, 1997).

130

bonnet, a tartan riding habit 'richly laced', with 'pistols at her saddle-bow.'[20] This was most likely an early nineteenth-century Romantic embellishment by Scott, though one based upon an established trope within popular literature contemporary to the '45. A salacious account of the life of Jenny Cameron of Glendessary published in 1746, for instance, cast Cameron as a passionate military leader, with a head-strong attitude to match the masculine overtones of her riding garb:

> When the Chevalier *Charles* came to *Lochiel*'s House, *Lochiel* sent an Order to Mr. *Cameron* of *Glendessery*, to raise his Men and join the Family Standard. Mr. *Cameron* incapable of obeying such a Summons, his Place was supplied by his Aunt Miss *Jenny*, who soon got together two hundred and fifty Men, and marched at the Head of them to the Pretender's Camp. She was dressed in a Sea-green Riding Habit, with a Scarlet Lapel trimmed with Gold; her Hair tied behind in loose Buckles, with a Velvet Cape, and scarlet Feather: She rode a bay Gelding, with green furniture, richly trimmed and fringed with Gold; instead of a Whip, she carried a naked Sword in her Hand; and in this Equipage arrived at the Camp. A Female Officer was an extraordinary Sight, and the Novelty being reported to the young Chevalier, he went out of the Lines to meet this Supply. Miss *Jenny* rode up to him, and without the least Dash in her Countenance, gave him an Officer-like Salute…[21]

Perhaps due to popular accounts such as the above, the identity of the female sitter in Alexander's 'Portrait of a Jacobite Lady' has traditionally been assigned to Jenny Cameron of Glendessary, though it has been noted that this attribution is highly

---

[20] Walter Scott, *Tales of a Grandfather; Being Stories Taken from Scottish History. Humbly Inscribed to Hugh Littlejohn, Esq. Third Series,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1830), II, p. 247.

[21] Archibald Arbuthnot, *A Brief Account of the Life and Family of Miss Jenny Cameron, the Reputed Mistress of the Pretender's Eldest Son. Containing Many Very Singular Incidents* (London, 1746), pp. 60-1. This entirely fictional account of Cameron's life, both in terms of style and structure, closely mirrors the 'whore-narratives' and conduct book subversions published during the early-to-mid eighteenth century, such as Defoe's *Moll Flanders* (1722), Fielding's *Shamela* (1741), and Cleland's *Fanny Hill* (1748).

debatable.[22] It was widely circulated that Cameron had accompanied her brother to watch the rising of the Prince's standard at Glenfinnan in August 1745 and, due to this close proximity to the Stuart heir, Cameron was repeatedly cited as the prince's Highland mistress in anti-Jacobite propaganda [Figs: 3.11 & 3.12].[23] As posed by Nicholson, Cameron was usually described by pro-Hanoverian satirists as 'wearing extraordinary tartan costumes' in her support of the Cause and, as noted above, popular chronicles of her involvement in the '45 placed her in the very midst of the Jacobite camp, where her male kinsmen dared not enter.[24] This interpretation of Cameron as both a violent and sexually promiscuous Jacobite 'Amazon' in print literature was simultaneously echoed in the popular visual culture of London engravers. A print of Cameron issued by P. Griffin of Fleet Street, for instance, shows Cameron attired in a tartan riding habit and kid gloves, grasping the hilt of a short sword. She wears the periwig and braided cap of a military officer, complete with cockade, while at her breast hangs a portrait miniature of Charles Edward Stuart [Fig: 3.13].[25] Griffin's inclusion of the portrait miniature alongside the controversial garb implies that Cameron's motivations for supporting the campaign were driven

---

[22] Robin Nicholson, *The Drambuie Collection: The Art Collection of the Drambuie Liqueur Company* (Edinburgh: The Drambuie Liqueur Company, 1995), p. 48.

[23] This pairing can be observed in several prints, with one in the *Blaikie* collection at *NLS* showing the couple riding together on horseback. Charles Edward Stuart has his sword raised and wears a plaid across his chest, while Cameron sits side-saddle in a flowered gown and riding jacket, a white rose in her hair. See: *NLS* Blaikie.SNP.15.8 (Anon., 'The Jiltmegant', etching on paper, mid-eighteenth century). Speculations about the love affairs of Charles Edward Stuart with Jacobite women are also expressed in: *NLS* Blaikie.SNPG.9.16 (Anon., 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart with Miss Cameron and Miss MacDonald. Oval portraits of Miss Cameron, Prince Charles, and Miss MacDonald (in that order) with text "How happy could I be with Either, Were t'other dear Charmer away. Beg. Op.", etching on paper, mid-eighteenth century). The print shows the Stuart heir torn between Cameron and Flora MacDonald. Cameron wears a riding-style tartan gown and feathered cap, while MacDonald sports a tartan gown and a portrait miniature of Charles Edwards Stuart around her neck.

[24] Nicholson, *The Drambuie Collection* (1995), p. 48.

[25] A direct comparison may be made between the riding attire worn by Cameron in Griffin's print and that worn by the female sitter in Alexander's portrait. See: *NGS* SP III 13.4 (P. Griffin, 'Jenny Cameron, *c.* 1700-1790. Adventuress; supporter of Charles Edward Stuart', line engraving on paper, date unknown).

primarily by her love (or lust) for the Stuart heir, as well as an unwomanly desire for adventure **[Fig: 3.14]**.[26]

Citing Jacobite women's adoption of the riding habit in visual and literary anti-Jacobite propaganda was therefore a common method of characterising the '45 as an unnatural subversion of the proper state of things. As it was deemed unbecoming for a woman to don the garb of a fighting man and assume the role of a commanding officer, so too was it seen as unbecoming for a populous to rise up in rebellion against its sovereign.[27] Without a working knowledge of Alexander's political and artistic life it would be easy to misinterpret the underlying message contained within his 'Portrait of a Jacobite Lady' **[Fig: 3.2]** as being simply an extension of this trend for morally ambiguous, unflattering representations of female Jacobitism. However, when Alexander's involvement in the '45 campaign, as well as his exile abroad and his numerous commissions for Jacobite adherents are taken into account, it is extremely unlikely that his 'Portrait of a Jacobite Lady' was meant as an attack upon the actions of Jacobite 'warrior women' such as Jenny Cameron of Glendessary or Lady Anne Mackintosh.[28] While in the hands of a Hanoverian supporter the image of a politically-engaged woman fulfilling the role of military commander, dressed in the

---

[26] A similar theme of 'love (or lust)' as the main motivator for female involvement in the '45 campaign may be observed in the following popular print, which satirises the presence of fawning women at the temporary Stuart Court at Holyrood. Note the woman kissing the Prince's fingertips and the large bed positioned prominently in the far-left hand corner of the chamber: *BM* 1898,0520.172 (Anon., Scotch Female Gallantry', hand-coloured etching on paper, *c.* 1745-6).

[27] For an excellent overview of this topic, see in particular: Carine Martin, 'Female Rebels': The Female Figure in Anti-Jacobite Propaganda' in *Living with Jacobitism* (2014), pp. 85-98. It should also be noted that this kind of 'gender-bending' criticism was not confined to the activities of Jacobite women. Royalist women had been criticised for engaging with military activity during the English Civil War during the previous century, while elite women such as Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire were harshly criticised for encouraging 'dangerous sexual mixing' when she and a gathering of society ladies attended her husband's camp at Coxheath dressed in military-style riding habits in 1780. See: Alison Plowden, *Women All on Fire: The Women of the English Civil War* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998); Matthew McCormack, *Embodying the Militia in Georgian England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 67.

[28] For use of the term 'warrior women' in the context of those Jacobite women who participated in the recruitment and leadership of troops during the '45, see: Murray Pittock, *Jacobitism* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998), pp. 78-82.

garb of a rebel officer, was a tool used to denigrate and delegitimise the actions of those Jacobite women who had come out in support of the '45, in the hands of an ardent Jacobite supporter such as Cosmo Alexander the image is decidedly celebratory. Through his calculated use of explicit emblems of Jacobite loyalty within the composition of the portrait, Alexander reclaims the controversial image of the tartan-clad Jacobite Amazon and reframes it as overtly patriotic.

Blue, White, and the Manchester Rebels: The Diary of Elizabeth Byrom

Following their victory at the Battle of Prestonpans in September 1745, the Jacobite army advanced across the Scottish border into Northern England. Jacobite sympathiser Elizabeth 'Beppy' Byrom kept a diary detailing the events which followed as the Jacobite forces marched into the county of Lancashire.[29] As her hometown of Manchester descended into disarray with the approach of the Jacobite soldiers, Byrom described how her neighbours either fled or proclaimed their intentions to stay and welcome the Stuart heir into the city.[30] In this heightened atmosphere of panic and hostile suspicion, Byrom took it upon herself to go shopping. On 8 October 1745, she wrote excitedly in her journal:

> [E]verybody in hiding for fear of the rebels; two regiments gone
> through this town; Mr. Hoole, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Lewthwaite
> preached against rebellion, my papa and uncle Houghton wrote
> after the last, and he left off before he had half done, but they came
> again the Sunday after and wrote, but he had made his sermon over
> again. I bought a blue and white gown off Mr Starkey, gave 12s.
> for it. The Presbyterians are sending everything that's valuable
> away, wives, children, and all, for fear of the rebels.[31]

The juxtaposition of concerns within this short diary entry are compelling, for though chaos clearly dictated the workings of the social and physical landscapes around her,

---

[29] See: Parkinson, ed., *The Journal of Elizabeth Byrom in 1745* (1857).

[30] By late November, Byrom declared that '…everybody is going out of town and sending all their effects away, there is hardly any family left but ours and our kin'. See: *Ibid.,* pp. 5-6.

[31] *Ibid.,* p. 4.

Byrom still felt the need to purchase a new gown.[32] While one might say that Byrom's priorities at this precarious moment were skewed towards inappropriate trivialities, it may also be inferred that the purchase was made in anticipation of an occasion when a fresh ensemble would be deemed most appropriate. Indeed, once the Jacobite army had entered the town proper on 29 November, Byrom participated fully in the spectacles of welcome that ensued. That evening she paraded in the street with her father, mother, sister and uncle to witness the bells, illuminations and soldiers' proclamations, before retiring to her aunt's home where she 'stayed till eleven o'clock making St. Andrew's crosses for them'.[33] The following morning, St Andrew's day, Byrom joined the crowd that gathered to watch Charles Edward Stuart inspect his recruits on horseback, before attending church to pray for the Jacobites. Later that evening she was invited to a supper given in honour of the Prince and his officers at the home of a neighbour, where she was presented to Charles 'and had the honour to kiss his hand'.[34]

It could be argued that Byrom's decision to specify the colour-scheme of the new gown so exactly in her journal suggests that it held some kind of personal and or public significance for the wearer. She would certainly not have been the only citizen to use colour-coded or explicitly partisan ornamentation during the '45 campaign to communicate their loyalties. For example, in relation to the sartorial patriotism of Hanoverian supporters in Scotland, black cockades were worn by many in Aberdeen when the Duke of Cumberland entered that town in March 1746.[35] Similarly, it was reported in the *Derby Mercury*, that a lady attending an audience with the Duke of Cumberland in Edinburgh appeared wearing a brooch wrought specially for the occasion: 'at the Top of her Stays, on her Breast, was a Crown well done in Beugals, and underneath, in Letters extremely plain to be seen, was WILLIAM DUKE OF

---

[32] Entries in Byrom's journal spanning October and November 1745 detail the state of high alert in Lancashire as well as the measures taken by individuals to safeguard themselves and their property. Byrom notes that bridges at Warrington, Stockport, Barton, and Salford were 'pulled up' to prevent traffic, that militia were 'put in readiness' across the county, the post-master was sent to London 'we suppose to secure the money from falling into the hands of the rebels', and that the majority of merchants 'shut up shop, and all the warehouses in town almost are empty'. See: *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[35] *The Newcastle Courant* (22–29 March 1746).

CUMBERLAND; on the right side of the Crown was the Word *Britain's*, and on the Left *Hero*.'[36]

In terms of discerning political and dynastic loyalties in the public space of Hanoverian Britain, the importance of the blue and white scheme used in Byrom's hastily purchased attire may be seen as two-fold. Firstly, the wearing of the colour blue was a fairly well-recognised indicator of party-political Toryism and of Jacobite sympathy by the mid-eighteenth century, especially when seen in the form of ribbons, cockades, and garlands **[Fig: 0.2]**.[37] The term 'True Blue' was popularly understood as the colour of party Jacobitism, hence Horace Walpole's famous phrase around the installation of suspected Jacobite sympathiser John Fane, 7th Earl of Westmorland, as an elected chancellor at Oxford University in July, 1759: 'I hear my Lord Westmoreland's own retinue was all be-James'd with true-blue ribbands'.[38] By the phrase 'be-James'd', Walpole was making an explicit correlation between the popular use of the colour blue in the public space and continued British support for the exiled James Francis Edward Stuart in the wake of the '45 defeat. Secondly, as proffered by Pittock, the colour white had long been regarded as the official colour of the House of Stuart, as well as being the colour most readily associated in the

---

[36] *The Derby Mercury* (7 February 1745).

[37] See in particular the 'Election Series' by William Hogarth (original oil paintings produced *c.* 1754–5, followed by popular prints published *c.* 1757–8), in which Tory voters are distinguished by their adoption of blue cockades and ribbons, while Whig voters are distinguished by their use of orange. The series, which comprises four vignettes, was based upon events of the General Election of 1754 as seen in the streets of Oxfordshire. In each vignette – 'The Election Entertainment', 'Canvassing for Votes, 'The Polling' and 'Chairing the Members' – the colour-coded cockades feature prominently as markers of party-affiliation. As can be observed in 'Canvassing for Votes', a Whig woman and a Tory woman hang over the balcony of a public house in order to purchase coloured ribbons from a journeyman. Their gowns are orange and blue, respectively. See: *Sir John Soane's Museum* P56 (William Hogarth, 'An Election II: Canvassing for Votes, oil on canvas, *c.* 1754–55). For further context regarding the importance of partisan sartorial adornment in the public spaces in Britain, see: Katrina Navickas, '"That sash will hang you": Political Clothing and Adornment in England, 1780-1840', *Journal of British Studies*, 49: 3 (2010), pp. 540-65.

[38] 'Horace Walpole to George Montagu, 19 July 1759', in Horace Walpole, *Private Correspondence of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford. Now First Collected*, 4 vols. (London, 1820), II, p. 105.

popular imagination with the concepts of honour and legitimacy.[39] When the two colours are taken together and contextualised in this manner, Elizabeth's use of them in her new gown implies an implicit knowledge of the wider political and dynastic circumstances in which these colours were most often observed.[40]

However, Byrom's utilisation of the blue and white colour-scheme within her ensemble may also be interpreted as a reflection of Jacobite emblems then-present within her immediate material landscape. The Scottish saltire of blue and white, for example, was being carried openly by troops in the Jacobite army **[Fig: 1.1]**, while Charles Edward Stuart himself was often noted in popular descriptions of his attire during the '45 as wearing the blue and white cross of St Andrew alongside his Star of the Garter **[Fig: 3.15]**.[41] Given that Byrom described sitting up at night in order to sew 'St Andrew's crosses' for soldiers in the Jacobite army, her awareness of the colour-scheme as being representative of Scotland's stake in the outcome of the '45 is not at all an outlandish notion.[42] Furthermore, complementary source material such as printed trial literature and newspaper reports of the activities of the Manchester Regiment point to the fact that Byrom was not alone in her recognition of the colour-scheme's partisan or regional qualities. As was discussed in Chapter One, rebel officer Thomas Deacon had been observed in the Bull's Head pub during the

---

[39] See: 'Appendix: Index of Symbols, Cant and Code' in Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition* (2013), p. 169.

[40] It should also be mentioned that the Byrom family purchased a salt-glazed cobalt blue teapot in 1766, possibly manufactured by Longton Hall, a ceramic factory in Staffordshire. The bright blue pot is decorated with the white rose of the Stuarts and bears the monogram 'C*R III', indicating that it was manufactured after the death of James Francis Edward Stuart. The teapot was recently auctioned by *Lyon & Turnbull*, see: 'Jacobite, Stuart, and Scottish Applied Arts' – Sale 429 / Lot 61 (Edinburgh: 13 May 2015).

[41] *Royal Collection Trust* RCIN 441923 (Order of the Thistle badge belonging to members of the House of Stuart, also known as the 'St Andrew Jewel'. Late seventeenth or early eighteenth century, with mid-1770s additions. These include a concealed portrait miniature of Princess Louise of Stolberg-Gedern, wife of Charles Edward Stuart from 1772. Bequeathed by Henry Benedict Stuart to George, Prince of Wales upon his death in 1807). While resident in Rome, the Prince was also painted by Louis Gabriel Blanchet wearing the St Andrew's cross suspended from a green ribbon, see: *RCT* RCIN 401208 (Louis Gabriel Blanchet, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart (1720-88)', oil on canvas, *c.* 1739).

[42] Parkinson, ed., *The Journal of Elizabeth Byrom in 1745* (1857), p. 11.

Manchester occupation with 'several blue and white Ribbands lying before him, which, when he was not waiting, he made up into Favours, and gave them to the Men enlisted.'[43] In 1749, the condemned plebeian Jacobites of the Manchester Regiment had been transported to the colonies for life with blue and white ribbons worn proudly about their person.[44] Also, as shall be discussed in more detail below, it should be noted that blue and white silk pincushions were sold commercially to the British public during the post-'46 period of reprisal, suggesting that the colour-scheme had symbolic resonance for Jacobite adherents beyond the confines of Manchester **[Fig. 3.20 & 3.21]**.[45]

While there is no surviving portrait of Elizabeth Byrom wearing her partisan gown or indeed any surviving articles of blue and white over-dress which can be convincingly associated with the '45, there are portraits of other well-known Jacobite women sporting blue and white attire. This would seem to imply that the colour-scheme enjoyed a fashionable, artistic status approaching – though not surpassing – that of the rebellious tartan, exemplified by the Jacobite visual culture produced by artists such as Cosmo Alexander **[Fig: 3.2]**. Richard Wilson, for example, produced two companion portraits of Jacobite heroine Flora MacDonald upon her release from the Tower of London in 1747. While the first portrait, discussed in Chapter Two, showed MacDonald wearing a chequered tartan gown bedecked with white silk ribbons **[Fig: 2.5]**, the second portrait featured a blue silk gown ornamented with white lace cuffs, a white lace collar, and white slashed sleeves, reminiscent of the national colours of Macdonald's birthplace **[Fig: 3.16]**.[46]

---

[43] Wilkinson, *A Compleat History of the Trials* (1746), pp. 143-4.

[44] *The Caledonian Mercury* (17 January 1749).

[45] *UAM* ABDUA 17969 (Pin cushion. Printed satin, 1746); *NMS* A.1987.258 (Pin cushion. Printed satin, 1746); These two so-called 'martyrs' pincushions have been examined and photographed personally by the author of this thesis. Other examples have been located using auction catalogues.

[46] Compare and contrast: *NGS* PG 1162 (Richard Wilson, 'Flora Macdonald [Fionnghal nighean Ragnaill 'ic Aonghais Òig], 1722-1790. Jacobite heroine', oil on canvas, *c.* 1747) and *National Portrait Gallery, London* 5848 (Richard Wilson, 'Flora Macdonald', oil on canvas, *c.* 1747).

Purple Sprig Calico: Betty Burke Gowns and the Burton Family of York

For a further example of an alternative Jacobite overdress, we turn back to the manuscript of *The Lyon in Mourning* compiled by Bishop Robert Forbes *c.* 1746–75.[47] In addition to Robert Forbes's much-cited account of Jacobite women parading about Edinburgh in tartan gowns to formalise the birthday of the Young Pretender in 1746, as discussed in Chapter Two, there is a lesser-known series of correspondence included in the manuscript collection between Forbes and his fellow Jacobite sympathiser, Dr James Burton of York. The letters contained within *The Lyon in Mourning* follow a convoluted commercial transaction, which took place between Forbes, Burton and an Edinburgh-based tailor called Stewart Carmichael in 1748.[48] The end result of this series of correspondence was the production of several dresses modelled upon a gown worn by Charles Edward Stuart in 1746, when he was forced to disguise himself as 'Betty Burke', an Irish serving maid to Flora MacDonald, in his flight across the Highlands **[Fig: 3.3]**.[49] While it has sometimes been suggested that Carmichael's gowns were made of tartan, the textile relic in *The Lyon in Mourning*, upon which his design was based, takes the form of a bleached cotton

---

[47] *NLS* Adv.MS.32.6.16-25 (Robert Forbes, *The Lyon in Mourning* manuscript collection compiled *c.* 1746-75). See textile relic attached to inside cover of third volume in series. For the printed version of Forbes' manuscript, see: Paton, ed., *The Lyon in Mourning*, 3 vols (1895-6).

[48] The transaction began in March 1748, when Burton requested six gowns of the Betty Burke pattern for his daughters. In April, Forbes advised Burton that the commission was in hand, but could not be completed until May given the high demand on Carmichael's business. The gowns were delivered at the end of May and in June Burton informed Forbes that the gowns were 'very much liked' by his daughters. He also mentioned that his wife had instructed a servant to sit up all night sewing, so that she might wear one of the gowns on an outing to Harrogate Spa the following day. In September, Burton wrote to Forbes requesting further yardage in the same pattern, but of 'the finer sort'. He also apologised for having not paid Carmichael for the original commission, but declared his intention to do so as soon as possible. Burton was advised by Forbes in November that 'Mr. Carmichael's gowns were all sold off before your letter came to hand, and the season being gone he had not time to answer your commission, which he is sorry for. However, if the ladies will have patience till next summer he will provide them.' See: Paton, ed., *The Lyon in Mourning* (1895), II, pp. 62-3, p. 105, p. 178, p. 181, p. 318, p. 320. This transaction neatly exemplifies the experience of fashionable consumption for many purchasers of sartorial goods in Britain during the mid-eighteenth century, when it was not uncommon to acquire things by proxy or order items at a distance.

[49] *NGS* SP IV 123.23 (J. Williams, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788. Eldest son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart', mezzotint on paper, *c.* 1746).

calico, block-printed with a pattern of purple sprig **[Figs: 3.4 & 3.4a]**.[50] The cotton printed by Carmichael was to be tailored into a set of gowns for the use of Dr Burton's daughters, the desire being that the material be as closely matched to the original fabric of the Prince's disguise as possible. The provenance of the original fabric, which can be seen secured to the inside cover of the third volume of Forbes's manuscript, appears relatively plausible, in so much as such things can ever be properly verified.

According to the account of the Prince's escape transcribed in Forbes's manuscript, partway through his covert journey across the Highlands, Charles decided to discard a female disguise provided to him by Flora Macdonald in order to throw off his pursuers, who had become aware of the ruse. The gown and accessories, after being hidden for a short time in a bush on the roadside, where picked up by the Prince's travelling companions upon their return and taken to the home of Lord Kingsburgh and his wife, who wished to preserve the costume as a memento of their part in helping the Prince evade capture. After debating on whether to burn the gown, fearing its discovery by Hanoverian soldiers, the family opted to keep it safe and claim that it belonged to a female family member should the need arise. A swatch cut from the gown was later conveyed to the Edinburgh-based tailor Stewart Carmichael by Kingsburgh, so that he could copy the pattern and fashion 'authentic' Betty Burke gowns to be sold from his shop. Carmichael then passed the original fabric to Forbes, whom he knew to be compiling a chronicle of the '45 rebellion and collecting relics associated with the Prince, and Forbes informed Burton in the course of their usual correspondence.[51] It must then be assumed that either Burton believed his daughters would enjoy the prospect of an authentic Betty Burke gown and made the order independently, or his daughters specifically asked he make the purchase from Carmichael upon learning of the new fashion. Writing to Burton in May 1748, Forbes acted as courier for the transaction, remarking:

> This now serves to cover the Letter of my Friend, Mr Stewart
> Carmichael, who takes this Opportunity of sending you (according

---

[50] For an example of this misattribution, see: Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People* (1989), p. 289.

[51] For the account of the Prince in female dress, his travels with Kingsburgh, and the journey of the swatch to Carmichael, see: Paton, ed., *The Lyon in Mourning* (1895), I, p. xviii, pp. 71-83.

to your Commission) the printed Cloath, which, I hope, will please the worthy Ladies, for whose use it is done. I can assure you, it is done exactly according to the Original, there being not one ace of Difference in the Figure.[52]

The most interesting aspect of this particular episode in Forbes's manuscript is the glimpse it affords us of the wilful commercialisation of an authentic Jacobite relic in the aftermath of the '45, undertaken for the purpose of creating a brand-new style of Jacobite fashion for the use of female supporters of the Stuart Cause in Britain. Unlike Elizabeth Byrom's purchase of a blue and white partisan gown in Manchester or Margaret Oliphant of Gask's gown of cream-coloured corded silk ornamented with emblematic Jacobite roses **[Fig: 3.1]** – which both represent sartorial choices informed by established and popularly recognised political colour codes and visual shorthand – the transaction enacted by Forbes, Burton, and Carmichael, points to the emergence of a thoroughly original strand of patriotic iconography within Jacobite sartorial culture in the aftermath of the '45 rebellion. Irrespective of whether the gowns were widely distributed beyond this small circle of correspondents, their creation highlights the desire for increased adaptability in the dress of Jacobite supporters during the post-'46 period of reprisal. Given that the purple sprig calico of the 'Betty Burke' gowns would have fallen into the same stylistic vein as a wealth of other printed calico ensembles of the mid-eighteenth century period, attaching specific Jacobite sentiments to such a gown in the public space would have been difficult for those unaware of the original Jacobite relic from which the design was taken.[53] This made the political sentiments attached to the gown and its printed pattern a suitably subtle tribute to the figure of Charles Edward Stuart in exile, easily deniable by the wearer, yet still entirely Jacobite in nature.

Pincushions, Ribbons and Garters: Examining the Commercial Context

The manufacture committee shall, from time to time, visit our warehouses, inspect the goods, and severely punish such

---

[52] Paton, ed., *The Lyon in Mourning* (1895), II, p. 105.

[53] For a comparison of contemporary calico styles then circulating in England, see: *VAM* T.219-1973 (Album with textile samples and fashion plates, compiled by Barbara Johnson. England, *c.* 1746–1823).

persons as shall be found to have any which emblematically favour Popery or the Pretender; such are your plaided chequered gowns, &c. which virtually imply the wearer's approbation of the Scotch Rebellion and the Church of Rome, of which this chris-cross work is a known type of figure. As for your pincushion-makers, I think they should be rigorously chastised, and their works publicly burnt, let the pretty misses cry as loud as they will. It is a monstrous shame that such an ancient necessary appendage to the ladies' toilets should be thus Jacobitised, and transformed from its primitive use and simplicity into a variegated tool of faction and sedition.

We would recommend it to the guardians and regulators of our dress, amongst whom I think some well-affected ladies should be admitted, to attend all public meetings at church, assembly, &c.; and to observe strictly, and punish severely, all deviations from decency and loyalty. The arrant Scotch plaid waistcoat, I desire may be animadverted upon with the utmost rigour: To appear in one of those ought to be deemed little less than setting up the Pretender's standard. I am sure it is literally hanging out his colours. I look upon such disaffected doublets, as so many Hercules's shirts, which immediately set the wearers a-madding, and proudly fancying themselves in the Pretender's livery. It may perhaps proceed from their being poisoned by the hands and breath of the rebel weavers of them. Let them, I say have Hercules's fate, and mount to Heaven in a flame.[54]

Set in the Jacobite hot-bed of Manchester in the years immediately following the '45 campaign, the scene outlined above is one of a rebellious sartorial culture on full display in the public streets of Hanoverian Britain. Manufacturers and purchasers alike are seen to engage in the explicit promotion of the Stuart Cause through the creation of a commercialised, counter-culture of Jacobite sartorial resistance. That the appearance of these 'plaided chequered gowns', 'disaffected doublets' and tartan pincushions in spaces of commerce tempted outbursts of civil disobedience is the

---

[54] S. Hibbert, *History of the Foundations in Manchester of Christ's College, Chetham's Hospital, and the Free Grammar School*, (London & Manchester, 1834), II, pp. 127-8.

major concern of the author. However, mention of a 'committee' of 'well-affected ladies' gathered to police such activity is likely tongue-in-cheek.

Garters, ribbons, and pincushions were not merely regarded as utilitarian items of dress in eighteenth-century Britain. They were also seen as significant cultural tools within rituals of courtship, community and family life, acting as material expressions of social intimacy. For instance, garters were often passed out as gifts to wedding guests, while some were snatched straight from the legs of newly-wedded couples by family and friends wanting to possess keepsakes of the nuptial day.[55] Garters carrying commemorative inscriptions were also fairly common during the eighteenth century and were often manufactured in order to coincide with moments of personal significance for the wearer. Love was a key theme of garter inscription, which complemented the intimate nature of garters as objects worn beneath layers of clothing, sitting close to the skin.[56] An early eighteenth-century garter, striped green, pink, black and yellow, and bearing the sentimental words 'AS KISSING WHEN TWO LOVERS MEET' speaks of what was most likely a romantic gift between sweethearts.[57] Garter inscriptions were usually presented as rhyming couplets, a line of verse per garter.[58] As extant examples do not always survive in their original pairs, some such inscriptions remain enticingly incomplete. For instance, a tablet woven garter from 1725 bearing the inscription 'WOVE WITHOUT SIGHT' sits alone in the collection of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, the other part of the verse

---

[55] Kristin Olsen, *Daily Life in Eighteenth-century England* (Westport & London: Greenwood Press, 1999), p. 40; Rosalind K. Marshall, *Virgins and Viragos: A History of Women in Scotland from 1080-1980* (Chicago: Academy Chicago, 1983), p. 84-5; R. A. Houston, *Bride Ales and Penny Weddings: Recreations, Reciprocity, and Regions in Britain from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 82.

[56] Eleri Lynn, *Underwear: Fashion in Detail* (London: V&A Publishing, 2010), p. 119: 'Simple ribbon or tape garters […] were for centuries the only way to hold stockings up. They were worn by both men and women and tied around the leg above the knee, until the arrival of braces for men at the end of the eighteenth century and suspenders for women towards the end of the nineteenth century.'

[57] *VAM* T.42-1955 (Early eighteenth-century garter). See also: *VAM* T.433-1970 (Garter inscribed with maxim: 'I love not this world in which thou must not stay, but love that treasure that abides away', eighteenth century).

[58] An example of an uncut pair of garters (as if straight from the loom) are currently on display at the Culloden Battlefield and Visitor Centre, on loan from National Museums Scotland. They bear the pro-Jacobite inscription, 'Come let us with one heart unite to bless the prince for whom we'll fight'.

lost along with the missing garter.[59] Of those textile tokens left with infants at the London Foundling Hospital from the mid-to-late eighteenth century, ribbons represented 'material emblems of attachment' between mothers and their lost children, as well as signifies of affection between fallen women and their absent lovers.[60] Pincushions were likewise used as material modes of commemoration within the lives of women and their extended family. Throughout the eighteenth century they 'were popular as courting and wedding presents, christening and New Year's gifts', their surfaces marked with significant names, dates and emblems either through stitchery or the arrangement of straight pins.[61] As everyday objects, pincushions were tied to the sartorial habits of women. Chloe Wigston Smith has described the pincushion in terms of its practical role within the maintenance of a woman's everyday apparel, 'an object that holds the crucial pins for fastening one garment to another (such as bodices to skirts and ruffles to sleeves) and without which women could not dress'.[62] It is therefore not surprising that these common sartorial objects became assimilated into cultures of patriotic display during the long eighteenth century, even when such patriotic display was in defiance of the ruling dynasty. In the production of partisan wares for the Jacobite body and home, manufacturers of these goods were responding to a popular demand for personal, tangible keepsakes of the late '45 campaign.

While the tone of the Manchester essay's call-to-action against 'your pin-cushion makers' and 'the rebellious weavers' of these 'Jacobitised' wares is undoubtedly of a satirical bent, mention of these objects being sold and worn during this period can be identified elsewhere. While convicted Jacobite soldier Sergeant Alexander Smith went to his execution in December 1747 with 'plaid-coloured ribbands' tied about his knees, Hanoverian soldier James Ray described 'pretty *Jacobite Witches* […]

---

[59] *CWF* 1956-17 (Tablet-woven commemorative garter. British, *c.* 1725).

[60] John Styles, *Threads of Feeling: The London Foundling Hospital's Textile Tokens, 1740-1770* (London: The Foundling Museum, 2010), p. 44, pp. 43-51.

[61] Claire Smith, 'The domestic landscape' in *Quilts, 1700-2010: Hidden Histories, Untold Stories,* ed. Sue Pritchard (London: V&A Publishing, 2010), pp. 166-7; *VAM* T.60-1935 (Satin damask pin cushion stuck with hand-made pins. English, 1745); Examples of late eighteenth-century christening pincushions include: *VAM* B.3-2009 and *VAM* B.4-2009.

[62] Chloe Wigston Smith, *Women, Work, and Clothes in the Eighteenth-Century Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 75.

wearing Plaid Breast-Knots, Ribbons, and Garters tied above the Knee' in his scathing history of the rebellion published in 1759.[63] The existence of the tartan pincushions – not to mention their perceived link to immoral behavior – may also be observed in popular balladry. In *Marian's Distress* (1750), a song which follows a young woman seduced at a spring fair by 'Colin Clout' and caught with child, tartan pincushions are counted among the 'the Beauties of the Fair' available for purchase by sweethearts. In *Marian's Distress* the pincushions are posited in cautionary terms amid an array of tantalising goods, all capable of delighting the senses of the overly curious:

> Here glittering Pewter its bright Gleam displays,
>
> There Leather-Breeches hang, and Bodice-Stays;
>
> With Ribbons there, Plaid Pincushions are seen,
>
> Whose P's and C's no Loyalty can mean;
>
> Here posied Garters flutter'd in the Way,
>
> There painted Hobby-Horses seem'd to neigh;
>
> Here Cake and Buns were pil'd in plenteous Store,
>
> And Ging'bread Folks so richly gilded o'er.[64]

In addition to such contextual evidence derived from written accounts, museum collections offer substantial material evidence to corroborate the notion that Jacobite pincushions and garter ribbons were manufactured and sold widely in Britain in the wake of the '45 defeat **[Figs: 3.17 & 3.18]**.[65] In contrast to the circulation of tartan

---

[63] *The Caledonian Mercury* (17 December 1747); *The Scots Magazine* (December 1747), pp. 601-2; Ray, *A Compleat History of the Rebellion* (1759), p. 181.

[64] *The Chester Miscellany. Being a Collection of Several Pieces, both in Prose and Verse, Which were in the Chester Courant from January 1745, to May 1750* (Chester, 1750), p. 257.

[65] *VAM* T.120-1931 (Silk tartan pin cushion with a woven silk garter ribbon, inscribed in white letters on a blue ground with maxim 'GOD BLESS P.C. AND DOWN WITH THE RUMP', *c.* 1745); *VAM* T.121-1931 (Loom-woven garter ribbon of green, blue, yellow, orange and white chequered silk tartan, inscribed 'OUR PRINCE IS BRAVE OUR CAUSE IS JUST', *c.* 1745). For an extant pair, in which the partisan inscription is used as a rhyming couplet across the two garters, see: *VAM* T.107-1938 (Pair of woven silk Jacobite garters inscribed 'GOD BLESS THE PRINCE AND SAVE THE KING' and the other 'WHILE WHIGGS AND RUMPS IN HALTERS SWING', *c.* 1745). Other

pincushions and garter ribbons among Jacobite consumers, there is also evidence to suggest that a patriotic counter-culture of Hanoverian ribbons was in existence at the same time. Held within the Victoria and Albert Museum, for example, is a pink silk hair or garter ribbon, stamped with a design which celebrates the defeat of the Jacobite army at Culloden and the role of William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland as commander of the Hanoverian forces. The design consists of the Royal arms, flanked by scrolling banners on either side, the left reading 'GLORIOUS WILLIAM' and the right 'REBELLION CRUSHD'; the design reads horizontally, repeating along the full length of the ribbon. The rest of the silk ground is scattered with flowers and arabesques, creating an attractive *mille fleur* effect. The stamp used to emboss the silk was evidently wider than the ribbon width, so the design is slightly truncated at the top and bottom edges **[Fig: 3.19]**.[66]

That numerous tartan pincushions and inscribed garters survive in museum collections across Britain, as well as occasionally appearing at auction, suggests that these particular items were manufactured commercially on a relatively large scale, at a point in time when the events and ideologies associated with the '45 campaign were still fresh enough in the public consciousness to facilitate noticeable consumer demand. However, the commercial context of these patriotic sartorial items is seldom appreciated within Jacobite material culture scholarship. Rather, the role of these objects is confined to their appearance within the domestic habits of middling or upper-class Jacobite women, with the significant stage of manufacture and the initial act of purchase being downplayed.[67] Nowhere is this oversight more apparent than

examples of these garters may be found on display in the Inverness Museum and Art Gallery and at the Culloden Battlefield and Visitor Centre.

[66] *VAM* T.115-1999 (Stamped silk ribbon commemorating the defeat of the Jacobite rebellion, embossed maxims reading 'CRUSHED REBELLION' and 'GLORIOUS WILLIAM', *c.* 1746). The ribbon was discovered in the secret drawer of an embroidered casket, dating from the seventeenth century, which was itself contained within a wooden travelling case. Both casket and case came from the Smart family of Norcott Hall, Hertfordshire, and family history associates the casket with a visit to the house by Charles II. It passed by inheritance to Elizabeth Smart, who married John Loxley in the nineteenth century. See: *VAM* T.114:1-1999 (Embroidered casket, top depicts Rebecca at the Well. English, *c.* 1660s); *VAM* T.114:3-1999 (Travelling case for embroidered casket. English, *c.* 1660s).

[67] These objects have been featured most heavily in the following works: Elenor D. Longman and Sophy Loch, *Pins and Pincushions* (London & New York: Longmans, 1911); Tuckett, 'National

within academic discussion of the 'martyrs pincushions', which were sold in large numbers during the period of the Jacobite treason trials *c.* 1746–7, discussed in Chapter One. Two of these pincushions are held by National Museums Scotland and in the University of Aberdeen special collections: the pincushions are rectangular, covered in white satin, plate-printed in blue on recto and verso with the names of condemned Jacobite prisoners. At the centre of the design is the emblem of the white rose, encircled by the maxim 'MART: FOR: K: &: COU: 1746'. The four corners of each cushion are finished with blue tassels **[Figs: 3.20 & 3.21]**.[68]

The first mention of the martyrs pincushions within a material culture study appears in Longman and Loch's antiquarian treatise *Pins and Pincushions* (1911), in which they are described as objects relating to the romanticised 'lost cause' of the Stuarts. In Longman and Loch's overtly nostalgic appraisal, the pincushions are described as 'touching' mementos worthy of those Jacobite lords who 'gave up their lives with gallant courage, thus earning for themselves the right to be enrolled amongst the heroes of history.'[69] In more recent academic studies of Jacobite material culture this lost cause narrative has been significantly downplayed in favour of examining the gendered usage and appeal of the pincushions. Pittock, for instance, has labelled the martyrs pincushions as 'explicit' Jacobite objects that would have fallen well within the purview of female supporters, classifying them as primarily domestic in nature, 'private or hidden, and thus not intended to communicate within a group, except possibly to a single favoured individual.'[70] Guthrie's analysis, meanwhile,

---

Dress, Gender and Scotland' (2009); Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition* (2013); Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (2013); Novotny, 'Sedition at the supper table' (2013); Novotny, 'Polite War: Material Culture of the Jacobite Era, 1688-1760', in *Living with Jacobitism* (2014); Forsyth, ed., *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (2017). Gendered usage is the dominant theme in the academic analysis of these objects, with the controversial commercial context from which they came being either downplayed or unexplored.

[68] *NMS* A.1987.258 (Pin cushion. Printed satin, 1746); *UAM* ABDUA 17969 (Pin cushion. Printed satin, 1746); It should also be noted that the studies of Longman and Loch and of Guthrie both cite an example once believed to have been in the Ashmolean Museum (Oxford), but which is now untraceable. See: Longman and Loch, *Pins and Pincushions* (1911), p. 171; Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (2013), p. 108.

[69] Longman and Loch, *Pins and Pincushions* (1911), pp. 170-72.

[70] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition* (2013), p. 24.

concentrates upon the quality of popular mourning contained within the design of the martyrs pincushions, describing them as being 'passive, already nostalgic' objects when placed in the context of the immediate aftermath of the '45 campaign and the public executions of its participants.[71] Furthermore, Guthrie follows Pittock in his contextualisation of Jacobite pincushions in general as being fundamentally domestic articles used predominantly by women as private forms of patriotic expression:

> The pincushions evoke small gatherings at the dressing-table,
> rainy afternoons and long evenings, and either solitude or a
> form of sociability very different from the more boisterous male
> club.[72]

Novotny approaches the martyrs pincushions in a similar vein, though foregrounds the craftsmanship involved in their production. However, while Novotny does note that 'the pincushion is made of printed fabric, not hand-lettered or embroidered, […] suggesting that this artefact was not a one-off, but rather one of a larger batch', she does not expand upon this observation further.[73] Instead, like Pittock and Guthrie, her analysis is centred upon highlighting the gendered dimension of the martyrs pincushions and does not dwell upon the commercial context of their manufacture. Interestingly, Novotny's comparative approach to object analysis does identify an example of a martyrs pincushion which sports the rare addition of a blue silk garter ribbon. This suggests a level of personalisation on the part of the owner following the original purchase, the aim being to make the pincushion more portable for wear about the female body as a kind of 'mourning accessory' much in the same way as a 'Down with the Rump' tartan pincushion with the matching ribbon tie **[Fig: 3.17]** could have been worn as a rebellious talisman, tied to the petticoat hoop of the wearer.[74]

In the recent exhibition 'Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites' (2017), an example of the martyrs pincushion from the collection of National Museums Scotland was displayed alongside a group of objects categorised as relating to the 'Trials, Pardons

---

[71] Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (2013), p. 133.

[72] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

[73] Novotny, 'Sedition at the supper table' (2013), p. 183.

[74] The pincushion in question was auctioned at Christie's in 2002 (Sale 9305, Lot 249). See: Novotny, 'Sedition at the supper table' (2013), p. 183.

and Retributions' of Jacobite adherents in the wake of the '45. Most importantly, included within this category were two bespoke mourning rings fashioned in memory of the Jacobites peers **[Figs: 3.22 & 3.23]**. While the commercial context of the martyrs pincushions was not explicitly addressed in this instance, by thematically grouping the pincushion with other portable tokens of popular mourning for the Jacobite lords, the role of artisanal goods in the moulding of public memories of the conflict was brought sharply to the fore of the object's interpretation.[75]

The martyrs pincushions are a macabre strand of mid-eighteenth-century commercial culture. Their place and usage within the material landscape of mid-eighteenth-century Jacobite display can be interpreted in a number of ways beyond their use in the domestic space, with their potential purchasers ranging from the ardently Jacobite to the less demonstratively partisan consumer. The temptation is to immediately categorise the martyrs pincushions as the sole preserve of female Jacobites of the upper-middling or elite classes, who would doubtless have viewed them as objects of sincere mourning. However, the fact that so many have survived would seem to indicate that the martyrs pincushions were produced in relatively large numbers for wider popular consumption. It would therefore not be unreasonable to suggest that at least some purchasers of the martyrs pincushions treated them not as objects representative of their own Jacobite loyalties, but as execution souvenirs bought to solemnise their individual interest in the fates of the condemned men.[76] It is very possible that not all those who possessed the martyrs pincushions were in fact ardent Jacobites, but rather informed consumers whose purchase marked their desire to document the shifting political landscape which surrounded them. In this vein, the martyrs pincushions may be interpreted as a material manifestation of early celebrity culture, which had begun to emerge in Britain by the mid-eighteenth century.

---

[75] *NMS* A.1987.258 (Pin cushion. Printed satin, 1746). See: Forsyth, ed., *Bonnie Prince Charlies and the Jacobites* (2017), pp. 246-50. The two rings featured alongside the pincushion: *NMS* H.NJ 88 (Mourning ring for Lord Lovat. Gold, c. 1747); *NMS* H.NJ 154 ('Four Peers' ring, possibly made by Ebenezer Oliphant. Gold and enamel, 1747).

[76] A favourable comparison can be made between execution pincushions and execution bobbins, which began to be sold during the early nineteenth century, particularly in the lace-making region of Devon. These souvenir bobbins were carved with the names of the condemned and sold to execution attendees. See: Christine Springett and David Springett, *Success to the Lace Pillow* (Rugby: Apex, 1988), p. 10, pp. 11-15.

However, instead of being imprinted with portraits of famous stage actresses, revolutionaries or literary figures, the martyrs pincushions were imprinted with the names of the famously condemned, thereby playing upon the public's curiosity regarding the chief actors in the failed rising.[77] In order to turn a profit, those who manufactured and sold the martyrs pincushions were deliberately exploiting the popular fascination which surrounded the high-profile executions of these elite Jacobite men, much in the same way that printmakers, ballad sellers and medal makers exploited popular interest in the treason trials and the subsequent executions to generate sales of their own wares **[Figs: 3.24 & 3.25]**.[78]

However, the pincushions may also be interpreted as objects of Jacobite propaganda, manufactured at a time of intense vulnerability for the movement, when the future of the Stuart Cause in Britain rested upon the respectability of its adherents. As remarked by André Krische, '[f]or much of the eighteenth century a criminal trial did not end with the judgement, but lasted till execution.'[79] In practice, this meant that the public sphere became a stage upon which condemned individuals protested their innocence, courted clemency, or else demonstrated gentlemanly acceptance in the face of their inevitable death. A method employed by many condemned rebels to encourage popular fondness among the general public was the process of publishing reports of their conduct while in prison or supplying copies of their last words to pamphleteers, a process Krische has termed 'impression management' and which Szechi has dubbed the 'Jacobite theatre of death'.[80] It would therefore not be unreasonable to suggest that the pincushions, which named condemned individuals

---

[77] See in particular: Ileana Baird and Christina Ionescu, eds., *Eighteenth-Century Thing Theory in a Global Context: From Consumerism to Celebrity Culture* (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2013).

[78] For example: *BM* 1880,1113.3456 (Anon., 'The Beheading of the Rebel Lords on Great Tower Hill', etching on paper, *c.* 1746); *BM* M.8542 (Bronze medal commemorating the execution of the Jacobite rebels and the role of the Duke of Cumberland in the suppression of the '45 campaign, *c.* 1746).

[79] André Krische, 'Noble Honour and the Force of Law: Trial by Peers, Aristocracy and Criminal Law in England from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century', in *What Makes the Nobility Noble? Comparative Perspectives from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth* Century, eds. Jörn Leonhard and Christian Wieland (Göttingen: Vandenhoech & Ruprecht, 2011), p. 78.

[80] *Ibid.*, p. 81. See also: Szechi, 'The Jacobite Theatre of Death' in *The Jacobite Challenge* (1988), pp. 57-73.

and placed their deaths in a favourable – even heroic – light, were manufactured and purchased by Jacobite sympathisers with the intension of bringing honour to the Stuart Cause during the turbulent post-'46 period of reprisal.

When interpreted in this wider context of Jacobite reputation management and the commercial souvenir culture which attended public execution, it seems clear that the martyrs pincushions were far from 'passive' commemorations of the fallen Jacobite peers. Rather, they formed a thoroughly active strand of continued Jacobite support and remembrance during the post-'46 period of reprisal. Also, if we consider that pincushions – alongside inscribed garters and hair ribbons – were thoroughly integrated into the emotional, social, and material landscapes of eighteenth-century women's lives, it is apparent that Jacobitised accessories had the potential to act as powerful, transformative objects of personal loyalty in the aftermath of the failed campaign.

Jacobite Fan Culture

A fan-leaf represented a blank canvas to both the manufacturer and the customer, an empty space awaiting whatever design best reflected topical concerns or the personal taste of the bearer. The fan – both as a sartorial object and as a visual medium – was the perfect vehicle for women to express their political partisanship in the public space, whilst also staying within the confines of polite behaviour. Much has been written regarding the development of fans as a uniquely feminine medium for cultural and emotional engagement during the long eighteenth century. However, very little of this work directly addresses the political genre of fan design and its influence upon collective memory.[81]

---

[81] Selected examples: Stephanie Fysh, *The Work(s) of Samuel Richardson* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997), pp. 75-8, on the 'Pamela fan' as reflection of female engagement with literary culture; Susan M. Stabile, *Memory's Daughters: The Material Culture of Remembrance in Eighteenth-Century America* (Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 2004), pp. 155-75, on the 'epistolary fan' as material conveyor of collective memory and emotion, particularly when given as gifts between friends and family members; Christina K. Lindeman, 'Gendered Souvenirs: Anna Amalia's Grand Tourist *verdute* fans' in *Materializing Gender in Eighteenth-Century Europe*, eds., Jennifer G. Germany and Heidi A. Strobel (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2016), pp. 51-66, on the participation of women with the intellectual high culture embodied by the Grand Tour, through the

There are few explicitly 'Jacobite' fans which can be reliably associated with the period prior to 1745. However, those which can be dated to the pre-'45 period fall comfortably within the visual tradition of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century Stuart Cause. Jacobite fans produced prior to 1745 are stylistically rather different to those manufactured during or after the '45 campaign. As shall be explored below, this alteration in the character of Jacobite iconography resulted from the changing circumstances of the Jacobite movement by the mid-eighteenth century and the elevation of the royal image of Charles Edward Stuart as the embodiment of the Stuart Cause in exile. This shift of focus is particularly evident in the designs of fans manufactured *c.* 1745–66, before the death of James Francis Edward Stuart and the subsequent break-up of the Stuart Court in Rome put a decisive end to Jacobite hopes of a legitimate restoration.[82]

One of the earliest known fans to showcase active support for the Stuart monarchy in Britain dates from the second half of the seventeenth century **[Fig: 3.26]**. Based upon its overall design, the fan can be reliably tied to a moment of high political significance for the Stuart dynasty: the Restoration of Charles II in 1660. Of English manufacture, the fan-leaf consists of pleated paper with a gilded edge, patterned on both recto and verso with a repeating woodcut design. The fan mount is made of elegantly carved ivory sticks and guards, held together by a mother of pearl washer. The woodcut design exhibited on the fan-leaf employs a visual shorthand popularly associated with the young adulthood of Charles II, emphasising his military participation in the English Civil War. Alongside ceremonial imagery connected with monarchical ritual and coronation regalia, such as orbs, scepters and crowns, the woodcut design is heavily populated with acorn and oak-leaf motifs. Scrolling banners bearing the maxim 'THE HAPY RESTORATION' weave in and out of these motifs, providing a persuasive date stamp by which to fix the fan within the

---

medium of 'souvenir fans'; On the political nature of fan designs, see in particular: Elaine Chalus, 'Fanning the Flames: Women, Fashion, and Politics' in *Women, Popular Culture, and the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Tiffany Potter (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), pp. 92-111.

[82] Unlike his father, Charles Edward Stuart was not formally recognised by the Papacy as 'Charles III' and as such it was difficult to maintain a veneer of legitimacy for the Cause. Also, Charles had become increasingly unstable since the '45 due to his alcoholism and precarious finances.

post-1660 period **[Fig: 3.26*a*]**. It is unlikely that the fan was produced any later than 1685, the year of Charles II's death.[83]

The intermingling of acorns and oak leaves with monarchical imagery is a deliberate patriotic design feature of the fan-leaf, aimed at invoking pro-Stuart sentiments in both the possessor of the fan and its intended audience. The inclusion of acorns and oak leaves within the design of a fan manufactured in celebration of the Stuart Restoration would have reminded all those who gazed upon it of Charles II's famous retreat from the Battle of Worcester in 1651, when he successfully concealed himself within the bows of an oak tree in the grounds of Boscobel House, evading capture by parliamentary forces.[84] The tale of the future king taking refuge in the Boscobel oak was extremely influential in the development of a pro-Stuart iconography during the exile of Charles II, as well as within the design of triumphal material culture which accompanied his Restoration and the early years of his reign.[85]

The image of (or illusions to) the Boscobel oak emerged as a mainstay of Caroline pageantry from 1660, periodically remerging in both material culture referencing the monarch and celebratory popular rituals, such as gatherings and processions in the public street. Royalists living in England during the period of the early Restoration (when Charles II's popularity was arguably at its peak) often incorporated the symbolic imagery of the 'Royal Oak' into domestic decoration and fashion accessories to demonstrate their devotion to the reinstated Stuart line of succession **[Fig: 3.27]**.[86] This was especially true at times of great personal, as well as political,

---

[83] *FM* Alexander 1723 (Folding paper fan celebrating the restoration of Charles II, printed using woodblocks, *c.* 1660). This fan was examined and photographed during a research visit to The Fan Museum in May 2015 and is featured here with the kind permission of the museum founder and director, Hélène Alexander.

[84] See in particular: Charles Spencer, *To Catch a King: Charles II's Great Escape* (London: William Collins, 2017).

[85] Murray G. H. Pittock, *The Invention of Scotland: The Stuart Myth and the Scottish Identity, 1638 to the Present* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 1991), p. 4, p. 12, p. 42, p. 52, p. 97; Antti Matikkala, *The Orders of Knighthood and the Formation of the British Honours System, 1660-1760* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2008), pp. 65-73.

[86] Examples of domestic decoration and personal accessories which use the visual imagery associated with the tale of the Royal Oak include: *VAM* 255-1906 (Fireback, cast iron, showing an oak tree with three crowns and the initials CR, England (probably Weald), mid-seventeenth century); *VAM*

significance for the newly reinstated Stuart monarch. For instance, a surviving piece of block-printed furnishing fabric can be reliably associated with Charles II's marriage to Catharine of Braganza in 1662 **[Fig: 3.28]**.[87] The fabric design shows the newly-wedded royal couple stood beneath a towering, fertile oak, its sprawling branches giving forth bountiful quantities of acorns, which are feasted upon by the birds of paradise depicted hovering above the couple's heads. The fabric design implies both their rightful sovereignty over the Three Kingdoms by their proximity to the Royal Oak of England, as well as the imminent production of a legitimate Stuart heir through their entry into married life.[88] Oak leaves and branches also made annual appearances on days held sacred to Charles II's personal history, such as

C.360:1&2-2009 (Delftware plaque showing Charles II, with the crowns of England, Scotland and Ireland, in the branches of the Boscobel oak. Contained within a frame made from the bark of an oak tree. British, probably London, *c.* 1660-70); *VAM* 898-1904 (A 'Boscobel Oak' locket, later seventeenth century). The tale of the Royal Oak also appeared within domestic embroidery projects, produced most often by the young and genteel women of the later seventeenth century. See in particular: *Holburne Museum* F236 (Embroidered panel featuring the restoration of Charles II. English, silk and metal thread raised work, *c.* 1665), in which the Boscobel oak motif is central to the overall design. For discussion of dynastic/political representation within early modern domestic textile embroidery, see: Ruth Geuter, 'Reconsidering the Context of Seventeenth-Century English Figurative Embroideries' in *Gender and Material Culture in Historical Perspective*, eds., Moira Donald and Linda Hurcombe (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), pp. 97-111; Mihoko Suzuki, *Subordinate Subjects: Gender, the Political Nation, and Literary Form in England, 1588-1688* (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 165-82.

[87] *VAM* T.17-1914 (Portions of a wall-hanging or furnishing fabric, on coarse hand-woven canvas, printed from wood blocks. English, later seventeenth century).

[88] The promise of a legitimate heir through the marriage of Charles II to Catharine of Braganza was never realised, as Catharine proved to be infertile and suffered multiple miscarriages during the early years of their marriage. In spite of her misfortune, Charles II refused to divorce Catharine, which would ultimately lead to the passing of the crown to James II and to the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688. As has been discussed by Edward Corp, Catharine has (quite unfairly) been remembered more for her 'failure' to produce a legitimate heir for the Stuart dynasty than for her contributions to matters of foreign policy and the 'revolution in English taste' which took place during her time as Queen consort. See: Edward Corp, 'Catharine of Braganza and Cultural Politics' in, *Queenship in Britain, 1660-1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynasty Politics*, ed., Clarissa Campbell Orr (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 53-73.

Restoration Day, which was celebrated well into the eighteenth century as a day of national joy, even by those not of the Jacobite persuasion.[89]

In response to the Stuart dynasty's renewed state of exile in the wake of the Glorious Revolution of 1688, the iconography of the providential Royal Oak was widely integrated into the visual and material language of late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century expressions of Jacobite patriotism.[90] For example, an illusion to the tale of Charles II hiding in the Boscobel oak is a prominent design aspect of a Jacobite fan, produced *c.* 1715–30 **[Fig: 3.29]**.[91] This particular fan is currently the earliest known example of an explicitly pro-Jacobite fan-leaf and, aside from the symbolism of the providential Boscobel oak, it displays multiple illusions to the Stuart Cause in exile. The fan design is also double sided, with the explicit Jacobite imagery on the recto of the leaf and an innocuous floral pattern displayed upon the verso. This design feature would have allowed for the fan to be turned one way or the other by the bearer, dependent upon the dynastic sympathies of their company.[92] That the fan was hand-painted on both sides also points to the monetary value and material quality of this fan, suggesting that its original owner was of a high social status and therefore able to afford the best in bespoke, fashionable accessories.[93]

---

[89] In 1660, parliament declared that 29 May was to be a public holiday of thanksgiving for the King's return and for the end of the nation's divisions. Also referred to as 'Oak Apple Day' or 'Royal Oak Day', the holiday was officially abolished in 1851, though it is still popularly observed in some parts of Britain. See in particular: Matthew Neufeld, *The Civil Wars After 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013), p. 203.

[90] See in particular: Eirwen E.C. Nicholson, 'The Oak v. The Orange Tree: Emblematizing Dynastic Union and Conflict, 1600-1796' in, *Anglo-Dutch Relations in the Field of the Emblem*, ed. Bart Westerweel (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 227-52.

[91] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People* (1989), p. 73: 'The visual images of Charles the martyr and of the king in the oak tree later provided Jacobites with contrasting models on which a repertory of graphic propaganda could be based.' Fans are here considered a form of 'graphic propaganda', in the sense that they communicated a political ideology visually via the design of the fan-leaf; *VAM* T.160-1970 (Hand-painted paper fan, *c.* 1715-30).

[92] Chalus, 'Fanning the Flames' in *Women, Popular Culture, and the Eighteenth Century* (2012), p. 101.

[93] Compared to printed fans, painted fans were more expensive because their manufacture required specialist skills and was highly labour intensive. Printed fans were often produced quickly and

The reference to the famous tale of the Boscobel oak in the design of this early Jacobite fan can be taken as a deliberate attempt to elicit a comparison between the (then) undecided fate of the exiled James Francis Edward Stuart and the triumphal personal history of his uncle, Charles II. By including such an historically charged aspect of Stuart iconography within the design of this fan-leaf, the manufacturer arguably hoped to remind the possessor of the fan that Charles II had been redeemed from exile due in no small part to the continued devotion of his supporters at home. Still further, by replacing the figure of Charles II with the likeness of James Francis Edward Stuart, the manufacturer desired the audience of the fan to place a similar degree of faith in James as those late seventeenth-century Royalists had placed in Charles. Affiliating James Francis Edward Stuart with the iconography of the Boscobel oak, with its motif of the three crowns of England, Scotland and Ireland, can also be interpreted as an attempt to emphasise his essential Englishness in spite of his prolonged residencies in France and Italy. As discussed in Chapter One, it was important for the Stuarts to remind both the followers and the doubters of the Jacobite movement that irrespective of where they might reside in exile, the senior branch of the Stuart dynasty remained true Englishmen at heart **[Fig: 3.29*a*]**. Also implicit within the symbolic design features of this early Jacobite fan is a nod to the continued propagation of the male line of the House of Stuart in exile. This is eluded to not only by the inclusion of a Stuart white rose in full bloom upon the fan-leaf, but also by the addition of two white rose buds on the cusp of flowering **[Fig: 3.29*b*]**. James Francis Edward Stuart is represented by the virile host rose, while the infant buds are thought to be illustrative of his two male heirs, Charles Edward (b. 1720) and Henry Benedict (b. 1725). The use of the white rose in the design of this particular fan-leaf is also of note because its inclusion pays testament to the fact that the symbol was a well-recognised facet of the iconography of the Stuart Cause, prior to the widespread civilian and military adoption of the white cockade during the '45 campaign.[94]

The Stuart iconography exhibited upon the *c.* 1660 fan **[Fig: 3.26]** and the *c.* 1715–30 fan **[Fig: 3.29]** are important to discuss, as they provide an indication of how the

---

cheaply and as such they tended to wear out faster than the sturdier, painted variety. See: Ivison Wheatley, *The Language of the Fan* (York: Fairfax House, 1989), p. 11.

[94] As discussed in Chapter One of this thesis.

visual culture of Jacobite patriotism was refashioned by the advent of the '45, when the sum of Jacobite hopes in Britain passed to the younger branch of the Stuart line of succession. As demonstrated below by an analysis of the iconography used upon fans produced for Jacobite women during and after the '45 campaign, the designers of pro-Stuart fans no longer dwelled upon the allegiance of British Jacobites to the exiled James Francis Edward Stuart. Instead, new designs focused upon glorifying the royal image of the *heir apparent*, Charles Edward Stuart, James's younger and eminently more charismatic counterpart. James had not set foot on British shores since his aborted efforts of 1715 and, similarly, most Jacobite supporters in Britain had never had direct contact with him, save for those few received at the Stuart Court in Rome. It therefore made perfect sense for fan-makers to celebrate the Stuart whose physical presence in Britain during the campaign itself had caused such an immediate and sustained sensation among Jacobite supporters at home.

Printed Jacobite fans contemporary to the '45 survive in greater numbers than their more expensive, hand-painted counterparts. However, while printed examples may be more numerous, they exhibit infinitely less variety in terms of their design. In fact, printed Jacobite fans which can be dated to the mid-eighteenth-century period are invariably of the same run of allegorical fan-leaves attributed to the Jacobite engraver Robert Strange. By tradition, this collection of fans is thought to have been produced by Strange during the prolonged Jacobite occupation of Edinburgh and gifted to those women who attended a ball at the Palace of Holyrood following the Jacobite victory at the Battle of Preston-pans in September 1745.[95] Numerous

---

[95] This attribution (and accompanying historical context) is often cited in catalogue entries for this particular fan design. However, a nineteenth-century biography of Strange compiled from primary sources makes no mention of Strange manufacturing an allegorical fan-leaf during the '45, still less of Strange being commissioned by Charles Edward Stuart to produce a fan in commemoration of the Preston-pans victory. Also, as recently discussed by Jacqueline Riding, Charles Edward Stuart made a significant effort not to publicly celebrate the Preston-pans victory in 1745 as he did not wish to appear to rejoice in the deaths of British subjects. Therefore, to commission a fan to mark the victory (not to mention distributing them among his female followers) would have been hypocritical of him in the extreme. Ergo, it would seem prudent to approach this traditional attribution and accompanying historical context with a healthy dose of skepticism. See: James Dennistoun, ed., *Memoirs of Sir Robert Strange, Knt., Engraver, Member of Several Foreign Academies of Design; And of his Brother-in-Law Andrew Lumisden, Private Secretary to the Stuart Princes, and Author of "Antiquities*

versions of the Robert Strange fan reside in private and museum collections, while still more are occasionally seen at auction.[96] However, all examples feature the same allegorical scene, which exemplifies the passing of Jacobite hopes in Britain from James Francis Edward Stuart to his eldest son, the charismatic Charles: Charles is depicted at the centre of the scene, arrayed in the armor of a conquering hero, attended by the classical gods of war, Mars and Bellona **[Figs: 3.30 & 3.30*a*]**. At the far-left of the leaf, Britannia is shown sitting beside her characteristic spear and shield, **[Fig: 3.30*c*]** while upon the far-right the god Jupiter strikes down the retreating Hanoverian family and their supporters **[Fig: 3.30*b*]**.[97]

Hélène Alexander, the founder and director of The Fan Museum in Greenwich, remains the only scholar to have conducted a systematic analysis of the visual and material language of the extant Jacobite fans attributed to Robert Strange.[98] Alexander's analysis is useful not only for providing an insight into the political use of allegory within Strange's composition, but also for identifying and comparing additional examples of Robert Strange fans held by other British collections. Alexander's comparative approach to these existing fans highlights the fact that

of Rome." (London: Longman, 1855), 2 vols; Riding, ''His little hour of royalty'' in *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (2017), pp. 96-125.

[96] Versions of the Robert Strange fan identified during the fieldwork for this chapter include: *FM* Alexander 626 (Hand-coloured, engraved paper folding fan mounted on painted ivory, attributed to Sir Robert Strange, *c.* 1745); *BM* 1891,0713.144 (Printed fan. Etching, hand-coloured, mounted on pierced ivory sticks, *c.* 1745); *NMS* H.UI 3 (Jacobite fan of paper mounted on ivory, with its original case, depicting Prince Charles Edward Stuart surrounded by classical gods, probably designed by Sir Robert Strange, *c.* 1745); *WHM* 647 (Hand-coloured, printed paper fan, *c.* 1745); *MFAB* 1976.292 (Paper fan, engraved and water-coloured, mounted on carved ivory sticks and painted ivory guards. English, *c.* 1745); *VAM* T.204-1959 (Overpainted, printed paper fan attributed to Sir Robert Strange, made *c.* 1745 and altered during the later eighteenth century). Finally, a Strange fan was auctioned by Sotheby's in London on 12 December 2012 (Lot. 30) and can be viewed on their e-catalogue of the sale: <http://www.sothebys.com/en/auctions/ecatalogue/lot.30.html/2012/english-literature-history-l12408> [Accessed 15 April 2018].

[97] *FM* Alexander 626 (Hand-coloured, engraved paper folding fan mounted on painted ivory, attributed to Sir Robert Strange, *c.* 1745).

[98] I would like to thank Hélène Alexander for allowing me access to view and photograph the Robert Strange fan held within the collection of The Fan Museum and for providing me with a copy of her article on the subject of Strange fans: Hélène Alexander, 'The Prince and the Fan', *Fan Association of North America Quarterly*, 6: 2 (1987), pp. 8-19.

while the basic design of the fans attributed to Strange remains consistent across extant versions, there are several notable differences between surviving examples. In the main, these differences pertain to the colouring of the engraved image and to the materials used to construct the supporting sticks and guards. Alexander also notes that there is at least one extant fan which directly imitates the Strange engraving, but which does not form part of the Strange object-group, indicating that the fan was visible enough to elicit commercial copying **[Fig: 3.31]**.[99] Alexander's study therefore widens the historical context of extant Robert Strange fans in a way not often addressed by museum catalogues, extending their known use beyond the initial appearance of the fans during the early, triumphal months of the '45 campaign. Instead, Alexander's survey shows that surviving fans attributed to Strange had a substantial afterlife which significantly outlasted the course of military Jacobitism. Alexander's work provides a useful introduction to the issues of contextual interpretation related to the iconographic study of fan design. However, her work is not exhaustive and several of her findings can arguably be taken further.

Pro-Hanoverian Battle Fans: Refashioning the Narrative of the '45

Fans issued in support of the House of Hanover were valued, fashionable commodities for many women in Britain throughout the long eighteenth century. Pro-Hanoverian fan designs appeared frequently across spaces of sociability to mark moments of high personal or political significance for the Hanoverian dynasty, effectively forming a patriotic counter-culture against those seditious fans wielded by Jacobite women.[100] The wedding of Princess Anne, the Princess Royal, to William, Prince of Orange and Nassau in March 1734 **[Fig: 3.32]**, for example, 'caught the

---

[99] Alexander, 'The Prince and the Fan' (1987), pp. 15-17; On the 'imitation' Strange fan, see: *NT* 852870 (Hand-painted paper fan fashioned in imitation of the fans attributed to Sir Robert Strange, *c.* 1745).

[100] Such fans reflect a multitude of contemporary topics and concerns, such as celebrating acts of royal patronage or the good health of the monarch. See in particular: *VAM* T.56-1933 (Engraved and hand-coloured paper fan, designed by Pietro Antonio Martini and made by Antonio Poggi. Depicts the Royal Family attending the Royal Academy exhibition, *c.* 1790); *BM* 1891,0713.64.+ (Mounted fan-leaf. Depicts crown above 'G R' monogram, inscribed 'On the King's/Happy Recovery' and 'Health is restored to ONE and happiness to Million's'. Hand-decorated with watercolour, foil, sequins, and gilding, *c.* 1789).

public imagination and fast-acting fan-makers vied […] to meet the demand for fans on the subject.'[101] Meanwhile, pivotal events such as the succession of George III, the first Hanoverian monarch to have been born and raised in Britain, in 1760 prompted the sale of fan designs which sought to promote his new role as a native, national figurehead.[102] An engraved, hand-painted fan-leaf in the collection of the British Museum, for instance, depicts a crowned bust of George III guarded by a British lion and the allegorical figures of Britannia and Justice. Britannia is shown taking water from the rocks surrounding the bust of George III, which she uses to wet the base of a Tree of Fine Arts, whose branches bear the maxims: 'PAINTING', 'SCULTURE', and 'ARCHITECTURE'. Justice sits cradling her characteristic scales and broadsword, looking out over a sprawling British coastline. A bird of providence, carrying an olive branch, makes her nest atop the Tree of Fine Arts, signifying to the possessor of the fan that George III's succession heralds the advent of cultural and domestic prosperity for his subjects **[Fig: 3.33]**.[103] In the wake of the British army's victory over the Stuart Cause in April 1746, celebratory 'battle fans' were introduced to represent pro-Hanoverian interpretations of the foremost military engagements of the '45 campaign. Such fans were useful propaganda tools for Hanoverian supporters to wield in the public forum, as – much like popular prints of the period which peddled anti-Jacobite sentiments – the fan-leaf provided a narrative space within which episodes of Jacobite failure could be showcased and the martial superiority of the British army brought to the fore. An analysis of two pro-Hanoverian battle fans are outlined below, the first relating to the Battle of Culloden **[Fig: 3.37]** and the second to the Siege of Stirling Castle **[Fig: 3.38]**.[104]

---

[101] Chalus, 'Fanning the Flames' in *Women, Popular Culture, and the Eighteenth Century* (2012), p. 100; *BM* 1891,0713.375 (Unmounted fan-leaf, celebrating the marriage of Princess Anne to William, Prince of Orange and Nassau. Plate-printed, hand-coloured, *c.* 1734).

[102] As opposed to Georges I/II, who had both been born and brought-up abroad and were less familiar with life in Britain when they took the throne.

[103] *BM* 1891,0713.425 (Unmounted fan-leaf, celebrating the new reign of George III. After etching by William Hogarth, hand-coloured, *c.* 1761).

[104] *VAM* T.205-1959 (Fan depicting the 'Surrender of the Jacobite leaders to the Duke of Cumberland after the Battle of Culloden'. Hand-coloured, printed paper with wooden sticks. British, *c.* 1746); *SMAG* 20720 (Fan depicting the 'Siege of Stirling Castle'. Hand-coloured, printed paper with carved wooden sticks, *c.* 1746).

160

As a genre of politicised sartorial object, 'battle fans' were a fairly recent form of female-orientated patriotic display during the period of the '45. Battle fans had first become popular with the British public as part of the outpouring of commercial material culture which had celebrated the career of naval hero Edward Vernon in the later 1730s and early 1740s, such as began to appear after his famous victory over the Spanish at the Battle of Portobello in 1739.[105] Battle fans such as those produced following, for instance, the Battle of Portobello or the unsuccessful Battle of Cartagena in 1741, actively shaped public perceptions of British victory or defeat during the early period of empire building, through the manufacturer's employment of patriotic visual shorthand within their fan designs.

For instance, when one directly compares two Vernon-themed battle fans held within the collection of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, this relatable, patriotic visual language is noticeably at the forefront of their compositions: the first fan, attributed to the London-based fan-maker Mary Gamble *c.* 1740, celebrates Vernon's much feted victory at Portobello, during which the admiral's fleet captured the Spanish naval base, an outpost deemed strategically important in the controlling of maritime trade in the Caribbean **[Fig: 3.34]**.[106] Gamble's composition places considerable stress upon the absoluteness of Vernon's triumph, as well as celebrating Britain's perceived success over Spanish mercantilism in the region more generally. Vernon himself is prominently featured on the left-hand side of the fan-leaf, graciously accepting the surrender of the Spanish governor of Portobello, a meeting which takes place beneath a British flag. Behind Vernon can be seen the wreckage of

---

[105] *NMM* OBJ0421 (A paper fan with ivory struts, printed with a hand coloured depiction of Vernon's victory at Portobello, 21 November 1739. Attributed to Francis Chassereau, 1740). For discussion of this fan see: Kathleen Wilson, 'Patriotism, Trade and Empire' in *Nelson, Navy & Nation: The Royal Navy & the British People, 1688-1815*, eds., Quintin Colville and James Davey (London: Conway, 2013), pp. 54-5. See also: James Davey, 'The Naval Hero and British National Identity 1707-1750' in *Maritime History and Identity: The Sea and Culture in the Modern World*, ed., Duncan Redford (London & New York: I.B. Tauris, 2014), pp. 13-37; Nicholas Rogers, 'From Vernon to Wolfe: Empire and Identity in the British Atlantic World of the Mid-Eighteenth Century' in *The Culture of the Seven Years' War: Empire, Identity, and the Arts in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World*, eds., Frans De Bruyn and Shaun Regan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), pp. 25-52.

[106] *CWF* 1981-195 (Woman's small folding fan with ivory sticks with painted and printed paper leaf, depicting the Battle of Portobello. The fan is signed 'M. Gamble', *c.* 1740).

the Spanish fortifications, beside which British sailors are shown rejoicing next to a red capped and coated grenadier guard, who beats a drum to communicate the Spanish surrender **[Fig: 3.34*a*]**. On the right-hand side of the fan-leaf can be observed a flood of Spanish merchants fleeing the area, their steeds and servants over-laden with salvaged commercial goods, only for a British lion to accost them in their attempt to escape **[Fig: 3.34*b*]**. The second fan, potentially manufactured in Lincolnshire in 1741, is far more subdued by comparison. While Gamble's battle fan of *c.*1740 is a riot of colour and pushes an overt, patriotic narrative upon the viewer, the later fan is constructed of a plainly-printed paper leaf mounted upon sticks of uncarved wood and bone. The scene depicted upon the fan-leaf documents the failure of the combined British and American naval forces to overcome the Spanish during the Battle of Cartagena in 1741 **[Fig: 3.35]**, which was blamed partially upon inclement weather and an outbreak of disease which had decimated the Anglo-American forces, rather than upon a lack of naval prowess on the part of Vernon.[107] In terms of both its simple colour pallet and subdued style, the second fan affects the look of a mid-century mourning fan, such as those manufactured following the death of Frederick, Prince of Wales in 1751 **[Fig: 3.36]**.[108] Each of these two battle fans, in their own manner, celebrates the apparent power of the British navy under Vernon's leadership and aims at communicating the national pride invested in his exploits on behalf of the empire by the British people, even when such exploits proved to be less than fruitful. Such fans were important propaganda tools in the hands of the British public in that they helped to shape the collective memory of Vernon's campaign against Spain during the War of Jenkin's Ear, much in the same way that the Vernon-themed ceramics which graced dinner tables and taverns across Britain or the Vernon-themed medals collected by British citizens acted as quotidian reminders of the nation's recent triumphs.[109]

---

[107] *CWF* 1985-109 (Folding fan with plain, uncarved bone and wooden sticks and a paper leaf with a map depicting the Battle of Cartagena, which occurred in 1741 between England and Spain over control of Spain's rich holdings in the Caribbean. Signed 'Spalding', *c.* 1741).

[108] *VAM* T.202-1959 (Mourning fan of painted vellum with gouache, mounted on ivory sticks and guards. British, *c.* 1751).

[109] Other examples of Vernon-themed commercial objects, besides fans, include commodities commonly associated with the domestic or associational space, particularly ceramics used at table or in taverns or medals collected or worn about the neck as a form of talisman: *VAM* 414:942-1885 (Mug

Battle fans depicting pro-Hanoverian interpretations of the military engagements of the '45 are seldom regarded by historians as useful primary sources for the study of emergent public memory and myth around the campaign. Rather, as a genre, battle fans produced during the post-'46 period of reprisal are generally subsumed within the 'commemorative' category of fan design and are thus regarded as purely documentary rather than potentially transformative objects.[110] A recent exception to this type of characterisation can be observed in the work of Danielle Thom. In her discussion of the popular use of the Duke of Cumberland's image in the construction of an 'anti-Jacobite visual strategy' in Britain *c.* 1745–6, Thom cites the Battle of Culloden fan held by the Victoria and Albert Museum as an example of the type of visual and material propaganda employed by Hanoverian supporters in the aftermath of the '45 as a method of delegitimising the Jacobite movement in the public space **[Fig: 3.37]**. Placing Cumberland's likeness in a position of power within the narrative of the fan design, argues Thom, allowed the object to function both as a site for 'fashionable display' and for the 'admiration of a popular heroic figure', while also enabling the possessor to express their 'anti-Jacobite views.'[111] Thom's characterisation of the Battle of Culloden fan in this manner is useful, as it recognises the potential of objects acting at the intersection of visual media and material culture to influence the public perception of an event through the strategic use of patriotic symbolism by their makers, in an object both highly portable and personal. As with Alexander's comparative study of the surviving Robert Strange fans, Thom's work is not exhaustive but does provide a research platform for further analysis of pro-Hanoverian battle fans as a patriotic sub-genre of political fan design.

---

of salt-glazed stoneware. Made in Staffordshire*, c.* 1740); *VAM* 414:984/&A-1885 (Teapot and cover of salt-glazed stoneware. Probably made in Burslem, *c.* 1740); *VAM* C.426-1915 (Dish of tin-glazed earthenware, painted, probably made by J. Flower, R. Frank, at Redcliff Back pottery, Redcliff Back, c. 1740); *NMM* MEC1037 (Brass medal commemorating Admiral Edward Vernon, featuring the capture of Porto Bello, 1739, and the attack upon Cartagena in 1741. British, after 1739).

[110] For instance, the inclusion of the Battle of Culloden fan within the chapter 'British Commemorative Fans' in the publication: Avril Hart and Emma Taylor, *Fans* (London: V&A Publications, 1998), pp. 72-5.

[111] Danielle Thom, ''William, the Princely Youth': The Duke of Cumberland and Anti-Jacobite Visual Strategy, 1745-6', *Visual Culture in Britain*, 16: 3 (2015), pp. 254-5.

The Siege of Stirling fan and the Battle of Culloden fan both blend elements of truth with traces of Hanoverian propaganda, contributing to the myth-making which surrounded the popular memory of the military defeat of Jacobitism in Britain. The scene depicted upon the Siege of Stirling fan, for instance, does reference events known to have occurred in the vicinity of Stirling in January–February 1746 **[Fig: 3.38]**. The substantial looting of the area by Jacobite soldiers and the accidental destruction of St Ninian's church by improperly stored gunpowder were events which did take place towards the end of the siege. However, the scene of surrender depicted in the left-hand corner of the fan-leaf is entirely fictitious, presumably incorporated so as to fix the impression of an overwhelming Hanoverian victory in the minds of those who saw it.[112] A similarly fictitious scene of surrender can be observed in the Battle of Culloden fan **[Fig: 3.37*a*]**, though the inclusion of red-coated infantrymen pursuing members of the retreating Jacobite forces across the Highland countryside may be regarded as accurate **[Figs: 3.38*b* & 3.38*c*]**.[113]

In contrast to the triumphal designs of pro-Hanoverian battle fans, Jacobite fans manufactured during the post-'46 period of reprisal were preoccupied with the fate of Charles Edward Stuart in his renewed state of exile and with managing the reputation of the Stuart Cause. Two designs, which can both be reliably dated to the mid-eighteenth-century period, express the continued loyalty felt among Jacobite adherents in Britain following the defeat at Culloden. However, instead of representing James Francis Edward Stuart as the *de jure* sovereign, as was the case in

---

[112] *SMAG* 20720 (Fan depicting the 'Siege of Stirling Castle'. Hand-coloured, printed paper with carved wooden sticks, *c*. 1746). If we also consider that the fan was manufactured to coincide with an event to bestow the freedom of the city upon the Duke of Cumberland in 1746, the propaganda purposes of this fan become even more apparent. I would like to thank the Stirling Museum & Art Gallery for providing such detailed information regarding the historical accuracy of this design via email correspondence, based on the research of museum staff (07/03/2017). For context on the Siege of Stirling, see: 'The Lost Victory: the Siege of Stirling Castle and the Advent of Cumberland, 18 January – 1 February 1746' (CH19) in Christopher Duffy, *Fight For a Throne: The Jacobite '45 Reconsidered* (Solihull: Helion & Company, 2015), pp. 357-64.

[113] *VAM* T.205-1959 (Fan depicting the 'Surrender of the Jacobite leaders to the Duke of Cumberland after the Battle of Culloden'. Hand-coloured, printed paper with wooden sticks. British, *c*. 1746). See in particular: Murray H. Pittock, *Culloden: Great Battles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

pre-'45 fans, these two designs further indicate that there had been a popular shift of Jacobite hopes in Britain from the father to his eldest son.

The first of the two designs was most likely executed during the 1750s, in either England or France **[Fig: 3.39]**.[114] Mounted on a support of red and white lacquered ivory, the fan-leaf depicts the Prince sporting his vaulted Highland persona, the origin of which was discussed in Chapter One. Dressed in a jacket, plaid and trews of chequered red and green tartan, a blue velvet bonnet, black brogues, and basket hilted broadsword, Charles's royal status is communicated via his garter star, sash and sceptre. He stands on the edge of a stretch of open water beside a bush of Scottish thistles, looking over his shoulder at a furtive British lion which stalks him from the rugged treeline **[Fig: 3.39*a*]**. Upon the verso of the fan is a tangle of thistles and a white rose **[Fig: 3.39*b*]**. The scene depicted upon the recto may be interpreted as a meditation on the Prince's flight from Scotland in the wake of the Culloden defeat, pursued by British government forces. That he carries with him the trappings of power 'over the water' to France is an indication of the popular hope vested in the idea of his eventual restoration to the British throne. That the white rose on the verso is in glorious full bloom denotes the notion that even in defeat, Jacobite loyalty to the bested Prince would remain strong and fruitful.

The second design pays tribute to the role of Charles Edward Stuart as a figurehead of multi-regional significance to the Jacobite movement, and may be reasonably dated to the 1760s **[Fig: 3.40]**.[115] In-keeping with the Prince's stance during the '45 campaign, visual signifiers of the House of Stuart's Scottish ancestry remain a prevalent aspect of the fan design. A profile portrait of Charles is contained within a gold roundel, flanked by winged putti. The Prince is shown dressed in armour, his garter star and sash, with an ermine-trimmed mantle lined with a bright multi-

---

[114] *FM* Alexander 1390 (Hand-painted paper fan. French or English, *c.* 1746). This fan was examined and photographed during a research visit to The Fan Museum in May 2015 and is featured here with the kind permission of the museum founder and director, Hélène Alexander.

[115] *NMS* H.1994.1052 (Hand-painted, paper fan mounted upon carved ivory guards and sticks, depicting Charles Edward Stuart as ruler of the Three Kingdoms of Great Britain, mid-eighteenth century). It should be noted that a similar fan is held by the Drambuie Collection and it currently on display at the Culloden Battle & Visitor Centre (National Trust for Scotland), see: Nicholson, *The Drambuie Collection* (1995), p. 10.

coloured tartan draped about his shoulders. The edge of the roundel is inscribed with the maxim: 'RETURN TO CAESAR THE THINGS THAT ARE CAESARS' [**Fig: 3.40***a*]. Beneath the princely image are spread the landmasses of the Three Kingdoms of Ireland, England, and Scotland. Upon each region is stood a female allegory, representative of each kingdom, complete with emblems of national significance. Ireland, arrayed in a blue gown and holding aloft a large palm frond, rests her arm upon a triangular Celtic harp [**Fig: 3.40***b*]. England, who wears a white gown and a blue shawl, treads upon a spear and shield bearing the King's Colours, lifting a crown towards the Prince in deference to his rightful claim to the British throne [**Fig: 3.40***c*]. Scotland, finally, sits beside a bush of thistles, sporting upon her head a feathered blue bonnet and with a tartan shawl streaming out behind her. The fanciful sett of the tartan shawl, coincidentally, matches that of the Prince, inferring their Scottish kinship [**Fig: 3.40***d*]. The verso of the fan bears a faithful representation of the north-front of St. James's Palace in London, the main residence of the monarchy in Britain and a building of great personal and political significance to the Stuart dynasty.[116] The bird of paradise seen flying above the palace, carries a ribbon inscribed 'My Home shall be Called the House of Prayer'. This is a direct reference to the biblical story of Jesus throwing the money lenders out of the temple in Jerusalem – much in the same way that Jacobite adherents wished to drive the Hanoverian dynasty from the seat of Stuart power [**Fig: 3.40***e*]. It is probable that this fan, which refers to Charles Edward Stuart under the moniker of 'CAESAR', dates to the post-1766 period, when the would-be-monarch adopted the title of Charles III upon the death of his father. This fan may be seen as representative of the last gasp of popular Jacobitism in material form, produced at a time when the charismatic figure once cut by Charles in the imaginations of his followers was slowly giving way to that of a drunken and depressed middle-aged man, struggling to make ends meet after the disbandment of the Stuart Court in Rome.[117]

---

[116] Charles I had slept in the palace the night before his execution in 1649, and all of the later Stuart monarchs – Charles II, James II, Mary II, and Anne – had been born within its walls. James Francis Edward Stuart had also been born there on 10 June 1688, shortly before the outbreak of the 'Glorious Revolution', with the palace itself becoming the centre of the infamous 'warming pan' controversy, which had questioned James' legitimacy and his mother's fertility.

[117] See: *NPG* 376 (Hugh Douglas Hamilton, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart', oil on canvas, *c.* 1785).

The transition of British Jacobitism from a viable political and military endeavour into one of untenable obscurity may be surmised by a further fan, held in the collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum. The fan leaf is another example attributed to the workmanship of Robert Strange, however it has been remounted and overpainted in the style of Neapolitan fans bought by pleasure-seeking Grand Tourists during the 1770s – a quaint souvenir of their time abroad, as opposed to a potent sartorial symbol of their Jacobite loyalties [Figs: 3.41 & 3.41*a*].[118]

Conclusion

The aim of this chapter has been to bring to the fore the various avenues of sartorial patriotism engaged in by Jacobite women during the mid-to-late eighteenth century, in order to provide a suitable contrast to the analysis of the male-dominated sartorial culture of military Jacobitism outlined in Chapter One and expanded upon in Chapter Two. It has also sought to outline the soft power of women as consumers of political ephemera during the long eighteenth century, and to place such objects within the lived experience of manufacturers and purchasers of topical wares.

While acknowledging that their absence from the explicit wording of the Disarming Act allowed female supporters of the Stuart Cause the freedom to indulge in the rebellious connotations of tartan during the post-'46 period of reprisal – as was discussed in Chapter Two – this chapter has shown that the subversive fabric was not the only form of sartorial patriotism open to Jacobite women living in Hanoverian Britain. Though undoubtedly the most recognisable and resonant of the outward trappings used to communicate Jacobite loyalty in the public space [Fig: 3.2], the wearing of tartan dress was in no way the sole method of sartorially expressing one's dynastic partisanship. For Elizabeth 'Beppy' Byrom of Manchester and Margaret Oliphant of Gask, for example, the subtle use of symbolic colour schemes and emblematic embroidery was at the forefront of their sartorial patriotism during the '45 campaign. The Burton family of York, by comparison, took a purple sprig calico associated with Charles Edward Stuart's flight across the Scottish Highlands as their inspiration to fashion an entirely new, highly secretive strand of Jacobite patriotic

---

[118] *VAM* T.204-1959 (Overpainted, printed paper fan attributed to Sir Robert Strange, made *c.* 1745 and altered during the later eighteenth century).

dress during the post-'46 period of reprisal. Unlike the obviousness of Jacobitised tartan, this method of sartorial resistance to Hanoverian authority could be appreciated only by those few aware of the textile relics retained by Bishop Robert Forbes for *The Lyon in Mourning* or those customers who patronised the business of Edinburgh-based tailor, Stewart Carmichael.

Although women's overdress was evidently manipulated by certain individuals to indicate their Stuart loyalties on specific occasions, this chapter has argued that it was actually objects contained with the intimate strand of fashionable accessory which arose as the dominant, everyday markers of sartorial patriotism among female supporters of the Stuart Cause in Britain during the mid-to-late eighteenth century. The acquisition of such objects was made possible by a marketplace already geared towards the production and sale of talismanic, patriotic wares, alongside the entrepreneurship of select manufacturers who recognised the lucrative potential of Jacobite consumers in want of a material connection with the exiled Stuarts. For a brief period following the defeat of the '45 campaign – predominantly during the later 1740s and early 1750s – small items of adornment associated with the female toilette, such as garter ribbons and pincushions, were wilfully Jacobitised by craftsmen to meet this burgeoning consumer demand.

Finally, in stark contrast to this world of Jacobite goods, it was shown how a counter-culture of pro-Hanoverian wares also emerged during this period to meet the need to celebrate the defeat of military Jacobitism and the safe-guarding of the British throne for George II and his descendants. By conducting a survey of pro-Jacobite and pro-Hanoverian patriotic fans produced before and after the '45 campaign, the concluding section of this chapter has successfully demonstrated how the iconography of contested nationhood found its way into spaces of fashionable sociability and – thereby – refashioned the popular memory of the last Jacobite defeat to reflect the doubtful future of the Stuart Cause in Britain which, by the end of the eighteenth century, had all but disappeared into obscurity.

PART TWO – The American Revolution

Liberty Cloth and the Patriot Cause: The Commercial Politics of Homespun in Revolutionary America

In 1770, John Beale Bordley, a wealthy tobacco planter and county judge from the colony of Maryland, commissioned a full-length portrait of himself from aspiring artist and close friend, Charles Willson Peale **[Fig. 4.1]**.[1] The men had studied together in their youth, and when Peale travelled to Britain in 1767 to hone his skills under noted Anglo-American portraitist and history painter Benjamin West, his trip was partially funded by Bordley. The resulting portrait was one of Peale's earliest commissions upon his return to the British North American colonies and it exemplifies the painter's particular skill of accommodating the visual language of Whig politics within the composition of his artistic works. This was particularly true in regard to his symbolic use of sartorial culture in the visual definition of the political characters of his sitters. In the case of the Bordley portrait, this can be seen in Peale's depiction of the emergent Republican ideology of homespun patriotism in his sitter's choice of attire.[2]

The wholesome aesthetic adopted by Peale in his representation of Bordley seeks to sentimentalise the natural landscape of colonial Maryland, while also rationalising the industrialising presence of colonial elites within it. Bordley's purpose in the landscape, as clearly demonstrated by the flocks of sheep grazing on the verdant grasslands stretching out behind him, is to harness the commercial potential of the landscape under his stewardship and to turn it to good use by his investment in a sustainable model of colonial agriculture. By carefully cultivating his land and

---

[1] *NGA* 1984.2.1 (Charles Willson Peale, 'John Beale Bordley', oil on canvas, c. 1770).

[2] Ellen G. Miles, 'Charles Willson Peale, 1741-1827' in *American Paintings of the Eighteenth Century: The Collections of the National Gallery of Art,* ed. Ellen G. Miles (Washington & New York: National Gallery of Art & Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 112; Peale has also been noted for his symbolic use of dress and material culture in portraits of American Quakers resident in Philadelphia at mid-century: Dianne C. Johnson, 'Living in the Light: Quakerism and Colonial Portraiture' in *Quaker Aesthetics: Reflections on a Quaker Ethic in American Design and Consumption*, eds. Emma Jones Lapsansky and Anne A. Verplanck (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), pp. 138-40.

nurturing his livestock, Bordley is shown to have created a profitable enterprise, allowing him to be personally and commercially self-sufficient within the British Atlantic region. This was a significant achievement given that Bordley's actions were performed at a time when the British government were actively trying to prevent the large-scale production of finished goods by Anglo-American artisans and agriculturalists resident in the colonies, in order that British merchants could maintain their long-standing monopoly upon the import of necessary and luxury goods into colonial ports. As discussed by Amelia Peck, the obvious advantages of this tightly-controlled system for the mother country 'included the receipt of raw goods such as wood, fur pelts, fish, and tobacco from the colonies', while the colonists themselves were essentially a 'captive audience for British manufactured products.'[3] Bordley's suit is testament to his accomplishment in this rigid system of imperial exchange, the inference being that the fine brown broadcloth of his coat, waistcoat, and breeches was woven and tailored for him using wool shorn from his own sheep and not from wool imported from England. Save for the ornate buckles adorning his shoes and the knee-straps of his breeches – both sartorial indicators of his affluent social status – he is free from the taint of British imported finery.[4] The subject's staunchly Republican, homespun attire is made all the more significant in Peale's composition by the inclusion of a red-coated British customs officer in the background of the painting, shown covertly leading a steed away from Bordley's property, over-burdened with the officer's ill-gotten gains. A shredded declaration of colonial rights lies trodden into the dirt at Bordley's feet, while a twist of poisonous

---

[3] Amelia Peck, '"*India Chints*" and "*China Taffaty*": East India Company Textiles for the North American Market' in *Interwoven Globe; The Worldwide Textile Trade, 1500-1800*, ed. Amelia Peck (New Haven & New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art & Yale University Press, 2013), p. 105. On the transatlantic system of imperial exchange, as related to dress and textiles specifically, see also: Robert S. DuPlessis, *The Material Atlantic: Clothing, Commerce, and Colonization in the Atlantic World, 1650-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016). On the role of transatlantic, imperial consumerism in the driving of revolutionary change in colonial America, see: T. H. Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

[4] Silver buckles were an indicator of wealth most often worn as accessories by the professional, landed, and merchant classes in colonial America (much the same as in Britain): Kathleen A. Staples and Madelyn Shaw, *Clothing Through American History: The British Colonial Era* (Santa Barbara: Greenwood, 2013), p. 353.

174

jimsonweed is seen crawling up the base of an allegorical statue of British Liberty, which stands sentinel on Bordley's right. Bordley points meaningfully to this worrying encroachment upon the statue, communicating an implicit warning through the stern set of his gaze and posture, then also being espoused by the radical Sons of Liberty: 'Don't tread on me.'[5]

It is no coincidence that Peale's portrait of Bordley was devised and executed *c.* 1770, the commission emerging at the very height of the Imperial Crisis in the British North American colonies.[6] It was during this period that tensions between the thirteen colonies and the British government were coming to a breaking point, as the result of Westminster's recent imposition of a series of unpopular taxes upon colonial trade and consumption, which included the Sugar Act of 1764, the Stamp Act of 1765, and the thoroughly divisive Townshend Duties of 1767 **[Fig: 4.2]**.[7] In a bid to have these taxes repealed and, by extension, to force the British government to allow colonial citizens a greater degree of autonomy within the British empire on a par with the rights of native residents of the British Isles, political actors across the thirteen colonies instigated a protest-culture of Non-Importation rhetoric and homespun patriotism. Mostly executed and enforced during the later 1760s and early 1770s, Non-Importation agreements penned in each of the thirteen colonies called for the boycott of British goods by the colonial populous and demanded that local communities exert economic and social pressures upon any colonial merchant or consumer who continued to indulge in British goods while the agreements were in

---

[5] For a full and thoughtful analysis of the homespun symbolism in Peale's 'Bordley' portrait, see: David C. Ward, *Charles Willson Peale: Art and Selfhood in the Early Republic* (Berkley & London: University of California Press, 2004), pp. 39-43; On the significance of the 'Don't Tread on Me' ideology in the politics of Revolutionary America, see: Alfred F. Young, *Liberty Tree: Ordinary People and the American Revolution* (New York & London: New York University Press, 2006), p. 354.

[6] The following compiled with reference to histories of the Imperial Crisis and popular protests of the Revolutionary era, outlined in: Edward G. Gray and Jane Kamensky, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the American Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Francis D. Cogliano, *Revolutionary America, 1763-1815: A Political History*, 2nd edn (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 49-76.

[7] *BM* 1868,0808.10059 (Anon., 'The able doctor, or America swallowing the bitter draught', line engraving on paper, 1774).

effect. Violent acts of coercion, such as tarring and feathering, came to characterise the underlying mob culture associated with Non-Importation protests **[Fig: 4.3]**. Meanwhile, the wearing of homespun garments and the domestic manufacturing of silk, wool, and linen came to characterise civil demonstrations of support across spaces of polite colonial society, the garb employed by advocates of colonial liberty as an emblematic, sartorial marker of their resistance to 'taxation without representation.'[8] The combination of Non-Importation rhetoric and the active support of domestic textile manufacturing initiatives within colonial communities came to be considered by many Patriots as a viable weapon of 'economic coercion' during the tenure of the Imperial Crisis. If the offending acts were not repealed, it was reasoned, 'the colonies would paralyze the British economic system by starving the English manufacturers' of their choice clientele.[9]

However, in spite of the implications contained within the name, the popular movement of Non-Importation did not in fact translate into a widespread trend of non-consumption during the Revolutionary period – that is, the total rejection of the transatlantic 'world of goods'.[10] Rather, as this chapter shall address, the Non-Importation agreements prompted the conscious refashioning of the character of patriotic consumption within the confines of the North American colonies, which was driven, shaped and maintained by the evolving political convictions of the Patriot Cause for American Independence. As exemplified by the actions of Bordley and Peale, instead of 'buying British' the impetus was to 'buy American' and to conspicuously support American manufacturing as a matter of emergent national pride as the Imperial Crisis developed into the Revolutionary War and, finally, into the founding of the American Republic.

---

[8] *BM* 1935,0522.2.120.c (Carington Bowles, 'A New Method of Macarony Making, as Practised at Boston in North America', hand-coloured mezzotint, 1774).

[9] Lawrence A. Peskin, *Manufacturing Revolution: The Intellectual Origins of Early American Industry* (Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), pp. 33-9, p. 36.

[10] On the 'world of goods', see: John Brewer and Roy Porter, eds., *Consumption and the World of Goods* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 1993); Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello, eds., *The Global Lives of Things: The Material Culture of Connections in the Early Modern World* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2016).

The charged rhetoric and public spectacles of homespun patriotism associated with the Non-Importation movement represents the most extreme and the most explicit manifestation of sartorial patriotism during the American Revolutionary period and, as this chapter shall demonstrate, arguably had a direct bearing upon the elevation of homespun to the dual-pedestal of patriotic commodity and political mindset within the early decades of independent American statehood. The homespun vision expressed within Bordley's portrait was realised (at least on a personal level) in the formative decades of America's independence. After the Revolutionary War had come to a close and the new nation was formally recognised by the international community in 1783, Bordley would establish several prosperous farmsteads in the state of Philadelphia, as well as become a noted founder of one of the first agricultural societies of the early American Republic. Bordley's actions in the aftermath of the war may be regarded as a reflection of the wider, concerted effort made by a number of US citizens in the early American Republic to make the homespun patriotism fostered during the Imperial Crisis a cogent, economic reality.[11] However, the vision of a homespun Republic pursued by early American industrialists such as Bordley would not be implemented on a truly national scale until well into the first half of the nineteenth century, when the physical infrastructure for domestic textile manufacturing in America had matured to the extent that the work of American artisans and agriculturalists could compete with the sheer quantity, quality and appeal of British manufactures.[12]

---

[11] Bordley's activities, contextualised, as well as the subject of economic nationalism through agricultural initiatives is covered by the following: Manuela Albertone, 'The American Agricultural Societies and the Making of the New Republic, 1785-1830' in *The Rise of Economic Societies in the Eighteenth Century: Patriotic Reform in Europe and North America*, eds. Koen Stapelbroek and Jani Marjanen (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2012), pp. 339-69; Peter D. McClelland, *Sowing Modernity: America's First Agricultural Revolution* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997).

[12] On the building of a viable infrastructure for early American textile production, see in particular: Ulrich, *The Age of Homespun* (2001); Zakim, *Ready-Made Democracy* (2006); Paul E. Rivard, *A New Order of Things: How the Textile Industry Transformed New England* (Hanover & London: University Press of New England, 2002); Adrienne D. Wood, *The Weaver's Craft: Cloth, Commerce, and Industry in Early Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003); Gail Fowler Mohanty, *Labor and Laborers of the Loom: Mechanization and Handloom Weavers, 1780-1840* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2006).

With the advent of peacetime in the mid-1780s, British imports had once again begun their steady flow into America's port cities, to the delectation and delight of a war-weary populous who found that the quality of American manufactures paled in comparison to the stylish fashion accessories and fine fabrics of European and Asian origin.[13] However, even as American artisans and politicians struggled to produce and promote domestic textiles among the 'citizen consumers' of the new United States, homespun remained a feted sartorial emblem of the country's newfound separateness from Britain.[14] Even to the present day, the homespun culture of colonial resistance continues to occupy a significant space within popular perceptions of the Revolutionary War and early Republican period, with ancestral homespun forming a noteworthy branch of America's curated history and of 'the nation's mythology' as a whole **[Fig: 4.4]**.[15] As shall be made plain in the following discussion, while the fashionability of homespun was only variously entertained within the early American Republic, the memory of the Revolutionary generation's engagement with homespun patriotism exerted considerable influence upon the material refashioning of patriotic display culture in Independent America.[16]

The aim of this chapter is to trace how homespun cloth became a recognised and respected symbol of emergent Republican nationhood during the American Revolutionary period, *c.* 1763–1815. The first section of this discussion shall contextualise the initial elevation of homespun as an emblematic marker of sartorial

---

[13] See in particular: Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution* (2004); Haulman, *The Politics of Fashion in Eighteenth-century America* (2011); Jonathan Eacott, *Selling Empire: India in the Making of Britain and America, 1600-1830* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2016).

[14] On the use of the term 'citizen consumers' in this context, see: Joanna Cohen, *Luxurious Citizens: The Politics of Consumption in Nineteenth-Century America* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017).

[15] Baumgarten, *What Clothes Reveal* (2002), p. 75. See also: Ulrich, *The Age of Homespun* (2001). The collection of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, DC, for example, holds numerous examples of ancestral homespun, collected and saved for posterity as a form of patriotic heritage. These holdings include woven textiles as well as unspun flax: *DARM* 1116 (Flax tow, late eighteenth century. Raised by the Holden family in Griswold, VT).

[16] This line of enquiry, while addressed in this chapter, shall also be expanded on more thoroughly in Chapters Five and Six in relation to the use of printed patriotic textiles in post-Revolutionary American homes and of the ultimate realisation of homespun politics in the wake of the Marquis de Lafayette's Farewell Tour of America in 1824–5.

resistance to British imperial oversight during the 1760s–70s, concentrating upon how its high-profile adoption by the colonial elite had made it an attractive patriotic commodity throughout much of the colonies by the beginning of the Revolutionary War in 1775. It shall then be demonstrated how patriotic acts of homespun became a noted part of the lived experience of colonial consumers, manufacturers and merchants because of the privations caused by Non-Importation and by the upheavals of the Revolutionary War years, the effect being that homespun commodities came to be regarded as a suitable alternative to British imports, as well as a source of morale, during times of transatlantic conflict. It shall further be considered how homespun dress and displays of early industrial textile production were employed as propaganda tools by proponents of economic nationalism during the fledgling decades of the new nation – with varying degrees of success – following the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1783. This penultimate section shall foreground the complex experience of American consumers from the mid-1780s to the early nineteenth century, when their desire for goods of British quality and fashionability in peacetime often overrode the Revolutionary rhetoric of domestic self-sufficiency, covered in more detail in Chapters Five and Six.[17] Finally, the resurgence of homespun rhetoric and of homespun patriotic displays in the wake of the Embargo Act of 1807 and in the lead-up to the subsequent War of 1812 shall be outlined, with the aim of demonstrating that homespun patriotism was at its most prevalent and effective in early American patriotic display culture when the nation found itself in direct opposition to Hanoverian Britain.

Non-Importation Rhetoric and Elite Spectacles of Homespun

That colonial elites such as Bordley were the ones publicly espousing the virtues of American-made homespun as a suitably fashionable, patriotic commodity for broader colonial consumption during the Imperial Crisis was arguably the most transformative element in the elevation of homespun from a common, earthly necessity to a sartorial distinguisher of national pride by the outbreak of the Revolutionary War in 1775.[18] A major consequence of the Non-Importation rhetoric

---

[17] This section shall significantly shape the continuing discussion of early American patriotic identity and the refashioning of transatlantic consumption covered by Chapters Five and Six.

[18] Auslander, *Cultural Revolutions* (2009), pp. 87-90.

of the 1760s–70s was the advent of a form of patriotic, conspicuous consumption that redefined colonial estimations of fashionability, which until this point had been almost wholly influenced by European styles and fabrics of European or Asian manufacture.[19] Homespun was made appealing to the colonial populous at large primarily by its association with the elite body and its amalgamation into elite social practices, such as the wearing of homespun attire at university graduations and subscription balls, which were events publicly attended by the upper echelons of American society and which were therefore a subject of considerable interest for the colonial press. As discussed by Katie Haulman in her analysis of the political economy of American Revolutionary fashion:

> In the hands of colonial resisters, the renunciation of fashion and embrace of homespun relied on much the same forms of social order as did the adoption of *la mode* – ones in which elite men and women performed for one another and then set the *ton* for others.[20]

As elite colonial women were considered to be the chief consumers of British imports at the time of the Imperial Crisis, especially of imported teas and dress fabrics conveyed by the merchant vessels of the British East India Company **[Fig: 4.5]**, their support for Non-Importation agreements was regarded as essential to their ultimate success by the political actors who penned them.[21] In particular, the role of women as producers of the raw material of homespun was seen as central to both the longevity and the respectability of the movement.[22] For Non-Importation agreements

---

[19] As covered by Baumgarten in her study of clothing culture in colonial and Federal America: Baumgarten, *What Clothes Reveal* (2002), pp. 76-105.

[20] Haulman, *The Politics of Fashion in Eighteenth-century America* (2011), p. 83.

[21] *BM* 2010,7081.3247 (R. Sayer and J. Bennet, 'A Society of Patriotic Ladies at Edenton in North Carolina', hand-coloured mezzotint, 1775). On the importance of tea abstention during the Imperial Crisis, see: Jane T. Merritt, *The Trouble with Tea: The Politics of Consumption in the Eighteenth-Century Global Economy* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017).

[22] Much has been written regarding women's performative and organisational roles in Non-Importation and Revolutionary political culture. See in particular: Mary Beth Norton, *Liberty's Daughters: The Revolutionary Experience of American Women, 1750-1800* (Boston, MA: Little Brown, 1980), pp. 156-70; Rosemarie Zagarri, *Revolutionary Backlash: Women and Politics in the Early American Republic* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); Ellen Hartigan-O'Connor*, The Ties That Buy: Women and Commerce in Revolutionary America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

to hold firm in the face of parliamentary pressure from the mother country, domestically-woven textiles had to be readily available in order to make up for the shortfall created by the colonial abstention from imported yardage – or, at the very least, this impression had to be given for the wider purpose of morale in the Patriot Cause.[23] A consequence of the desire for female sponsorship was that the organisation of public spinning bees and the performance of private labour by elite colonial women fast became a hallmark of female participation in the enactment of Non-Importation rhetoric.

Before the advent of the Imperial Crisis the undertaking of spinning cloth was considered by many American women 'a common and often tedious task', particularly when set against the vast array of ready-made fabrics available to them in every shade and weave via the system of transatlantic trade operating upon their doorsteps.[24] However, the Non-Importation movement and its associated rhetoric of domestic self-sufficiency transformed this most mundane and potentially isolating of household duties into a form of convivial, patriotic performance across both the public and private spaces of colonial society. This can be seen particularly in the activities of northern women – such as those who lived in the Non-Importation hotbed of Boston – whose participation in large-scale spinning bees provided them with an avenue of patriotic resistance on a par with throwing crates of imported tea into colonial harbors.[25] However, as recently suggested by Ulrich, whereas the willful destruction of British merchant goods was regarded by some political actors as disruptive to the point of anarchy, the sight of elite colonial women engaged in the industrious pursuit of communal spinning was posited by commentators as a moral,

---

[23] On the perceived importance of female 'industry' and the drive by colonial newspapers to politicise the household economy during the Imperial Crisis, see: Ray Raphael, *A People's History of the American Revolution: How Common People Shaped the Fight for Independence* (New York: Perennial, 2002), pp. 135-6.

[24] Merril D. Smith, *Women's Roles in Eighteenth-Century America* (Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood, 2010), p. 110.

[25] On the symbolic importance of the Boston Tea Party to the American Independence movement, see: Benjamin L. Corp, *Defiance of the Patriots: The Boston Tea Party and the Making of America* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2010); Alfred F. Young, *The Shoemaker and the Tea Party: Memory and the American Revolution* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1999). See also: Joseph Cummins, *Ten Tea Parties: Patriotic Protests That History Forgot* (Philadelphia, PA: Quirk Books, 2012).

stabilising force within the much fraught Non-Importation movement.[26] This was especially true in the regions of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Long Island, where the so-called 'Daughters of Liberty' were noted to gather in large numbers at the homes of their religious ministers to spend a companionable day spinning flax before crowds of interested spectators. The atmosphere of these public meetings was most often described as congenial, sometimes competitive, with the patriotic spinners engaging in 'enlightening conversation' as they worked the wheels, stopping only to eat American produce and to conspicuously drink cups of local, herbal tea.[27]

By comparison, the spinning activities engaged in by elite women in the southern colonies during the Imperial Crisis were performed far less openly and with decidedly less emphasis upon the power of female companionship. As discussed by Cynthia Kiemer, the difference between northern and southern participation in patriotic homespun production was dictated by the physical contrasts inherent within the disparate landscapes of the thirteen colonies. While northern women who lived in towns or upon family farms found it easy to participate in large-scale communal spinning bees alongside their female friends and neighbours, southern women conducted the majority of their spinning and weaving pursuits on isolated farmsteads and plantations, which were usually situated miles away from family and friends. 'Unlike northern women', states Kiemer, 'who publicly presented the fruits of their collective labor to local committees and officials, southern women toiled in obscurity.'[28] While the more private nature of southern women's homespun industry tended to preclude it from the attention of the colonial press, it was hardly insignificant. In fact, as shall be shown in the following section of this chapter, such understated accommodation of patriotic homespun culture into the everyday lives of

---

[26] Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, 'Political Protest and the World of Goods', in *The Oxford Handbook of the American Revolution* (2013), p. 74.

[27] For a discussion of the various bees, of the public reaction to them, as well as the political agency afforded to those women who participated, see: Norton, *Liberty's Daughters* (1980), pp. 166-7. Also, on the emergence of spinning 'matches' alongside more conventional 'demonstrations' of homespun patriotism facilitated by the American ministry at this time, during which female attendees competed to produce the best species of homespun, see: Ulrich, *The Age of Homespun* (2001), pp. 177-84.

[28] Cynthia A. Kiemer, *Beyond the Household: Women's Place in the Early South, 1700-1835* (Ithaca, NY: Cornel University Press, 1998), p. 76.

southern women arguably lent the Non-Importation movement greater legitimacy in the long term.

The engagement of elite colonial women with spectacles of homespun patriotism often saw the 'rude' fabric making inroads into the performative spaces of upper-class sociability, such as were most common in America's port cities or colonial capitals. Alongside the much-touted spinning bees, the most famous of these instances to appear in the colonial press occurred at a ball in Williamsburg, Virginia on 13 December 1769. The ball had been financed by the recently prorogued House of Burgesses, ostensibly to honour the imperial governor Norborne Berkley, 4th Baron de Botetourt. On 11 May 1769, Governor Boteourt had been forced to officially dissolve the House of Burgesses at Williamsburg for their impertinence in addressing their disapproval of the Townsend Duties in writing, directly to George III. In response to this, the prorogued burgesses had immediately retired to the Apollo Room of Hay's Raleigh Tavern in Williamsburg, where they had signed an agreement presented by George Washington and drafted by George Mason, calling for Non-Importation to be imposed in Virginia until the repeal of the Townsend Acts.[29] However, in spite of this fundamental disagreement between Botetourt and the burgesses, the governor remained a highly respected figure within Virginian society and was known to show sympathy, unofficially, for the difficult position that the colonists found themselves in. In private, he predicted that the British parliament would repeal the offending taxes due to the sustained colonial protests they had inspired. However, as the official representative of British authority in Virginia he was obliged to tow the Loyalist line in the public performance of his duties.[30] The decision of the prorogued burgesses to host a ball in honour of Governor Botetourt may have been in recognition of his popularity, as well as a show of tacit respect for his private appreciation of the burgesses' viewpoint in the transatlantic dispute. Whatever the motivation, the ball proved a perfect stage upon which the sartorial politics of homespun patriotism could be performed by supporters of the freshly

---

[29] David Lee Russell, *The American Revolution in the Southern Colonies* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000), pp. 40-1.

[30] See overview of incident in: Barbara Carson, *The Governor's Palace: The Williamsburg Residence of Virginia's Royal Governor* (Williamsburg, VA: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1978), p. 16.

penned Non-Importation agreement. As reported in the *Virginia Gazette* on 14 December 1769, in the immediate aftermath of the ball:

> [I]t is with the greatest pleasure we inform our readers that the same patriotic spirit which gave rise to the association of the Gentlemen on a late event, was most agreeably manifest in the dress of the Ladies on this occasion, who, to the number of near one hundred, appeared in homespun gowns; a lively and striking instance of their acquiescence and concurrence in whatever may be the true and essential interest of their country. It were to be wished that all assemblies of American Ladies would exhibit a like example of public virtue and private economy, so amiably united.[31]

The appearance at the Williamsburg ball of so many elite Virginian women purposefully sporting homespun attire was clearly a carefully orchestrated affair. This collective, premeditated act of sartorial resistance was meant as an unequivocal demonstration of their support for the position of the burgesses and of the newly formed Virginia Association. It may also be regarded as a rebuke of those colonial elite in attendance at the ball who had refused to adhere to the edicts of Non-Importation, wrapped up within this deliberate snub against Governor Boteourt's decision not to publicly support the collective will of the burgesses.

A similar incident of sartorial resistance can be observed in the actions of the elite colonial women of Charleston, South Carolina in the spring of 1781. As described by British army officer Frank Moore in his diary of the Revolutionary War, at a public assembly in May 1781 the women of Charleston treated the British officers billeted amongst them with the utmost contempt. Their disapproval was evident, stated Moore, not only in their behavior towards the gentlemen soldiers, but also in their choice of dress:

> …the women are seldom or never to be persuaded to dance. Even in their dresses the females seem to bid us defiance; the gay toys which are imported here they despise; they wear their own homespun manufactures, and take care to have in their breast knots, and even on their shoes something that resembles their flag of the thirteen stripes. An officer told Lord Cornwallis not long ago, that

---

[31] *The Virginia Gazette* (14 December 1769).

> he believed if he had destroyed all the men in North America, we
> should have enough to do to conquer the women. I am heartily tired
> of this country, and wish myself at home.[32]

The public engagement of elite colonial women in spectacles of Non-Importation and domestic manufacturing initiatives during the Imperial Crisis did not simply call for the donning of American-made dress at subscription balls or for the stage-managed production of homespun cloth at communal spinning bees. It also called for an overt attitude of thrift and reuse in regard to their pre-Revolutionary clothing, such as those garments constructed of British and East India Company fabrics imported prior to the commencement of the Non-Importation agreements.[33] In other words, upper-class American women had to be prepared to 'make do and mend' to further the success of the Patriot Cause. As shall be discussed in more detail in Chapter Five in relation to the provision of plate-printed patriotic textiles in the households of the American Republic, the recycling and re-gifting of textile yardage and the refashioning of older styles of dress for reasons of good economy was already a prominent aspect of early modern sartorial culture in the British Atlantic region by the 1760s–70s, but during the era of the American Revolution the practice took on a greater political significance in the isolated, colonial landscape.[34] The rhetoric of Non-Importation – and later, the considerable privations caused by the Revolutionary War itself – required that a greater level of care and consideration be taken over the maintenance of one's wardrobe and of the decoration of one's domestic space. Refashioning and re-use were deemed eminently patriotic pursuits in this context, especially if the act of refashioning involved incorporating homespun in lieu of or alongside old-style imported fabrics. An overt example of this trend of

---

[32] Frank Moore, *Diary of the American Revolution. From Newspapers and Original Documents* (New York, 1858), II, p. 430.

[33] Linda A. Kerber, *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1980), p. 38.

[34] Ariane Fennetaux, 'Sentimental Economies: Recycling Textiles in Eighteenth-century Britain' in *The Afterlife of Used Things: Recycling in the Long Eighteenth Century*, eds. Ariane Fennetaux, Amélie Junqua and Sophie Vasset (London & New York: Routledge, 2015), pp. 121-41; Miles Lambert, '"Small Presents Confirm Friendship": the 'Gifting' of Clothing and Textiles in England from the Late Seventeenth to the Early Nineteenth Centuries', *Text: For the Study of Textile Art, Design and History*, Vol. 32 (2004/5), pp. 24-32.

patriotic recycling during the term of the Imperial Crisis, and of the ideological reasoning which underpinned it, has been provided by the research of Laurel Thatcher Ulrich: 'In Sutherland, Massachusetts, a lady of fashion made and quilted a petticoat from remnants in her scrapbag, patching together forty-five pieces for the outside and ninety-two for the lining. With such efforts, surely Parliament would relent.'[35]

This drive to proactively and prominently recycle the trappings of the Old world for the security of the New can be observed across a number of surviving sartorial objects dating from the American Revolutionary period. A quilt currently in the collection of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, for example, represents a fine example of domestic textile recycling performed by a New England family *c.* 1765–85 [**Fig: 4.6**].[36] The backing of the quilt is constructed from a variety of scrap fabrics, both imported and homespun, including swatches of plain brown silk, bleached and blue wool, and a blue and white striped wool [**Fig: 4.6*a***]. The quilt top, meanwhile, consists of a pieced central panel of glazed indigo worsted, overworked with a floral pattern of crewel embroidery. This central panel was potentially a former set of bed hangings, given the style of the decoration. Around this central panel are quilted lengths of glazed pink worsted, likely taken from an imported bedcover [**Fig: 4.6*b***].[37] Again from the collection of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation can be found an example of bed furniture refashioned into good quality daywear: a quilted petticoat, belonging to a Quaker woman from Pennsylvania [**Fig: 4.7**].[38] Dating to approximately *c.* 1750–70, the petticoat is constructed from an old

---

[35] Cited by Ulrich, *The Age of Homespun* (2001), p. 177.

[36] *CWF* 1974-193 (Quilt, constructed from a variety of recycled materials. American, probably New England, *c.* 1765-85).

[37] Two quilts, one held by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and the other by the American Museum in Bath, England, may be favourably compared to the style of the quilted lengths of glazed pink worsted used in the recycled bed cover: *CWF* 1952-204, 1 (Quilt, pink worsted whole cloth. American, probably New England, *c*. 1750-1800); *American Museum* 2004.22 (Pink whole-cloth quilt, *c*. 1760-80). See: Laura Beresford and Katherine Hebert, *Classic Quilts from The American Museum in Britain* (London: Scala, 2009), p. 20.

[38] *CWF* 2005-299 (Petticoat made from bed quilt, *c*. 1750-70). According to the curator's comments, the pattern upon the petticoat closely resembles patterns used on bed quilts and quilted petticoats

bed cover of quilted, pale blue Chinese silk, backed with a glazed indigo wool **[Fig: 4.7a]**. The quilted pattern along the hem of the petticoat, which showcases a design of fat vases and scrolling flowers, would have formed a panel of the original bed cover and serves as an interesting decorative feature of the garment **[Fig: 4.7b].** Given the period to which both the silk and the petticoat can be reliably dated, it would not be at all unreasonable to suggest that the re-use of the bedcover in this manner was in response to the edict of patriotic frugality then being publicly pushed by proponents of Non-Importation. While the fabric itself is not the product of American industry, the reuse of an old imported material in this manner would have been an eminently acceptable alternative to purchasing something new. This practice of patriotic frugality fostered during wartime was continued by elite colonial women during the early decades of the American Republic, such as by Martha Washington during her tenure as First Lady and by her female descendants. For instance, at least two sewing cases constructed from remnants of Martha Washington's early gowns survive in museum collections today **[Figs: 4.8 & 4.9]**.[39]

While female participation in the patriotic performance of Non-Importation was highly sought after, elite spectacles of homespun were not the exclusive domain of upper-class women during the Imperial Crisis and Revolutionary War years. Elite men, the major authors of the Non-Importation agreements, also had their parts to play. In 1768–9, for instance, graduating seniors at the prestigious institutions of Harvard and Yale made a show of appearing in clothing of American-manufacture in open support of the Non-Importation rhetoric then pervading the political landscape of the colonies.[40] However, this male-orientated trend of elite homespun spectacle was not the preserve of the more well-established seats of higher learning in British North America. The same practice can be observed at the commencement ceremony

---

made by the Philadelphia Quaker community during this period. For comparison, see: *CWF* 2017-315 (Quilted petticoat, *c.* 1750-70).

[39] *MV* W-588 (Sewing case, *c.* 1800-40); *CWF* 1971-1419 (Sewing case made from Martha Washington's gowns, *c.* 1800). A note of provenance included with the *CWF* example indicates that the gowns were worn by Washington during her time at the White House, while further research has assigned a date range of 1760 to 1800 for the silks used in the construction of the sewing case.

[40] Zakim, *Ready-Made Democracy* (2003), p. 12; Auslander, *Cultural Revolutions* (2009), pp. 87-8; Barbara Clark Smith, *The Freedoms We Lost: Consent and Resistance in Revolutionary America* (New York & London: The New Press, 2010), p. 98, p. 101.

for the first graduating class of the newly-established College of Rhode Island in the town of Warren in 1769, where it was noted that: 'Not only the candidates, but even the President, were dressed in American manufactures.'[41] Meanwhile, at the College of New Jersey in Princeton 'the new collegiate look' of patriotic homespun attire had become so ubiquitous among the school's graduating classes during the years of the Imperial Crisis that it was considered practically mandatory by 1770.[42]

The graduating seniors at Yale did not confine their use of homespun spectacle to the enclosed spaces of collegiate ceremony. They also extended their convictions into the public sphere of popular print, placing an advertisement in a local newspaper which proclaimed their resolution and boldly requested the participation of New Haven society in the forwarding of the Patriot Cause by asking them to supply the class with the necessary articles of homespun dress for the ceremony:

> The Senior Class in Yale-College have unanimously agreed to make their Appearance at the next public Commencement, when they are to take their first Degree, wholly dressed in the manufactures of our own Country: And desire this public Notice may be given of their Resolution, that so their Parents and Friends may have sufficient Time to be providing Homespun Cloaths for them, that none of them may be obliged to the hard Necessity of unfashionable Singularity, by wearing imported Cloth.[43]

However, as discussed by Louis Leonard Tucker in his history of Yale, this 'unanimous' proclamation was not wholly subscribed to and did not, in fact, deliver all that was promised. At least three or four seniors of the Yale contingent of 1769 were not in sympathy with the proposed action, but their objections were overridden by the enthusiasm shown by the majority of their classmates who came out in support of the action. Furthermore, not all of the graduating seniors who committed to participation in the spectacle were able to procure a full suit of homespun clothes

---

[41] *Providence Gazette and Country Journal* (9 September 1769). Quoted in: Josiah P. Tustin, *A Discourse Delivered at the Dedication of the New Church Edifice of the Baptist Church and Society, in Warren, R. I.* (Providence RI, 1845), p. 181.

[42] Willis Rudy, *The Campus and a Nation in Crisis: From the American Revolution to Vietnam* (London: Associated University Presses, 1996), p. 6.

[43] The statement appeared within an issue of the *New Haven* newspaper in 1769. Quoted in: Brooks Mather Kelley, *Yale: A History* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1999), p. 83.

and were obliged, after all, to wear the English fashion when they took their degrees.[44] As was noted by one of the scholars in attendance, 'we were put to some difficulty to obtain all the articles of American manufacture' though those which managed the feat found themselves '[i]nspired with a patriotic spirit' and 'took pride in our plain coarse republican dress, and were applauded by the friends of Liberty.'[45]

Alongside the agricultural efforts of early American industrialists such as John Beale Bordley and the performance of homespun patriotism in America's intellectual arenas by colonial graduates, political actors such as Benjamin Franklin championed the ethos of the homespun movement in his professional and personal activities at home and abroad.[46] While a colonial agent in London (1757-62, 1764-75), Franklin had used the public platform of the British press to defend the quality of America's domestic products during the term of the Imperial Crisis, publishing a number of letters in British newspapers under the provocative pseudonym of 'Homespun' and regularly spoke upon the issue in parliament.[47] In personal correspondence with his wife Deborah in April 1766, he encouraged her from his vantage point across the Atlantic to continue to wear clothes of 'your own spinning' during periods of commercial uncertainty, so as to present America as self-sufficient during moments of crisis. Even as the Stamp Act was repealed by parliament, Franklin informed Deborah:

> Had the trade between the two countries totally ceased, it was a comfort to me to recollect that I had once been clothed from head to foot in woolen and linen of my wife's manufacture, that I never was prouder of any dress in my life, and that she and her daughter might do it again if it was necessary. I told the Parliament that it was my opinion, before the old clothes of the Americans were worn out,

---

[44] Lewis Leonard Tucker, *Connecticut's Seminary of Sedition: Yale College* (Salisbury, CT: The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission of Connecticut, 1974), pp. 42-3.

[45] Quoted in: *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[46] Much in the same manner as George Washington did during the early decades of the Republic, as shall be shown in the section 'Washington's Inauguration Suit: Fashioning the Vision of a Homespun Republic', later in this chapter.

[47] Benjamin Franklin, *Autobiography and Other Writings*, ed. Ormond Seavey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 286-91; George Goodwin, *Benjamin Franklin in London: The British Life of America's Founding Father* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2016).

they might have new ones of their own making. And indeed if they

had all as many clothes as your old man has, that would not be very

unlikely; for I think you and George reckoned when I was last at

home, at least 20 pair of old breeches.[48]

Nevertheless, given the repeal of the offending act and the momentary lull of hostilities between Britain and the colonies, Franklin put 'joking apart' and sent Deborah a gift of fourteen yards of 'pompadour satin' from Spitalfields, as well as various other luxuries, in recognition of her frugality and self-reliance during the Stamp Act crisis.[49]

In addition to encouraging the female members of his family to set a positive example as advocates of Non-Importation by urging them to manufacture their own attire as patriotic duty required, Franklin also acted as an early proponent of the commercial manufacture of American silk. First in his official capacity as colonial agent in London and secondly in his role as ambassador of the new United States to France from 1776 to 1785, Franklin engaged in lobbying activities on the behalf of the Philadelphia Silk Society in an attempt to raise the profile of American manufactured luxuries abroad. As outlined by Lawrence Peskin, Franklin's initial efforts in London were to present silk as a viable colonial contribution to the British economic system of fashionable consumption. However, Frankin's efforts to promote the American silk project in Britain were more often perceived as a problematic endeavour during the pre-war period, as it created 'the potential for new economic competition between colony and mother country.'[50] Discussed most recently by Zara Anishanslin, Franklin's work to foster a good reputation for American silk, on a par with the respected quality of British products, only gained significant ground once the American colonies had retained France as a military ally in 1778. In order to cement recognition of America's production of 'luxurious homespun' in a transatlantic context, Franklin's daughter, Sally Franklin Bache, conveyed a gift of twenty-two yards of Pennsylvania silk for the use of Queen Marie Antoinette. As suggested by Anishanslin, this act may be regarded as richly

---

[48] Walter Isaacson, ed., *A Benjamin Franklin Reader* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003), pp. 211-12.

[49] *Ibid*., p. 212.

[50] Peskin, *Manufacturing Revolution* (2003), pp 30-3.

'symbolic of the unravelling of American ties to the British Empire of commerce' in the early years of America's independence.[51]

The advent of elite spectacles of homespun, such as those outlined above, saw the entry of the fabric into the upper echelons of colonial polite society and, by extension, into the annals of Revolutionary memory. However, elite performances of homespun manufacturing and sartorial display were just a small part of the overall success of homespun patriotism in the forging of America's independent national identity. As the next section of this chapter shall demonstrate, the performance of homespun patriotism was not the sole pursuit of the American upper-classes or political elite. It was also well within the purview of ordinary colonists, such as middling consumers and local manufactures.

Accommodating Patriotic Homespun in Everyday Life

In 1775 there was a shortage of wool in the colony of Virginia. This fact was made all the harder to bear for Virginian residents given the country's recent entry into the Revolutionary War with Britain and the material privations this act entailed. Sheep were scarce in the Southern colonies, so it was recommended at this time that Virginian spinners and weavers combine what little wool they had available with home-grown cotton, which when woven together and processed would shrink up to produce a mixed-cloth that was both warm and hardy enough for everyday wear. This economical manifestation of homespun culture, born as much out of necessity as it was out of patriotic fervour, can be observed in a surviving Virginia cloth coat currently in the collection of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation **[Fig: 4.10]**.[52] To the naked eye the coat appears to be constructed of an unbleached, coarse, serviceable cotton, of the type one might associate with outdoor work.[53] However, as discussed by Baumgarten, the fashionable cut of the coat belies the rusticity of the homespun textile and the absence of a lining **[Fig: 4.10*a*]**, while microscopic

---

[51] Zara Anishanslin, *Portrait of a Women in Silk: Hidden Histories of the British Atlantic World* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2016), pp. 308-9.

[52] Baumgarten, *What Clothes Reveal* (2002), p. 96; *CWF* 1964-174,A (Coat, cotton and wool Virginia cloth, *c.* 1780).

[53] Such as that worn by a slave or labourer, see: Meredith Wright, *Everyday Dress of Rural America, 1783-1800* (New York: Dover Publications, 1992), p. 12.

analysis of the fibres and closer inspection of the coat's protected areas, such as the interior pockets, pleated back, and button holes [**Figs: 4.10*b*, *c*, *d***], shows that the mixed-textile had been 'dyed in the wool' to affect a napped surface of blue flecked with brown in imitation of imported broadcloth.[54] Both the style of the coat and the method of its manufacture indicate that the garment was not intended for menial labour, but for the affectation of an elegant silhouette suited to the realms of social calling. As well as paying testament to the ingenuity of Virginian colonists during the wool shortages of the mid-1770s, the material qualities of the Virginia cloth coat demonstrate how pride in colonial self-sufficiently could make the accommodation of homespun culture both a practical and a fashionable endeavour for ordinary colonists during wartime.

Object-based evidence – such as the Virginia cloth coat – and documentary material dating from the American Revolutionary period indicates that colonial citizens actively attempted to accommodate patriotic homespun culture into the running of their day-to-day lives, in ways other than the high-profile, rebellious displays of patriotic refashioning engaged in by members of the colonial elite. The patriotic consumption of homespun culture was not confined to shows of sartorial resistance through public spectacle, such as the defiant wearing or manufacturing of homespun at the spinning bees, balls, and graduation ceremonies of the 1760s–70s, as discussed in the previous section of this chapter. The patriotic consumption of homespun during this period of considerable political unrest and material privation in the colonies was also an understated affair, perpetrated by Americans whose seemingly mundane, everyday decisions regarding the sourcing of dress and domestic decoration contributed towards constructing the patriotic vision of American self-sufficiency which persisted into the Republican era.

This type of everyday 'consumer virtue' can be difficult to interpret in hindsight, particularly when set against such a charged atmosphere of Non-Importation rhetoric, merchant boycotts, and public demonstrations of sartorial resistance.[55] In

---

[54] Baumgarten, *What Clothes Reveal* (2002), p. 101. Over time the cotton warp has outlasted the mixed cotton-wool of the weft, with the wool of the weft having largely disintegrated to leave noticeable slubs on the surface of the fabric.

[55] 'Consumer virtue' as related to the act of patriotic consumption is discussed extensively in the following: Padhraig Higgins, *A Nation of Politicians: Gender, Patriotism, and Political Culture in*

order to illustrate this comparatively understated (yet equally valid) engagement by ordinary colonists with the patriotic principles of the American homespun movement, the following section shall identify how individual manufacturers and consumers chose to accommodate homespun products in place of or alongside established patterns of colonial commerce during the periods of the Imperial Crisis and the Revolutionary War. It may be assumed that through such everyday engagements with patriotic homespun culture that the high-level rhetoric of Non-Importation and the patriotic vision of American self-sufficiency was allowed to filter downward and impact more keenly upon the lived experiences of colonial communities. This shall be exemplified by the following three examples of 'consumer virtue' and merchant enterprise, as drawn from personal and business account books dating from the Imperial Crisis and Revolutionary War years: the overtly patriotic rebranding of textile merchandise by a weaver in East Hampton, Long Island;[56] the provisions made by a dry goods merchant in Orange County, Virginia, to allow for the bartering of homespun among his local clientele;[57] and the difficult compromise made by an apothecary in Williamsburg, Virginia, in the decision to have his American-made cloth finished professionally by a London printer.[58]

An Anonymous Weaver Peddling Liberty Cloth in Long Island, *c.* 1768–9

Over the duration of the Imperial Crisis there was a noted increase in the number of regional, commercial enterprises being set up throughout the colonies. These new businesses were founded upon the belief that the patriotic fervour surrounding the provision of domestic manufactures would induce colonial consumers to buy American products in the long term, even after the Non-Importation movement had run its course and British imports resumed. The hope was that rather than returning fully to the 'old tenets of the British system' that the industrialising effect that the Imperial Crisis had had upon domestic manufacturing in America would be viewed

Late Eighteenth-Century Ireland (Madison & London: University of Wisconsin Press, 2010), pp. 91-2, pp. 82-105.

[56] *JDCMPE:* Doc. 1604 (Weaver's and carter's account book, *c*. 1755-1797).

[57] *JRL* MS.1966.1 (Andrew Shepherd account book, *c.* 1773-1790).

[58] *JRL* MS.39.8 (Dr James Carter's invoice book, *c*. 1752-74).

'as a springboard to a new postcolonial economy based on domestic production at least as much as on overseas trade.'[59] In addition to the efforts of colonial citizens, a number of migrant artisans from Europe made the journey to British North America during the turbulent years of the 1760s–70s to ply their expertise in textile manufacturing and finishing among those colonists disaffected with the British monopoly on imported wares. These opportunistic newcomers worked in many fields of textile processing, such as George Williamson, who operated a flax and hemp dressing business in Philadelphia in 1768, two English broadcloth weavers who moved to Pottstown, Pennsylvania, in 1769 and were still advertising their goods in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* in 1773, and Christopher Leffingwell, who established a fulling mill and dye house in 1770 in the settlement of Norwich, Connecticut.[60] As the nation edged ever closer to the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, patriotic entrepreneurship was rife.

Between May 1768 and February 1769 an anonymous weaver living in the township of East Hampton, Long Island, entered a number of conspicuous transactions into his account book.[61] These transactions were noted in the separate account pages for three of his fellow Long Islanders – Aaron Isaacs, Joseph Osborn and Thomas Wickham – and pertained to the weaving and fulling of nearly seventy yards of what the anonymous weaver termed 'Liberty Cloath'. Isaacs owed £1 5s 4d for 43½ yards, Osborn's debt totalled 19s 1d for 15¼ yards, and Wickham's bill amounted to 6s 7d for 9½ yards.[62] Of the three, Aaron Isaacs was a prominent merchant with his own prosperous storefront in East Hampton and was a known proponent of the Patriot Cause within the community. When Long Island was taken by the British army in 1778, for instance, he was among those who sacrificed their property and fled to Connecticut rather than take the oath of allegiance to George III under the supervision of Governor William Tryon.[63] As well as his dealings in the provision of

---

[59] Peskin, *Manufacturing Revolution* (2003), pp. 30-44, p. 30.

[60] These examples are discussed in detail by: Staples and Shaw, *Clothing Through American History: The British Colonial Era* (2013), p. 154.

[61] *JDCMPE* Doc. 1604.

[62] *Ibid.*, f.8v (Osborn); *Ibid.*, f.18v (Isaacs); *Ibid.*, f.20v (Wickham).

[63] Peter Ross, *A History of Long Island: From its Earliest Settlement to the Present Time* (New York: Lewis Publishing Company, 1903), Vol. II, p. 475. It is unclear whether Isaacs purchased the liberty

'Liberty Cloath' for his more overtly patriotic clientele, the anonymous weaver of East Hampton also produced an array of textiles suitable for sartorial and domestic use in the daily life of the colony, including varieties of linen, flannel, cotton, and worsted. Alongside weaving and sowing his own flax, he also acted as a carter for the community, transporting loads of wood, hay, seaweed, coal, and dung across the length and breadth of Long Island.

Meanwhile, on the opposite side of the Atlantic, a linen weaver living in the North of England by the name of Ralph Watson was circulating copies of *The Weaver's Guide* – a promotional draft book containing Watson's diaper and damask paper patterns for linen tablecloths.[64] The *Guide* was produced by Watson for the express purpose of soliciting business in his locality of Aiskew near Bedale in the North Riding of Yorkshire during the second half of the eighteenth century.[65] The sixteenth pattern showcased in Watson's *Guide* is titled 'Wilks and Liberty', in reference to the controversial figure of the English Whig politician John Wilkes, who at that time was advocating for American Independence.[66] Without the evidence of an accompanying pattern or draft book there is no way of knowing what an example of Long Island 'Liberty Cloath' might have looked like, or even if it would have been noticeably different from the other fabrics being manufactured by the same East Hampton weaver. It likely bore no resemblance whatsoever to the 'Wilks and Liberty' pattern being manufactured and advertised across the ocean by Ralph Watson in the North Riding of Yorkshire. However, the radical political culture underpinning these two commercial textile products undoubtedly shared a similar origin. In spite of the

---

cloth in such a large quantity for the purpose of turning it to stock, though it is a tantalising possibility and begs the question of how far this Long Island 'Liberty Cloath' circulated within the colony.

[64] *North Yorkshire County Record Office* Z.371/1 (The Weaver's Guide: linen designs of Ralph Watson of Aiskew, eighteenth century).

[65] Both Watson and his *Guide* are discussed in: John Styles, *The Dress of the People: Everyday Fashion in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 140-1.

[66] Styles, *The Dress of the People* (2007), p. 141 (Figure. 67).

geographical gap which existed between their respective makers, ideologically and opportunistically speaking the two commodities were inextricably linked.[67]

Just as Ralph Watson hoped to compel British supporters of Wilkes to patronise his business through his provision of 'Wilks and Liberty' table linens, the anonymous weaver peddling 'Liberty Cloath' to the residents of Long Island had made a shrewd choice in the refashioning of their textile wares so as to appeal directly to the sensibilities of Patriot consumer's like Aaron Isaacs during the height of the Imperial Crisis.[68] While consciously upholding the rhetoric of Non-Importation in the running of his business, the East Hampton weaver was simultaneously exploiting the Non-Importation movement as an opportunity for commercial gain and product experimentation, recognising and tapping into a new market of conspicuous consumption in the colonies which regarded domestic homespun as increasingly fashionable, patriotically relevant, and blissfully free from the taint of British influence.

Andrew Shepherd's Acceptance of Homespun Bartering, *c.* 1774–9

The account book of Andrew Shepherd, a dry goods merchant in Orange County, Virginia, provides an interesting insight into the bartering habits of his customers for the years *c.* 1773–90.[69] The majority of entries in Shepherd's account book date from

[67] For context on Wilkes, including his relationship with/influence on American concepts of civil liberty, see: Peter D. G. Thomas, *John Wilkes: A Friend to Liberty* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 159-75.

[68] See: John Brewer, 'The Number 45: A Wilkite Political Symbol' in *England's Rise to Greatness, 1660-1763*, ed. Stephen B. Baxter (Berkeley, LA & London: University of California, 1983), pp. 349-80. While there is little indication that 'Liberty Cloath' was sold in a similar fashion outside of the confines of Long Island (though more research needs to be done in this area to verify), in the case of material culture manufactured specifically to attract supporters of John Wilkes there is ample evidence of merchant opportunism. Extant objects, intended for display across the public and domestic spaces of Britain and America, include lapel badges (*BM* 2003,0331.3; *BM* OA.377), finger rings (*VAM* M.152-1962), ceramic punchbowls (*VAM* C.20-1951; *VAM* 3618-1901; *VAM* C.49-1939), earthenware teapots (*VAM* 414:1109/&A-1885), soft-paste porcelain figurines (*WM* 1957.1392), and printed cotton handkerchiefs (*CWF* 1951-447).

[69] *JRL* MS.1966.1; On the importance of bartering and goodwill in the structure of colonial commerce, as well as on methods and attitudes to sartorial consumption in eighteenth-century

the first half of the 1770s, representing the transitional moment between the outbreak of the Revolutionary War in 1775 and the lingering influence of the Non-Importation rhetoric of the 1760s and early 1770s. Rather than dealing in the provision of luxury items, Shepherd's inventory consisted primarily of necessary sartorial goods, such as hair ribbons, shoes, and stockings, as well as the materials for home tailoring, such as plain and plaid yardage, leather, thread and wax for the making of clothing and footwear. Of those textiles mentioned in Shepherd's accounts, orders for yardage of linen are by far the most common, particularly, 'brown' and (to a much lesser extent) 'white' linen. The demarcation of linens by colour in Shepherd's account book does not relate to the use of dyes, but to the natural colour of untreated linen (brown) and to linen which has been bleached by the sun (white).[70] Shepherd's clientele was drawn predominantly from the artisanal and professional members of the community, including blacksmiths, shoe makers, military men, and plantation owners.

While a number of Shepherd's customers settled the balance of their accounts with cash, there are several entries which detail the bartering of goods of equal or near value. On 3 December 1773, for instance, Samuel Young put three yards of plaid to his account worth 4s and supplied Shepherd with five cabbages and half a bushel of potatoes – Shepherd valued these at 1s 5d and credited Young's account accordingly. Ten days later Young would put 6 yards of brown linen on his account worth 6s in exchange for 'almost' three pecks of potatoes, valued by Shepherd at 11d.[71] However, Shepherd's accounts show that he was also happy for his customers to balance their accounts not only with victuals, but also with yards of homespun cloth during the Revolutionary War period. This can be observed, in particular, through his dealings with Sansford Ransdale and Sally Pelly, whose entries span the years 1774–80 and 1777–9 respectively.[72]

Virginia more generally, see in particular: Ann Smart Martin, *Buying into the World of Goods: Early Consumers in Backcountry Virginia* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008).

[70] Susan Ouellette, *US Textile Production in Historical Perspective: A Case Study of Massachusetts* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2007), p. 34.

[71] *JRL* MS 1966.1, f.33r (Samuel Young, account covering 1773-6).

[72] *JRL* MS 1966.1, f.17r (Sansford Ransdale, account covering 1774-80); *JRL* MS 1966.1 f.37v (Miss Pelly, account covering 1777) and *JRL* MS 1966.1 f.40r (Salley Pellie, account covering 1778-9).

The transactions noted on Sansford Ransdale's account indicate that he was most likely a professional weaver operating in the local area, as rather than dealing with Shepherd in cash he exclusively battered yards of quality wool and striped cottons in exchange for ready-made sundries, such as a psalm book in August 1774 and half a dozen buttons in September 1779.[73] Local woman Sally Pelly also balanced her account with Shepherd by supplying him with large quantities of homespun on a regular basis, but of a meaner quality than that provided by Ransdale. On 25 November 1777, for example, Pelly supplied Shepherd with two varieties of 'Negro Cloth'. The two varieties supplied by Pelly represented two degrees of quality, or else cloth of different fibres. The first entry of 38 yards was valued at 6d a yard, while the second entry of 18 yards was valued at 9d a yard. Shepherd accordingly credited Pelly's account with £1 12s 6d.[74] She was to provide an additional 38 yards of 'Negro Cloth' in July 1779, this time valued at a meagre 3d a yard.[75] While it may be presumed that both Ransdale's and Pelly's manufactures were turned to stock in Shepherd's dry goods concern, they were clearly intended for the consumption of vastly different clientele. While Ransdale's quality homespun products would have been within the purview of the average colonial customer in need of serviceable sartorial goods in lieu of imported fabrics, Pelly's manufactures were meant to clothe Orange County's population of labourers and slaves.

During the eighteenth century, colonial slaveholders would regularly make bulk orders of imported textiles from British merchants for the provision of slave clothing, mostly in plains, plaids, and a variety of woollen material known as (but unlike the later classification of) 'cotton'. This inexpensive yardage was coarse but relatively

---

Note: There are two women listed in Shepherd's accounts who traded their homespun for goods/sundries, 'Miss Pelly' (1777) and 'Salley Pellie' (1778-9). It is very likely that these two women are in fact the same person, with a variously spelt surname. Therefore, transactions attributed to 'Miss Pelly' are here amalgamated with the transactions attributed to 'Salley Pellie' and are discussed under the standardised name 'Sally Pelly'.

[73] *JRL* MS 1966.1, f.17r (Sansford Ransdale, account covering 1774-80). It should be noted that given the frequency with which he supplied Shepherd with sartorial products, Ransdale's account was constantly in credit. It may be presumed that this was a fruitful business relationship built upon strong communal ties and that Ransdale's manufactures found a ready place on Shepherd's shelves.

[74] *JRL* MS 1966.1 f.37v (Miss Pelly, account covering 1777).

[75] *JRL* MS 1966.1 f.40r (Salley Pellie, account covering 1778-9).

warm and was restricted to a range of colours designated for slave consumption, usually white, green, or blue.[76] The outfitting of slaves was by seasonal allotment. As such, the majority of slaves would receive two full sets of gender-specific clothing per year.[77] With the advent of Non-Importation and the shortages caused by the Revolutionary War itself, this practice was no longer tenable for the majority of planters. The slave owners of Orange Country were therefore forced to resort to local suppliers such as Shepherd, who stocked cheap varieties of homespun cloth obtained through the industry of home-weavers such as Pelly.[78] Shepherd's acquisition of slave cloth woven domestically by Pelly during the Revolutionary War years indicates the pair's commercial participation not only in the bartering of homespun during a time of patriotic crisis, but also in the continued efforts of Virginian colonists during wartime to demark slaves from their masters by imposing standards of dress – but without reliance upon British suppliers. This can be regarded both as an accommodation of homespun and as a recasting of its use as patriotic when placed in the hands of Virginian slave owners.[79]

It is through identifying and contextualising such instances of communal bartering, as engaged in by Shepherd, Ransdale, and Pelly, that we can gain a sense of the social value and uses of domestically produced cloth in Revolutionary America, in a manner quite distinct from the high-profile, public activities of the upper echelons of colonial society. Shepherd's actions and those of his customers indicate how the regular consumer might accommodate homespun culture into the running of their

---

[76] Baumgarten, *What Clothes Reveal* (2002), pp. 114-5. See also: Linda Baumgarten 'Plains, Plaid and Cotton: Woolens for Slave Clothing', *Ars Textrina,* 15 (1991), pp. 203-22.

[77] Susan Atherton Hanson, 'Clothing Allotments' in *World of a Slave: Encyclopaedia of the Material Life of Slaves in the United States. Volume 1: A-I,* eds. Martha B. Katz-Hyman and Kym S. Rice (Santa Barbara: Greenwood, 2011), pp. 121-3.

[78] An example of this in the context of Shepherd's business may be observed both in his dealings with Pelly and potentially with William Golding, blacksmith to the Albemarle plantation. See: *JRL* MS 1966.1 f.20r (William Golding, account covering 1775-77). In August 1775, Golding purchased cheap 'damaged' brown linen for the plantation, either for himself, for a labourer, or for the use of a slave.

[79] Another example, alongside that presented by Shepherd's encouragement of a local barter economy of homespun for slave consumption, can be seen in the activities of the Washington family at Mount Vernon, Virginia. In 1775, a wood-frame spinning house was erected on the plantation for the treatment of raw materials used in the construction of slave clothing. See: Debora A. Reid, 'Spinning Houses' in *World of a Slave* (2011), pp. 479-80.

everyday lives. Particularly in the case of Shepherd's dealings with Pelly, we can see that Shepherd was making a conscious decision not to import cloth for slave consumption as he would likely have done before the outbreak of war, instead encouraging domestic production in his locality by providing a bartering platform that would economically benefit the weaver.

James Carter's Commission of Printed Virginia Cotton, *c.* 1771

Dr James Carter was an apothecary and tobacco planter in the town of Williamsburg, Virginia. Carter opened his apothecary shop, the Unicorn's Horn, in Williamsburg in 1751, following his immigration from Britain. It operated until 1779, when he sold it to his brother, William Carter. However, he would continue to practice medicine in Williamsburg until his death in 1794.[80] Carter's invoice book details the professional, household, and sartorial goods he purchased on his own account for the years 1752–74.[81] The invoice book therefore encompasses the period before and during when the rhetoric of Non-Importation held the most sway in colonial America, a rhetoric which Carter would have been more than familiar with given his residence in the political hotbed of Williamsburg.[82] Many of the entries in Carter's invoice book detail the types of imported goods that Carter purchased from a variety of British merchants operating in and around the colony of Virginia, including details of the commission, conveyance, and insurance costs associated with shipping goods across the Atlantic and then the transportation of those goods from their port of arrival to Williamsburg. Given Carter's profession it is not surprising that the majority of invoices include repeated mention of drugs, medicines and other goods

---

[80] Biographical information for James Carter gleaned from: Harold B. Gill, Jr., *The Apothecary in Colonial Virginia* (Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia, 1972), p. 92.

[81] *JRL* MS.39.8.

[82] As well as being the setting for the rebellious actions of the House of Burgesses and the formation of the Virginia Association in 1769, as discussed in the previous section, see the following discussions of the role of Virginia in the American Revolution more generally: John E. Selby, *The Revolution in Virginia, 1775-1785* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia, 1988); Bruce A. Ragsdale, *A Planter's Republic: The Search for Economic Independence in Revolutionary Virginia* (Madison, WI: Madison House, 1996); Kevin Raeder Gutzman, *Virginia's American Revolution: From Dominion to Republic, 1776-1840* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2007).

essential to his apothecary trade, such as English ceramics and glassware.[83] However, the invoice book also shows Carter's penchant for imported fabrics and for ready-made articles of dress in the English style, such as handkerchiefs, gloves and stockings.

The first invoice listed in Carter's ledger dates to December 1752 and details a commission for British merchant James Bland, which amounted to a total cost of almost £36. Included within the commission were orders for multiple pairs of shoes, boots and pumps, purple, red and white handkerchiefs, kid gloves and fine thread hose, five hundred 'Best London needles' and copious yardage of brown Holland, fine drab cloth and superfine fustian. Alongside this large quantity of imported textiles and fashionable accessories, Carter also ordered objects essential for the material furnishing of his home and of his new business enterprise as befitted his social status, including four dozen smelling bottles, four dozen white stone plates, an assortment of shallow and deep dishes and a Dutch oven. Such a large array of goods implies that he was importing sartorial and domestic products not only for himself, but also for his female dependents.[84] For much of the 1760s, Carter's reliance on imported goods did not drastically decrease in step with the demands of Non-Importation rhetoric and he continued to place orders with British merchants for imported textiles, dress accessories, and British-manufactured tools associated with his trade. Judging by the evidence of his invoice book alone, Carter's consumer habits during the period of the Imperial Crises broadly mirror the patterns of expenditure outlined in his first commission to Bland in December 1752, shortly after setting up his apothecary practice in Williamsburg. That is, but for one rather notable exception.

In August 1771, Carter detailed a payment to John Norton & Sons of London for the sum of £1 12s for 'Printing 16 yards Virginia Cotton'.[85] Norton was not himself a

---

[83] For more on Carter's professional role as apothecary/surgeon in Williamsburg and his use of imported goods in the pursuit of his trade, see: Ivor Noël Hume, *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1969), p. 75; Shron Cotner, Kris Dippre, Robin Kipps and Susan Pryor, *Physick: The Professional Practice of Medicine in Williamsburg, Virginia, 1740-1775* (Williamsburg, VA: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 2003), pp. 30-1.

[84] *JRL* MS.39.8 f.11r.

[85] *JRL* MS.39.8 f.74r.

textile printer, but a tobacco merchant who travelled between Virginia and London carrying shipments of Virginian tobacco and returning with British manufactures, which he would then deliver to those colonial clients for whom he had acted agent.[86] Carter's request was therefore one of conveyance and for the commissioning of Norton to find a London-based textile printer to undertake the work desired, while also selling Carter's small consignment of tobacco grown upon his homestead. This one entry poses an intriguing question regarding Carter's level of engagement with the practice of patriotic consumption in the colony of Virginia on the eve of the Revolutionary War: Could a garment constructed of American-made cloth still be considered a patriotic commodity when finished by an English printer?

Correspondence between Carter and Norton during January 1772 gives further details of the apothecary's commission, as well as providing an insight into the intended recipient of the newly-printed Virginia cloth: Mrs Carter, who desired the cloth to be dyed purple and augmented with a pattern of coloured flowers, presumably for use as the base fabric of a gown.[87] While the cloth being discussed by Carter and Norton does not appear to have survived in articles of dress associated with Williamsburg and its environs, an impression of the resulting garment may be gleaned from a woman's jacket currently in the collection of the Victoria & Albert Museum in London. Dating from approximately 1780, the jacket is constructed from a resist-dyed, printed cotton chintz produced in South-East India, lined with a coarse blue and white striped cotton. The fabric has a dark purple ground with a striking floral and vine design executed in red, white, and blue, and is arguably comparable to the design wished for by Mrs Carter **[Fig: 4.11]**.[88]

---

[86] The Nortons were a prominent trading family within colonial Virginia, with a wide network of clientele on either side of the Atlantic. On their activities see: Smart Martin, *Buying into the World of Goods* (2008), p. 44, p. 169; Linda Sturtz, *Within Her Power: Propertied Women in Colonial Virginia* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 152; Rhys Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), p. 217*n*.

[87] *JRL* MS.36.3 (John Norton & Sons Papers, 1750-1902), Folder 52, 3 (of 12) - 'James Carter to John Norton, 6 January 1772'.

[88] *VAM* IS.370-1992 (Jacket made of resist-dyed and printed cotton chintz. South-East India, *ca.* 1780).

Carter's characterisation of the fabric as being 'Virginia cotton' is significant in his commission to Norton. Historically, 'Virginia cloth' was a term used to designate rough cloth woven from a mixture of locally raised flax tow and cotton and was most suited to the common dress of servants and day labourers.[89] As discussed in reference to the homespun bartering of Andrew Shepherd, by the 1770s the domestic textile manufactures of Virginia were increasingly coming to supplant imported cloth in the outfitting of the slave population of Revolutionary Virginia. Advertisements for runaway slaves posted *c.* 1768–80 in the *Virginia Gazette*, a paper published and circulated within Carter's hometown of Williamsburg, pay testament to this shift in usage. In October 1768, a slave woman called Jude ran away from the household of Mary Clay of Chesterfield, was described as wearing 'her winter clothing, also a blue and white striped Virginia cloth gown, a Virginia cloth coperas and white striped coat.'[90] Running away from William Gregory of Charles City County in May 1769, a slave man called Peter stole 'sundry clothes, such as crop Negroes usually wear, also a white Virginia cloth waistcoat and petticoat, a Tarlton plaid gown, and sundry other of his wife's clothes.'[91] Finally, within the term of the Revolutionary War, a slave woman named Sukey absconded from William Timslet of New Castle in August 1780, described as wearing a dress of 'white Virginia cloth' and a linen bonnet.[92]

As shall be discussed in significantly more detail in Chapter 5, the resources and technology to print cloth to a standard comparable with British and Asian imported fabrics was not widely available in the colonies at this time, even if domestic weaving and the growth of natural dyestuffs had become more widespread in the colonies by the mid-eighteenth century.[93] For Dr Carter's 19 yards of Virginia cotton

---

[89] Florence Montgomery and Linda Eaton, *Textiles in America, 1650-1870: A Dictionary Based On Original Documents, 52 Prints And Paintings, Commercial Records, American Merchants' Papers, Shopkeepers' Advertisements, and Pattern Books With Original Swatches Of Cloth* (New York & London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007), p. 372.

[90] *The Virginia Gazette* (20 October 1768).

[91] *The Virginia Gazette* (11 May 1769).

[92] *The Virginia Gazette* (19 August 1780).

[93] Dye stuffs were grown mainly for export, not domestic use and the technology available for printing was scarce before the advent of Independence. See in particular: Andrea Feeser, *Red, White, and Black Make Blue: Indigo in the Fabric of Colonial South Carolina Life* (Athens, GA: University of

to be printed to a standard and style that was acceptable for wear by someone of Mrs Carter's race and social class it was therefore deemed necessary for the American-made cloth to be printed outside of the colony. As Dr Carter was still involved with the tobacco trade in London just prior to the outbreak of the Revolutionary War and had no reason to believe that the relationship would not continue, it would seem that having American-made cloth printed there as part of his long-standing business relationship with Norton would allow him to engage in a compromised form of patriotic consumption, while also satisfying the demands and limitations placed upon him by his social status, his wife's personal tastes, and the geographical restrictions impeding his support of domestic dying and printing. After all, he may have reasoned to himself or anyone who sought to question his motives, the Virginia cotton which formed the base of Mrs Carter's new gown was undeniably of American manufacture and so supported the industrial enterprise of his closest neighbours.

Washington's Inauguration Suit: Fashioning the Vision of a Homespun Republic

> The President of the United States, on the day of his inauguration, appeared dressed in a complete suit of homespun cloaths: but the Cloth was of so fine a fabric, and so handsomely finished, that it was universally mistaken for a foreign manufactured superfine-Cloth. This fact, the Editor hopes, will apologize for his not having mentioned, in his last paper, a circumstance, which must be considered as not only flattering to our Manufacturers in particular, but interesting to our Countrymen in general.
>
> His Excellency the Vice-President, appears also in a suit of American Manufacture- and several Members of both Houses are

Georgia Press, 2013); Andrea Feeser, Maureen Daly Goggin and Beth Fowkes Tobin, eds., *The Materiality of Color: The Production, Circulation, and Application of Dyes and Pigments, 1400-1800* (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2012); Linda Eaton, *Printed Textiles: British and American Cottons and Linens, 1700-1850. Based on the 1970 classic by Florence M. Montgomery* (New York: The Monacelli Press, 2014).

distinguished by the same token of attention to the manufacturing interest of their country.[94]

On 6 May 1789, the *Gazette of the United States* published the above apology to its readers for not having specified in the previous issue of the newspaper the origins of the suit of clothes worn by George Washington at his presidential inauguration, which had taken place on the balcony of Federal Hall in New York City on April 30 **[Fig: 4.12]**.[95]

Encapsulated within the 'apology' printed by the *Gazette* is a thinly veiled compliment regarding the president's success in marrying the best of the fledgling nation's domestic cloth industry with the eminently stylish line of Anglo-European taste. To achieve such a natural balance between the Old and the New worlds of the young Republic was a difficult business – a hair's breadth one way would have reeked of unsophisticated 'provincial rusticity', effectively implying that post-Independence Americans were incapable of outfitting their leaders, while the use of 'fancy British cloth cut in the latest style would project a servile emulation unbefitting the new president of a free people.'[96] The decision to dress the new president in a plain brown suit of American-manufacture was carefully considered by both Congress and Washington, for while they desired their leader to be respected by the people they did not want for him to be worshipped in the manner of a monarch at his coronation.[97] 'He would be a strong leader, chosen from among the people' and he would look, as far as was appropriate, akin to them.[98] The president's

---

[94] *The Gazette of the United States* (6 May 1789).

[95] *WM* 1957.0816 A (Amos Doolittle (Engraver) and Peter Lacour (Draftsman), 'FEDERAL HALL / The Seat of CONGRESS', etching on paper, New Haven *c.* 1790).

[96] Kariann Akemi Yokota, *Unbecoming British: How Revolutionary America Became a Postcolonial Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 95.

[97] See: Kathleen Bartoloni-Tuazon, *For Fear of an Elective King: George Washington and the Presidential Title Controversy of 1789* (Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 2014); Eric Nelson, *The Royalist Revolution: Monarchy and the American Founding* (Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 2014).

[98] Charlene Bangs Bickford and Kenneth R. Bowling, *Birth of the Nation: The First Federal Congress, 1789-1791* (Lanham MD: Madison House, 1989), p. 25. On the equation of homespun culture with popular sovereignty and the 'new realities of republican life', see: Zakim, *Ready-Made Democracy* (2003), pp. 24-5.

inauguration suit currently resides at George Washington's ancestral home of Mount Vernon, Virginia **[Fig: 4.13]**.[99] Both coat and breeches are constructed of brown woollen broadcloth, which has been shrunk and napped to affect the appearance of velvet. The coat narrows at the hips and is double-breasted with a square cutaway just below the waistline of the breeches, of a similar style to certain English frock coats of the same period **[Fig: 4.14]**.[100] It is partially lined with plain linen, also thought to be of American manufacture.

The broadcloth for Washington's suit had been woven and dyed for him in Hartford, Connecticut by The Hartford Woolen Manufactory – a promising domestic enterprise which had garnered significant interest from local financiers and statesmen with the advent of peacetime. The advertising campaign instigated by one of the company's directors, Jeremiah Wadsworth, had caught Washington's eye in January 1789 because of its savvy use of hearty patriotic language and the Republican-style branding of its range of domestic broadcloths, which included shades of 'Congress Brown', 'Hartford Grey', and 'London Smoke'.[101] Writing to his friend Henry Knox of New York on 29 January 1789, Washington enquired after the 'superfine American Broad Cloths to be sold at No. 44 in Water Street', requesting cloth 'enough to make me a suit of Cloaths', adding that 'Mrs Washington would be equally thankful to you for purchasing for her use as much of what is called (in the Advertisement) London Smoke as will make her a riding habit.'[102]

According to T. H. Breen, Washington was determined to appear at his inauguration dressed entirely in Hartford cloth: 'Knowing how much politics depended on performance, he used the occasion to communicate to the public his personal commitment to economic nationalism.'[103] To further cement his pledge to support

---

[99] *MV* W-574/A-B (Suit, *c.* 1789).

[100] For comparison, see: *VAM* T.281-1991 (Man's frock coat of grey striped wool. English, *c.* 1790).

[101] *The Daily Advertiser* (21 January 1789).

[102] 'From George Washington to Henry Knox, 29 January 1789', in *The Papers of George Washington*, *Presidential Series, Vol. 1: 24 September 1788 – 31 March 1789*, ed. Dorothy Twohig (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1987), pp. 260-1.

[103] T. H. Breen, *George Washington's Journey: The President Forges a Nation* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2016), p. 167. Also, on the development of New England broadcloths and woollens: Rivard, *A New Order of Things* (2002), pp. 79-94.

America's burgeoning domestic enterprises, Washington purchased at least one other suit of Hartford cloth to wear during public speeches and private events as a marker of his civic pride in American textile manufacturing, this time of a dark military blue reminiscent of the blue and buff woollen coat worn as part of his regimental silhouette, made iconic by his service during the Revolutionary War.[104] Also held within the collection at Mount Vernon, the second Hartford suit is sadly incomplete, missing the breeches and with all of the coat buttons removed by relic hunters during the nineteenth century **[Fig. 4.15]**.[105]

However, Washington's personal commitment to the cause of patriotic homespun production demonstrated by these two surviving (and much feted) garments does not communicate the whole truth of Washington's sartorial character in the aftermath of the Revolution. Rather, they communicate only his most public side as politician and national hero. As discussed by Kariann Akemi Yokota, 'The repudiation of British governance did not bring about a repudiation of its goods. Looking into the homes of the Founding Fathers would quickly dispel any notion that only a Loyalist would harbor a penchant for luxury imports.'[106] Indeed, an examination of other extant garments worn by the Washington family and now held within the collection at Mount Vernon reveals a far more complex story of Republican consumption by the First President and First Lady of the new United States of America, which was clearly tempered by the difficult realities of new statehood. Leaving aside the Hartford suits worn for the public purposes of propaganda by Washington during his presidential terms, surviving pieces of the Washington wardrobe do not show an obvious personal commitment to the consumption of American homespun.

Only a handful of garments contained within the Mount Vernon collection can be tentatively said to be of authentic American manufacture. An extremely rare eighteenth-century bathing garment, worn by Martha Washington in the summers of 1767 and 1769 during her visits to the Berkeley Springs of West Virginia, can be characterised as an example of early American homespun when compared against extant fabrics drawn from other collections **[Fig: 4.16]**.[107] Cut in the style of an

---

[104] *NMAH* AF.16148M (George Washington's regimental uniform, *c.* 1789).

[105] *MV* W-1514 (Coat, *c.* 1790-1800).

[106] Yokota, *Unbecoming British* (Oxford, 2011), p. 86.

[107] *MV* W-580 (Bathing gown, *c.* 1767-9).

ordinary shift with circular lead weights sewn into concealed pockets at the hem to prevent its rise underwater, the gown is constructed of blue and white checked linen similar to examples of homespun gingham held by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation **[Fig: 4.17]** and the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston **[Fig: 4.18]**.[108] Elsewhere, a suit comprised of bleached white cotton breeches and a matching waistcoat, are believed to have been worn by George Washington during the period *c.* 1770–85 as informal working attire.[109] Donned during mounted inspections of his farmland – where the spinning of homespun cloth by Washington's slaves was taking place as early as the mid-1770s in response to the Non-Importation agreements – the suit would have been both cool and breathable in the oppressive heat of the Virginia sun.[110]

While material evidence of homespun consumption is slim across surviving pieces of the Washington wardrobe, what is evident on the part of the First family is a concerted commitment to the adoption of Republican plainness during Washington's presidential terms. As exemplified in the celebrated portrait of statesman Samuel Adams **[Fig: 4.19]** and in Peale's portrait of James Beale Bordley in 1770, 'Republican plainness' was a style of dress characterised by the moderate consumption of good quality cloth in a range of serviceable shades and fabrics, with the intention being to always look well but never ostentatiously so.[111] Adornments

---

[108] *CWF* 1999-225 (Apron of blue and white check linen, marked 'EF' and '1776' in white silk cross-stitch. American, *c.* 1776); *MFAB* 98.1822f (Linen plain weave, gingham fragment. Late eighteenth or early nineteenth century, New England).

[109] *MV* W-2673 (Waistcoat of white cotton, *c*. 1770-85); *MV* W-1515 (Breeches of white cotton, *c.* 1770-85).

[110] Reid, 'Spinning Houses' in *World of a Slave* (2011), p. 479.

[111] *MFAB* L-R 30.76c (John Singleton Copley, 'Samuel Adams', oil on canvas, *c.* 1772). Related to but not exemplified by the use of American homespun, the moderate simplicity of Adams's dress is referred to as 'republican plainness' in a later nineteenth-century biography of the statesman, see: William Vincent Wells, *The Life and Public Service of Samuel Adams, Being a Narrative of his Acts and Opinions, and of his Agency in Producing and Forwarding the American Revolution. With Extracts from his Correspondence, State Papers, and Political Essays*, 3 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1865), II, p. 211. See also on the issue of appropriate dress for state officials, particularly in reference to Adams's appearance at the Continental Congress in 1774: Benjamin H. Irvin, *Clothed in Robes of Sovereignty: The Continental Congress and the People Out of Doors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 24-6.

which might speak to the wearer's private wealth, such as the addition of lace frills, silk, and metallic thread-work, were either entirely absent or else kept to a bare minimum.[112] A number of surviving pieces from the Washington wardrobe demonstrate this ideological embrace of frugality and sartorial restraint as a matter of national pride, particularly those dating from the 1780s-90s when the First family and their consumer habits were under closer public scrutiny. As discussed by Barry Schwartz, while it was a well-known fact in the nation that Washington was a wealthy individual, 'that wealth was never converted, in the people's eyes, to sensual pleasure, and so never undermined the people's conviction that he was really one of them.'[113] Schwartz's observation is borne out in various aspects of the Washington's surviving public and private attire.

A banyan worn during the blistering Virginian summers *c.* 1780–99, for example, plays to the prevailing male fashions of the day while also acting as a suitably understated expression of Washington's privileged position within American society **[Fig: 4.20]**.[114] Though constructed of an imported fabric, the regular printed pattern of red and blue check upon the plain weave cotton strikes a decidedly conservative air when compared against more noticeably flamboyant examples worn in the British Atlantic region during the later eighteenth century **[Fig: 4.21]**.[115] Elsewhere in the Mount Vernon collection a waistcoat of voided silk velvet shows significant evidence of reuse and repair over a considerable period, a testament to Washington's commitment to the value of thrift while in office, akin to the patriotic recycling

---

[112] David Kuchta has observed that a form of 'Republican plainness' emerged in male fashion in Britain post-1688, as a repudiation of the lavish ostentation of absolutist monarchy: 'Modest dress proclaimed the new political principle of limited monarchy established by the Revolution settlement: through a kingdom, England had the manners of a republic.' The concerted effort by American politicians during the early decades of the Republic to abstain from imported luxuries in favour of sporting homespun or (at the very least) imported plains may be regarded in the same vein. See: David Kuchta, *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity: England, 1550-1850* (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 2002), p. 95.

[113] Barry Schwartz, *George Washington: The Making of an American Symbol* (New York: The Free Press, 1987), p. 157.

[114] *MV* W-2407/A (Printed cotton banyan, *c.* 1780-99).

[115] For comparison see: *VAM* T.215-1992 (Banyan, cotton chintz from the Coromandel Coast of South-East India, painted and dyed, lined with a European block-printed cotton. Tailored in England, *c.* 1750-75).

habits of elite colonial women during the Imperial Crisis and Revolutionary War years **[Fig: 4.22]**.[116] Originally lavender, black, and cream, with buttonholes edged in yellow silk thread, the waistcoat's muted palette would have made a strong but subtle contrast with the sombre, black velvet outerwear favoured by Washington during the years of his presidency.

Like her husband, Martha Washington also demonstrated a suitable level of Republican sobriety in her dress and demeanour throughout his presidency, in both her public and private duties as First Lady.[117] This included the adoption of Republican plainness as her *modus operandi*, a definitive contrast to her sartorial preferences prior to her marriage to Washington, which had been dominated by a taste for Spitalfields silk and London fripperies.[118] Martha's pronounced shift to sartorial sobriety in the wake of American Independence can be best observed in the design and construction of an oft-used, one-piece gown of brown, satin-weave silk worn by her during the later presidential years of the 1790s **[Fig: 4.23]**.[119] Through this highly fashionable yet restrained ensemble it may be presumed that Martha set an example of 'understated elegance for the nation and future presidents' wives to follow.'[120] The simple sophistication of her public dress was remarked upon by her contemporary Abigail Adams, who noted following their first meeting in July 1789 during one of the well-attended levees hosted by the Washingtons, that the First Lady

---

[116] *MV* W-2149 (Voided silk velvet waistcoat, possibly of French or English origin, *c*. 1780-90). This is not the only one of Washington's surviving waistcoats to show evidence of extensive reuse and repair. See also: *MV* W-2446 (False double-breasted and square cut waistcoat, constructed of English or French imported silk. Original use *c*. 1775-85, refashioned in 1790s).

[117] On Martha Washington's role and reputation as First Lady, see in particular: Robert F. Dalzell, Jr. and Lee Baldwin Dalzell, *George Washington's Mount Vernon: At Home in Revolutionary America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 198-202; Jeanne E. Adrams, *First Ladies of the Republic: Martha Washington, Abigail Adams, Dolley Madison, and the Creation of an Iconic American Role* (New York: New York University Press, 2018), pp. 45-100.

[118] Baumgarten, *What Clothes Reveal* (2002), p. 84; Anishanslin, *Portrait of a Woman in Silk* (2016), p. 90.

[119] *MV* W-1523 (Gown of brown satin-weave silk. Possibly English, *c*. 1790-1800).

[120] *Ibid*. See curator's comments on catalogue entry for object, which makes this observation. Also, according to a hand-written note attached to the gown by Martha Washington's granddaughter, Eliza Parke Curtis Law, the gown was a favourite of the First Lady indicating that it was worn often in both public and private.

was 'plain in her dress, but that plainness is the best of every article… Her hair is white, her teeth Beautifull, her person rather short than otherways… her manners are modest and unassuming, dignified and femenine, but not the Tincture of ha'ture about her.' After two weeks in the First family's acquaintance, Adams stated in high praise of Martha, '…I found myself much more deeply impressed than I ever did before their Majesties of Britain.'[121]

However, even with the abstemious example set by the First family, a continued preference for British luxury imports continued to typify the consumer habits of US citizens for much of later eighteenth century and into the nineteenth.[122] In spite of the public patronage and enthusiasm shown by the Washingtons and other political celebrities during the formative years of the Republic, the Hartford Woolen Manufactory of Connecticut did not live up to their much-publicised expectations and had gone out of business by 1794 – as a result of poor sales. As discussed at length by T. H. Breen, the 'Hartford experiment' failed for a number of reasons, including inexperienced directors, difficulties in acquiring labour and raw materials, as well as a mixed reputation for quality. Though Washington and other American statesmen had sung the company's praises in the wake of the inauguration, customers who purchased Hartford cloth on their recommendation found that the dyes ran easily when washed and that the fabric itself was 'very poor and hard in spinning' when compared to imported British textiles.[123] As shall be explored more thoroughly in Chapters Five and Six, it would take the looming prospect of renewed conflict with Britain and the return of a Revolutionary war hero to US shores during the early

---

[121] Quoted in John P. Kaminski, *Abigail Adams: An American Heroine* (Madison, WI: Parallel Press, 2007), p. 105.

[122] This fraught relationship will be explored in Chapter 5, focussing on the period *c.* 1783–1815, using the ubiquity of British printed furniture fabrics in American homes as an analytical lens. On the persistence of European styles of dress and the import of luxury goods into the US more generally during this period, see in particular: Haulman, *The Politics of Fashion in Eighteenth-Century America* (2011), pp. 181-216; Cohen, *Luxurious Citizens* (2017), pp. 15-45.

[123] For Washington's continued support of The Hartford Woolen Manufactory (even when they were unable to meet popular demand and maintain quality) and the production issues experienced by the company which led to its ultimate failure, see: Breen, *George Washington's Journey* (2016), pp. 167-73. See also: Chester McArthur Destler, 'The Hartford Woolen Manufactory: The Story of a Failure', *Connecticut History Review*, 14, (1974), pp. 8-32.

nineteenth century for American consumers to once again invest wholeheartedly in the patriotic cause of economic nationalism.

The Embargo Act of 1807 and the War of 1812: A Resurgence of Homespun Patriotism

Renewed discord between Britain and the United States of America during the early nineteenth century brought about a return of the homespun rhetoric within America's political and socio-economic cultures. It also saw the casting of a popular veneer of sentimentality across the homespun endeavours of those colonial patriots who had championed Non-Importation initiatives during the Imperial Crisis and the Revolutionary War years. Following the international outrage of the Chesapeake-Leopard Affair and the subsequent introduction of the Embargo Act against British imports by the federal government under Thomas Jefferson in 1807, the performance of homespun politics made a righteous return to the public sphere of American patriotic display.[124] Demonstrations of domestic manufacturing, celebrations of domestic agriculture and textile production, and elite spectacles of homespun attire all experienced a resurgence along the road towards the outbreak of the War of 1812.[125] However, such public performances of homespun patriotism now had the benefit of a supporting, though still relatively small-scale and imperfect, industrial infrastructure.

The major difference between the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century manifestations of popular homespun patriotism in America was the improved calibre of the young nation's resources for textile manufacturing: the opening of Samuel Slater's first water-powered cotton mill in Rhode Island in 1791 and Eli Whitney's patent of the

---

[124] On the transatlantic crisis of the Chesapeake-Leopard affair, which saw the Royal navy attempt to impress US sailors into their service during war with France, and the retaliatory ethos behind the Jefferson's Embargo Act of 1807, see: Spencer Tucker and Frank T. Reuter, *Injured Honor: The Chesapeake-Leopard Affair, June 22, 1807* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1996); George C. Daughan, *1812: The Navy's War* (Philadelphia, PA: Basic Books, 2011); Cogliano, *Revolutionary America, 1763-1815* (2009), pp. 241-2, pp. 244-7. While it might be argued that the Embargo Act was bad for the American economy, as suggested by Cogliano, there is no doubt that it was a significant patriotic rallying-cry.

[125] Sometimes referred to as the 'Second Revolutionary War'.

cotton gin in 1794 had begun to gradually alter the character of domestic textile production in America in the years since the much-maligned failure of the Hartford Woolen Manufactory of Connecticut.[126] As stated throughout this chapter, while the production and trade of homespun cloth during the late colonial and early Republican periods had been a decidedly local and often informal affair participated in by a smattering of professional weavers, early industrialists, and amateur homebodies, as discussed by Barbara Brackman, by the advent of the Embargo Act in 1807 much of the cloth being woven in homesteads across the country by a new generation of patriotic spinners was largely being produced using commercially available, factory-spun yarn.[127] This was a significant milestone in the furtherance of the American Republic's vision of domestic self-sufficiency, as envisioned by John Beale Bordley in his homespun portrait of 1770 and by George Washington during his homespun inauguration of 1789.

As the prospect of a second Revolutionary War against Britain loomed, volunteer militias in the United States were implored by both the public and by American manufacturers to don homespun uniforms and accoutrements in place of European manufactures. Following the institution of the Petersburg Manufacturing Society in June 1808 – to which the public subscribed '25,000 dollars immediately' – it was resolved by the Petersburg Troop of Calvary to appear 'on the 4th of July, with an uniform of white Virginia cloth.' Commenting upon the spectacle, the *Petersburg Intelligencer* asked, 'would it not be praise-worthy in the officers of militia to wear constantly pantaloons and waistcoats of the growth and product of our own fields and loom'?[128] In May 1809, John P. Lherbette of New York, advertised 'an improved KNAPSACK' for military use, 'which in point of durability and convenience, has been pronounced by the best judges infinitely superior to any hitherto in use. The officers of the different volunteer companies in the United States, are respectfully

---

[126] See in particular: Rivard, *A New Order of Things* (2002); Angela Lakwete, *Inventing the Cotton Gin: Machine and Myth in Antebellum America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).

[127] Barbara Brackman, *Clues in the Calico: A Guide to Identifying and Dating Antique Quilts* (Lafayette, CA: C&T Publishing, 2009), p. 38.

[128] Reprinted in *The National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser* (17 June 1808).

solicited to adopt them.'[129] Endeavours such as these to present America's fighting men on the eve of renewed conflict with Britain in garb constructed of the nation's burgeoning sartorial industries recalled the dress of America's rebellious colonial military in 1775, when soldiers of the Continental army had fought against British redcoats, dressed variously in buckskin leggings, hunting shirts, and a mixed state of homespun regimentals under the direction of General Washington.[130]

Reports of regional successes in early industrial textile production immediately began to fill the pages of US newspapers following the introduction of Jefferson's Embargo Act, much in the same way as they had amid the Imperial Crisis of the 1760s–70s. In April 1809, for instance, it was reported that the President of the newly-invested South Carolina Homespun Company had made a spectacle of using a newly constructed power-loom to weave a length of 'Negro Cloth' before a gathering of several ladies and gentlemen of the surrounding district 'whom were highly pleased with the performance, and joined in congratulations on the pleasing prospect of success.'[131] As the relationship between Britain and America continued to fray in the run up to the War of 1812, this same factory was referred to in a newspaper notice attacking an agent of the London Phoenix Insurance Company (a British fire insurance firm operating in the US), who had refused to provide insurance either to

---

[129] *The National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser* (22 May 1809).

[130] The characteristic blue and buff uniforms most commonly associated with the Continental army were not introduced until 1779 and their adoption was by no means universal. Dressing in homespun regimentals manufactured by patriotic colonists in support of the war effort was certainly a consistent feature, particularly during the early years of the conflict and at times of severe shortages among the troops. Linen hunting shirts and buckskin leggings, as worn by Native Americans, were suggested by Washington as a cheap and convenient method of clothing members of the militia and he particularly recommended the use of 'Tow Cloth' then being spun in the colonies of Rhode Island and Connecticut. There is certainly evidence to suggest the partial adoption of this form of frontier-inspired military dress by the colonial militia, and that supporters of the dress believed it encouraged a 'levelling spirit' among the rank and file and officer classes in keeping with the tenets of a 'people's war'. See in particular: Neal Thomas Hurst, '"kind of armour, being peculiar to America:" The American Hunting Shirt' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of William and Mary, 2013); Gregory T. Knouff, *The Soldiers' Revolution: Pennsylvanians in Arms and the Forging of Early American Identity* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), pp. 38-40; Baumgarten, *What Clothes Reveal* (2002), pp. 96-7.

[131] *The National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser* (10 April 1809).

the South Carolina Homespun Company or to the Homespun Factory of Charleston in August 1809. It was heavily implied by the paper that the refusal was meant as a deliberate act of commercial sabotage by Britain, to undermine America's renewed bid to expand their domestic production. It was an accusation not without weight, as investing in a mill without the protection of fire insurance would have seemed a daunting prospect, considering the highly combustible nature of raw cotton.[132]

Public gatherings and events which celebrated the gains of domestic agriculture and regional textile production since the Revolution abounded, such as the feted 'Annual Sheepshearing' contest held in Arlington, Virginia in April 1808. This was an event supervised by George Washington Parke Curtis, the adoptive son and step-grandson of the late George Washington. Very much in-keeping with the improving spirit of John Beale Bordley and his homespun ideology of 1770, gentlemen farmers from Virginia and neighbouring Maryland presented specimens of sheep bred upon their own land in the hopes of winning the 'Prize Cup', while female members of the local gentry 'produced each a piece of cotton cloth, of their own home manufacture' for the prize of a golden apple. 'It was cause of infinite gratification', reported *The National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser*, 'to see this patriotic and praise-worthy establishment, so numerously and respectably attended, and already exhibiting such strong evidence of the utility contemplated by its worthy founder [President George Washington].' Following the prize giving, the guests retired to a marquee where Curtis delivered a rousing speech that outlined his conviction that domestic manufacturing was beneficial not only to the economic stability of the local community but also to the nation as a whole, after which he invoked the example set by the late-great 'General Washington' in his support of homespun manufacturing during his presidential terms. In the aftermath of Curtis' address, an attendee moved that all future meetings of the Arlington Sheepshearers should be attended only by members 'clad in American manufacture', a motion which was 'immediately and unanimously adopted.'[133] The previous month, a 'Republican Feast' had been held in Petersburg, Virginia, where attendees had raised a toast to 'Native simplicity and homespun elegance' after a chorus of the Revolutionary ballad *Yankee Doodle*.[134]

---

[132] *The National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser* (14 August 1809).

[133] *The National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser* (6 May 1808).

[134] *The National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser* (14 March 1808).

Meanwhile, at a similar gathering in Wilmington, Delaware, a rope maker had used a toast to ridicule non-supporters of the Embargo Act: 'May the Legislator who refused to encourage the manufactures of his country be compelled to wear a *homespun* neck-cloth.'[135]

Unsurprisingly, elite spectacles of homespun attire within the public spaces of independent America also made a reappearance with the approaching spectre of war. Two homespun coats currently held by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation can be reliably dated to *c.* 1805–10, placing their period of primary use at the peak of the second popular movement of homespun patriotism in the United States.[136] Both are manufactured of what appears to be American cotton, according to provenance: the first was found near Columbus, South Carolina and is constructed of a faded blue plain-woven cotton **[Fig: 4.24]**, while the second has a Connecticut history and consists of a white cotton warp and blue cotton weft, producing a tweed effect **[Fig: 4.25]**. The cut of each coat exemplifies the dominant silhouette of men's fashion in the British Atlantic during the early nineteenth century, consisting of a double-breasted front with a square cut-away at the waist **[Fig: 4.25*a*]**, with a turned-down collar and vent in the centre-back to produce the appearance of 'tails' **[Fig: 4.24*a*]**. Both of these garments would not have been out of place at a social function organised by members of the Republican upper-class, such as the annual gathering of the Arlington Sheepshearers, or even within the walls of the Capitol building in Washington, where it was observed by onlookers in November 1808: '[it] is in the highest degree interesting to notice the handsome and respectable appearance of a large number of the members of Congress in full suits of *Homespun*. In most instances the cloth is a mixture of wool and cotton and in some cases equals in appearance foreign fabrics.'[137]

---

[135] *The Delaware Gazette* (8 July 1809).

[136] *CWF* 1999-74 (Man's coat. Probably South Carolina, *c.* 1805-10); *CWF* 1991-442 (Man's coat, blue homespun cotton. Probably Connecticut, *c.* 1805-10).

[137] *The National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser* (11 November 1808).

Conclusion

From the outset of the Imperial Crisis in the mid-1760s, homespun politics was an essential element of the colonial opposition to British control over transatlantic trade. The weaving and wearing of homespun cloth by consumers accustomed to purchasing imported fabrics representative of the finest taste and quality available in the Anglo-American world was a powerful act of defiance undertaken by colonial citizens. As civil unrest developed into open warfare from 1775, such acts of sartorial resistance to Hanoverian authority graduated from the realm of political protest into that of legitimatising, patriotic performance of an emergent Republican identity. As this chapter has successfully demonstrated, homespun patriotism emerged in various forms across the social spectrum of Revolutionary America, with both ordinary and elite colonial citizens engaging in displays of domestic self-sufficiency for the furtherance of the Patriot Cause.

However, wholesale national investment in homespun patriotism only proved to make both economic and cultural sense for American manufacturers and consumers during periods of direct conflict with Britain. With the advent of peacetime in 1783, it was difficult for the average US citizen to reconcile patriotic ideology with the material realities of fledgling statehood; namely, the lack of readily available, good quality domestic products and the allure of far superior British goods once again flooding America's port cities. That being said, while the material reality of purchasing homespun during the early Republican period made it an unattractive commodity for the fashionable consumer on a continual, everyday basis, homespun politics remained a prevalent aspect of the evolving national character of the new United States of America in the wake of the Revolution, as evidenced by the public activities of political actors such as George and Martha Washington. By conjuring a compromise in the guise of 'Republican plainness', the First Family openly advocated patriotic disdain for imported luxuries without practicing total abstention. In this manner, consumers navigating the fluctuating commercial landscape of the early American Republic were able to present themselves as culturally and materially sophisticated on a par with pre-war requirements of fashionable taste, while at the same time exerting an outward appearance of sartorial restraint which aligned with the founding rhetoric of the United States of America. As shall be shown in Chapter Six, this fraught relationship between the convictions of sartorial patriotism and the

vulnerable state of American national identity would not alter until domestic textile manufacturing in the new United States had significantly matured during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, thereby meeting the interwoven consumer desires of quantity, quality, and taste.

As shall be expanded upon further in Chapter Five, this process of 'unbecoming British' was a difficult and arduous journey for the patriotic American homeowner, who – while wishing to support burgeoning local enterprise – found that homespun wares simply could not satisfy the social and cultural requirements of class-appropriate domestic décor.[138] However, the patriotic refashioning of the Independent American interior was far from an insular journey for American manufacturers and consumers. British makers of luxury commodities, such as printed furnishing fabrics, faced the challenges posed by the advent of American statehood with a spate of sartorial goods aimed at appeasing the political convictions of the citizen consumers of the newly founded Republican marketplace.

---

[138] See: Yokota, *Unbecoming British* (Oxford, 2011).

Chapter Five

Refashioning Patriotic Display for an Independent Interior: Republican Cottons in the United States of America, *c.* 1783–1815

Writing in his diary for 16 February 1777, statesman and later-President of the United States of America, John Adams, described an evening spent with a group of friends in the port town of Baltimore, during which he observed a striking new form of interior decoration:

> They have a fashion, in this town, of reversing the picture of
> King George III. in such families as have it. One of these topsy-
> turvy kings was hung up in the room where we supped, and
> under it were written these lines, by Mr. Throop, as we are told.
>
> *Behold the man, who had it in his power*
>
> *To make a kingdom tremble and adore,*
>
> *Intoxicate with folly. See his head*
>
> *Placed where the meanest of his subjects tread.*
>
> *Like Lucifer, the giddy tyrant fell;*
>
> *He lifts his heel to Heaven, but points his head to Hell.*[1]

Barely six months prior to Adams's social call in Baltimore, a mob of soldiers and civilians who had been galvanised by a public reading of the Declaration of Independence in New York converged upon the lead statue of George III at Bowling Green, smashing it to pieces in a fit of reforming zeal. A number of these pieces were collected together and transported to Litchfield, Connecticut, where they were melted down for use as bullets by the Revolutionary forces. It is thought that fragments of

---

[1] Charles Francis Adams, ed., *The Works of John Adams, Second President of the United States: With a Life of the Author, Notes and Illustrations, by his Grandson Charles Francis Adams*, 2 vols (Boston, 1850), II, p. 434.

the statue were stolen and hidden in and around the homes of Connecticut Loyalists, for many small pieces of the statue have been found buried in the area **[Fig: 5.1]**.[2]

From as early as 1774, across the country 'Americans engaged in an orgy of iconoclastic violence in the streets' searching for 'any imperial symbol to destroy.'[3] Royal arms and portraits were taken down and broken, the King's name was removed from government and legal documents, streets and buildings were hastily renamed and, in perhaps the most 'potent rejection' on George III's dwindling authority in the American colonies, crowds held mock trials, executions, and funerals for the British monarch, which often included desecrating the King's effigy.[4] However, unlike these more vicious outbursts of popular iconoclasm, what John Adams had witnessed that night in Baltimore in 1776 falls more comfortably within Novotny's theory of 'polite war' or Pittock's discussion of 'wordless sedition'.[5] What Adams had been privy to was an early example of patriotic refashioning in the late eighteenth-century American home, a process by which the material culture of British loyalty was dismantled and replaced by sartorial objects expressive of the evolving political culture of fledgling American Republicanism.

However, the popular urge to refashion the patriotic trappings of everyday life so as to better reflect the changing mood of the colonies was not confined to the performance of subversive rituals within an existing Loyalist landscape. It was also evident within the complex, post-Independence commercial culture which emerged during the formative years of American statehood, when new decorative items were manufactured and sold in the British Atlantic region as a compliment to the newly established Republican marketplace. Object-based analysis of the commercially-

---

[2] *NYHS* 1878.5 (Fragment of the equestrian statue of King George III, *c.* 1770-6); Tabitha Barber and Stacy Boldrick, eds., *Art Under Attack: Histories of British Iconoclasm* (London: Tate Publishing, 2013), pp. 106-107. There are at least ten other pieces of the statue in the collection of the New York Historical Society alone.

[3] Brendon J. McConville, *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), p. 306.

[4] Jeremy Black, *Crisis of Empire: Britain and America in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Continuum, 2010), p. 130.

[5] As discussed in relation to the sartorial patriotism of British Jacobites in Part One of this thesis. See: Novotny, 'Polite War: Material Culture of the Jacobite Era, 1688-1760', in *Living with Jacobitism* (2014), pp. 153-72; Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1760* (2013).

produced, sartorial culture designed specifically for use in the Independent interior of the Patriot home has featured sporadically in recent scholarship; Breen and Ulrich for example, have highlighted the conflicted relationship between the American consumer and the British manufacturer on the eve of the Revolutionary War, as embodied by the transatlantic trade of 'No Stamp Act' teapots peddled during the Imperial Crisis **[Fig: 5.2]**.[6] As posed by Ulrich, these little white pots, which stand 'less than five inches tall' are 'filled with historical meaning.'[7] Referring to an example recently acquired by the National Museum of American History, Ulrich has challenged the historian to use the 'No Stamp Act' teapot as a lens through which to interpret the political power of commercial goods and, by extension, to judge the transformative capabilities of consumers and manufacturers of these goods in the refashioning of the Revolutionary World:

> Once a commodity, it is now a marker of cultural and political change. Once a container for a popular hot drink, it is now a piece in a scholarly puzzle. It invites us to consider the relationship between the political protests that led to the American Revolution and the commercial expansion that stimulated the production and marketing of objects like the Smithsonian's "No Stamp Act" teapot.[8]

The major aim of this chapter is therefore to incorporate discussion of imported and domestically produced patriotic furnishing fabrics into this burgeoning historical

---

[6] Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution* (2004), p. xii; Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, 'Political Protest and the World of Goods' in *The Oxford Handbook of the American Revolution* (2013), pp. 64-84; *NMAH* 2006.0229 (Teapot, ceramic creamware. Inscribed in black lettering 'No Stamp Act' on front and 'America, Liberty Restored' on reverse. Possibly manufactured by the Cockpit Hill Factory, Derby, *c.* 1766-70); *CWF* 1953-417,A&B (Teapot, ceramic creamware. Inscribed in red lettering 'No Stamp Act' on front and 'America, Liberty Restored' on reverse. Staffordshire, *c.* 1766-70).

[7] Ulrich, 'Political Protest and the World of Goods' in *The Oxford Handbook of the American Revolution* (2013), pp. 64.

[8] *Ibid.*; It should be noted that a recent primer on the Stamp Act identified the 'No Stamp Act' teapot as a viable primary source for the study of the American Revolution, characterising it as an element of the political culture of colonial resistance, alongside cartoons and the iconographic designs of newspaper headings. See: Johnathan Mercantini, ed., *The Stamp Act of 1765: A History in Documents* (Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2018), p. ix, p. 106. However, textiles notably do not feature in Mercantini's primer.

debate, the focus being upon promoting the advantages of object-based research methodologies within the study of Revolutionary culture. Prior to the international recognition of American independence in the aftermath of the Revolutionary War, British calico printers had produced fine, copperplate-printed patriotic fabrics for their colonial customers which stressed ties of loyalty between the Hanoverian royal family and their subjects living abroad. These patterns made use of common symbols of British nationhood, such as medallion portraits of George III, Britannia with her shield bearing the King's Colours, and the majestic British lion. All three of these popular patriotic symbols can be observed in a pattern designed and engraved by David Richards and executed by a print-works in Manchester, *c.* 1780–5 [**Figs: 5.3, 5.3***a* **& 5.3***b*].[9] However, with the advent of American statehood in 1783 and the subsequent resumption of trade between the US and Europe, there emerged a new style in patriotic furnishing fabrics in the British Atlantic region. This was an entirely 'Republican style' of interior decoration, manufactured specifically to refashion the private and social spaces of the newly Independent American household. This style enthusiastically celebrated the change in the patriotic identities of American consumers, while also emphasising their release from the imperial control of Hanoverian Britain.

The 'Republican cottons' featured in this chapter have been discussed by a number of textile historians and museum professionals, chiefly those with direct access to British and American textile collections. The important work of curators during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries – such as the collected works of the Victoria & Albert Museum, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and the Winterthur Museum – has done much to uncover the artistic and industrial contexts of patriotic pattern production in the British Atlantic region in the period immediately following the American Revolution.[10] Curators Florence Montgomery and Linda Eaton of the

---

[9] *WM* 1969.3322.001-004 (Copperplate-printed cotton in purple or sepia colourway, c. 1780-5. In four fragments.); *VAM* CIRC.90-1960 (Copperplate-printed cotton in purple or sepia colourway, c. 1780-5); *CHSDM* 1954-55-1 (Copperplate-printed cotton in purple or sepia colourway, c. 1780-5).

[10] Peter C. Floud, 'The English Contribution to the Development of Copper-plate Printing', *Journal of the Society of Dyers and Colourists*, 76: 7 (1960), pp. 425-34; Linda Parry, ed., *British Textiles: 1700 to the Present* (London: V&A Publishing, 2010); Edith A. Standen, 'English Washing Furnitures', *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, 23: 3 (1964), pp. 109-24; Florence M. Montgomery, *Printed Textiles: English and American Cottons and Linens, 1700-1850* (London: Thames & Hudson,

Winterthur Museum, in particular, have uncovered invaluable information regarding calico printers in the British Atlantic region who manufactured patriotic cottons for the American marketplace and, through the investigation of provenance records and supporting manuscript evidence, have revealed the identities of a number of American buyers. Their work has also shed light upon patriotic pattern production in America itself as performed by domestic artisans, though the focus has largely been upon the nineteenth rather than the eighteenth-century experience.[11] The vast majority of sketches, paintings and mezzotints which served as the visual references for pattern-drawers in Europe have also been paired with surviving fabrics held by British and American textile collections and through this their place within the early iconography of Independent American nationhood has been – somewhat – mapped.[12]

However, beyond the well-founded observation that the Republican cottons manufactured in Britain enjoyed significant popularity among American consumers after the Revolution, the complicated space occupied by these fabrics in the material refashioning of American patriotic display has not yet been adequately addressed by

---

1970); Florence M. Montgomery, *Textiles in America, 1650-1870: A Dictionary Based on Original Documents, Prints and Paintings, Commercial Records, American Merchant's Papers, Shopkeepers' Advertisements, and Pattern Books with Original Swatches of Cloth. Foreword by Linda Eaton* (New York & London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007); Linda Eaton, *Printed Textiles: British and American Cottons and Linens, 1700-1850. Based on the 1970 classic by Florence M. Montgomery* (New York: The Monacelli Press, 2014). See also: Mary Schoeser and Celia Rufey, *English and American Textiles: From 1790 to the Present* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1989); Susan Greene, *Wearable Prints, 1760-1860: History, Materials, and Mechanics* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2014).

[11] Mainly Eaton, who has worked on updating Montgomery's earlier core scholarship to include the new research being done using the Winterthur Museum textile collection. Eaton is arguably the current authority in this area. For a discussion that outlines the state of American textile printing during the late eighteenth/nineteenth century, with some reference to examples of (mainly nineteenth-century) patriotic printing see: Eaton, *Printed Textiles* (2014), pp. 81-101, p. 332-6, p. 341-2, pp. 344-5, pp. 348-9.

[12] How the symbols used in patriotic textile design evoked American ideas of new nationhood is exemplified by this object-based discussion of the earliest known domestically-manufactured patriotic handkerchief [*WM* 1959.0963]: John R. Monsky, 'From the Collection: Finding America in Its First Political Textile', *Winterthur Portfolio*, 37: 4 (2002), pp. 239-64.

scholars of early American patriotic identity.[13] Neither have the commercial outputs of American artisans and European print-works (particularly those from France) been sufficiently incorporated into this discussion, despite the object-based evidence to be found in British and American textile collections which indicates a concerted effort by these parties to produce sartorial culture to compete with the continued ubiquity of British wares in the aftermath of Revolution.

The two main areas of research which have addressed the appeal of patriotic patterns and their use within the Independent American interior have been: discussion of these fabrics within the object-category of early Americana/commemoratives and the use of these fabrics in women's political quilting.[14] While both of these approaches are valuable, they do not fully communicate the lived experience or practical considerations encountered by the manufacturers and purchasers of Republican cottons during the formative years of American independence. Neither do they address how the introduction of Republican iconography into the confines of the American home *c.* 1783–1815 bolstered the evolving national character of US citizens during this difficult period of transition, when victory was still fresh and the gains of the Revolutionary War were arguably at their most vulnerable and ill-defined.

---

[13] There is certainly a body of recent literature into which the analysis of Republican cottons could be situated, however the study of textiles is in no way a significant aspect of this existing scholarship. See in particular these interdisciplinary works on material culture, citizenship, and American identity: Catherine E. Kelly, *Republic of Taste: Art, Politics, and Everyday Life in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016); Jennifer Van Horn, *The Power of Objects in Eighteenth-Century British America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2017).

[14] Herbert Ridgeway Collins, *Threads of History: Americana Recorded on Cloth, 1775 to the Present* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1979); Diane L. Fagan Affleck, Paul Hudson, and Thomas W. Leavitt, eds., *Celebration and Remembrance: Commemorative Textiles in America, 1790-1990* (Lowell, MA: Museum of American Textile History, 1990); Linda Eaton, *Quilts in a Material World: Selections from the Winterthur Collection* (New York: Abrams, 2007), pp. 138-61; Lynne Zacek Bassett, *Massachusetts Quilts: Our Common Wealth* (Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England, 2009), pp. 194-200. See also: Robert Shaw, *American Quilts: The Democratic Art, 1780-2007* (New York & London: Sterling, 2009); Sue Reich, *Quilts: Presidential and Patriotic* (Atglen, PA: Schiffer Publishing, 2016).

This chapter aims at significantly forwarding that discussion by pursuing the following lines of enquiry: providing a cultural context for the emergence of Republican cottons in America during the mid-1780s; discussing the place of copperplate-printed cottons, more generally, within prevailing trends of interior decoration in the British Atlantic region during the later eighteenth century; outlining the practical difficulties experienced by American and French manufacturers of patriotic patterns, and how these were partially responsible for British printers' domination of the market; and highlighting the considerable entrepreneurship of British calico printers following the loss of their dedicated colonial marketplace, as evidenced by the various ways in which their new Republican patterns effectively anticipated the changing patriotic identities of their American consumers during the period *c.* 1783–1815.

Lastly, the concluding section of this chapter will challenge the manner in which patriotic furniture fabrics manufactured in the British Atlantic region have been approached by scholars, particularly in terms of discussing the root cause of their popularity among American citizens. Moving away from analyses which have focused purely upon the 'commemorative' aspects of patriotic patterns, this final section will align the emergence of Republican cottons with the lived experience of American buyers and discuss what exactly was expected of such fabrics in terms of their quality, fashionability, and lifespan.

The Emergence of Republican Cottons in the American Marketplace, *c.* 1785

Writing to his sister Nancy from the comfort of his uncle's New York home in 1785, Thomas Lee Shippen described to her the patriotic iconography which decorated the copperplate-printed cotton furniture of his private quarters:

> I find my uncle here in a Palace, and think indeed that he does
> the honors of it, with as much ease and dignity as if he had been
> always crowned with a real diadem. My chamber is a spacious
> and elegant one and prettily furnished. I now write in it and
> which way soever I turn my eyes I find a triumphal Car, a
> Liberty Cap, a Temple of Fame or the Hero of Heroes, all these

and many more objects of a piece with them, being finely represented on the hangings.[15]

Shippen's description of the iconography displayed prominently about his bedchamber aligns closely with a British pattern commonly referred to by textile curators as 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' **[Fig: 5.4]**, which was marketed towards American consumers by British calico printers during the second half of the 1780s. As with many of the copperplate-printed furnitures which crossed the Atlantic during the later eighteenth century, this pattern is thought to have been manufactured by an English print-works, located either in the cotton county of Lancashire or in the calico country surrounding the city of London.[16]

The pattern was evidently popular among the moneyed and fashionable upper-classes of the early American Republic, judging by the sheer quantity in which it survives across British and American textile collections in the form of upholstery scraps, bed and window furniture, and quilts.[17] As with all of the Republican cottons discussed in this chapter, the pattern was designed and manufactured in the years immediately following the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1783. This treaty officially brought to a close the hostilities of the Revolutionary War, guaranteed Britain's formal recognition of American independence, and paved the way towards a revival of

---

[15] Quoted in: Ethel Armes, ed., *Nancy Shippen: Her Journal Book, The International Romance of a Young Lady of Fashion of Colonial Philadelphia with Letters to Her and About Her* (Philadelphia & London: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1935), pp. 229-30.

[16] All of the cotton furnitures discussed in this chapter have been subject to curatorial provenance research by those scholars discussed in the introduction to this chapter. Most have been traced to these industrialised areas in Britain, with the main areas of production being in the city of Manchester and in the area of Surrey.

[17] Examples of this pattern are present in too many museum collections to list here in full. For the purposes of this thesis, examples of this pattern have been found in the holdings of the following institutions: the Victoria & Albert Museum, the Smithsonian Institution, the Winterthur Museum, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Chicago Art Institute, the Museum of Fine Art, Boston, and the Daughters of the American Revolution Museum. See later footnotes for references to specific pieces in this pattern, in relation to issues such as attribution, contrasting colourways, and design orientation.

transatlantic trade between Britain and the now 'definitively established' United States of America.[18]

As shall be discussed in the following sections of this chapter, British-made Republican cottons were markedly different from those patriotic furnishing fabrics being produced by textile printers in America and France in celebration of American independence. Aside from pronounced disparities in terms of quality and style, the majority of these cottons can be positively identified as being of British manufacture because of the three blue threads found in the selvages of surviving examples. These blue threads can be observed, for instance, in an example of the pattern 'The Death of General James Wolfe' (*c.* 1785) **[Fig: 5.5]** from the collection of the Daughters of the American Revolution Museum and in the 'America Presenting at the Altar of Liberty Medallions of Her Illustrious Sons' pattern held by Winterthur Museum **[Fig: 5.6]**.[19] These blue threads indicate a positive date stamp of *c.* 1774–1811, when this customs regulation upon English-manufactured cottons was being enforced and when the fashion for copperplate-printed wares was arguably at its height.[20] There are blue threads present in the selvages of several examples of 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' which confirm the English origin of the pattern, including in this upholstery off-cut presented in a red colourway currently in the collection of the Winterthur Museum **[Fig: 5.7]**.[21]

Composed of two complementary scenes, this most popular of British-made Republican cottons, 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' is littered with numerous references to the early visual language of the American founding.[22] George Washington is the most prominent figure in the first of the two scenes. He is a suitable choice of figurehead for the new nation, given the military

---

[18] Auslander, *Cultural Revolutions* (2009), p. 95.

[19] *DARM* 75.8 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785); *WM* 1962.0208 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

[20] Montgomery, *Printed Textiles* (1970), p. 111. Note: the absence of blue threads in the selvage of a printed calico does not necessarily mean it was produced outside of England. Rather, it is more likely that the maker did not adhere to the regulation. Alternatively, the absence of blue threads in a known-English pattern could also imply that the piece is a copy produced after 1811.

[21] *WM* 1969.3179.001 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1780-90).

[22] See in particular: David Hackett Fischer, *Liberty and Freedom: A Visual History of America's Founding Ideas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

and political influence he exerted in American society during (and well after) the Revolutionary War.[23] Washington is depicted driving a gilded chariot drawn by a pair of leopards. The Continental army is ranged out behind him, marching in strict formation and brandishing their colours. The female embodiment of America reclines behind Washington's protective stance, bearing a tablet inscribed with the words 'AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE 1776'. Moving past the roots of a thriving Liberty Tree piled high with discarded weaponry and bound with a distressed copy of the Stamp Act, Washington's advance is heralded by two Native Americans blowing ceremonial horns, from which flutter two flags: The Rebellious Stripes and the coiled rattlesnake insignia associated with the Sons of Liberty.[24] Rather than leading his people into battle, the composition suggests that Washington's onward progress is one of triumphal, peaceful homecoming. **[Fig: 5.7*a*]**

In the second scene, Minerva, goddess of wisdom, brandishes a shield emblazoned with an emblem of thirteen stars, representative of the original Thirteen States of America. With her unencumbered arm, Minerva gestures towards a Temple of Fame in the distance, while looking back at the two figures of Benjamin Franklin and the female embodiment of Liberty who follow in her wake. Franklin carries a scroll, perhaps meant to represent the Declaration of Independence or the Treaty of Paris, and one end of a banner upon which is written 'WHERE LIBERTY DWELLS THERE IS MY COUNTRY.' To reinforce the banner's maxim, Liberty moves in companionable step with Franklin, shouldering the iconic cap and pole of her namesake.[25] Guarding the steps of the Temple of Fame are two cherubs balancing a

---

[23] See in particular: Barry Schwartz, *George Washington: The Making of an American Symbol* (New York: The Free Press, 1987); Barbara J. Mitnick, ed., *George Washington: American Symbol* (New York: Hudson Hills Press, 1999).

[24] The origins of the Liberty Tree, the Rebellious Stripes and the coiled rattlesnake insignia of the Sons of Liberty can all be traced to political disturbances surrounding the Imperial Crises of the 1760s, when American colonists first began to establish a symbolic visual and material language of resistance to the imperial control being exerted by the British government. The appearance of these controversial symbols within a British-made textile printed for the post-Independence American marketplace is an indication that pattern drawers in Britain recognised the significance of this early iconography and its mobilising role during the formative years of the Revolutionary War.

[25] For the significance of the 'liberty cap' in the political cultures of America, France and Britain, see: Yvonne Korshak, 'The Liberty Cap as a Revolutionary Symbol in America and France', *Smithsonian*

map of the British Atlantic region between them, while an angel hovers above the approaching procession, using a ceremonial horn to call the party up to the Temple. The implication of the scene is that as the party moves forward in unity they symbolically usher in the bright future of their fledgling nation **[Fig: 5.7*b*]**.

The visual references used to create the profiles of Washington and Franklin in this English-manufactured calico entered the public domain during the period of the Revolutionary War and were executed by artists directly associated with the Patriot Cause. Washington's profile, for instance, can be traced to a portrait painted in 1780 by American artist and Washington's former aide-de-camp, John Trumbull **[Fig: 5.8]**.[26] The image would later be issued as a mezzotint by London-engraver Valentine Green in 1781 **[Fig: 5.9]**.[27] Franklin's likeness derives from a medallion portrait produced by Italian medallist, Jean Baptiste Nini, taken during Franklin's diplomatic ventures to Paris. As well as appearing in print form, the Nini portrait was widely distributed in France in the form of collectable, clay medallions **[Fig: 5.10]**.[28]

Among a number of material indicators that this particular calico was much in vogue in the British Atlantic region include its appearance in various colourways, such as red, china blue, brown, and purple **[Figs: 5.11 & 5.12]**.[29] In addition, details of the design vary between existing pieces. For example, a rectangular bed curtain currently in the collection of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation shows a significant

Studies in American Art, 1: 2 (1987), pp. 52-69; James Epstein, 'Understanding the Cap of Liberty: Symbolic Practice and Social Conflict in Early Nineteenth-Century England', *Past & Present*, 122 (1989), pp. 75-118.

[26] *MET* 24.109.88 (John Trumbull, 'George Washington', oil on canvas, 1780).

[27] *National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution* NPG.76.54 (Valentine Green (after John Trumbull), 'General Washington', mezzotint on paper, 1781).

[28] *CHSDM* 1941-68-1 (Moulded terracotta medallion, *c.* 1777); On the mass-reproduction of Franklin's image, especially in the context of his diplomatic relationship with France during the 1770s–80s, see: Lester C. Olson, *Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004), pp. 188-94.

[29] *VAM* CIRC.93-1960 (Red variation: Furnishing fabric, c. 1780-90); *WM* 1969.3182 (China blue variation: Printed textile, c. 1780-90); *DARM* 74.300 (Brown variation: Printed textile, c. 1785); *WM* 1955.0063.001-009 (Purple variation: Bed hangings and bedcover, c. 1780-90). Note: examples described as being 'brown' or 'sepia' are most likely examples of a faded purple colourway.

alteration in the technical execution of the pattern when compared against other museum holdings. Presented in a red colourway upon a linen-warp, cotton-weft textile, the design has been orientated to the left rather than to the right, effectively reversing the original pattern **[Fig: 5.13]**.[30] The substantial variation evident across these surviving examples suggests that the pattern was reissued multiple times and by different printers hoping to capitalise upon the pattern's popularity among US citizens during the pivotal years of the 1780s–90s, using revised or duplicate plates.

It is important to note here that the chamber being described by Thomas Shippen in his correspondence with Nancy was not just any guest room in any New York townhouse. It was a guest room in the home of Richard Henry Lee, then-President of the Confederation Congress. Located at No. 3 Cherry Street, the mansion had been leased and furnished for the President at the expense of the Congress.[31] The existence of a British-made patriotic furniture fabric in the chief executive's home – a building which stood at the very heart of the newly independent nation – highlights the problematic relationship with fashionable consumption experienced by many American homeowners during the early decades of the Republic. As was discussed in Chapter Four, the 1780s–90s was a time when the nation was struggling to prove itself self-sufficient in terms of its domestic manufacturing of high-quality textiles, with many US citizens trying and failing to disentangle themselves from European notions of fashionable taste. The impetus to buy American was strong at this critical moment in the nation's founding, with Washington himself often performing his official duties donned in suits of broadcloth spun and dyed for him by the Hartford Woollen Manufactory in Connecticut. However, in private he and many other Americans continued to purchase their textile (and other luxury) goods in large part from British manufacturers. This was a simple matter of quality and value – when compared to the majority of available American-made products, the dyes used in British fabrics were less likely to run and the material was deemed far hardier.[32]

The presence of a British-made patriotic furniture fabric in the executive home also highlights the impressive entrepreneurship of British calico printers following the

---

[30] *CWF* 1959-18 (Red variation, reversed: Bed curtain, c. 1785).

[31] Thomas Patrick Chorlton, *The First American Republic, 1774-1789: The First Fourteen American Presidents* (Bloomington, IN: Author House, 2011), p. 422.

[32] See Chapter 4 for detailed discussion.

loss of a dedicated colonial marketplace in the 1770s, which until the upheavals of the American Revolution had been a guaranteed source of income for many textile printers operating in Britain.[33] Once the American colonies had been officially severed from Britain by the Treaty of Paris in 1783, American merchants and consumers had been presented with the opportunity to trade with other European powers alongside Britain – most notably France.[34] This arguably led to a competitive atmosphere between European textile printers, who began to vie for the position of chief arbiter of taste within the former British colonies. A notable consequence of this drive to dominate the luxury goods market in the new United States was that several calico printers in Britain attempted to create patriotic furniture fabrics which would specifically address the evolving Republican character of the American consumer, while also being of a fine enough quality to attract the discerning eye of the upper-class American homeowner. These printers recognised that one way of keeping their American customers satisfied during this period of commercial uncertainty in the British Atlantic region was to appeal to their emerging sense of independent American nationhood in the same way they had catered to their Anglo-American loyalties prior to the Revolutionary War **[Fig: 5.3]**. Consequently, certain British printers made a concerted effort to maintain levels of print quality and pattern suitability during the period *c.* 1783–1815. As shall be explored in more detail below, this was something which, despite their best efforts, their commercial competitors in America and France struggled to achieve to the same degree.[35]

Trends of Interior Decoration in the British Atlantic Region

> Textiles played a particularly noteworthy role in colour schemes.
> As the most expensive category of domestic good after precious

---

[33] See: Peck, '"India Chints" and "China Taffaty"' in *Interwoven Globe* (2013), pp. 104-19; Baumgarten, *What Clothes Reveal* (2002), pp. 76-105; Haulman, *The Politics of Fashion in Eighteenth-century America* (2011).

[34] The prospect of a Franco-American trade alliance, rather than the fraught reality which ensued, was what spurred competition. See: James Livesey, *Making Democracy in the French Revolution* (Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 2001), pp. 109-10.

[35] See in particular: Joanna Cohen, 'To Catch the Public Taste': Interpreting American Consumers in the Era of Atlantic Free Trade, 1783-1854' in *The Atlantic World*, eds., D'Maris Coffman, Adrian Leonard and William O'Reilly (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2015), pp. 573-96.

> metals, textiles constituted a visible way of adorning a room with colour at the same time that they conveyed messages about the intended importance of the space.

As discussed by Stephen Hague, decorating rooms in a primary colourway was a popular choice in both Britain and America during the second half of the eighteenth century, with the aesthetic choices of British artisans and consumers proving to be a considerable influence upon the character of American taste.[36] Commissioning wallpapers alongside soft furnishings and upholstery – chiefly bed hangings, coverlets, window curtains and slip covers – in fabrics of matching colours was therefore a fairly common practice during the period, as can be observed in household and business records of the mid-to-late eighteenth century, as well as in the material qualities of surviving sartorial objects.[37]

At Otterden Place, a mansion house near Feversham in Kent, for example, there was a veritable cornucopia of colour-themed rooms by 1780, including a 'White Room', 'Green Room', 'Red Bed Room', 'Yellow Dressing Room and Closet', 'Yellow Room', and a 'Blue Striped Room and Closet'.[38] The Yellow Room and adjoining Dressing Room and Closet were themed upon a combination of mahogany furniture and the liberal application of yellow silk damask, while the Blue Striped Room and Closet was styled with mahogany furniture and blue and white copperplate-printed cotton hangings, window curtains and counterpanes.[39] The practice of colour-matching can also be observed in the decoration of homes in colonial and Federal America, as exemplified by George Washington's decoration of Mount Vernon, Virginia. In 1759 he ordered a tester bed from London to be dressed with 'Chintz

---

[36] Stephen Hague, *The Gentleman's House in the British Atlantic World* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), p. 91.

[37] On the importance of matching papers to textiles to produce a cohesive colour scheme, see: Amanda Vickery, *Behind Closed Doors: At Home in Georgian England* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 172-5.

[38] *A Catalogue of the Genuine Household Furniture, China, Brewing and Garden Utensils, of Otterden Place, near Feversham, Kent. […] Which will be Sold by Auction, by Mr. Whitcomb, On Monday the 26th of June, 178-, and the three following Days* (London, 1780), p. 3-4, pp. 7-8, pp. 10-11, p. 14.

[39] *A Catalogue of the Genuine Household Furniture, China, Brewing and Garden Utensils, of Otterden Place, near Feversham, Kent* (London, 1780), pp. 3-4, pp. 7-8.

Blew Plate cotton furniture' made to match a sample of wallpaper sent with his order. He also requested that a coverlet, four chair seats, festoon curtains and window cornices be covered with the same material, so as to make the room 'uniformly handsome and genteel.'[40]

Copperplate-printed furnitures were well-suited to meet the stylistic requirement of elegant uniformity preferred by upper-class consumers for the interior decoration of their homes. The innovative technique of printing onto cotton and linen grounds using engraved metal plates was first introduced into the British Atlantic region by Irish printer Francis Nixon in 1752 at the Drumcondra print-works near Dublin. By 1757, Nixon had moved to England and entered into a partnership with George Amyand at his calico printing factory in Phippsbridge, Surrey. From here the fashion quickly spread.[41] Being monochromatic, usually presenting as a red, blue, or purple colourway printed upon a bleached cotton or linen ground, it was a relatively simple matter to match these fabrics to corresponding papers and the types of wood used for cabinetmaking. Also, in terms of their transatlantic availability, copperplate-printed textiles were a ready commodity because of the monopoly of British merchants both at home and abroad.

In his *Observations on the Commerce of the American States* (1784), John Baker Holroyd, 1st Earl of Sheffield, declared that Britain and Ireland would continue to be the chief importers of printed textile goods into the United States for the foreseeable future. This was on account, he argued, of the competitive price and fine quality of their products and because of the enduring American preference for British-made furnishing fabrics even after Independence. While acknowledging that British manufacturers were beginning to experience competition in the Atlantic region from new printing manufactories in the Netherlands, France, and Switzerland, Sheffield maintained that 'Britain and Ireland, it is thought, will have the advantage in this

---

[40] Eaton, *Printed Textiles* (2014), p. 65; Helen Maggs Fede, *Washington's Furniture at Mount Vernon* (Mount Vernon, VA: The Ladies Association of the Union, 1966), p. 18.

[41] Melinda Watt, "Whims and Fancies": Europeans Respond to Textiles from the East' in *Interwoven Globe* (2013), pp. 99-100.

branch, especially in callicoes for beds and furniture in fine patterns, distinguished by their beauty and neatness.'[42]

Plate-printed fabrics imported into the United States of America from manufactories in Europe were most commonly used in the decoration of semi-private domestic spaces, such as in bedrooms and parlours. While they appeared in multiple forms of upholstery and soft furnishings around the American home, their most common application by far was in the dressing of beds. According to Florence Montgomery, during the long eighteenth century the high-post bed 'reigned supreme' in America, with a fully-dressed bedstead having 'no equal as a measure of a man's position.' By this, Montgomery is referring to the rubric of taste which demanded that a lavish amount of time and money be expended upon the proper dressing of beds and the visibility of the bed within the social life of the home.[43] This rubric was fashioned and reinforced through the circulation of European design literature in America during the period, with publications such as George Hepplewhite's pattern book *The Cabinet-Maker and Upholsterer's Guide* (1788) proving to be particularly influential in the interior decoration of American upper-class homes.[44]

Hepplewhite's *Guide* places a clear emphasis upon the acts of bed-dressing and bed-design as indications of a person's wealth and social status in the British Atlantic region: 'Beds are an article of much importance, as well on account of the great expense attending them, as the variety of shapes, and the high degree of elegance

---

[42] John Baker Holroyd, *Observations on the Commerce of the American States […] A New Edition, Much Enlarged. With an Appendix, Containing Tables of the Imports and Exports of Great Britain to and from all Parts, Also, the Exports of America, &c. With Remarks on those Tables, and on the late Proclamations, &c.* (London, 1784), pp. 40-41.

[43] Montgomery, *Printed Textiles* (London, 1970), p. 49. This point shall be developed further, with specific object-based examples, in the final section of this chapter: 'Reconsidering the Appeal of Patriotic Furniture Fabrics'.

[44] Hepplewhite's *Guide* was first published posthumously in London in 1788 by Alice Hepplewhite. However, all references to the *Guide* in this chapter are to the third edition of 1794, which was revised and significantly expanded from the original. For a comparison to Hepplewhite see the works of Thomas Sheraton, also a distinct influence upon cabinet-making in Federal America. However, Sheraton's *Drawing Book* does not put as much emphasis on the importance of bed-dressing as Hepplewhite's *Guide*: Thomas Sheraton, *The Cabinet-Maker and Upholsterer's Drawing Book: In Three Parts,* 2 vols (London, 1793-4).

which may be shown in them.'[45] Hepplewhite's *Guide* elaborates further upon a hierarchy of bed-dressing seemingly informed by the wealth of the individual and the type of room which the bed was intended to furnish. Though the *Guide* states that beds may be adorned 'in almost every stuff which the loom produces', Hepplewhite also indicates that plain or corded white dimity will satisfy the most basic demands for 'elegance and neatness', while beds in state-rooms should be furnished with 'silk or satin, figured or plain, also of velvet, with gold fringe, &c.' In Hepplewhite's hierarchy, plate-printed cottons and linens manufactured in Manchester occupy a comfortable middle ground between stylishly simple necessity and opulent grandeur, as 'the elegance and variety of patterns […] afford as much scope for taste, elegance, and simplicity, as the most lively fancy can wish.'[46]

Hepplewhite's hierarchy can be observed in practice within the late eighteenth-century domestic interior by examining estate auction catalogues from the period, which usually detail not only the contents of rooms but also the status of the rooms themselves. A catalogue of an estate auction which took place in Southampton in June 1794 at the home of the late Mrs Hoadley shows that her 'Middle Bed Room' was furnished quite plainly with a four-poster bed decorated in 'check furniture' cotton, while her 'Best Bed Room' contained a much grander bedstead hung with 'printed cotton furniture', and featuring a goose feather mattress and bolster. Window curtains fashioned 'to correspond' with the printed cotton bed hangings were also listed, indicating that the room had been decorated 'of a piece' in line with prevailing standards of interior decoration.[47]

The English 'patriotic style' – typified by the creations of David Richards of Manchester **[Fig. 5.3]** and evident across other copperplate-printed furnitures

---

[45] Alice Hepplewhite, *The Cabinet-Maker and Upholsterer's Guide […] The Third Edition, Improved* (London, 1794), p. 17.

[46] Hepplewhite, *The Cabinet-Maker and Upholsterer's Guide* (1794), p. 18.

[47] *A Catalogue of Household Furniture, Plate, Linen, China, and Other Valuable Effects, Late the Property of Mrs. Hoardley, deceased, Which will be Sold by Auction, by Mess. Hookey and Son, on the Premises, No. 169, High Street, Southampton, on Wednesday Dec. 10th, 1794, and following Days* (Southampton, 1794), p. 10.

depicting the social life of the Hanoverian royal family **[Figs: 5.14 & 5.15]**[48] – was in no way the dominant theme represented in furnishing fabrics of the later eighteenth century. Rather, it was just one strand of a multifaceted oeuvre of copperplate-printed textiles, which reflected 'the zeitgeist of contemporary culture'.[49] Calico subjects ranged from an appreciation of the pastoral and the neoclassical, to a growing fascination with the East **[Figs: 5.16 & 5.17]**, as well as mirroring topical concerns, such as the works of acclaimed actor and playwright David Garrick or the exotic voyages of Captain James Cook to Tahiti and New Zealand **[Figs: 5.18 & 5.19]**.[50] Republican cottons emerged out of this 'zeitgeist' of popular interest in current affairs and, in terms of fashionability, were regarded in similar terms to less politically controversial patterns. While the designs of Republican cottons were more overtly patriotic than most other copperplate-printed furnitures then on the market they were not considered gauche, but instead regarded as eminently stylish commodities well-suited to the tasteful interior decoration of an upper-class American home. In terms of their monetary value, Republican cottons were certainly costly, luxurious commodities and therefore carried a higher social pedigree than the cruder, patriotic souvenirs manufactured during the post-Independence period, such as this circular pincushion, plate-printed with the likenesses of Washington and Franklin **[Figs: 5.20 & 5.20*a*]**.[51] As shall be further contextualised below, the major

---

[48] The following cottons were designed after engravings by J. Seymour in London *c.* 1779, but date to the mid-1780s: *MET* 62.43.1 (Copperplate printed cotton depicting King George III and his family, *c.* 1785); *MET* 62.43.2 (Copperplate printed cotton depicting King George III hunting in Windsor Park, *c.* 1785).

[49] Watt, "Whims and Fancies", in *Interwoven Globe* (2013), p. 100. For a detailed discussion of these styles, see: Wendy Hefford, 'Design for Printed Textiles in England: 1750 to 1850' in *British Textiles* (2010), pp. 77-178; Standen, 'English Washing Furnitures' (1964), pp. 109-24

[50] *VAM* T.527-1985 (Chair seat cover of plate-printed cotton in China blue colourway, *c.* 1770-95); *VAM* T.96-1959 (Chinoiserie furnishing fabric in a red colourway, *c.* 1775); *CHSDM* 1959-51-1-b (Copperplate-printed cotton in a brown colourway, *c.* 1785); *CWF* 1963-193 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a brown colourway, *c.* 1785).

[51] *WM* 1959.0570 (Silk, plate-printed pincushion. Possibly English, *c.* 1800-25). A pincushion such as this would have been manufactured following the deaths of Franklin and Washington, when the 'Cult of Washington' arose during the early decades of the nineteenth century. This shall be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

appeal of Republican cottons among American consumers was their relative stylishness, their fine quality, and their social exclusivity.

The Difficulties of Manufacturing American Printed Textiles

A uniquely 'American style' of patriotic decoration had begun to evolve in the new United States in the later eighteenth century alongside the process of formalising American statehood and the gradual implementation of technological advancements across America's domestic industries.[52] From the mid-1770s onwards, the design and adoption of official emblems of government, the advent of ceremonies of national significance, and the growth of the party system within the young Republic, allowed American artisans the opportunity to experiment with patriotic styles of sartorial goods in reaction to the fluctuating political culture of the early nation state.[53] While furnishing fabric is the main focus of this chapter, it was in no way the only material medium used to express patriotic sentiments across the domestic and social spaces of the early American Republic. A multiplicity of material surfaces were employed as canvasses, as the domestic industries of the new nation developed to meet the challenge posed by patriotic refashioning. Among other things, these included commercial manufacturers of patterned wallpapers.

Patterned wallpapers served a similar performative function to patriotic furnishing fabrics in the re-dressing of the Independent American home, in that their application allowed an individual's personal environment to reflect the changing face of the new nation's political landscape, while also communicating the good taste of the purchaser.[54] Imported papers, such as those manufactured in England, France and

---

[52] Auslander, *Cultural Revolutions* (2009), pp. 95-112; See also: Kelly, *Republic of Taste* (Philadelphia, 2016); Irvin, *Clothed in Robes of Sovereignty* (Oxford, 2011); Zakim, *Ready-Made Democracy* (2003).

[53] See in particular: Deborah Harding, *Stars and Stripes: Patriotic Motifs in American Folk Art* (New York: Rizzoli, 2002); Elinor Lander Horwitz, *The Bird, the Banner, and Uncle Sam: Images of America in Folk and Popular Art* (Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 1976).

[54] Hague, *The Gentleman's House in the British Atlantic World* (2015), pp. 91-2; Amanda Vickery, '"Neat and Not Too Showey": Words and Wallpaper in Regency England' in *Gender, Taste, and Material Culture in Britain and North America, 1700-1830*, ed. John Styles and Amanda Vickery (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2006), pp. 201-22; Vickery, *Behind Closed Doors* (2009), pp. 160-83.

Asia, were the only ones available in America until approximately the 1760s, and it was these imported papers which continued to influence the designs and techniques applied to American-made papers during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries **[Fig: 5.21]**.[55] Patriotically-themed wallpapers of American manufacture began to emerge in the former colonies soon after the Declaration of Independence and they, like the copperplate-printed yardage being imported from Britain, displayed elements of Republican iconography embedded within settings inspired by the neoclassical style. One of the earliest surviving American papers, block-printed in black, white and grey, is a prime example of the Eurocentric neoclassical style amalgamating with a uniquely American 'Republican style': Standing beside the figure of a Native American maiden, a patriot of the Lexington Minutemen tramples British laws beneath his feet and extends a copy of the Declaration of Independence to a weeping Britannia. The scene is contained within a Grecian, curtained archway, flanked by decorative urns **[Fig: 5.22]**.[56] It is worth noting, however, that when these American 'paper stainers', as they were referred to at the time, began to issue patriotic wallpaper patterns to challenge the ubiquity of imported papers from Europe and Asia in the later eighteenth century, they were often forced to under-price their wares so as to make them more attractive to domestic purchasers.[57]

The imperial restrictions imposed by Britain upon the American textile industries during the colonial period continued to impact upon the domestic craft economy of the early United States in the wake of the Revolution.[58] As has been discussed at length by Eaton, laws passed in Britain from the later 1660s onwards had forbidden the emigration of artisans and the export of machinery into America, with calico

---

[55] Catherine Lynn, *Wallpaper in America: From the Seventeenth Century to World War I* (New York & London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1980), p. 14; For an example of British-made patriotic wallpaper in neoclassical style, sold in Britain and America during the 1760s-70s, see: *CHSDM* 1970-26-2 (Sidewall, showing 'Britannia' pattern. Block-printed on joined sheets of handmade paper, *c.* 1765).

[56] *CHSDM* 1960-250-1-a/f (Sidewall, showing 'Lexington Minutemen' pattern *c.* 1775-99. Block-printed on handmade paper.)

[57] Shirley Teresa Wajda, 'Wallpaper' in *Material Culture in America: Understanding Everyday Life*, eds., Helen Sheumaker and Shirley Teresa Wajda (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, 2008), p. 472.

[58] As was discussed in Chapter Four, in relation to the Imperial Crises and the rise of homespun patriotism.

printers and 'any blocks, plates, engines, tools, or utensils used in, or which are proper for the preparing or finishing of the calico, cotton, muslin, or linen printing manufactures, or any part thereof' being explicitly included from 1782 until the repeal of these acts in 1824.[59] This meant that while some forms of patriotic American artisanship had begun to flourish during the final decades of the eighteenth century, such as wallpaper production, American manufacturers of patriotic furniture fabrics struggled to participate in the material refashioning of the Independent American interior.

Deficiencies in the available technology and a lack of resources and domestic expertise, alongside an almost non-existent industrial infrastructure for the support of textile printing on any large scale, had the effect of putting American-made furnishing fabrics at a commercial disadvantage to British-made Republican cottons during the final quarter of the eighteenth century. This being said, while European manufacturers certainly dominated the high-fashion textile market in the early Republic, domestic job printers were able to operate on a modest, highly regional level. Job printers specialised in fulfilling commissions brought to them by customers within their immediate localities and were often informal or short-lived operations. The majority of American job printers did not work with cloth taken from their own stock; instead, they worked with material brought to them by their customers. This arrangement allowed them to run lean businesses, as having and maintaining a large stock of plain cloth for the perusal of potential customers was expensive and ultimately did not return a reliable profit. Instead, American job printers concentrated their revenue into acquiring the most essential tools of their trade — printing paraphernalia — such as dyestuffs, pigments, fixatives, vats, woodblocks and (very occasionally) plates.[60] Given that the restrictions imposed by Britain upon the exportation of printing equipment and expertise to America was not formally lifted until 1824, working with plates remained somewhat difficult for American printers even after Independence. Moreover, printing plates, in contrast to wooden blocks and tools, were difficult to fashion domestically; consequently, the

---

[59] Eaton, *Printed Textiles* (2014), p. 82; These restrictions were in place until 1824, with varying levels of success.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 28, pp. 81-2.

vast majority of extant textiles with a verifiable early American provenance are block-printed, stamped or stencilled.[61]

American-made bed furniture which can be reliably attributed to the late eighteenth century can be found in the Winterthur Museum textile collection, as well as in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. The commercial outputs of early printing firms such as Walters & Bedwell of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, during the mid-1770s **[Figs: 5.23, 5.23*a* and 5.23*b*]**[62] and of the Waterman family of South Scituate, Massachusetts, during the period *c.* 1780–1815 **[Figs: 5.24 & 5.25]**[63] are already well known to textile historians because of their treatment by Montgomery and Eaton.[64] However, there are lesser-known examples of early American printing which, though not attributable to a particular maker, are of comparable quality and significance. Take this example of a bed curtain, thought to have been printed in the vicinity of Lexington, Massachusetts, during the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century **[Fig: 5.26]**.[65] The repeat pattern is comprised of blue twisted ribbon motifs alternating with rows of blue-green leafy stems and red floral sprigs, potentially

---

[61] While this statement refers specifically to the textile collection of the Winterthur Museum, field research conducted for this thesis across a number of collections has not revealed any American plate-printed textiles dating further back than the early nineteenth century. This is not to say that they did not (or do not still) exist, but that they were surely in the minority of American domestic manufactures in the late eighteenth century.

[62] *WM* 1958.0605.001-006 (Block-printed linen bed furniture, manufactured in Philadelphia by Walters & Bedwell *c.* 1775-6).

[63] *WM* 1969.0575 (Pieced quilt, composed of block-printed textiles by the Waterman family *c.* 1780–1815); *WM* 1969.0576 (Wholecloth quilt, composed of block-printed textiles by the Waterman family c. 1780-1815); *WM* 1964.0551.001-013 (Chest containing tools used by the Waterman Family in South Scituate, MA, late eighteenth/early nineteenth century). NB: the blocks have been definitively matched to those in the patterns of both quilts.

[64] Eaton, *Quilts in a Material World* (2007), pp. 98-102; Eaton, *Printed Textiles* (2014), p. 90, pp. 129-31, pp. 348-9; Montgomery, *Printed Textiles* (1970), p. 10, p. 83, p. 85, p. 88, p. 185, p. 190, p. 214.

[65] *MFAB* 98.1821 (Block-printed linen curtain fragment, late eighteenth/early nineteenth century). NB: Another example of this pattern, in the collection of Historic New England and mentioned in Eaton, *Printed Textiles* (2014), p. 128, comes with a family history of the cloth being homespun and 'set aside until the stenciler came to the neighbourhood.' The printing method used in the HNE example has been identified as pigments in oil.

meant to imitate imported chintz **[Fig: 5.26*a*]**.[66] The design was achieved quite simply, but effectively, by using no more than four separate blocks and a maximum of three dyes upon a plain-woven linen ground – a feat of industry well within the purview of the average American job printer during this period.

When one considers the occupational limitations experienced by American textile printers during the first decades of Independence, it is not altogether surprising that American-made patriotic textiles dating from the 1770s–90s are exceedingly rare. Far more common in museum collections of domestically printed American textiles are examples of patriotic yardage dating from the later nineteenth century, when the textile printing industry in America had matured to the extent that American printers could compete with European imports. These later nineteenth-century patriotic textiles are more truly representative of the 'commemorative cottons' genre than the late eighteenth-century Republican cottons which are the main focus of this chapter, in that these later textiles were manufactured commercially on large scales so as to coincide with specific events of national significance.[67] The Centennial celebrations of 1876, for example, were marked by an outpouring of mass-manufactured patriotic yardage from American mills, particularly from the thriving textile region of Fall River, Massachusetts.[68] When compared against the patriotic fabrics produced by job

---

[66] For discussions of the significance of imported Indian and British chintz into America and their general fashionability during the eighteenth century, see: Rosemary Crill, *Chintz: Indian Textiles for the West* (London: V&A Publishing, 2008); Giorgio Riello and Tirthankar Roy, eds., *How India Clothed the World: The World of South Asian Textiles, 1500-1850* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2009); Peck, '"India Chints" and "China Taffaty"' in *Interwoven Globe* (2013), pp. 104-19; Eacott, *Selling Empire* (2016).

[67] On the function of events of national significance in the forging of nineteenth-century American identity, in particular the Centennial Exposition of 1876, see: Kimberly Orcutt, *Power and Posterity: American Art at Philadelphia's 1876 Centennial Exhibition* (Philadelphia, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2017); Susanna W. Gold, *The Unfinished Exhibition: Visualising Myth, Memory, and the Shadow of the Civil War in Centennial America* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2017).

[68] The official catalogue for the Centennial Exposition, which took place in Philadelphia in 1876, indicates that the majority of vendors in attendance who were dealing in printed cottons where from Fall River, MA. However, a small number of manufacturers advertising 'coloured cotton goods' and 'printed and dyed calicoes' hailed from Lowell, MA and Providence, RI, respectively: United States Centennial Commission*, International Exhibition, 1876: Official Catalogue* (Philadelphia, 1876), pp. 119-21.

printers during the formative years of the Republic, these Centennial patterns were 'abundant in detail, fast in color and modest in price.'[69] These Centennial fabrics represent the vast strides taken by American textile manufacturing in the century following Independence, in that these patterns were printed by employing the latest roller printing technology, could feature up to eight different colours, and used fast dyes which would not bleed or blur **[Figs. 5.27 & 5.28]**.[70]

By contrast, late eighteenth-century examples of domestic patriotic printing follow a more restricted pallet of predominantly blue and red and their designs betray the irregularity of printing by hand. For the most part, American patriotic fabrics printed during the formative years of the Republic take the form of small decorative accessories or occasional bedding, such as handkerchiefs and display quilts which bear simple yet overtly patriotic motifs. From a technical standpoint, early domestic examples clearly reflect the fact that American textile printers struggled to acquire the resources needed for the costly and more complex process of copperplate printing – the process which, unfortunately for them, produced the most taste-appropriate form of bed furniture and upholstery fabric used in upper-class homes in the British Atlantic region.[71] Extant American-made patriotic handkerchiefs and display quilts dating from the final quarter of the eighteenth century showcase an exclusive use of blocks, stamps, and hand-finishing in the assembly and execution of their designs. This style of printing was easier for American printers to execute than plate-printing, but lacked the fine detail and the sharp, elegant contrast achieved by the copperplate-printed fabrics being produced by competing manufactories in Europe.

Artistically speaking, American-made patriotic textiles did not reflect the late eighteenth-century preoccupation with uniform, neoclassical style exemplified by the majority of European designs discussed in this chapter. Rather, American-made patriotic patterns reflected the desire of US citizens to celebrate the newest aspects of their national and cultural identities as and when they emerged. This reactionary

---

[69] Barbara Brackman, *Clues in the Calico: A Guide to Identifying and Dating Antique Quilts* (Lafayette, CA: C&T Publishing, 2009), p. 25.

[70] *Ibid.* Examples include: *NMAH* T7723 (Fragment of roller-printed cotton, *c.* 1876) and *NMAH* T17321 (Fragment of roller-printed cotton made to imitate pieced work, *c.* 1876).

[71] See section 'Trends of Interior Decoration in the British Atlantic Region' in this chapter for a detailed discussion of the transatlantic fashion for copperplate-printed textiles.

'folk' style was achieved through centring textile designs upon popular Revolutionary heroes, by prominently displaying new emblems of government, and by commenting upon political issues of the moment. The latter is best exemplified by this block-printed cotton handkerchief issued towards the end of our period in *c.* 1808–9 featuring an American Eagle calling for 'REVENGE' in the wake of the highly-charged Chesapeake-Leopard Affair, which had seen the British navy seriously encroaching upon US neutrality during the Napoleonic Wars **[Fig: 5.29]**.[72]

The emergence of the American Eagle as the de facto emblematic symbol of home-grown US patriotism during the 1780s-90s was as a consequence of the Continental Congress incorporating the native bird into the design of the Great Seal of the United States of America in 1782 and its subsequent dissemination through American currency with the implementation of the Coinage Act of 1792 **[Figs: 5.30 & 5.31]**.[73]

The journey to create an official, unifying emblem of government for the new nation had begun sometime earlier in 1776 with the combined efforts of Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams. However, their initial design had represented an uneasy meeting of colonial and Eurocentric symbolisms: a crest composed of the initials of the original Thirteen Colonies, flanked on one side by the figure of a colonial frontiersman dressed in buckskins and by the female embodiment of Liberty

---

[72] *WM* 1959.0970 (Block-printed cotton handkerchief made in North America, *c.* 1808-9); As discussed in Chapter Four, the Chesapeake-Leopard Affair was a key event in the cause of the War of 1812, eliciting strong reactions from the American public which included crowd action and the creation of reactionary material culture. See: Paul A. Gilje, *Liberty on the Waterfront: American Maritime Culture in the Age of Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), pp. 146-7; Tucker and Reuter, *Injured Honor: The Chesapeake-Leopard Affair, June 22, 1807* (1996).

[73] *The National Archives of America* 595257 (Charles Thompson's design for the Great Seal, 1782); *NMAH* 1991.0357.0122 (10 cents coin, copper. Displaying profile of Liberty on the obverse and eagle on the reverse. United States Mint, Philadelphia *c.* 1792); On the role of the design of the Great Seal in the construction of early American national identity, see: Sally Webster, *The Nation's First Monument and the Origins of the American Memorial Tradition: Liberty Enshrined* (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2015), pp. 176-8; Irvin, *Clothed in Robes of Sovereignty* (2011), pp. 129-33, pp. 203-4; Auslander, *Cultural Revolutions* (2009), pp. 96-8, pp.105-6; Hackett Fischer, *Liberty and Freedom* (2005), pp. 130-4, pp. 145-51; For a comprehensive history of the various designs of the Great Seal and those who participated in its formalisation between 1776-82, see: Richard S. Patterson and Richard Dougall, *The Eagle and the Shield: A History of The Great Seal of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976).

with cap and pole on the other; an eye of providence overlooks the group, while a banner bearing the motto 'E PLURIBUS UNUM' twirls about their feet.[74] Only the distinctive motto and eye of providence were taken forward into future incarnations of the Seal.

Two committees and six years later, a design produced through a collaborative effort between the Secretary of the Confederation Congress, Charles Thomson and Philadelphia attorney and amateur heraldist, William Burton, was given final congressional approval on June 20, 1782. The chosen emblem incorporated elements of earlier designs, including the motto from the initial design offered by Franklin, Jefferson and Adams. However, the choice to make the Seal's central symbol an American Bald Eagle grasping in its talons an olive branch and the arrows of war was comparatively new, taken from a design tabled in May 1782. Burton, who had proposed the inclusion of the bird, explained that it was '[t]he Symbol of supreme Power & Authority, and signifies the Congress.'[75] It is evident that Congress approved of the inclusion of the eagle because delegates associated it with 'an American commitment to classical republicanism in keeping with certain iconographic traditions', in that the eagle had been a prominent symbol of power for the Roman Empire.[76] With its learned references to European traditions alongside the incorporation of uniquely American symbols, the chosen design of the Great Seal 'conveyed in condensed form a powerful message that could be understood internationally – that the new nation was self-governed.'[77]

The motif of the American Eagle was integrated into various aspects of American-made sartorial culture in subsequent decades, including quilts and women's needlework **[Fig: 5.32]**,[78] and commercial manufactures such as patterned

---

[74] Auslander, *Cultural Revolutions* (2009), pp. 96-7.

[75] Quoted in: Irvin, *Clothed in Robes of Sovereignty* (2011), p. 204.

[76] Olson, *Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community* (2004), p. 233.

[77] Webster, *The Nation's First Monument* (2015), p. 178.

[78] *NMAH* T14833 (Eagle quilt attributed to Susan Strong, Ohio, *c.* 1825-40); *NMAH* T15316 (Eagle quilt made in Baltimore County, Maryland, *c.* 1800-25).

wallpapers **[Fig: 5.33]**[79] and loom-woven coverlets **[Fig: 5.34]**.[80] However, only a small number of late eighteenth-century printed textiles with a verifiable American provenance survive which feature the emblem. Two block-printed quilt tops **[Figs: 5.35 & 5.36]**, one held by the Winterthur Museum and the other by the National Museum of American History, both feature designs that are in clear imitation of the Great Seal of the United States.[81] The two quilts are thought to have been manufactured and printed in Kentucky at some time between 1790–1825, potentially by the same printer given the similarities in size, placement, and the design of the blocks used in each quilt.[82] Both quilt tops were executed by a job printer using multiple blocks to create the central motif of the eagle and the surrounding decorative elements, which include stars, shields, sunbursts, birds of paradise, and the inscription 'LIBERTY'. Close examination of the areas of transfer on both quilt tops reveals that the blocks were applied after the fabric had been quilted, as the ink penetrates to the stitching of the seams. This is a clear indication that the quilt tops were made or commissioned separately by their owners before being brought to the printer to be decorated, rather than the printed tops being sold as unmade panels to be quilted later. As previously indicated. it is extremely unlikely that the job printer would have sold these quilt tops as finished pieces for a characteristic of American job printers was their unwillingness to invest in stocks of plain fabric or ready-made

---

[79] *CHSDM* 1998-75-166 (Sidewall, showing 'Eagle' pattern. Block-printed on joined sheets of handmade paper, *c.* 1780).

[80] *NMAH* 1982.0572.01 (Jacquard double-woven, blue and white coverlet woven by James Alexander of Orange County, NY, *c.* 1824); *NMAH* T12819 (Jacquard double-woven, blue and white coverlet initialled 'S.D.', *c.* 1832); *NMAH* 1991.0829.01 (Jacquard double-woven, blue and white coverlet woven by David D. Haring of Bergen County, New Jersey, *c.* 1833)

[81] *WM* 1960.0008 (Quilt centre, block printed using Prussian blue, *c.* 1790-1800); *NMAH* T15294 (Quilted counterpane, *c.* 1800-25).

[82] Provenance records for the *NMAH* example associate the commission of the printing with a 'Mrs Farris of Kentucky' and attribute the quilting to her daughter Elizabeth Nunn. Elizabeth was born in Virginia in 1783, married William Nunn in 1805, and died in Kentucky in 1871. This would mean that she executed the quilting as a young woman during the early nineteenth century, possibly to mark an important event in her life (such as her marriage) or as a celebratory piece for an event of national significance (perhaps during the War of 1812). There is no family history provided alongside the *WM* example to corroborate a Kentucky provenance, meaning this attribution results solely from the similarities in printing technique and block design.

bedding. Both quilts have been block-printed using the pigment Prussian blue in oil and have faded considerably with repeated washings, indicating a history of heavy use by their owners.[83]

Winterthur Museum holds one further example of printed display bedding inspired by the Great Seal, though its design is considerably more complicated than that used in the Kentucky quilts **[Fig: 5.37]**.[84] The printer has employed a greater variety of blocks and stamps and more than one pigment in the execution of the design. Printed to shape, the bedcover was hemmed before being stamped in a combination of Prussian blue and vermillion pigments in oil. Provenance records associate it with the state of Rhode Island *c.* 1782–1810, however this attribution is somewhat debatable.[85] Unlike the Kentucky quilts, the eagle is not the major decorative feature of the Rhode Island bedcover **[Fig: 37*a*]**. At the centre of the rectangular textile is a ten-sided sunburst, with the eagles positioned at four points around it among a littering of stars, *fleur de lis*, birds of paradise and floral borders **[Fig: 37*b*]**.

Alongside the design and circulation of printed textiles inspired by the Great Seal, display handkerchiefs were also used by some American printers to convey other aspects of Revolutionary iconography to US citizens. As has been discussed in extensive detail by handkerchief and bandana expert John R. Monsky, there exists a limited run of block-printed display handkerchiefs attributed to the Philadelphia printer John Hewson, *c.* 1775–90, which exemplify some of the earliest aspects of Independent American iconography as designed by an American artisan.[86] Among extant versions of the handkerchief is a quilted example held by the Winterthur

---

[83] An identifying feature of Prussian blue, aside from the way it sits upon the surface of fabric as opposed to staining the fibres in the manner of natural dyes, is how it fades from bright blue to a light grey when washed with an alkaline soap. See: Anita B. Loscalzo, 'Prussian Blue: The Development of a Colorant and Its Use in Textiles', *Uncoverings: The Research Papers of the American Quilt Study Group*, 31 (2010), pp. 65-104.

[84] *WM* 1965.0086 (Cotton counterpane – or table cover - block printed using Prussian blue and vermillion, *c.* 1782-1810).

[85] The dealer who sold [*WM* 1965.0086] to Winterthur Museum in 1965 indicated a Rhode Island provenance, but did not provide supporting documentary evidence for the attribution. Research by curatorial staff has been unable to verify this claim.

[86] See: Monsky, 'From the Collection: Finding America in Its First Political Textile' (2002), pp. 239-264.

Museum, which once formed the central panel of a pieced counterpane **[Fig: 5.38]**. The design of the handkerchief exemplifies the secular veneration which attended George Washington as a military icon of the fight for American liberty, prior to his investment as the first US President. His image is encircled by the inscription: 'GEORGE WASHINGTON ESQ. FOUNDATOR AND PROTECTOR OF AMERICA'S LIBERTY AND INDEPENDENCY.' Also featured prominently around the edges of the design are regimental and regional flags related to the individual military efforts of the Thirteen States during the Revolution. These include the flag of the rebellious Sons of Liberty, which bears the formidable emblem of the coiled snake and the warning 'DON'T TREAD UPON ME' **[Fig: 38*a*]**. A rare survivor of the pre-Republican era, Hewson's limited run of Revolutionary War textiles represent the fluctuating iconography which accompanied the transition between colonial and Independent nationhood.[87]

As examples of early American patriotic printing, these rare pieces from the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries communicate a not insignificant degree of cultural and economic investment by the American public in the cause of domestic manufacturing during the formative decades of Independence. They also betray a desire on the part of their makers to materially celebrate the evolving iconography of the new nation as and when it appeared. However, when compared against the work of their European competitors, the varying quality and scattered nature of American patriotic textile production during the formative years of the Republic meant that, in most instances, these domestically produced fabrics were ill-suited to properly furnish the bedrooms and parlours of the American upper-class home.

The Limited Success of French Patriotic Patterns in America

French textile printers, emboldened by the successful alliance made between America and France during the Revolutionary War, produced patterns to mark American Independence between the mid-1780s and early 1790s. These, along with other French furnishing fabrics, entered the US through port cities such as

---

[87] *WM* 1959.0963 (Quilt centre, featuring a block-printed cotton handkerchief made in Philadelphia, *c.* 1775-90). Another example from the Winterthur collection: *WM* 1965.0010 A (Block-printed cotton handkerchief made in Philadelphia, *c.* 1775-1785).

Philadelphia and New York, or as the result of US citizens travelling between France and America during this period and purchasing sartorial goods first-hand from Parisian merchants.[88] However, while French patriotic furnishing fabrics were undeniably of fine quality, they appear to have enjoyed only limited success in the American Republic when compared against the ubiquity of British-made Republican cottons.[89]

Many of the French patriotic patterns currently held by British and American textile collections were issued by the prestigious Oberkampf Manufactory at Jouy-en-Josas, a commune in close proximity to the fashionable areas of Paris and Versailles. The Oberkampf Manufactory's reputation for high quality furnishing fabrics during the final decades of the eighteenth century had the effect of branding Jouy-en-Josas as a centre of excellence in the design and execution of printed cottons, an assumption which lasted well beyond the closure of the manufactory in 1843. Monochromatic printed textiles of the type produced by Oberkampf are often popularly referred to as *toile de Jouy* – 'cloth from Jouy' – even to the present day. This is in spite of the fact that many textiles produced in this style came from other centres of production in France, such as Nantes (*toiles de Nantes*) or Normandy (*toiles Normandes*).[90]

The Oberkampf Manufactory had begun to issue copperplate-printed textiles in 1770, with the company director, Christophe-Phillippe Oberkampf, commissioning designs directly from independent artists in France. Most notable among these was Jean-Baptiste Huet, who created the bulk of Oberkampf's neoclassical, antique, and patriotic patterns during this period.[91] According to the research of Melanie Riffel and Sophie Rouart, out of the fifty surviving copperplate-printed designs which can be reliably attributed to the Oberkampf Manufactory, thirty-two of these are known

---

[88] Mary Schoeser and Kathleen Dejardin, *French Textiles: From 1760 to the Present* (London: Laurence King, 1991), pp. 70-1.

[89] This assertion is based broadly on the ratio of French to British patriotic prints observed in American textile collections during the field research conducted for this thesis. By far, British patterns are in the majority. While this method of appraisal is not definitive it is certainly compelling.

[90] Sarah Grant, *Toiles de Jouy* (London: V&A Publishing, 2010), p. 10.

[91] Josette Brédif, *Toiles de Jouy: Classic Printed Textiles from France, 1760-1843* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1989), pp. 52-8.

to have been executed by Huet.[92] Huet designed the two patterns of American patriotic interest issued by Oberkampf in the immediate aftermath of the Revolutionary War, *c.*1783–9: '*La Liberté américaine* /American Liberty' **[Fig: 5.39]**[93] and '*Hommage de l'Amérique à la France /* America Pays Homage to France' **[Fig: 5.40]**.[94]

Upon first inspection, the design of '*La Liberté américaine* /American Liberty' does not lend itself to a patriotic interpretation. With surviving examples printed predominantly in a red colourway, the pattern is composed of two rustic scenes, separated by an assortment of interweaving garlands, beribboned branches, and grape-laden vines, the home of monkeys, squirrels, birds and butterflies. These plentiful borders and the sentimental agricultural scenes of farming, fishing and familial harmony, give the impression of a land steeped in peace and prosperity. Among the borders are two medallions, the only explicit symbols of patriotism to be found in Huet's design. In the first medallion a woman is shown in profile wearing a Phrygian cap. Above her is the inscription 'LIBERTAS AMERICANA' and the date '4 JUL 1776' – the date upon which the Declaration of Independence was first issued in Philadelphia **[Fig: 5.39*a*]**. The second medallion shows a scene expressive of

---

[92] Melanie Riffel and Sophie Rouart, *Toile de Jouy: Printed Textiles in the Classic French Style* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2003), p. 212-13.

[93] Surviving examples include: *VAM* T.487-1919 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1783-9); *WM* 1961.0031.001-025 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785. Ex-bed furniture comprising twenty-five pieces, including bed hangings and valances.); *WM* 1961.0058 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785. Valance.); *WM* 1964.0046 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785. Fragment.); *MET* 59.208.60 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785.); *AIC* 1990.217 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1783-9. Valance.); *MFAB* 39.53 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785. Curtain.); *CHSDM* 1995-50-70-a,b (Two fragments of copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1783-9).

[94] Surviving examples of the original, unaltered pattern include: *AIC* 1952.636 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785.); *MET* 24.23 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785); *CHSDM* 1995-50-94 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785. Valance.); *WM* 1969.3327 (Panel of copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785); *WM* 1969.3060 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.*1785. Used in a wholecloth quilt.); *WM* 1967.0145 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1785. Quilted valance.); *WM* 1952.0348.002 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1785. Used in a wholecloth quilt, probably made in America *c.* 1785–1810).

heroism and fraternity, inspired by Greek and Roman mythology: Minerva (France) defends the infant Hercules (America) against a ferocious leopard (England). The accompanying inscription 'DIIS ANIMOSUS INFANS' and the dates '1777 OCT 17' and '1781 OCT 19' indicate significant defeats for the British army at Saratoga and Yorktown [**Fig: 5.39***b*].[95] The pattern was latter imitated by J. P. Meillier et Cie of Beautiran, c. 1790-1800, as evidenced by a surviving wholecloth quilt and associated bed furniture currently held at the Winterthur Museum.[96]

By contrast, '*Hommage de l'Amérique à la France* / America Pays Homage to France' is a far more overtly patriotic composition by Huet. The pattern is centred upon a group scene, in which a procession 'pays homage' to the female embodiment of France and her military entourage. The procession consists of the female embodiment of America in Native American headdress carrying the club of Hercules, followed closely by Liberty in similar garb shouldering her iconic cap and pole, a man who carries the flag of the Thirteen States, with a slave bringing up the rear clutching a copy of the Declaration of Independence. The latter is portrayed in a similar manner to the kneeling slave motif represented in Josiah Wedgewood's famous abolitionist medallions, perhaps meant as a reproach of America's continued involvement in the slave trade in spite of the rhetoric of equality so central to the Republican ideology.[97] Around this central grouping are ships and military structures, which are included in reference to the expeditionary forces of La Fayette and Rochambeau that had provided assistance to America during the Revolutionary War.[98] Surviving in both red and blue colourways, '*Hommage de l'Amérique à la France* / America Pays Homage to France' was extremely popular during the later eighteenth century, as evidenced not only by its multiple appearances in American and European textile collections, but also by the complementary material culture associated with it. The design inspired a block-printed wallpaper by the Réveillon

---

[95] Riffel and Rouart, *Toile de Jouy* (London, 2003), pp. 70-1; Brédif, *Toiles de Jouy* (London, 1989), p. 140; Grant, *Toiles de Jouy* (London, 2010), pp. 112-3.

[96] *WM* 1969.3833.001-002 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790–1800. Used in a wholecloth quilt and associated bed furniture, *c.* 1790–1800).

[97] For comparison see: *VAM* 414:1304-1885 (Abolitionist medallion of white jasper, with a black relief and mounted in gilt-metal. Etruria, *c.* 1787).

[98] Riffel and Rouart, *Toile de Jouy* (London, 2003), pp. 68-9; Brédif, *Toiles de Jouy* (London, 1989), p. 141.

factory in Paris, for example, and was also imitated in a block-printed cotton issued by a manufactory in Nantes.[99] The block-printed version survives predominantly in a combined red and purple colourway, the pattern much simplified **[Fig: 5.41]**.[100]

The limited success of French patriotic patterns within the American Republic may be partially explained by the fact that, when compared against designs issued by British printers during the same period, designs such as those issued by Oberkampf did far less to address specifically the evolving national character of US citizens. As the patterns issued to mark American Independence were manufactured for both domestic and international consumption the resulting designs did not always fully reflect themes of American patriotism, but rather represented the emerging French interpretation of popular Republicanism.[101]

French Republican cottons utilised patriotic iconography in a very different way to those issued by their British competitors. Rather than focusing upon the veneration of popular politicians, military-men and philosophers who were regarded by US citizens as instrumental to the victorious outcome of the American Revolution, such as George Washington and Benjamin Franklin, French pattern-makers lent more heavily upon the use of neoclassical symbolism and allegories of nationhood to communicate Republican sentiments within their designs. A stark contrast between the French and the British patterns is that America's victory is far from the main focus of the designs. Instead, French designers such as Huet concentrated upon emphasising the decisive role of their own country in the winning of the Revolutionary War, casting France as the deliverer of American *liberté*.[102] An example of this trope of representation can be observed in both patterns issued by Oberkampf, though most markedly in '*Hommage de l'Amérique à la France / America Pays Homage to France*'. In both the plate and the imitation block-printed versions of the design the allegorical figure of America has been depicted as

---

[99] See Figures 91 & 92 in Riffel and Rouart, *Toile de Jouy* (London, 2003), p. 69.

[100] Surviving examples of the Nantes imitation include: *WM* 1969.3326 (Fragment of block-printed cotton in red and purple colourway, *c.* 1785–90); *CHSDM* 1995-50-278-a,b,c (Three fragments of block-printed cotton in red and purple colourway, *c.* 1785); *MET* 59.208.61 (Panel of block-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785–90).

[101] Standen, 'English Washing Furnitures' (1964), p. 124

[102] Grant, *Toiles de Jouy* (London, 2010), p. 108.

noticeably subservient to the embodiment of France, while other aspects of the pattern celebrate the might of the French military.[103] While this pattern was certainly not manufactured to directly contradict the American interpretation of the outcome of the Revolutionary War, it is debatable whether all US citizens would have wanted it in their homes.[104]

Another factor which may have contributed to the limited success of French Republican cottons abroad was the timing of the nation's own Republican revolution, which saw French manufactories turning their attentions away from the export market and concentrating their efforts upon the material refashioning of their own patriotic identity. The period *c.* 1789–93 – from the fall of the Bastille to the execution of Louis XVI – saw significant experimentation in the design of those French patriotic patterns aimed exclusively at domestic consumers. When a constitutional monarchy was established under Louis XVI and the National Assembly from 1790–2, French manufactories began to issue patterns in support of the short-lived compromise between autocratic and republican ideals.

The Oberkampf Manufactory was a prominent force among those working to refashion patriotic patterns during this brief constitutional period. Christophe-Phillippe Oberkampf had himself been a notable royalist during the pre-Revolutionary years; in June 1783, for instance, his factory had received the title of *Manufacture Royale* from the Bourbon monarchy. In March 1787 Oberkampf himself was presented with a patent of nobility from Louis XVI and in November 1789 the royalist printer had contributed to a patriotic subscription, making a donation of 50,000 *livres* to the King's treasury. However, Oberkampf was also a savvy businessman and was not above laying aside his private politics for the good of his manufactory.[105] Between 1790–1, Oberkampf commissioned Huet for two patterns in support of the new political order in France: '*La Fête de la Fédération /*

---

[103] Riffel and Rouart, *Toile de Jouy* (London, 2003), p. 69. Examples of the altered pattern include: *CHSDM* 1995-50-287 (Fragment of copper-plate printed cotton in blue colourway, *c.* 1789); *MFAB* 40.770a-c (Bed curtain and two valances. Copperplate-printed cotton in blue colourway, *c.* 1789).

[104] Not all American citizens were comfortable with the Franco-American alliance, some considering it a betrayal of their British roots.

[105] Riffel and Rouart, *Toile de Jouy* (London, 2003), p. 15.

The Feast of the Federation' **[Fig: 5.42]**'[106] and '*Louis XVI restaurateur de la liberté / Louis XVI, restorer of liberty*' **[Fig: 5.43]**.[107] While both of Oberkampf's constitutional patterns place Louis XVI in a favourable light, positioning him as the humble mediator of the will of the people, the abundance of Republican iconography in each design, such as the Phrygian cap, the *tricolore* cockade, and the ruins of the Bastille, effectively eclipse the authority of the Bourbon monarch.[108]

It is important to note here that British calico printers were also invested in the material refashioning of French patriotic identity during this transition and responded to the French Revolution much in the same way as they had to the changes wrought by the American Revolution. More work is needed in this area, but there is at least one pattern which can be reliably attributed to a British printer and there are multiple surviving examples of it in museum collections, mostly in the form of fragmentary valances and bed hangings **[Fig: 5.44]**. Blue threads present in the selvage of an example held by Winterthur Museum indicate a British origin and its survival in more than one colourway points to a substantial run. The design features scenes derived from events which took place in France during the summer of 1789, such as the storming of the Bastille and the popular adoption of the *tricolore* cockade. The design also indicates the support still being shown to Louis XVI at this time, whose likeness is represented in a monument erected in celebration of French *liberté*.[109]

Later, with the execution of Louis XVI and the subsequent Terror, changes were again imposed upon patriotic patterns to reflect the rapidly shifting political situation

---

[106] *CHSDM* 1957-51-1-a,b,c (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790–1); *MET* 26.265.53 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1793); *VAM* 1682-1899 (Valance of copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1792).

[107] *CHSDM* 1995-50-37-a,b (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790–1); *CHSDM* 1944-22-5-a (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790–1); *MFAB* 42.400 (Quilted panel of copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790–1); *MET* 27.44.1 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790–1).

[108] Riffel and Rouart, *Toile de Jouy* (London, 2003), pp. 72-3.

[109] Surviving examples of this pattern, mostly as fragments or pieces of bed furniture, include: *VAM* T.63-1936 (Valance of plate-printed cotton in purple colourway, *c.* 1790); *WM* 1982.0325 (Textile fragment in purple colourway, *c.* 1789–90); *MFAB* 27.145 (Fragment in purple colourway, quilted during the nineteenth century); *AIC* 1925.146 (Plate printed furnishing fabric in red colourway, *c.* 1790); *MET* 26.238.7 (Panel of copperplate-plate printed cotton in a purple colourway, *c.* 1790).

in France. During the 1790s, '*Hommage de l'Amérique à la France /* America Pays Homage to France' was reissued by Oberkampf with all references to the Bourbon monarchy removed. An example of the revised pattern executed in china blue, currently held by the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, clearly shows the embodiment of France without her crown and with the *fleur de lis* erased from the front of her ceremonial shield **[Fig: 5.45]**.[110] This change reflects a significant degree of political sensitivity on the part of the draftsman, as well as good commercial sense on the part of Oberkampf. Unlike the Manufactory's constitutional patterns, which 'would have been hastily ripped from many a bed' after the flight of the royal family to Varennes in June 1791, making revisions to an already popular pattern such as '*Hommage de l'Amérique à la France /* America Pays Homage to France' was a sound investment, likely to appeal to Republican purchasers on either side of the Atlantic.[111] The reissue of the pattern in its altered form, with its removal of monarchical motifs, was likely meant as a reaffirmation of the transatlantic fraternity between the two nations during this difficult period of upheaval as well as a tacit recognition of the end of the *ancien régime*.

However, in spite of the efforts made by French printers such as the Oberkampf Manufactory to participate actively in the material refashioning of American nationhood during the formative years of Independence, Britain remained the chief European purveyor of patriotic patterns to America from the mid-1780s into the early nineteenth century. In fact, the overall number of French textiles imported into

---

[110] *MFAB* 40.770a-c (Copperplate-printed cotton bed furniture in blue colourway, *c.* 1789. Fragment of bed curtain and two valances); See also: *CHSDM* 1979-88-1-a, b (Copperplate-printed cotton fragment in red colourway *c.* 1789 and contrasting fragment of copperplate-printed cotton fragment in red colourway, *c.* 1785); *CHSDM* 1995-50-287 (Fragment of copperplate-printed cotton bed furniture in blue colourway, *c.* 1789).

[111] Standen, 'English Washing Furnitures' (1964), p. 124; The popular desire for revised constitutional patterns is not only evident in the commercial outputs of manufactories such as Oberkampf. There is also evidence of D.I.Y revisions being applied to constitutional patterns by their owners, such as in a surviving example of Gorgerat Frères et Cie's '*À La Gloire de Louis XVI*' currently held by the Cooper Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum in New York (as discussed in the Introduction to this thesis). A liberty cap has been stitched over the crown worn by the embodiment of France and the *fleur de lis* on her shield have been obscured in an attempt to make it appear like she is cradling a globe. See *CHSDM* 1995-50-31-a, b (Two fragments of copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1789).

America *c.* 1783–1815 never approached that issued from Britain, which on average sent one-third of its manufactured exports to the United States during this period.[112] It was clearly not only a matter of pattern suitability which ensured British supremacy in this area, it was also one of overwhelming quantity.

While France issued American-themed patriotic patterns only very occasionally, British printers proved to be remarkably consistent in their marketing of Republican cottons to America *c.* 1783–1815. As shall be explored in the following section, the majority of the Republican cottons manufactured in Britain during the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries display an impressive level of adaptability to the shifting political and cultural landscapes of Independent America. They were also increasingly sensitive to the evolving national character of their US customers and were able to tailor their designs accordingly throughout the period, in a way never achieved by their other European competitors.

The Entrepreneurship of British Calico Printers, *c.* 1783–1815

Between 1782 and 1790, two different versions of a copperplate-printed pattern were issued for sale in the British Atlantic region. Early versions of this furnishing fabric were derived from a collection of popular prints by the notable satirist, Henry William Bunbury, *c.* 1779–81, and display a tongue-in-cheek, highly chaotic view of a British military encampment.[113] Men tumble ineptly from their horses in every direction, observed by a ragtag assortment of redcoats and camp followers, while piles of supplies and weaponry haphazardly litter the camp ground **[Fig: 5.46]**.[114] Post-Independence versions of the same pattern, thought to have been issued *c.* 1785–90, have been altered to remove the inscription 'ROYAL ARTILLERY G. III. R.' from a drumhead positioned at the base of the guide ropes of a soldier's tent. As can be seen in a later version of the 'Bunbury' pattern executed in red on bleached cotton in the collection of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, the inscription has

---

[112] Schoeser and Dejardin, *French Textiles* (London, 1991), p. 71.

[113] For details of date, attribution, and the titles of each of the Bunbury prints used in the pattern, see: Eaton, *Printed Textiles* (2014), p. 202.

[114] Early versions of the 'Bunbury' pattern: *CWF* 1951-492, 1-4 (Copperplate-printed bed furniture in brown colourway, *c.* 1782. Four fragments); *CWF* 1970-26 (Copperplate-printed cotton in brown colourway, *c.* 1782); *AIC* 1952.585a-b (Copperplate-printed cotton in purple colourway, *c.* 1782).

been obliterated from the surface of the printing plate and replaced with a tangle of long grass across the skin of the drumhead, though faint impressions of the original words remain visible **[Figs: 5.46*a* & 5.47]**.[115] Evidently the English manufacturer of this particular pattern believed that any reference to the British monarchy, even in a design clearly intended to poke fun at the character of the British military, would be antithetical to the mood of the newly Republican American consumer. With this alteration, seemingly so slight, American customers could purchase the textile without prejudice.[116]

This is just one example of the initiative shown by British calico printers during the period *c.* 1783–1815, during which time the industry was forced to adapt to America's transition from a colonial to a Republican marketplace. The entrepreneurship of British calico printers can be best observed in a number of 'Republican cottons' issued by printers during this period, such as the previously discussed 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' furniture fabrics noted by Thomas Shippen in 1785. In order to maintain their status as the chief-importers of patriotic textiles into America during the period of commercial uncertainty which followed the Revolutionary War, British printers had to participate actively in the material refashioning of the Independent American interior, a process by which the former trappings of colonial loyalty to the Hanoverian royal family were replaced by a material culture in praise of the new nation's leaders and reformed system of government.

British and American textile collections host an impressive array of copperplate-printed Republican cottons, manufactured predominantly by English print-works during the final decades of the eighteenth century both for the American export market and, interestingly, for limited domestic consumption.[117] Significantly, there is

---

[115] Later versions of the 'Bunbury' pattern with this alteration: *CWF G*1971-1560 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785–90); *CHSDM* 1955-10-1-a (Copperplate-printed cotton in brown colourway, *c.* 1785–90); *WM* 1960.0030.001 (Copperplate-printed bed furniture in brown colourway, *c.* 1785–90); *WM* 1959.0026.003 (Copperplate-printed cotton in purple colourway, *c.* 1785–90).

[116] Baumgarten, *What Clothes Reveal* (2002), p. 87.

[117] The majority of English cottons sourced for this chapter are held by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Smithsonian Institution, the Victoria & Albert

evidence to suggest that patriotic designs which were popular in America – such as 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' – were also being sold to customers in Britain during this period. Cultural historian Stephanie Kermes has suggested that English inns 'wanted to impress their guests with linens printed with this Washington allegory', a statement reinforced by the research of Eaton who has identified at least one instance of the pattern 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' being used as bed hangings at an inn in the provincial town of Carlisle in the early 1800s.[118] Writing in 1807, the English poet Robert Southey commented upon the presence of the pattern in his rented apartment, though his disdainful tone confirms the fact that the vogue for monochromatic, topical copperplate prints had reached its peak some time before and that he found the topic of the cotton questionable in an English context:

> My bed curtains may serve as a good specimen of the political
> freedom permitted in England. General Washington is there
> represented driving American independence in a car drawn by
> leopards, a black Triton running beside them, and blowing his conch
> – meant, I conceive, by his crown of feathers, to designate the native
> Indians. In another compartment, Liberty and Dr. Franklin are
> walking hand in hand to the Temple of Fame, where two little
> Cupids display a Globe, on which America and the Atlantic are
> marked. The tree of liberty stands by, and the stamp act reversed is
> bound round it. I have often remarked the taste of the people for
> these coarse allegories.[119]

Museum and the Winterthur Museum. While it is understood that there is a wealth of examples to be found in the American Museum of Textile History collection located in Lowell MA, the permanent closure of this institution in June 2016 has made its holdings impossible to include in this particular study.

[118] Further study is required to determine just how popular Republican cottons were in Britain: Stephanie Kermes, *Creating an American Identity: New England, 1789-1825* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 83; Eaton, *Quilts in a Material World* (2007), p. 140.

[119] Quoted in: Eaton, *Quilts in a Material World* (2007), p. 140. Eaton notes how copperplate had decreased in fashionability between its appearance in New York in 1785 and this sighting in 1807: 'These two references neatly define a period of twenty years, the time period during which designs for furnishing textiles remained in production. Within that space of that time, however, the fabric has

This was by no means the first instance of a liking for Republican-style in printed textiles being shared between British and American consumers. Rather, this was arguably the natural conclusion of a wider turn within British patriotic pattern production during the second half of the eighteenth century, which had begun to assert itself on the very eve of the American Revolution. This wider turn was characterised by the desire to appeal to both sides of the political coin in order to maintain customer loyalties, even when base mercantile opportunism contradicted the personal allegiances of a manufacturer.[120] As resistance to British governance arose in the American colonies during the Imperial Crises of the 1760s–70s, some British artisans had reacted with due sensitivity to the winds of political change. That calico printers were beginning to recognise the encroaching influence of popular Republicanism among their colonial customers in the early years of the Revolution is evidenced by the circulation of a politically divisive handkerchief in the British Atlantic region, which was manufactured in a print-works in Britain and sold to customers both at home and abroad *c.* 1775 **[Fig: 5.48]**.[121]

The design of the handkerchief extols the virtues of the radical British politician John Wilkes, who was an outspoken supporter of American Independence and an ardent critic of George III. A result of this inflammatory rhetoric was that Wilkes became the poster-child for popular conceptions of liberty and justice throughout America, particularly in the city of Boston which was considered by many as the epicentre of colonial discontent.[122] The handkerchief is printed in blue upon a bleached linen ground, employing a combination of block and copperplate printing techniques. In

---

slipped down the social scale from the highly fashionable house of a prominent politician in a major city to an inn located in an unfashionable provincial town in the north of England.'

[120] As exemplified by the outputs of the Oberkampf Manufactory during the French Revolution, as discussed in the previous section.

[121] *CWF* 1951-447 (Plate-printed handkerchief, *c.* 1775); An additional example has been identified by Beverly Lemire in the Gunnersbury Park Museum in London, see: Beverly Lemire, *The Business of Everyday Life: Gender, Practice and Social Politics in England, c. 1600-1900* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), p. 130, p. 140 (*n.* 87).

[122] See: Richard Archer, *As If an Enemy's Country: The British Occupation of Boston and the Origins of Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Russell Bourne, *Cradle of Violence: How Boston's Waterfront Mobs Ignited the American Revolution* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2006).

the central medallion stands the figure of Wilkes, flanked on either side by the female embodiments of Liberty and Britannia. In his left hand he holds the Magna Carta, while he steps firmly upon a sheaf of papers labelled 'General Warrants'. The latter refers to search and arrest warrants levelled against Wilkes and his newspaper in 1763, when his criticisms of George III had caused a stir across Britain and the colonies. The main indication that the handkerchief was manufactured so as to appeal to audiences on both side of the Atlantic is the inscription upon the banner framing the bottom edge of the central medallion: 'In this Years Reign may Englands Genius See an end of party rage – and America Free' **[Fig: 5.48*a*]**.

Though the Wilkes handkerchief may be regarded as only a small token and not as impressive a sartorial display of one's political identity as a full suite of patriotic bed furniture or domestic upholstery, the existence in America of British-made handkerchiefs themed upon anti-Hanoverian sentiments from as early as 1775 indicates that British calico printers had begun to consider the implications of Independence for their trade in patriotic furnishings even before the Revolution concluded in America's favour in 1783. Once wholesale transatlantic trade had been re-established in the years following the Treaty of Paris, the urge to refashion printed-patriotic wares for export came once more to the fore of British patriotic pattern production.

While some British printers, such as the creators of the 'Bunbury' pattern, took the route of selective revisionism, others went down the path of transplanting monarchical imagery for secular veneration. This style was conceivably inspired by the Loyalist patterns which had been successful before Independence, such as the design issued by David Richards of Manchester *c*. 1780 **[Fig: 5.3]**, but with their essential elements refashioned upon Republican lines so as to cater to the altered political sensibilities of their target market. Where there had once been feted portrait medallions of George III printed prominently upon cotton furnitures intended for export, there were now glorified images of Revolutionary heroes and American statesmen. The design 'America Presenting at the Altar of Liberty Medallions of Her Illustrious Sons' **[Fig: 5.49]**, issued alongside the previously discussed pattern 'The

Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington', neatly exemplifies this style of secular veneration.[123]

The design also references Trumbull's depiction of Washington, though instead of placing him in a triumphal carriage at the head of an advancing army, he is shown paying grateful homage to the Altar of Liberty. An angel places a wreath upon his brow, while blowing upon a trumpet from which flutters a ribbon inscribed: 'WASHINGTON AND INDEPENDENCE' **[Fig: 5.49*a*]**. The female figure of America kneels at the foot of the Altar and, beneath the solemn gaze of the embodiment of Liberty, offers feted portrait miniatures of the heroes of the Revolutionary War. It is through analysis of these portraits that the composition may be reliably dated, as they are based upon a collection of engraved medallions taken by Swiss-American artist Pierre Eugène du Simitière during the Revolutionary War years, which were then popularly distributed shortly before his death in 1784.[124] As in the composition of 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington', the design of the 'Altar of Liberty' calico is littered with iconography celebrating the end of war and the advent of peace: a regiment marching beneath the Thirteen Stripes, an abandoned military encampment, and mounds of discarded weaponry can be seen alongside the busy workings of birds, bees, flora and fauna.

Eaton has suggested that the popular patterns 'American Presenting at the Altar of Liberty Medallions of Her Illustrious Sons' and 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' may well have been designed by the same engraver and, while there is no information printed upon surviving examples to corroborate this, there are certainly stylistic similarities evident in the patterns themselves.[125] It was rare for British manufacturers to include the name of the engraver or the responsible print-works within the cottons they produced, which makes a proposal such as Eaton's nearly impossible to verify without supporting documentary evidence. However, there were exceptions, including the Loyalist

---

[123] *WM* 1962.0208 (Copperplate-printed bed furniture in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

[124] See for comparison: Pierre Eugène du Simitière, *Heads of Illustrious Americans: Containing Portraits of General Washington, Henry Laurens, Esq., John Jay, Esq., S. Huntingdon, Esq., Charles Thompson, Esq., J. Dickinson, Esq., Silas Deane, Esq., General Read, Governeer Morris, Esq., Maj. Gen. Baron Steuben, W. H. Drayton, Esq., Maj. Gen. Gates* (London, 1783).

[125] Eaton, *Printed Textiles* (2014), p. 203.

patterns designed by David Richards of Manchester and at least one Republican cotton which can be reliably attributed to a print-works operating in the British southeast during the later eighteenth century. This attribution is possible because the same maker's mark is present across all surviving versions of the pattern, proclaiming the manufacturer as Henry Gardiner of Wandsworth, Surrey [**Figs: 5.50*a* & 5.51*a***].

Previous research conducted by Peter Floud of the Victoria and Albert Museum had suggested that Gardiner's business was not properly established until 1792, though was large enough to employ 200 hands. Certainly, an entry for Gardiner in one of London's many business directories does not appear until 1793–4, when he was listed as operating a storefront at 56 Bread Street, Wakefield, in addition to his manufacturing concern at Wandsworth. However, more recent research conducted by Eaton has found that Gardiner had built a structure overlooking his bleach fields in Surrey as early as 1783, meaning that printed cottons attributed to him are conceivably older than previous estimates of the early to mid-1790s. It is believed that his print-works closed *c.* 1815.[126]

Available in both red and blue colourways [**Figs. 5.50 & 5.51**], Gardiner's Republican cotton 'The Apotheosis of George Washington' conforms to the trope of secular veneration also represented in the hugely popular patterns 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' and 'America Presenting at the Altar of Liberty Medallions of Her Illustrious Sons'. The figures of George Washington and Benjamin Franklin are again integral to the design, though the latter plays a reduced role in comparison to the former. Washington stands at the centre of the design, flanked on all sides by allegorical persons representative of the various iconographic aspects of America's newfound Independence. He cradles the female embodiment of Liberty beneath his arm, her cap and pole appearing from behind his shoulder, while he reaches out to grasp the proffered hand of Commerce whose foot rests upon

---

[126] Victoria & Albert Museum et al, *Catalogue of a Loan Exhibition of English Chintz: English Printed Furnishing Fabrics from Their Origins until the Present Day* (London: H.M.S.O., 1960), p. 75; Montgomery, *Printed Textiles* (1970), pp. 285-6; T. Davidson, *Wakefield's Merchant and Tradesman's General Directory for London, Westminster, Borough of Southwark and Twenty-Two Miles Circular from St. Paul's, For the Year, 1794* (London, 1794), p. 117; Eaton, *Printed Textiles* (2014), pp. 204-5.

domestic manufactures for export, namely a bale of cotton and a hogshead of rum or tobacco. The goddess Minerva and god Hercules, who together represent wisdom, war, and strength, protect Washington, while Franklin sits off to the side at the base of an obelisk upon which a hovering angel has inscribed the words: 'INDEPENDENCE 1776.' At the forefront of the design a medallion portrait of Cato is laid against the trunk of a tree, a reference to the influential statesman of the late Roman Republic. Behind the allegorical arrangement glimpses of prosperous port cities and merchant ships loaded with goods can be seen occupying the fringes of the design.[127] Commercial success through the provision of domestic manufactures and American participation in transatlantic trade is a hallmark of Gardiner's patriotic aesthetic, evidenced not only by this Republican cotton but also in the design of a handkerchief he manufactured for export to the former colonies, *c.* 1792 **[Fig: 5.52]**.[128] Seated beneath a palm tree is the allegory of America, flanked on either side by the stately figures of Washington and Franklin. Washington, dressed in his regimentals, holds the hand of Liberty, presenting her to America. Franklin, arrayed in a Roman toga of the Senate, is portrayed as the protector of Commerce, who sits at his feet surrounded by US goods for export. A ship can be observed in the background of the scene, flying the American flag and ready to set sail for Britain now that peace and prosperity reign **[Fig: 5.52*a*]**.

British calico printers continued to manufacture patriotic patterns for the American marketplace well into the first half of the nineteenth century, even during periods of direct conflict between the two nations. In the immediate aftermath of the War of 1812, for instance, British textile printers began to manufacture cottons which praised the military and maritime prowess of their erstwhile foes. The fabric used as the backing for this pieced quilt, for example, pays homage to the exploits of the US navy **[Figs: 5.53 and 5.53*a*]**.[129] Moreover, these post-1812 cottons reflected an increased acceptance being shown by British pattern-drawers towards American-made symbols of US patriotism. This was a significant development in the transatlantic recognition of the formal iconography of early American nationhood

---

[127] *WM* 1952.0306.003 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1790–1800); *WM* 1969.3187 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a blue colourway, *c.* 1790–1800).

[128] *WM* 1959.0957 (Plate- and block-printed handkerchief in blue colourway, *c.* 1792).

[129] *WM* 1969.3058 (Pieced quilt *c.* 1830–40. Backing fabric was printed in England *c.* 1820).

which, by the early nineteenth century, had become notably distinct from the trappings of its colonial past. The American Bald Eagle of the Great Seal, for instance, which had been entirely absent from Republican cottons manufactured in Britain during the later eighteenth century, began to appear with increasing frequency in post-1812 British cottons and plate-printed handkerchiefs manufactured for export: **[Fig: 5.54]** and **[Fig: 5.55]**.[130]

As this section has decisively shown, British calico printers did much to maintain their supremacy in the field of patriotic pattern production for American consumption *c.* 1783–1815. They achieved this difficult feat by consistently responding to the cultural changes which accompanied the formalisation of America's independent statehood during the 1780s–90s, while also maintaining a superior level of print and fabric quality in comparison to the products of their American and European competitors. However, the style for copperplate-printed fabrics had largely fallen out of favour with the American upper-class homeowner by the early nineteenth century and had instead been relegated towards America's burgeoning souvenir market.[131] It was also around this time that the improved state of American textile manufacturing began to generate competition with the ubiquity of British imports, with American consumers increasingly turning their attention to textiles printed in America as a matter of economic nationalism.[132] By the turn of the century, neoclassical and nationalistic styles of copperplate-printed yardage had become antiquated within the dominant trends of interior decoration in the British Atlantic region and thus the prosperous era of British-made Republican cottons came gradually to a natural close.

---

[130] *WM* 1969.0436 A (Plate-printed handkerchief in a red colourway. Scotland, *c.* 1810–20); *WM* 1969.3843 (Plate-printed cotton in a brown colourway, pieced. Scotland, *c.* 1810–20).

[131] This shall be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Six, in reference to those commemorative fabrics produced in Britain for the American souvenir market as a complement to the early nineteenth-century 'Cult of Washington'.

[132] This shall also be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Six, in reference to the printed textiles fashioned by American artisans to coincide with the Marquis de Lafayette's Farewell Tour of America in 1824–5.

Reconsidering the Appeal of Patriotic Furniture Fabrics

Discussions of Republican cottons and their use in the domestic space have seldom strayed beyond commenting upon their sudden appearance in the American home following the upheavals of the Revolutionary War, most markedly in the period *c.* 1785–90 when the fashion for copperplate-printed textiles was arguably at its height. This has given rise to the assumption that these fabrics were only fleeting fascinations for American consumers who, when caught up in the turbulence of new nationhood, wanted to document the moment through the purchase of commemorative textiles. While it is perfectly acceptable for this type of contextualisation to be used to explain the existence of smaller-scale, improvised or inexpensive political objects, which may well have appealed to American consumers as topical curios, this form of analysis becomes less compelling when applied to long-term, expensive investments, such as upholstery and bed furniture. It does not fully consider the lived experience of upper-class American homeowners in the later eighteenth century and ignores the practical concerns which would have tempered their desire to purchase such fabrics merely on a whim.

The process of interior decorating was a costly and complicated undertaking for the American homeowner during the long eighteenth century.[133] Commissioning furniture from cabinetmakers and upholsterers was a considerable investment, both in terms of the money and time spent. The intention was that pieces commissioned for specific rooms would last many years and might eventually be passed on to the next generation within a family.[134] Householders who put their energies into obtaining fashionable, high-quality furnishings were therefore making a concerted effort to impress upon their acquaintances not only that they possessed a sense of cultural refinement, but also that they were able to afford the very best.

---

[133] See in particular: Hague, *The Gentleman's House in the British Atlantic World* (2015); Dena Goodman and Kathryn Norberg, eds., *Furnishing the Eighteenth Century: What Furniture Can Tell Us About the European and American Past* (New York & Abingdon: Routledge, 2007).

[134] Clive Edwards and Margaret Ponsonby, 'Desirable Commodity or Practical Necessity? The Sale and Consumption of Second-Hand Furniture, 1750-1900' in *Buying for the Home: Shopping for the Domestic from the Seventeenth Century to the Present*, eds., David Hussey and Margaret Ponsonby (Aldershot & Burlington: Ashgate, 2008), p. 119.

American householders embarking upon refurnishing projects encountered an additional layer of difficulty in comparison to their European neighbours, in that so many of the luxury goods they desired had to be ordered by proxy through a network of family members, friends, and professional associates, before being conveyed across the Atlantic as cargo – a process which could take months to orchestrate, often at great added expense.[135] With these practical considerations in mind, it is clear that the time has come for scholars to reframe the appeal of patriotic furniture fabrics in order to appreciate more fully their function as *statement pieces* within the Independent American home. As highly noticeable and imposing objects, full suites of patriotic cotton furniture at once combined the immediate desire of the purchasers to express their political convictions with the longevity and practicality required of interior decoration. When compared to a commemorative ring, a party sash or a coloured cockade – which could be put on or taken off again in an instant – patriotic furniture fabrics had to be lived with on a day-to-day basis.

When we acknowledge that individuals may only redecorate a room in their homes very occasionally during a tenancy, the purchase of patriotic fabric specifically for that room becomes less about expressing a fleeting interest in topical politics and more about making a long-lasting commitment to displaying a patriotic identity openly among family and friends. The patriotic fabrics used in bed furniture and upholstery would have been continually assessed by members of the possessor's social circle, who, during a visit might judge his or her hosts on their choice of decor – such as Thomas Shippen did during his stay at his uncle's New York residence in 1785, or Robert Southey did when he rented a room in a provincial inn in Carlisle in 1807. Through repeated interactions with visitors – who might remark upon chairs upholstered in patriotic fabrics or sleep beneath a canopy of patriotic hangings – one's refashioned patriotic identity would be continually reinforced.

To frame the purchase of patriotic furniture fabric as a temporary fascination with national politics therefore fails to fully appreciate the overlapping social and private functions of bedchambers and parlours in the late eighteenth-century home, where a

---

[135] Amy H. Henderson, 'A Family Affair: The Design and Decoration of 321 South Fourth Street, Philadelphia', in *Gender, Taste, and Material Culture in Britain and North America, 1700-1830* (2006), pp. 267-91; Ellen Hartigan-O'Conner, 'Collaborative Consumption and the Politics of Choice in Early American Port Cities', in *Ibid*, pp. 125-50.

highly visible statement piece would have been intended to satisfy the political sensibilities of the homeowner as well as impress upon the guest the patriotic credentials of their host.[136] It was not enough that these fabrics be examined, touched, and talked about, the intention was also that they be remembered.

Without visual references indicating how patriotic furniture fabrics might have looked *in situ* in the bedrooms and parlours of the American upper-class, it is arguably difficult to gauge their full impact as statement pieces. As was discussed earlier in this chapter, through perusing the publications of upholsterers and cabinetmakers of the period, as well as by examining representations of bed furniture in early American art, prevailing styles of bed-dressing can be ascertained and contextualised.[137] However, such sources do not show us how, specifically, patriotic patterns were used, or explain their impact within specific domestic contexts.[138] Nor is there much written evidence which describes patriotic patterns in active use in the British Atlantic region during the period *c.* 1785–1815. This can be explained by the lack of importance placed on the minute details of domestic décor by the authors of contemporary life writing. As stated by Amanda Vickery: 'Interiors do not easily offer up their secrets. The backdrop of a life is rarely the fodder of diaries and letters, just as routines are less interesting to record than events.'[139] It is at this point that the interpretive work of museum and historic house curators and the implementation of an object-based research methodology becomes indispensable to the scholar in communicating the impressive visual and material qualities of patriotic patterns and

---

[136] The emerging desire for comfort and solitude among the British and American upper-class (who could afford the luxury) led to a greater degree of segregation of rooms by function during the later eighteenth century. Parlours/sitting rooms were allocated for informal social calling and relaxation. Bedrooms, while certainly being more private spaces, were accessible to close friends and family under appropriate circumstances, with provision for guest bedchambers not being uncommon in larger homes. Specifically addressing the American context, with consideration of rural, urban, and regional differences, see: Theodore J. Zeman, ed., *The Greenwood Encyclopaedia of Daily Life in America: Volume 1: The War of Independence and Antebellum Expansion and Reform, 1763-1861* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2009), pp. 42-53.

[137] See section 'Trends of Interior Decoration in the British Atlantic Region' in this chapter.

[138] At this time, as far as the author of this thesis is aware, there is no known visual reference showing a patriotic pattern being used within the confines of a late-eighteenth-century American home.

[139] Vickery, *Behind Closed Doors* (2009), p. 3.

in appreciating their role as statement pieces within the Independent American interior.

Period room displays in historic houses provide the researcher with a curated impression of how patriotic furnishing fabrics were used by professional upholsterers to create statement pieces for their American customers, as shown here in the McIntire Bedroom at Winterthur Museum **[Fig: 5.56]**.[140] In addition to this kind of interpretive work available to view in historic houses and museums, a realistic understanding of patriotic furniture fabrics as statement pieces may also be constructed by working directly with the collections of heritage institutions. This allows the researcher to examine sartorial objects and their associated records simultaneously in order to build an interweaving material and historical context, which may-well reinforce or run contrary to the curated experience of patriotic textiles on display in period rooms. When available, information gleaned from provenance records can be used to further contextualise the material evidence of an object, providing substantial insight into how that particular object was used, by whom, where, and why.

A set of bed furniture, consisting of a fragmentary valance and a set of two straight panel bed hangings, currently in the collection of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation **[Fig: 5.57]** serves as a useful illustration of this object-based investigative method.[141] The bed furniture displays the pattern 'America Presenting at the Altar of Liberty Medallions of Her Illustrious Sons' in a faded purple colourway and is known to have once belonged to the family of Dr John Minson Galt. Galt had been Surgeon General of Virginia during the Revolutionary War and as such would have cut a prestigious figure in his hometown of Williamsburg. As discussed earlier, the English origins of the furnishing fabric can be verified by the presence of blue threads in the selvage. The pattern itself can then be reliably dated to *c.* 1785 by tracing the visual references used in the composition of the design, as well as by comparing it to other examples of the same pattern in contrasting colourways and orientations. The dimensions of the furniture and the nail holes

---

[140] Pictured: *WM* 1960.0166 (Wholecloth quilt, *c.* 1780–1800); *WM* 1974.0135.002-010 (Bed hangings, *c.* 1780–90). Compiled from different donations within their collection, the curatorial staff at Winterthur Museum have used their knowledge and initiative to reconstruct this statement piece.

[141] *CWF* 1978-246,1 (Set of bed furniture used in Williamsburg by the Grant family, *c.* 1785).

visible along the linen tapes gathering together the material of the valance provides further indication that it was once affixed to the tester frame of a tall, four-post bed [**Fig: 5.57*a***]. Upon closer inspection, the valance conforms to the 'petticoat' style signified as most taste-appropriate in Hepplewhite's *Guide* of 1788, indicating that the Galt family chose to conform to prevailing standards of British fashionability in their choice of interior decoration and, once more, could afford to do so. The decision of the Galt family to purchase this particular calico and style it in this particular manner during the mid-to-late 1780s may therefore be interpreted in a number of ways: that Dr Galt's personal stake in the Revolution made the purchase both personally and politically appealing, that the family were conscious of the social position they were required to publicly maintain through their purchasing habits and decorating techniques, and that the prospect of acquiring luxury commodities after the prolonged privations of war overrode any qualms regarding the geographical origins of the fabric.

Finally, in reassessing the popular appeal of patriotic furnishing fabrics for the American upper-class consumer, it should be stated that the afterlives of patriotic furnishing fabrics should not be disregarded. Rather, by analysing beyond the points of manufacture and procurement, and by considering the complete lifespans of these textiles within the Independent American home, scholars can better judge the full impact of patriotic textiles upon the evolution of America's national identity from the eighteenth into the early nineteenth century. Even when hangings, bedding, or upholstery were replaced by their owners they would seldom be disposed of entirely, as doing so would have represented poor household economy. Instead, owners would often repurpose fabrics in handicraft or clothing projects, or else elect to store these pieces away – intact – potentially for future re-use. Increased academic focus has been paid of late to the 'afterlives of things', including consideration of the high value placed upon household textiles and their incorporation into domestic recycling habits and second-hand clothing trades during the long eighteenth century.[142] As yet,

---

[142] See in particular: Georg Stöger, 'Urban Markets for Used Textiles – Examples from eighteenth-century Central Europe', *Selling Textiles in the Long Eighteenth Century: Comparative Perspectives from Western Europe*, eds. Jon Stobart and Bruno Blondé (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), pp. 210-25; Ariane Fennetaux, 'Sentimental Economics: Recycling Textiles in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *The Afterlife of Used Things: Recycling in the Long Eighteenth Century*,

however, these discussions have not been brought to bear upon patriotic textile usage in the British Atlantic region.

Once their primary usage as interior decoration was over, either through ordinary wear-and-tear or changing concepts of taste, there is plentiful object-based evidence to suggest that patriotic fabrics continued to serve as proof of a patriotic heritage within a family through the processes of inheritance, preservation, and donation, or by their incorporation into contemporary domestic recycling practices. This patriotic heritage can be best examined through surveying the various states in which patriotic patterns survive in textile collections across Britain and America today, whether that be through assessing donations of unaltered bed furniture, identifying examples of patriotic textiles repurposed into items of clothing **[Fig: 5.58]**[143] or incorporated into patchwork quilts **[Figs: 5.59 5.59*a*]**,[144] or by studying acquisitions of ex-upholstery scraps which have been consciously saved over multiple decades rather than thrown away by their owners **[Figs: 5.60]**.[145]

Just as an owner would mark ordinary household textiles with stitched initials or – less commonly – full names so as to indicate an object's place within the material landscape of a specific household **[Fig: 5.61],** the act of marking can be occasionally observed in patriotic furnishing fabrics or display handkerchiefs to achieve a similar end **[Figs: 5.51*b* & 5.62]**.[146] This habitual marking of patriotic textiles indicates a

---

eds. Arianne Fennataux, Amélie Junqua and Sophie Vasset (New York & Abingdon: Routledge, 2015), pp. 122-41.

[143] *VAM* T.377-2009 (Double-breasted banyan made of repurposed copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, c. 1830. Pattern is an example of *toiles de Nantes*, titled '*Le Départ de la Garnison: Les Français en Garnison*' and was issued *c.* 1821. French.).

[144] *NMAH* T14719 (Early nineteenth-century patchwork quilt, which contains discernible sections of 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' pattern).

[145] *WM* 1969.8394.001-015 (Fifteen pieces of ex-upholstery fabric featuring 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' pattern. Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1780–90). In the British context, see: *NMM* TXT0125 (Four pieces of ex-upholstery fabric featuring a pattern celebrating Horatio Nelson. Acorn and banner motif, block-printed or hand-stamped in two tones of blue upon a bleached cotton ground, *c.* 1798–1806).

[146] *DARM* 81.19 (Bedsheet of bleached homespun linen, *c.* 1830. Marked 'E.F.'); *DARM* 55.11 (Woollen blanket, late eighteenth century. Marked 'A.H.'); *WM* 1969.3187 (Copperplate-printed cotton in blue colourway, *c.* 1790. Marked 'M.A.B'); *CWF* 2009-18 (Plate-printed handkerchief memorialising the death of George Washington, *c.* 1800. Marked 'Sarah. A. W).

drive towards practicality and personalisation, which firmly situates such objects within the everyday lives of eighteenth and nineteenth-century Americans.[147] Furthermore, interpreting instances of mending in extant patriotic textiles can also provide the scholar with an indication of the long lives enjoyed by many of these objects within the domestic spaces of eighteenth and nineteenth-century America. Such physical interventions highlight the strong personal attachment felt by owners for these material manifestations of their family's patriotism. Sophisticated mending, as seen here in an example of Gardiner's 'The Apotheosis of Washington' pattern executed in a red colourway, speaks of a desire to preserve the original design as much as possible against the passage of time. As can be observed in details of Washington's face and in the wing tip of a hovering angel, techniques of invisible darning and the addition of patches using scraps of the same pattern have left the overall panel looking relatively undamaged **[Figs: 5.50*b* & 5.50*c*]**.[148] By contrast, the visible patching evident on this Great Seal quilt arguably has less to do with saving the design of the printed patriotic pattern and more with ensuring the continued functionality of the object as a display piece for future generations **[Fig: 5.37*b*]**.[149] In each instance, the impetus to preserve – even restore – these objects is prevalent and, as such, should be considered as fundamental aspects of their historic interpretation. Such acts of preservation, restoration, and documentation within the lifecycle point towards a not-insignificant desire on the part of the owners to create and maintain their patriotic identities through the stewardship of these textiles, even after their initial roles as topically-relevant, high-fashion statement pieces within the late eighteenth-century American home had come to an end.

---

[147] Additional examples: *CWF* 1958-486 (Plate-printed handkerchief showcasing the genealogy of the British royal family, *c*. 1783. Marked 'R.G.'); *WM* 1964.1485 (Plate-printed handkerchief memorialising the death of Alexander Hamilton, *c*. 1819. Marked 'S x W'); *WM* 1960.1015 (Plate-printed handkerchief memorialising the death of George Washington, *c*. 1820. Marked 'HO').

[148] *WM* 1952.0306.003 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c*. 1790).

[149] *WM* 1965.0086 (Cotton counterpane block printed using Prussian blue and vermillion, *c*. 1782–1810).

Conclusion

This chapter has shown that a continued preference among American consumers for the purchase of British imported fabrics over the new nation's domestic manufactures was a major factor in determining the success of Republican cottons in the British Atlantic region during the later decades of the eighteenth century. In spite of the rhetoric of economic nationalism and the high-profile spectacles of homespun patriotism engaged in by the political classes of the Early Republic, as discussed in Chapter Four, the quality and suitability of furnishing fabrics remained just as important to upper-class American consumers in the material communication of their social standing, wealth, and taste after the Revolution as it had done during the colonial period. However, this is not to say that upper-class American consumers lacked agency in the design and production of patriotic textiles being marketed by British printers in the aftermath of the Revolution.

As demonstrated by the multiple examples discussed throughout this chapter, British pattern-drawers worked hard to complement the emergent sense of a collective, Republican identity in America by taking their lead from their American consumers in selecting which subjects would be celebrated by the new range of patriotic patterns produced for export. Several British printers strived to make appropriate use of the visual references created by prominent artists associated with the new Republic, such as the oil paintings of John Trumbull and the etched medallion portraits of American politicians issued by Jean-Baptiste Nini and Pierre Eugène du Simitière. In doing this, British pattern-drawers created a faithful pantheon of Revolutionary imagery that their American customers would recognise, enjoy, and wholeheartedly invest their time and money in acquiring. These printers evidently understood that, even with a British monopoly upon the transatlantic trade of printed textiles in the region, the patriotic sensibilities of the new American nation needed to be addressed, accommodated, and celebrated for that monopoly to be maintained.

French pattern-drawers, by comparison, did not seek to engage with the patriotic refashioning of the Independent American interior to nearly the same degree or with as much sensitivity as British manufacturers. As such, French printers could not hope to compete with their British counterparts in catering to the dual desires of ideology and taste that dominated the blossoming Republican marketplace in Independent America. Meanwhile, though early American textile printers were actively

attempting to fashion their own Independent iconography through the provision of block-printed patriotic textiles, they found their work too easily overshadowed by the quantity and quality of those British Republican patterns pouring into the country with the advent of renewed trade in the wake of the Treaty of Paris.

In conclusion, this chapter has sought to shed light upon the complicated space occupied by British-made patriotic furniture fabrics within the material refashioning of American nationhood in the Early Republican period, *c.* 1783–1815. It has attempted to move beyond the typical assertions made by scholars who examine America's emergent Independent identity in terms of its commemorative material culture and adopt a multidimensional approach, which takes into account the lived experience and concerns of the manufacturers and purchasers of Republican cottons in the British Atlantic region. Over the course of this discussion it has become clear that these fabrics represented something beyond the idea of simple 'commemoration', both to their European manufacturers and to their American owners. Rather, such fabrics represented a compromise between the past and the present realities of transatlantic consumption in the British Atlantic region at a time when the dominance of British fashion in her former colonies was being questioned and when the nascent American sense of a collective, Republican identity was at its most vulnerable and ill-defined.

The Making of Revolutionary Memory: The Marquis de Lafayette's Farewell Tour of America, *c.* 1824–5

In the collection of the David Bishop Skillman Library at Lafayette College, in Easton, Pennsylvania, there is a brightly coloured, roughly printed banner of homespun cloth, featuring a heroic equestrian portrait of a young man surmounted by the words: 'YORKTOWN 1781' **[Fig: 6.1]**.[1] The youth pictured is Marie-Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de Lafayette, and the moment memorialised upon the banner is the decisive victory of the combined Franco-American forces over the British army at Yorktown, the battle which effectively paved the road towards eventual peace between the former colonies and the mother country.[2] Lafayette, who in 1777 at the age of nineteen had travelled from France to pledge his support to General George Washington, played a crucial role during the Siege of Yorktown and was present when the British officers made their formal surrender on 17 October 1781.[3] His proximity to such a pivotal moment of victory, not to mention his popular appeal as a skilled 'boy soldier' taken under Washington's wing, ensured that Lafayette became a celebrated figure of the Revolutionary War years.[4] However, the 'YORKTOWN 1781' banner is not contemporary to the celebratory aftermath of the battle. Rather, it was printed by a New York baker to mark the final visit of the

---

[1] *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: IV. 4 (Parade banner printed in blue, red, and yellow using a carved cake board, designed by William Farrow of New York, *c.* 1824–5).

[2] On the importance of the Siege of Yorktown and the various ways in which it was viewed by participants in the fighting, see in particular: John D. Grainger, *The Battle of Yorktown, 1781: A Reassessment* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005).

[3] On the fraternal relationship which developed between Lafayette and Washington from their first meeting in 1777, see: David A. Clary, *Adopted Son: Washington, Lafayette, and the Friendship that Saved the Revolution* (New York: Bantam Books, 2007). On the role of Lafayette at Yorktown, see: John R. Maass, *The Road to Yorktown: Jefferson, Lafayette and the British Invasion of Virginia* (Charleston, VA: The History Press, 2015).

[4] See in particular: Lloyd Kramer, *Lafayette in Two Worlds: Public Cultures and Personal Identities in the Age of Revolutions* (Chapel Hill, NC & London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Anne C. Loveland, *Emblem of Liberty: The Image of Lafayette in the American Mind* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University, 1971).

Marquis de Lafayette to American shores for his prestigious 'Farewell Tour' of 1824–5.[5] The Tour would last from July 1824 to September 1825, encompassing personal visits to twenty-four states, and was the source of fervent national pride for the citizens of the fledgling Union.

T. M. Cheney, a law student at Harvard University, made multiple references to Lafayette's Farewell Tour in his diary for the month of August 1824, describing the great anticipation experienced by himself and his fellow graduates in the days leading up to Lafayette's arrival in the city of Boston:

> The event which excites most interest at the present time is the
> arrival in N York of the Marquis LaFayette. He has been received
> with every testimony of respect and escorted into and through the
> city of [New York] with the utmost pomp and ceremony – he is
> expected in Boston soon.[6]

After witnessing the grand entrance of Lafayette into Boston on August 30 at the head of a procession near fifteen-hundred strong, Cheney was introduced to the Revolutionary War hero at the State House where they shook hands. To mark the event, Cheney procured a commemorative table napkin – manufactured for use at a subscription ball or dinner held in Lafayette's honour – cut out the central medallion that bore the likeness of Lafayette surrounded by the familiar maxim 'La Fayette. The Nation's Guest, The Friend of Washington, The Hero & Philanthropist', and placed the token between the pages of his journal as a lasting reminder of the day **[Fig: 6.2]**.[7]

Cheney was by no means the only American on the hunt for Lafayette memorabilia over the course of the Tour, or indeed after it. The vast array of Lafayette-themed lapel ribbons, table napkins, kid gloves, plate-printed handkerchiefs, and loom-

---

[5] The date of the banner may be reliably ascribed because the cake board from which it was printed has been located, with verifiable provenance, in the collection of the New York Historical Society: *NYHS* 1937.592 (Cake board, carved by John Conger and belonging to William Farrow of New York, *c.* 1825–35).

[6] See object file for: *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: IV. 8a (Centre portion of engraved napkin, c.1824. Taken from the diary of T. M. Cheney of Boston).

[7] *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: IV. 8a (Centre portion of engraved napkin, c.1824. Taken from the diary of T. M. Cheney of Boston).

woven coverlets issued by American textile manufacturers and dry goods merchants during the mid-1820s pay testimony to the popular esteem afforded the 'Nation's Guest'. Similarly, the overwhelming presence of these items in present-day museum and library collections attests to the continued significance of the event within the rapidly evolving landscape of American patriotic culture in subsequent years, kept relevant by the stewardship of later generations of proud Americans.[8] The continued significance of Lafayette's patriotic legacy in nineteenth-century America is evidenced not only by the preservation of souvenirs within family lines, but also by the flurry of printed mourning ribbons manufactured in the US to mark the General's death in 1832 **[Fig: 6.3]**,[9] as well as his inclusion in the pantheon of Revolutionary War heroes represented within the designs of the Fall River quilting fabrics issued during the Centennial Exhibition of 1876 **[Fig: 6.4]**.[10]

The visit of the Marquis de Lafayette in 1824–5 closes this discussion of patriotic refashioning in the context of Revolutionary America as it represents an important transitionary moment in the sartorial culture of early American nationhood: the

---

[8] Examples selected for discussion in this chapter have been drawn mainly from the Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection (ca. 1780 -) held by the David Bishop Skillman Library at Lafayette College, Easton PA. I would particularly like to thank the Head of the Special Collections & College Archives, Diane Shaw, for allowing me unfettered access to this collection for the three days I was in Easton. Other examples used in this chapter have been sourced mainly from the Lafayette Collection held by the Carl A. Kroch Library at Cornell University, the Daughters of the American Revolution Museum, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, the Winterthur Museum, and the National Museum of American History. However, this is but a small sampling of the surviving Lafayette memorabilia produced during and immediately after the Tour. For a comprehensive overview, see in particular: Stanley J. Idzerda, Anne C. Loveland, and Marc C. Miller, *Lafayette, Hero of Two Worlds: The Art and Pageantry of His Farewell Tour of America, 1824-1825* (Hanover & London: The Queens Museum in Association with the University Press of New England, 1989).

[9] *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: VI. 24.4 (Printed cream silk mourning ribbon for Lafayette, advertising public funeral rites to be performed in Philadelphia, *c*. 1834).

[10] *WM* 1969.1274 (Detail of appliqued quilt attributed to Pennsylvania region, backed with roller printed commemorative fabric produced in Fall River, *c*. 1876). Note: As with many of the 1876 Centennial fabrics, this pattern survives across multiple collections including that of the National Museum of American History and the Cooper Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum. There has been some debate as to whether the portrait medallion used within the pattern refers to President Andrew Jackson or to Lafayette. However, the majority of curators cite Lafayette as the intended subject of the print.

realisation of homespun politics as related to the solidification of a uniquely American style of patriotic display. The previous two chapters of this thesis have charted the compromises made by patriotic consumers in the United States of America during the formative years of their Independence, when the realities of inadequate domestic production, pre-existing transatlantic trade relationships, and the continued dominance of a Eurocentric ideal of fashionable taste interfered with the Revolutionary goal of American self-sufficiency. This final chapter analyses the culmination of this struggle between the nation's colonial past and her Independent present in the material refashioning of her patriotic sartorial culture, which finally saw American artisanship and consumer preference reach a point of mutual accommodation around the celebration of the last great Revolutionary War hero of their generation: the Marquis de Lafayette.

For Americans, Lafayette's Farewell Tour of 1824–5 represented a singular moment in the history of their fledgling nation. As was recently discussed by Catherine Kelly in her exploration of the relationship between art and American citizenship in the Early Republic, for US citizens the return of Lafayette to American shores in the summer of 1824 'had the feel of a last hurrah, marking the moment the Revolution became a thing of recorded history rather than lived memory.' Through Lafayette, US citizens 'could simultaneously celebrate the founding generation and cement their connections to it' through the public performance of patriotism by their organisation of Tour events and by the manufacture and purchase of commemorative sartorial goods on American soil.[11] It is not often addressed by historians of early American nationhood how the domestic manufacture of Tour memorabilia afforded US citizens the opportunity to reflect upon the improved state of the nation as it approached the fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1826. However, as shall be observed in this chapter – predominantly through the analysis of printed Tour handkerchiefs, gloves, and lapel ribbons – national milestones such as the increased maturity and sustainability of American manufacturing and the refashioning of the nation's built patriotic landscape upon strictly Republican lines were reoccurring themes in the American-made sartorial culture which surrounded the Tour.

---

[11] Kelly, *Republic of Taste* (2016), p. 236.

However, as the opening section of this chapter shall demonstrate, the elevation of the Marquis de Lafayette within American-made patriotic culture did not emerge without significant precedent. The abundance of Lafayette themed products which were bought and sold in the United States of America during the 1820s–30s is representative of just one strand of a much larger transatlantic trend of popular consumption which was centred upon the commemoration of the pivotal naval and military figures of the day, best described by Linda Colley as 'the cult of elite heroism'.[12] This was a material form of secular veneration made fashionable in the first quarter of the nineteenth century by British manufacturers of patriotic wares, with reference to cultural celebrities of the British Atlantic region, such as General James Wolfe **[Fig: 0.5]**, Horatio Nelson **[Fig: 6.5]**, the Duke of Wellington **[Fig: 6.6]** and, most significantly for the American market, George Washington **[Fig: 6.7]**.[13]

Importantly, what differentiated the American craze for Lafayette-themed sartorial goods from the commemorative material culture which surrounded contemporary 'cults of elite heroism', was that the majority of the textile souvenirs manufactured to mark Lafayette's Farwell Tour of 1824–5 were the result of American artisanship as opposed to European imports. To clarify, this is not to imply that the Tour did not stimulate the manufacture of commemorative Lafayette wares on both sides of the Atlantic. Indeed, there are plenty of European-made sartorial objects which can be reliably associated with the souvenir market surrounding the Tour, mainly of French and British manufacture. However, European-made Lafayette textiles such as Jacquard loom-woven dress fabrics **[Fig: 6.8]** and printed silk handkerchiefs **[Figs: 6.9 & 6.10]** are significantly overshadowed by the wealth of material issued by American textile manufacturers.[14] For American artisans and citizen consumers

---

[12] Colley, *Britons* (2005), pp. 177-93.

[13] Extant ephemera include: *WM* 1975.0112 ('The Death of General Wolfe' earthenware, lead-glazed mug, *c.* 1800); *VAM* T.98-1959 (Fragment of 'Trafalgar Chintz' furnishing fabric, block printed by John Bury of Lancashire, *c.* 1806–7); *VAM* T.428&A-1985 (Patchwork quilt of block printed cottons commemorating the victory of the Duke of Wellington at Vittoria, *c.* 1829); *WM* 1956.0038.101 (Cotton mourning handkerchief for George Washington, plate-printed in Glasgow, *c.* 1795–1805).

[14] For example: *WM* 1969.0064 (Man's cravat of loom woven silk bearing 'LAFAYETTE' pattern, French, *c.* 1824–5); *NMAH* T.15589 (Plate and stamp printed silk neckerchief, French, *c.* 1824–5); *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: V. 21 (French, block-printed silk bandanna worn during the welcome celebrations for Lafayette in Philadelphia, *c.* 1824).

alike, this was the ultimate realisation of homespun politics, as well as the advent of a uniquely American patriotic style actively built upon the Revolutionary tenets of economic nationalism.

Sacred to the Memory of the Illustrious Washington

Technological innovations in the textile printing industry in Europe during the later eighteenth century, such as the move away from plate to roller and cylinder printing, had the effect of making patriotic patterns cheaper to produce and therefore more readily affordable to those lower down the social ladder.[15] As was outlined in Chapter Five, once the fashion for nationalistic styles of British copperplate furniture had waned, designs which may be more suitably characterised as 'commemorative' emerged to decorate the Independent American home. These later commemorative textiles manufactured in Britain for the American export market were printed cheaply and in limited runs so as to specifically coincide with moments of national significance in the US and, as such, were aimed at attracting a much wider and less discerning customer base. Nowhere else can this popular embrace of commemorative textile culture in the British Atlantic region be better observed than in the influx of British-made mourning textiles following the death of George Washington in 1799. Already becoming *au fait* with the manufacture of sartorial goods for the 'cult of elite heroism' due to the popular lament of General James Wolfe and the celebration of Horatio Nelson in the 1780s and early 1790s, British textile printers were easily able to dominate and shape the sartorial character of the resulting 'Cult of Washington' in early nineteenth century America. As shall be discussed in this opening section in reference to several surviving sartorial objects, British display handkerchiefs were particularly influential in the transformation of Washington's figure in the American imagination from Revolutionary war hero to the Household God of Federal America **[Fig: 6.11]**.[16]

---

[15] See discussions in Chapters Four and Five.

[16] Observe, for example, the reverential space occupied by the image of Washington above the mantelpiece in John Lewis Krimmel's genre painting 'The Quilting Frolic' (1813). Washington's image is flanked by scenes of American naval victory and is set above silhouette portraits of family members. See: *WM* 1953.0178.002 A (John Lewis Krimmel, 'The Quilting Frolic', oil on canvas, c.

George Washington was undeniably the figurehead of America's cult of Revolutionary War heroes during the early nineteenth century, a movement made widespread in the United States following his death at Mount Vernon in December 1799. Even though Washington had become something of a controversial political figure over the course of his two presidential terms (1789-97), with the rise of the Democratic Republican party threatening his Federalist agenda, his death proved transformative for his reputation and secured his legacy as the feted Founding Father of modern America. As discussed by Susan Purcell, dying 'allowed him to transcend mere mortality and assume ultimate status as an eternal hero along with the celebrated martyrs of the Revolution.'[17] The country united together in an unprecedented show of national mourning at the passing of Washington, the first official president of the still young United States of America.[18] As has been observed by Simon Newman, communal commemorative rites immediately began to intrude upon various aspects of everyday life in the wake of Washington's death: 'Few Americans can have been left unaware of these rites: muffled church bells, booming cannon, flags flying at half mast, and black ribbons of mourning pervaded the public sphere.'[19] Indeed, both commercial and home-produced mourning paraphernalia abounded in America during this period, ranging from generic badges of sorrow sold by American dry goods merchants and street vendors – black mourning ribbons being a prime example – to more elaborate, artistic creations incorporated into the interior decoration of American homes, such as women's watercolours **[Fig: 6.12]**, needlework **[Fig: 6.13]**, and other hand-crafted mementos expressive of the nation's grief.[20]

1813). See also: Susan M. Stabile, *Memory's Daughters: The Material Culture of Remembrance in Eighteenth-Century America* (Ithaca, NY & London: Cornell University Press, 2004).

[17] Sarah J. Purcell, *Sealed with Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), p. 172.

[18] See in particular: Gerald E. Kahler, *The Long Farewell: Americans Mourn the Death of George Washington* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008).

[19] Simon P. Newman, *Parades and the Politics of the Street: Festive Culture in the Early American Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), p. 69.

[20] Meredith Eliassen, 'Columbia Mourns: The Distaff Side of Washington's Long Farewell' in *Women and the Material Culture of Death*, eds. Beth Fowkes Tobin and Maureen Daly Goggin (London & New York: Routledge, 2016), p. 125; *DARM* 87.5 (Watercolour morning picture on bleached linen

Many of the surviving American-made textile objects associated with the Cult of Washington take the form of ephemeral display pieces, which were made specifically to be worn prominently about the body during events of public commemoration of the fallen president, either during the initial funerary proceedings of 1800 or during nineteenth-century anniversary celebrations dedicated to commemorating milestones of Washington's life. Extant pieces in American heritage collections showcase a mixture of professional and amateur workmanship. Two mourning armbands in the Daughters of the American Revolution Museum collection, for instance, typify this spectrum of skill and personal investment by the makers. Ostensibly crafted for the same purpose – to act as a form of generic mourning dress, the import of which being readily seen, recognised, and respected by those in close proximity to the wearer – one was manufactured commercially **[Fig: 6.14]**, while the other was made by an individual, presumably working within the privacy of their own home but to public purpose **[Fig: 6.15]**. The former is made of a thin, cream silk ribbon, now heavily fragmented, upon which has been plate-printed a miniature medallion scene of mourners gathered around a neoclassical tomb, which displays Washington's silhouette above the ubiquitous patriotic symbol of the American Eagle, featured upon the Great Seal **[Fig: 6.14*a*]**. The latter example is a wider band of cream silk, overlaid with black crape and edged with a black crape rosette **[Fig: 6.15*a*]**. Beneath the crape is an oval drawn lightly in pen ink, with the letters 'G W' at its centre. This motif was previously stitched in black silk thread, of which some is still visible **[Fig: 6.15*b*]**. Both of these objects are heavily damaged, betraying a history of intense use and their continued existence as souvenirs, conveyed through subsequent generations of Americans as treasured mementos of the nation's early history.[21]

---

ground, *c.* 1800); *CWF* 1956.604.1 (Embroidered silk mourning picture with painted embellishments, 'Sacred to the Memory of Illustrious Washington', attributed to Philadelphia *c.* 1805); *NMAH* T.19321 (Silk memorial picture, *c.* 1800-15); *DARM* 73.300 (Papercut mourning picture mounted upon a gilt-frame mirror, *c.* 1800). See also the mourning pieces commissioned from commercial artists for the domestic interior, such as the fine wax tableaus, painted and gilded behind glass executed by the German modeller John Christian Rauschner, who was active in New York *c.* 1799-1808: *WM* 1957.0820 A (Wax picture depicting mourners gathered at Washington's tomb, *c.* 1800).

[21] *DARM* 2073 (Cream silk ribbon printed with memorial scene, *c.*1800); *DARM* 64.70 (Mourning armband of cream silk and black crape with a handstitched emblem to George Washington, *c.* 1799-1800).

Also held in the collection of the Daughters of the American Revolution Museum is a rare example of a memorial textile worn by an active participant in a commemorative procession held in memory of Washington during the early nineteenth century: a parade apron belonging to a patriotic hatter, most likely worn during a procession celebrating the centennial of Washington's birth, which took place in New York City, *c*. 1831–2.[22] The apron consists of a cream silk body, hemmed with a pleated blue ribbon, and was intended to be tied at the waist and neck with matching ribbons and a blue silk cockade **[Fig: 6.16]**. The emblem of a man's hat has been stitched upon the chest in black silk thread, indicating the profession of the wearer to parade spectators **[Fig: 6.16*a*]**. The procession would have consisted of various professional groups, publicly gathered to march in a unified show of respect to the memory of the first president, whose portrait can be seen plate-printed upon the white silk front of the ceremonial garb.

Such examples notwithstanding, most of the printed textile commemoratives issued to mark Washington's death during this period were the product of British rather than American artisanship. A popular side-line of the British-made patriotic furniture fabrics discussed in Chapter Five were the plate-printed handkerchiefs manufactured to celebrate Washington's political and military achievements during the final decades of the eighteenth century. Responding to the advent of communal commemorative rites for the former president and the quick spread of the material culture of secular mourning within American society during the year 1800, British draftsmen amended their handkerchief designs to reflect the new space occupied by Washington's memory in American patriotic display culture.[23] In death he was no

---

[22] *DARM* 2281 (Parade apron, *c*. 1831-2). Not to be confused with the aprons worn by Freemasons – of which Washington was a member – during meetings and public ceremonies, which start at the midriff and do not tie about the neck. For an example see: *NMAH* 2013.71.1abc (Masonic apron, late eighteenth century).

[23] George Washington's death was by no means the sole topic of commemoration for British printers at this time, though it was arguably the most heavily featured in products sent to America during the early nineteenth century. The deaths of other notable American statesmen were also addressed by British printers, though nowhere near to the same degree. See, in particular, a plate-printed handkerchief memorialising Alexander Hamilton: *WM* 1964.1485 (Plate-printed handkerchief, *c*. 1800-10). A popular composite design featuring scenes in memory of the Boston Tea Party, the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the Battle of Saratoga, and the presidential terms of

longer regarded solely as a celebrity of the Revolutionary War years, but as a deified icon who epitomised the ideals of the modern American nation, made all the more poignant to the citizen consumers of the US as they moved forward into the new century without him.

An example of a British handkerchief issued prior to this shift in the representation of Washington in the collective American imagination can be observed in this plate-printed handkerchief, manufactured in a red colourway upon a bleached cotton ground, *c.* 1785–95 **[Fig: 6.17]**.[24] Stylistically speaking, the representation of Washington used within this particular handkerchief can be favourably compared to the ethos of the British-made Republican cottons issued during the 1780s–90s. The secular veneration of George Washington alongside other American statesmen of the Early Republic – namely John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, John Jay, Henry Laurens, Thomas Mifflin, William Henry Drayton, Baron von Steuben, Nathanael Green, John Dickinson, Charles Thomson, and Gouverneur Morris – is a key theme of the handkerchief's design, the focus being upon Washington's substantive political and military prowess. Not at all dissimilar to the composition of the popular furnishing pattern 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' discussed in Chapter Five **[Fig: 5.4]**, Washington is depicted in the central scene of the handkerchief in the equestrian style of a Revolutionary War hero, riding at the head of an army marching under American and French colours, signifying the successful alliance made between the two countries during the closing years of the conflict. Washington gestures for the allegorical figures of Peace and Prosperity to return to the blindfolded figure of Justice the sword she had bestowed upon him to overcome the threat of British tyranny. Inscribed upon the stone plinth supporting the

---

George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams features heavily in American textile collections. Though, similarly, these numbers do not approach the wealth of commemorative wares manufactured solely to mark Washington's passing: *WM* 1959.0960 (Blue variation. Plate printed handkerchief, *c.* 1800-25); *WM* 1959.0961 (Red variation. Plate printed handkerchief, *c.* 1800-25); *CHSDM* 1995-50-52 (Red variation. Plate printed handkerchief, *c.* 1800-25); *NMAH* H.35606 (Purple variation. Plate printed handkerchief, *c.* 1800-25). This design can be reliably attributed to the Anderston print-works near Glasgow, which was operated by Richard Gillespie. Supporting documentary evidence provides a persuasive date stamp.

[24] *WM* 1959.0958 (Plate-printed handkerchief in red colourway, *c.* 1785-95).

allegorical party is the triumphal phrase: 'Gen. Washington directing Peace to restore to Justice the sword which had gained Independence to AMERICA' **[Fig: 6.17*a*]**.

By comparison, British-made patriotic handkerchiefs designed and issued in the decades immediately following Washington's death in 1799 fall comfortably within the same category as those commemorative textiles fashioned to memorialise popular heroes of British nationhood, the most celebrated of these arguably being British naval heroes such as Horatio Nelson, whose funeral procession appeared on handkerchiefs, cushion covers, and bed furniture **[Fig: 6.18]**.[25] At the same time as 'Trafalgar chintzes' were being block-printed at John Bury's printworks in Lancashire in commemoration of Nelson's illustrious downfall at the Battle of Trafalgar in 1805 **[Fig: 6.5]**, printing firms in Glasgow were issuing handkerchiefs depicting Washington's dying moments at Mount Vernon **[Fig: 6.19]**.[26]

In terms of composing a narrative of virtuous nationhood, these British display handkerchiefs represent an important transitionary moment in the patriotic display of Washington's image in the United States of America, while also arguably providing a cultural touchstone for the later elevation of Lafayette within the designs of American-made commemorative textiles of the 1820s-30s. While the copperplate-printed cottons and display handkerchiefs circulated during the 1780s-90s had chiefly sought to celebrate Washington's pivotal role in attaining American Independence during the Revolutionary War years, the commemorative designs manufactured in Britain during the early 1800s moved beyond the early 'Republican

---

[25] It is important to note that imported printed textiles were by no means the only commercialised commemorative objects to represent the transformative 'apotheosis' of Washington, which marked his entry into the same 'cult of elite heroism' occupied by Nelson. Prints, jewellery, glassware, and ceramics bearing Washington's likeness and mythologised life story were also popular. Such wares were manufactured in enormous quantities across Europe and Asia, expressly for export to the grieving American marketplace *c.* 1800. For examples and further context, see in particular: William Ayres, 'At Home with George: Commercialization of the Washington Image, 1776-1876' in *George Washington: American Symbol*, ed. Barbara J. Mitnick (New York: Hudson Hills Press, 1999), pp. 91-106.

[26] *VAM* T.98-1959 (Furnishing fabric of block-printed cotton, made by John Bury, Lancashire, *c.* 1806-7); *MET* 16.28 ('Trafalgar Chintz', block-printed cotton. Attributed to John Bury of Lancashire, *c.* 1806); *MFAB* 63.8 ('Trafalgar Chintz', cotton, block-printed with painted details. English, *c.* 1806); *NMM* TXT0119 (Block-printed furniture fabric, *c.* 1806. Tea ground variation).

style' of secular veneration and into the realms of deification. By the early nineteenth century Washington had been elevated to the status of the Household God of Independent American nationhood, his commercially printed life-story being stitched lovingly into the centre of patchwork quilts up and down the country **[Fig: 6.20],** while multiple versions of his iconic likeness witnessed the rhythms of everyday life from the walls of the nation's parlours **[Fig: 6.11]**.[27]

The Cult of Washington, though heavily informed by British ideals of national commemoration and sustained in large part by British manufacturers of patriotic textile goods, had set the stage for the emergence of a uniquely 'American-style' of patriotic display culture by the time of Lafayette's arrival in the US in August 1824. The building blocks of what constituted a truly Independent-style of American patriotic display culture had been firmly laid by the advent of communal commemorative rites around Washington's death and by the apotheosising of Revolutionary heroism in the collective consciousness of US citizens.[28] All that was required for the solidification of that Independent-style within the homes and public spaces of the young Republic was an increase in the maturity and sophistication of the printed textile industry in America and the impetus to let that maturity shine forth upon the national stage. Lafayette's Farewell Tour of 1824–5 afforded American artisans that opportunity. American purchasers, recently galvanised by the rhetoric of economic nationalism which had informed the homespun display culture of the War of 1812, began to set aside their penchant for European patriotic wares and invested instead in furthering the Revolutionary vision of American self-sufficiency first put forward during the turbulent years of the Imperial Crises by early industrialists such as John Beale Bordley **[Fig: 4.1**] and by the late president, George Washington.

---

[27] For an example of the iconic handkerchief pattern 'The Death of General Washington' incorporated in this manner as a patriotic display piece, see: *CWF* 2012-172 (Pieced framed centre medallion quilt, incorporating a plate-printed handkerchief memorialising the death of George Washington, *c.* 1810). See also: *WM* 1953.0178.002 A (John Lewis Krimmel, 'The Quilting Frolic', oil on canvas, *c.* 1813).

[28] See in particular: Michael A. McDonnell, Clare Corbould, Frances Clarke, and W. Fitzhugh Brundage, eds., *Remembering the Revolution: Memory, History, and Nation Making from Independence to the Civil War* (Amherst & Boston: University of Massachusetts Press: 2013). Teresa Barnett, *Sacred Relics: Pieces of the Past in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 2013); Sarah Knott, *Sensibility and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009).

As was expanded upon in Chapter Four, the first quarter of the nineteenth century witnessed the beginnings of the American love affair with large-scale cotton production and a renewed interest in the national benefits of agricultural self-sufficiency. This meant competition for British calico printers, whose grasp upon the patriotic textile market in America had begun to wane with the outbreak of the War of 1812 and the inevitable disruption of international trade which followed. Having introduced the style for commemorative textiles into America with the advent of the Cult of Washington, as war raged once more between the two countries British artisans were unable to prevent American printers from gaining the upper hand in terms of the production and the application of commemorative styles. Once the war was over, they had effectively lost their monopoly over the trade and American artisans had cultivated both a loyal customer-base and a reputation for improved quality.

As was shown in Chapters Four and Five, while the War of 1812 had done little to deter British printers from continuing to issue patriotic patterns for general consumption by US citizens post-1815, it had placed the rhetoric of homespun patriotism back at the forefront of American political culture.[29] With trade embargoes and naval conflicts disrupting the flow of foreign imports of British textiles into America's port cities during the early decades of the nineteenth century, American entrepreneurs were provided with the motivation to seriously invest in cotton cultivation and to implement technology that would industrialise the spinning, weaving, finishing, and printing aspects of the cotton trade. New England mills increasingly began to work with raw cotton being grown upon Southern plantations and mechanised looms and roller printing technology pirated from European industrialists were introduced into America's early manufactories, so that by 1836 an estimated 120 million yards of printed cotton textiles were being produced domestically in the US on an annual basis.[30] The young nation's complete dependence upon European manufactures had finally begun to lessen, allowing patriotic pattern production in America to come into its own around the celebration

---

[29] See the discussion in Chapter 4.

[30] Peck, '"India Chints" and "China Taffaty"' in *Interwoven Globe* (2013), p. 119.

of the last great Revolutionary War hero of their generation: the Marquis de Lafayette.

Defining Revolutionary Memory Through the Design of Lafayette Textiles

Returning from his wedding celebrations in Alexandria, Virginia, Benjamin Hallowell composed a poem for the enjoyment of his uncle, with verses which marvelled at the sheer glut of Lafayette-themed wares Hallowell had seen for sale about the city streets:

> Each lover of liberty surely must get
>
> Something in honor of La Fayette.
>
> There's a La Fayette watch-chain, a La Fayette hat,
>
> A La Fayette this, and a La Fayette that.
>
> But I wanted something as lasting as life,
>
> And took to myself a La Fayette wife.[31]

The irreverent tone of Hallowell's poem notwithstanding, his observation regarding the advent of Lafayette-mania within American society in the mid-1820s was well-founded. The diversity of Lafayette wares available within the United States during and after Lafayette's Farewell Tour in 1824–5 betray both the prevalence and the general appeal of souvenir culture within America by this period and the various environments in which these objects were used and displayed by US citizens. Everyday objects for use in the home and in the public street were manufactured specifically to bear the General's likeness or name, including items as disparate as umbrellas **[Fig: 6.21]**, clothes brushes **[Fig: 6.22]**, and hand mirrors **[Fig: 6.23]**.[32]

---

[31] Benjamin Hallowell, *Autobiography of Benjamin Hallowell…* (1883), p. 99, quoted in: Barbara H. Magid, 'Commemorative Wares in George Washington's Hometown' in *Ceramics in America*, ed. Robert Hunter (Hanover & London: The Chipstone Foundation in association with the University Press of New England, 2006), p. 25.

[32] *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: V. 29 (A 'Nation's Guest' commemorative umbrella manufactured by Martinot and Roe of New York, *c.* 1824–5); *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: V. 7 (Clothes brush, with 'LAFAYETTE 1825' printed onto the bristles, *c.* 1825); *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: V. 9 (Circular hand mirror with pewter edging, displaying watch paper portrait of Lafayette on the verso, *c.* 1824–5).

The trend even extended to baby shoes, with an American mother presenting her infant son at a reception for the visiting dignitary sporting 'a little beaver hat with a La Fayette cockade upon it & a pair of blue shoes with the head of La Fayette on the front part of them.'[33] An extant pair, constructed of soft pink leather, lends credence to the tale **[Fig: 6.24]**.[34]

Just as those US citizens who made patriotic pilgrimages to Mount Vernon in the early nineteenth century had begun to snip off buttons from George Washington's suits, they had also begun to hunt out relics associated with the Nation's Guest.[35] They collected waistcoats and jewellery he had worn **[Fig: 6.25]**, blankets and bed curtains he had slept under, and hoarded parade paraphernalia associated with the famous spectacles of the Tour, such as painted flags and printed lapel ribbons.[36] Lafayette was himself a proponent of the urge to possess mementos which spoke to the nation's recent Revolutionary history. Upon his own visit to Mount Vernon in October 1824, he participated in this venerating behaviour by accepting a gold memorial ring containing a lock of George Washington's hair before moving to cut a sprig of cypress from the site of Washington's tomb to carry with him during his

---

[33] Quoted in Kevin D. Murphy, 'A Printed Map Case for the Marquis de Lafayette: Memory and Geography in the Early Republic', *West 86th: A Journal of Decorative Arts, Design History, and Material Culture*, 20: 1 (2013), p. 103. The episode is described in the diary of Caroline Olivia Ball Laurens (March 1825), currently in the collection of the South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, SC.

[34] The baby shoes are a new addition to the special collection of the David Bishop Skillman Library at Lafayette College in Easton, Pennsylvania and are currently awaiting cataloguing. Current number: 8468. Address enquiries to Diane Shaw, Director for Special Collections & College Archives. I would like to thank Diane for showing me the shoes during my research trip to the library in February 2017.

[35] See also: *NMAH* AF.35573 (Fragments of the Star-Spangled Banner made by Mary Pickersgill in 1814 in Baltimore, MD, which were cut from the original flag by members of the Appleton family *c.* 1880).

[36] *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: IV.1.2 (Waistcoat of white cotton muslin, embroidered with silk, worn by Lafayette during his Farewell Tour of America, *c.* 1824–5); *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: V.29 (Blanket purportedly slept under by Lafayette during the American Tour, early nineteenth century); *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: IV.3 (Painted parade banner depicting George Washington, possibly used during the Philadelphia celebrations, 1824).

return journey to France.[37] This touching scene was itself commemorated upon souvenir snuff boxes issued during the Tour, manufactured so that admirers of Lafayette could reflect on the Revolutionary general's example of honourable remembrance whenever they reached for a pinch of snuff **[Fig: 6.26]**.[38]

The final visit of the Revolutionary War hero to US shores from 1824–5 presented domestic manufacturers and the purchasers of patriotic wares with the opportunity to reaffirm the fading memories of the Revolutionary generation and to celebrate their continued relevance for post-Independence Americans, whose understanding of the Founding was built predominantly upon the collective recollections of those who had lived through it. At the advancing age of sixty-seven, Lafayette's presence in America 'rekindled memories of the Revolution at the very moment when the physical evidence of the war – and especially veterans – was disappearing.'[39] In the public character and personal history of Lafayette, well known to Americans through his popular exploits during the Revolutionary War and later as a result of his conservative stance during the Terrors of the French Revolution, 'Americans saw a living link to George Washington and the glories of the founding era.'[40] American artisans who produced printed patriotic textiles to mark the welcome celebrations of the Tour exploited these facets of Lafayette's public character and personal history in order to reflect the unique space he had come to occupy in the domestic narrative of the American Revolution. In the designs of lapel ribbons, kid gloves and handkerchiefs, Lafayette was presented both as a Revolutionary War hero in his own right as well as a long-standing friend to the original Founding Father, George

---

[37] Marian Klamkin, *The Return of Lafayette, 1824-1825* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975), p. 96.

[38] *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: V. 15.2 (Carved ebony snuffbox depicting the scene of Lafayette at Washington's grave. French, *c.* 1830s).

[39] Michael A. McDonnell, Clare Corbould, Frances Clarke, and W. Fitzhugh Brundage, 'Introduction: The Revolution in American Life from 1776 to the Civil War' in *Remembering the Revolution: Memory, History, and Nation Making from Independence to the Civil War*, eds. Michael A. McDonnell, Clare Corbould, Frances Clarke, and W. Fitzhugh Brundage (Amherst & Boston: University of Massachusetts Press: 2013), p. 8.

[40] Christine H. Messing, John B. Rudder, and Diane Windham Shaw, *A Son and his Adoptive Father: The Marquis de Lafayette George Washington* (Mount Vernon, VA: The Mount Vernon Ladies Association, 2006), p. 75.

Washington. In this manner, American artisans framed the Frenchman as an essential iconographic element of the patriotic display culture of the new United States **[Figs: 6.27 & 6.28]**.[41]

The Germantown Handkerchiefs: Performing New Nationhood

The most common surviving American-made commemorative handkerchiefs associated with Lafayette's Farewell Tour were printed in Philadelphia *c.* 1824–5, an attribution reliably derived from the 'Germantown Print-Works' signature incorporated into the design **[Fig: 6.29]**.[42] Drawing upon the research of scholars such as Montgomery and Eaton, it is now possible to sketch an impression of the emergent industrial infrastructure in Philadelphia, which underpinned the 'Germantown Printworks' signature prominently inscribed upon the lower-edge of the handkerchief.[43] The commercial area of Germantown had an established manufacturing profile by the mid-1820s, with a history of linen weaving and paper-making stretching back as far as the seventeenth century. As noted by Eaton, the 'fast-flowing' waters of the Wissahickon and Wingohocking creeks that dominated the Germantown landscape made the area eminently suited to the practicality of calico printing; the power generated by water mills built along the creeks drove the newly constructed cylinder printing machines and engraved copper-rollers employed by a number of calico printers working in the district by the early nineteenth century.[44] Of these, speculates Eaton, the most likely author of the handkerchiefs was the printworks operated by Thorpe, Siddall & Co, a rapidly growing concern by the

---

[41] *DBSL* Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection: VI. 14 (Plate-printed and hand-tinted silk lapel ribbon depicting America welcoming Lafayette with 'HONOUR GRATITUDE & PUBLIC ESTEEM', *c.* 1824–5); *WM* 1955.0103.003 & 1955.0103.004 (Pair of white leather gloves, printed with a dual portrait of Washington and Lafayette surmounted by the maxim 'IMPERISHABLE THEIR FAME', *c.* 1824–5).

[42] Surviving examples of the 'Germantown Print-Works' handkerchief, roller-printed in a brown or purple colourway upon a bleached cotton ground *c.* 1824 include (selected): *WM* 1967.0144; *MET* 44.109.6; *DARM* 70.224.

[43] Eaton, *Printed Textiles* (2014), pp. 93-4.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

1820s which had claimed to enjoy ready-access to cylinder printing technology as early as 1809.[45]

The true patriotic significance of the design of the 'Germantown Print-Works' handkerchief is not to be found in its appropriation of the traditional symbols of popular commemoration, such as the inclusion of a feted medallion image of Lafayette at its centre or the transcriptions of speeches given to mark the General's arrival in Philadelphia, which occupy the kerchief's middle ground. These design features are of secondary importance when analysed alongside the top and bottom borders of the handkerchief, which feature two scenes of identifiable, regional importance in the staging of the Tour: the entry of Lafayette's ship into New York Harbour on 16 August 1824 and the subsequent festivities held at Castle Garden and the Welcome Parade which attended Lafayette's procession towards the renovated State House in Philadelphia on 28 September 1824. By prominently showcasing these two scenes of regional significance in the top and bottom borders of the handkerchief, the draftsman's aim was to communicate the collective pride of US citizens regarding the prosperous state of their nation and the development of its own uniquely American patriotic culture during the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

Implicit in the patriotic design of the 'Germantown Print-Works' handkerchief is the importance of the work of regional organisers and local artisans to the successful execution of the Tour's grandest spectacles. Though Lafayette's invitation to visit the United States of America had come from the Federalist government under President James Monroe, each of his receptions was organised on a local level by men and

---

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 94; Eaton has repeated this assertion elsewhere, posing that 'Germantown Printworks' was the name under which Thorpe, Siddall & Co were popularly known before they became properly established later in the nineteenth century. Eaton also notes that Thorpe, Siddall & Co claimed in 1809 to be the first printworks in the USA to employ cylinder-printing machines, an assertion which would have put Philadelphia at the cutting-edge of textile printing in the Early Republic. However, it may be speculated that such a claim was part of the patriotic culture of domestic manufacturing initiatives performed in the wake of the Embargo Act of 1807 (as discussed in Chapter Four). Further research needs to be done in this area. See: Philip Scranton, *Proprietary Capitalism: The Textile Manufacturers at Philadelphia, 1800-1885* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 109; Linda Eaton, 'Winterthur Primer: Nothing to Sneeze At: Commemorative Handkerchiefs for the American Market', <https://www.incollect.com/articles/winterthur-primer-nothing-to-sneeze-at-commemorative-handkerchiefs-for-the-american-market> [accessed 30 April 2016].

women from across the political spectrum.[46] Thus, perhaps inevitably, the process of national celebration became simultaneously tied to expressions of 'localism and sectional pride.'[47] A high level of regional investment in ensuring that the festivities were appropriately grand and thus worthy of attendance by the Nation's Guest can be observed in the hard work of the organisational committees of the participating towns and cities.[48] Arguably the most memorable of these locally stage-managed Tour events were the emblematic welcome celebrations that took place in New York and Philadelphia in 1824. These particular celebrations were carefully choreographed, at great expense, so as to be leading examples for the Tour celebrations which came after them. That the organisational committees responsible for the events proved successful in their endeavour is evidenced by the prominence with which the curated patriotic landscapes of New York and Philadelphia figure in the design of the 'Germantown Print-Works' handkerchief.[49]

---

[46] Marc H. Miller, 'Lafayette's Farewell Tour and American Art' in *Lafayette, Hero of Two Worlds: The Art and Pageantry of His Farewell Tour of America, 1824-1825*, Stanley J. Idzerda, Anne C. Loveland, and Marc C. Miller (Hanover & London: The Queens Museum in Association with the University Press of New England, 1989), pp. 106-7.

[47] Purcell, *Sealed with Blood* (2002), p. 172.

[48] A journal detailing these events can be found in an account of the Farewell Tour penned by Lafayette's personal secretary, originally published in French in 1829 and subsequently translated into English and circulated in America. See: Auguste Levasseur, *Lafayette in America in 1824 and 1825: Or, Journal of a Voyage to the United States*, 2 vols., translated by John D. Goodman (Philadelphia: Carey and Lea, 1829). That local individuals and organisations invested heavily in the success of the Tour can also be judged by the wealth of personal correspondence received by Lafayette on his journey, sent by members of regional societies and institutions. Furthermore, regular citizens kept records of the spectacles in scrap/commonplace books. See in particular: *NYHS* Mss. Col. AHMC Thomas, Ann (Ann Thomas's book of poems from children to welcome the Marquis de La Fayette to New York, Sept. 16, 1824); *CKL* Archives 4116 Bd. Ms. 13, 6 (Lafayette – Letters, etc. Rec'd: Group of poems and songs dedicated to, or inspired by, Lafayette, in French and English; dating from the period of his American Tour, 1824-5); *CKL* Archives 4116 Bd. Ms. 14 (Lafayette American Tour Scrapbook, 1824-5); *MHS* Ms. N-586 (John Newhall's commonplace book and diary, 1825).

[49] On the centrality of the Lafayette parade spectacles to the success and popular memory of the tour in the United States of America, as well as the influence these spectacles had upon the public performance of American patriotism by future generations, see: Susan G. Davis, *Parades and Power: Street Theatre in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1992); Rosemary K. Bank, *Theatre Culture in America, 1825-1860* (Cambridge: Cambridge

Shortly after the arrival of Lafayette's ship into New York Harbour in August 1824, a committee of local gentlemen had been formed to organise a fete in his honour at Castle Garden.[50] Several meetings of the committee were held throughout August and early September, during which all the necessary arrangements were made for the citizens of New York to express 'their grateful sense of the merits of this distinguished stranger on his return to this city'.[51] Sub-committees were put in place at each meeting as new concerns arose: a committee in charge of acquiring decorations from local artisans and labourers, a committee to organise the designing, printing, and selling of tickets, a committee to hire musicians to play for the dancing, a committee responsible for buying ample refreshments and, lastly, a committee to 'police' Castle Garden during the fete in order to deter would-be gate-crashers.[52] The final accounts, which were meticulously kept by the committee secretary Col. James Jones, show that a total sum of $8715 had been paid to various businesses in New York in preparation for the fete.[53] The efforts of the organising committee clearly thrilled those guests in attendance, judging by the remarks of Miss H. Kinney, who informed her friend Mary Backus of Norwich, Connecticut in a letter penned shortly after the event, that 'the most sumptuous entertainments have been given that the taste and liberality of our City could devise...'[54]

The lavish cost and local enthusiasm invested into the fete was in-keeping with the rejuvenating spirit which underpinned Lafayette's Farewell Tour. The landscape in and around Castle Garden, for instance, was given a new lease of life by the proceedings. Before the Tour the area of Castle Garden, Battery Park, and New York Harbour, had been the city's base of naval operations during the War of 1812. When

---

University Press, 1997), pp. 9-22; Jhennifer A. Amundson, 'Staging a Triumph, Raising a Temple: Philadelphia's "Welcoming Parade" for Lafayette, 1824' in *Commemoration in America: Essays on Monuments, Memorialisation, and Memory*, eds., David Gobel and Daves Rossell (Charlottesville & London: University of Virginia Press, 2013), pp. 89-113.

[50] *NYPL* MssCol 17967 (Lafayette Ball records, 1824).

[51] *Ibid.*, 'Committee minutes' (18 August 1824).

[52] *Ibid.*, 'Committee minutes' (30 August 1824); 'Committee minutes' (2 September 1824). For an example of the tickets printed for the event, see: *NYHS* PR.022.9 (Invitation to the fete held at Castle Garden, 1824).

[53] *Ibid.*, 'Bills paid and ordered to be paid' (September 1824).

[54] *NYHS* Mss. Col. AHMC Backus, Mary (Letter to Mary Buckus, 19 September 1824).

Castle Garden was leased for public entertainments by city officials from July 1824 in preparation for Lafayette's arrival, the former military fort was transformed into a thriving space of fashionable sociability, in which citizens promenaded, attended assemblies, and listened to concerts. The desire to improve the area continued well after the close of Lafayette's Tour and by the 1830s the space had become a popular waterside resort, with boat races, fireworks displays and hot-air balloon aeronautics delighting visitors from near and far.[55]

As officials in New York focussed their efforts upon rejuvenating Castle Garden in a manner worthy of the 'distinguished stranger', similar preparations attended the built patriotic landscape of Philadelphia, the city in which the Declaration of Independence had been signed almost half-a-century before. As discussed by Gary Nash, the ethos of national remembrance that encompassed Lafayette's visit 'refocused attention on the virtue and heroism of the revolutionary generation in a way that kindled Philadelphians' reverence for historic sites that could be transformed into sacred spaces.'[56] Such was the case with the iconic buildings associated with the key moments of the American Revolution, such as the dilapidated State House, which had begun to steadily crumble and decay in the years since the Declaration had been signed there.

The design of the Germantown handkerchief symbolises not only the gratitude felt by the Revolutionary generation towards a noted military figure of their recent past, but also the obvious pride invested by US citizens in the Republican landscape of their own creation. The two scenes derived from the celebrations held at New York and Philadelphia to welcome Lafayette to America in 1824 neatly encapsulate the innovations wrought upon the performative character of American patriotic culture since the advent of Independence in 1776. The focus deliberately drawn within the design of the 'Germantown Print-Works' handkerchief towards renovated buildings of national significance, to the social and cultural refinements of US citizens, and to the grandiose commemorative rites that elevated the Tour to international acclaim, signified to the purchaser of the handkerchief all of the hallmarks of a politically safe

---

[55] Stages of transformation of the Castle Garden area outlined in: Barry Moreno, *Castle Garden and Battery Park* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia, 2007), pp. 15-19.

[56] Gary Nash, *First City: Philadelphia and the Forging of Historical Memory* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), p. 7

and stable nation. That the design was displayed upon a bleached cotton ground of American manufacture, printed by American craftsmanship in a city which had been so central to the forging of early American Republicanism, further illustrated to those US citizens who purchased the handkerchief the entrenched legitimacy of their new-found nationhood and their country's nascent break with the cultural trappings and industrial limitations of its colonial past.

Conclusion

The array of domestically-manufactured, Lafayette-themed sartorial goods which were made available to American consumers during the Farwell Tour of 1824–5 provide an insight into the increased maturity and sustainability of American textile production achieved by this period. Similarly, the ubiquity of these items indicates the increased importance placed by US citizens upon the role of economic nationalism in the securing of true independent statehood during the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

While American consumers certainly continued to purchase commemorative textiles imported from Europe during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, by the year of Lafayette's visit American consumers had secured access to a home market of domestically produced sartorial goods that was more sophisticated and diverse than the one they had enjoyed during the formative years of their Independence. This was the ultimate realisation of the Revolutionary era's preoccupation with the rhetoric of homespun politics, communicated at last via the mass-production and circulation of good quality, American-made sartorial culture at a moment of singular significance for the nation.

The patriotic value placed upon the young Republic's reduced need to import such commemorative wares from European – and particularly British – manufacturers cannot be too greatly overstated. As can be seen confidently expressed in a double-woven coverlet of indigo and bleached wool manufactured in New York state during the final months of the Tour, marking the fourth of July celebrations:

'AGRICULTURE & MANUFACTURERS ARE THE FOUNDATION OF OUR
INDEPENDENCE. JULY 4. 1825 GNRL LAFAYETTE' **[Fig: 30]**.[57]

---

[57] *NMAH* T.18131 (Blue and white loom-woven wool coverlet, *c.* 1825). Variations on this pattern:
CWF 1976.609.5 (Blue and white loom-woven wool coverlet, *c.* 1830); *MFAB* 48.407 (Blue and
white loom-woven wool coverlet, *c.* 1833); *NMAH* T.14962 (Red and white loom-woven wool
coverlet, *c.* 1836). There are approximately 125 known coverlets bearing the 'Agriculture &
Manufactures' pattern with a date range of 1822-40. Of these, 31 contained General Lafayette's name
in the corner block of the design beneath the main patriotic inscription, manufactured *c.*1824-7. It was
once thought that examples of the 'Agriculture & Manufactures' coverlet were produced in the
workshop of weaver John Alexander, who settled in Orange County, NY in 1798. An example of his
work from 1824 is held by the Smithsonian Institution: *NMAH* 1982.0572.01 (Blue and white loom-
woven wool coverlet, *c.* 1824). However, subsequent research has argued that many of these examples
are the work of apprentices of Alexander who operated near Dutchess County, NY. See: Clarita S.
Anderson, *American Coverlets and their Weavers: Coverlets from the Collection of Foster and Muriel
McCarl* (Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation in association with Ohio University Press,
2002), p. 29, p. 234; Amelia Peck, *American Quilts & Coverlets in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*
(New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art in association with Dutton Studio Books, 1990), p. 141-3.

The aim of this thesis has been to examine how processes of 'patriotic refashioning' were set in motion by episodes of rebellious, contested nationhood in the British Atlantic region during the long eighteenth century. This has been achieved by conducting two complementary case studies, which have focused on charting the role of patriotic sartorial culture in the accommodation of revolutionary change within the everyday lives of political actors, manufacturers and consumers.

Central to this interdisciplinary study has been the interrogation of patriotic goods and attire, the aim being to better understand the evolving motivations for their inclusion in displays of popular resistance by political actors. In particular, this thesis has sought to quantify the shifting relationship between political culture and the material landscape of the body and home during the long eighteenth century, a period when habits of popular consumption increasingly reflected topical concerns of collective nationhood. It has been shown that by implementing a predominantly object-based research methodology to the study of patriotic display, historians of material culture can gain a valuable insight into the transformative role played by sartorial objects during periods of contested nationhood in the British Atlantic region. Furthermore, this thesis has successfully demonstrated that to fully understand the impact of emblematic dress and patriotic décor at moments of political upheaval, the lived experience of political actors, manufacturers, and consumers must be addressed and thoroughly contextualised within the wider material landscape of everyday life. This point is particularly true in regard to commercially produced patriotic wares, which were most often manufactured in the immediate aftermath of national conflict when the collective, popular memories of these events were at their most fluid and impressionable.

Finally, this thesis has explored how patriotic styles of dress and domestic décor in Britain and America helped shape popular memories of rebellion, looking at the evolution of rebellious iconographies about the body and home and the commercialisation of patriotic styles of dress and interior decoration during celebrations of singular, national significance. By addressing the lasting implications of rebellion for the design, commercial manufacture, and procurement of patriotic

sartorial objects towards the latter end of the eighteenth and into the early nineteenth century, this thesis has complicated the idea that such items were created and procured merely to satisfy the desire felt by consumers for the acquisition of fashionable, passive commemoratives. Rather these objects had the potential to be instruments of change.

300

<u>Bibliography</u>

Primary Sources

Objects

- *The American Museum, Bath*

2004.22 (Pink whole-cloth quilt, *c.* 1760-80).

- *The Art Institute of Chicago*

1925.146 (Plate printed furnishing fabric in red colourway, *c.* 1790).

1952.585a-b (Copperplate-printed cotton in purple colourway, *c.* 1782).

1952.636 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

1990.217 (Valance. Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1783-9).

- *The British Museum*

1891,0713.64.+ (Mounted fan-leaf. Depicts crown above 'G R' monogram, inscribed 'On the King's/Happy Recovery' and 'Health is restored to ONE and happiness to Million's'. Hand-decorated with watercolour, foil, sequins, and gilding, *c.* 1789).

1891,0713.144 (Printed fan. Etching, hand-coloured, mounted on pierced ivory sticks, *c.* 1745).

1891,0713.375 (Unmounted fan-leaf, celebrating the marriage of Princess Anne to William, Prince of Orange and Nassau. Plate-printed, hand-coloured, *c.* 1734).

1891,0713.425 (Unmounted fan-leaf, celebrating the new reign of George III. After etching by William Hogarth, hand-coloured, *c.* 1761).

2003,0331.3 (Gold lapel badge in the form of the number 45. English, *c.* 1763).

M.8542 (Bronze medal commemorating the execution of the Jacobite rebels and the role of the Duke of Cumberland in the suppression of the '45 campaign, *c.* 1746).

OA.377 (Silver 'Wilkite Badge', in the form of numerals '45'. English, *c.* 1763).

- *The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation*

1951-447 (Plate-printed handkerchief, *c.* 1775).

1951-492, 1-4 (Four fragments. Copperplate-printed bed furniture in brown colourway, *c.* 1782).

1952-204, 1 (Quilt, pink worsted whole cloth. American, probably New England, *c.* 1750-1800).

1956-17 (Tablet-woven commemorative garter. British*, c.* 1725).

1958-486 (Plate-printed handkerchief showcasing the genealogy of the British royal family, *c.* 1783).

1959-18 (Red variation, reversed: Bed curtain, *c.* 1785).

1963-193 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a brown colourway, *c.* 1785).

1964-174,A (Coat, cotton and wool Virginia cloth, *c.* 1780).

1970-26 (Copperplate-printed cotton in brown colourway, *c.* 1782).

1970-175 (Fragment of Martha Washington's dress stitched to paper in an oval frame with inked inscription of provenance, late eighteenth/early nineteenth century).

1971-1419 (Sewing case made from Martha Washington's gowns, *c.* 1800).

1974-193 (Quilt, constructed from a variety of recycled materials. American, probably New England, *c.* 1765-85).

1976.609.5 (Blue and white loom-woven wool coverlet, *c.* 1830).

1978-246,1 (Set of bed furniture used in Williamsburg by the Grant family, *c.* 1785).

1981-195 (Woman's small folding fan with ivory sticks and a painted and printed paper leaf, with a scene depicting the Battle of Portobello. The fan is signed 'M. Gamble', *c.* 1740).

1985-109 (Folding fan with plain, uncarved bone and wooden sticks and a paper leaf, with a map depicting the Battle of Cartagena, which occurred in 1741 between England and Spain over control of Spain's rich holdings in the Caribbean. Signed 'Spalding', *c.* 1741).

1991-442 (Man's coat, blue homespun cotton. Probably Connecticut, *c.* 1805-10).

1999-74 (Man's coat. Probably South Carolina, *c.* 1805-10).

1999-225 (Apron of blue and white check linen, marked 'EF' and '1776' in white silk cross-stitch. American, *c.* 1776).

2005-299 (Petticoat made from bed quilt, *c.* 1750-70).

2009-18 (Plate-printed handkerchief memorialising the death of George Washington, *c.* 1800).

2017-315 (Quilted petticoat, *c.* 1750-70).

G1971-1560 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785-90).

- *Cooper-Hewitt Smithsonian Design Museum*

1941-68-1 (Moulded terracotta medallion, *c.* 1777).

1944-22-5-a (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790-1).

1954-55-1 (Copperplate-printed cotton in purple/sepia colourway, *c.* 1780-5).

1955-10-1-a (Copperplate-printed cotton in brown colourway, *c.* 1785-90).

1956.604.1 (Embroidered silk mourning picture with painted embellishments, 'Sacred to the Memory of Illustrious Washington', attributed to Philadelphia *c.* 1805).

1957-51-1-a,b,c (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790-1).

1959-51-1-b (Copperplate-printed cotton in a brown colourway, *c.* 1785).

1960-250-1-a/f (Block-printed on handmade paper. Sidewall, showing 'Lexington Minutemen' pattern *c.* 1775-99).

1970-26-2 (Block-printed on joined sheets of handmade paper. Sidewall, showing 'Britannia' pattern *c.* 1765).

1979-88-1-a, b (Copperplate-printed cotton fragment in red colourway *c.* 1789 and contrasting fragment of copperplate-printed cotton fragment in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

1995-50-31-a, b (Two fragments of copperplate-printed cotton depicting 'A la glorie de Louis XVI', in a red colourway, *c.* 1789).

1995-50-37-a,b (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790-1).

1995-50-52 (Red variation. Plate printed handkerchief, *c.*1800-25).

1995-50-70-a,b (Two fragments of copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1783-9).

1995-50-94 (Valance. Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

1995-50-287 (Fragment of copper-plate printed cotton in blue colourway, *c.* 1789).

1995-50-278-a,b,c (Three fragments of block-printed cotton in red and purple colourway, *c.*1785).

1998-75-166 (Sidewall, showing 'Eagle' pattern. Block-printed on joined sheets of handmade paper, c. 1780).

- *The Daughters of the American Revolution Museum, Washington DC*

55.11 (Woollen blanket, late eighteenth century).

57.16 (Leather pocket-book, early nineteenth century).

64.70 (Mourning armband of cream silk and black crape with a handstitched emblem to George Washington*, c.* 1799-1800).

70.224 (Roller-printed cotton handkerchief depicting the arrival of Lafayette into Philadelphia, attributed to the German-town Printworks *c.* 1824–5).

73.300 (Papercut mourning picture mounted upon a gilt-frame mirror, *c.* 1800).

74.300 (Brown variation: Printed textile, *c.* 1785).

75.8 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

81.19 (Bedsheet of bleached homespun linen, *c.* 1830).

87.5 (Watercolour morning picture on bleached linen ground, *c.* 1800).

1116 (Flax tow, late eighteenth century. Raised by the Holden family in Griswold, VT).

2073 (Cream silk ribbon printed with memorial scene, *c.* 1800).

2281 (Parade apron *c.* 1831-2).

3822a-b (Set of linen pillowcases, eighteenth century).

- *The Fan Museum, Greenwich*

Alexander 626 (Hand-coloured, engraved paper folding fan mounted on painted ivory, attributed to Sir Robert Strange, *c.* 1745).

Alexander 1390 (Hand-painted paper fan. French or English, *c.* 1746).

Alexander 1723 (Folding paper fan celebrating the restoration of Charles II, printed using woodblocks, *c.* 1660).

- *Glasgow Museums*

E.1990.59.1 (Woollen, twill-weave hard tartan man's coat. Scottish, *c.* 1740-50).

- *The Holburne Museum, Bath*

F236 (Embroidered panel featuring the restoration of Charles II. English, silk and metal thread raised work, *c.* 1665).

- *Inverness Museum and Art Gallery*

INVMG.0000.0167 (Embroidered silk waistcoat, eighteenth century).

INVMG.0000.0168 (Embroidered wool dress coat, eighteenth century).

INVMG.1981.153 (Fragment of Bonnie Prince Charlie's plaid, left at Moy Hall the day before the Battle of Culloden).

INVMG.1985.103.115 (Highland Revival short hunting jacket, *c.* 1810-30).

L.INVMG.1984.026.a-b (Isabella Fraser's tartan wedding dress and plaid, worn in Inverness-shire for the Fraser-MacTavish union of 1785).

- *The Metropolitan Museum of Art*

16.28 ('Trafalgar Chintz', block-printed cotton. Attributed to John Bury of Lancashire, *c.* 1806).

24.23 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

26.238.7 (Panel of copperplate-plate printed cotton in a purple colourway, *c.* 1790).

26.265.53 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1793).

27.44.1 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790-1).

44.109.6 (Roller-printed cotton handkerchief depicting the arrival of Lafayette into Philadelphia, attributed to the German-town Printworks *c.* 1824–5).

59.208.60 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

59.208.61 (Panel of block-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785-90).

62.43.1 (Copper plate printed cotton with King George III and his family, *c.* 1785).

62.43.2 (Copper plate printed cotton with King George III hunting in Windsor Park, *c.* 1785).

C.I.37.66a, b (Robe à l'Anglaise, silk. American or European, *c.* 1770).

- *Mount Vernon Ladies' Association*

W-574/A-B (Suit, *c.* 1789).

W-580 (Bathing gown, *c.*1767-9).

W-588 (Sewing case, *c.* 1800-40).

W-1514 (Coat, *c.* 1790-1800).

W-1515 (Breeches of white cotton, *c.* 1770-85).

W-1523 (Gown of brown satin-weave silk. Possibly English, *c.* 1790-1800).

W-2149 (Voided silk velvet waistcoat, possibly of French or English origin, *c.* 1780-90).

W-2407/A (Printed cotton banyan, *c.* 1780-99).

W-2446 (False double-breasted and square cut waistcoat, constructed of English or French imported silk. Original use *c.* 1775-85, refashioned in 1790s).

W-2673 (Waistcoat of white cotton, *c.* 1770-85).

- *Museum of Fine Art, Boston*

27.145 (Fragment in purple colourway, quilted during the nineteenth century).

39.53 (Curtain. Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

40.770a-c (Bed curtain and two valances. Copperplate-printed cotton in blue colourway, *c.* 1789).

42.400 (Quilted panel of copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790-1).

48.407 (Blue and white loom-woven wool coverlet, *c.* 1833).

63.8 ('Trafalgar Chintz', cotton, block-printed with painted details. English, *c.* 1806).

98.1821 (Block-printed linen curtain fragment, late eighteenth/early nineteenth century).

98.1822f (Linen plain weave, gingham fragment. New England, late eighteenth or early nineteenth century).

1976.292 (Paper fan, engraved and water-coloured, mounted on carved ivory sticks and painted ivory guards. English, *c.* 1745).

- *National Maritime Museum, Greenwich*

AAA4860 (Earthenware mug, transfer-printed in blue, fluted and slightly flared at the base with a painted ochre rim. One side bears a portrait of Nelson, inscribed around the portrait 'ENGLAND EXPECTS EVERY MAN TO DO HIS DUTY below 'Shew me my Country's Foes, the Hero cry'd, He saw-He fought-He conquer'd-and he di'd.' On the other side is depicted a naval battle, with the word 'VICTORY' inscribed above, *c.* 1806).

AAA4957 (Earthenware teapot, transfer-printed in blue with an overall wave design, with motifs and inscriptions celebrating Nelson's victories at the Battle of the Nile and the Battle of Trafalgar, *c.* 1806).

GGG0450 (Rummer with a bucket bowl, a collared stem with a knop and a terraced foot. Wheel-engraved on one side with a warship in full sail inscribed 'VICTORY', on the other side with a wreath containing the words 'LORD NELSON OCTR. 21 1805', early nineteenth century).

JEW0094 (Pinchbeck fob seal set with a cornelian intaglio, engraved with portrait of Horatio Nelson above the word 'TRAFALGAR', early nineteenth century).

JEW0327 (Oval black glass cameo mounted on the head of a metal scarf pin, *c.* 1805).

MEC1037 (Brass medal commemorating Admiral Edward Vernon, featuring the capture of Porto Bello, 1739, and the attack upon Cartagena in 1741. British, after 1739).

OBJ0084 (Pink and white enamel patch box, design of guns and naval trophies surmounted by a scroll inscribed 'Nelson and British Gratitude.' Bilston, *c.* 1805).

OBJ0094 (Blue and white enamel patch box, inscribed on lid 'WHEN Nelson knew the Battle won he said to fate GODS will be done.' Bilston, *c.* 1805).

OBJ0421 (A paper fan with ivory struts, printed with a hand coloured depiction of Vernon's victory at Portobello, 21 November 1739. Attributed to Francis Chassereau, 1740).

TXT0119 (Block-printed furniture fabric, *c.* 1806. Tea ground variation).

TXT0125 (Four pieces of ex-upholstery fabric featuring a pattern celebrating Horatio Nelson. Acorn and banner motif, block-printed or hand-stamped in two tones of blue upon bleached cotton, *c.* 1798–1806).

- *National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution*

1982.0572.01(Blue and white loom-woven wool coverlet, *c.* 1824).

1991.0357.0122 (10 cents coin, copper. Displaying profile of Liberty on the obverse and eagle on the reverse. United States Mint, Philadelphia *c.* 1792).

1991.0829.01 (Jacquard double-woven, blue and white coverlet woven by David D. Haring of Bergen County, New Jersey, *c.* 1833).

2013.71.1abc (Masonic apron, late eighteenth century).

AF.16148M (George Washington's regimental uniform, *c.* 1789).

AF.35573 (Fragments of the Star-Spangled Banner made by Mary Pickersgill in 1814 in Baltimore, MD, which were cut from the original flag by members of the Appleton family *c.* 1880).

H.35606 (Purple variation. Plate printed handkerchief, *c.* 1800-25).

T.7723 (Fragment of roller-printed cotton, *c.* 1876).

T.12819 (Jacquard double-woven, blue and white coverlet initialled 'S.D.', *c.* 1832).

T.14719 (Early nineteenth-century patchwork quilt, which contains discernible sections of 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' pattern, *c.* 1785).

T.14833 (Eagle quilt attributed to Susan Strong, Ohio, *c.* 1825-40).

T.14962 (Red and white loom-woven wool coverlet, *c.* 1836).

T.15294 (Quilted counterpane, *c.* 1800-25).

T.15316 (Eagle quilt made in Baltimore County, Maryland, *c.* 1800-25).

T.15589 (Plate and stamp printed silk neckerchief, French, *c.* 1824–5).

T.17321 (Fragment of roller-printed cotton made to imitate pieced work, *c.* 1876).

T.18131 (Blue and white loom-woven wool coverlet, *c.* 1825).

T.19321 (Silk memorial picture, *c.*1800-15).

- *National Museums Scotland*

A.1906.337 (Sleeved silk waistcoat, *c.* 1727-60).

A.1964.553 & A (Woman's dress and skirt of cream-coloured corded silk, said to have been worn by Margaret Oliphant of Gask at the Great Ball of Holyrood after the Battle of Prestonpans. British, *c.* 1745).

A.1987.184 E (Fragment of red tartan, associated with Charles Edward Stuart).

A.1987.216 (Man's jacket of hard tartan trimmed with red velvet, silver braid and gilt metal buttons. British, *c.* 1780 – 1800).

A.1987.258 (Pin cushion of plate-printed cream satin with blue tassels, *c.* 1746).

A.1993.62 A, B (Coat and breeches from a Royal Company of Archers uniform of a hard twill-weave wool tartan, lined in fustian with napped surface, *c.* 1750).

A.1995.564 (Brown wool, embroidered textile fragment).

H.1994.1052 (Hand-painted, paper fan mounted upon carved ivory guards and sticks, depicting Charles Edward Stuart as ruler of the Three Kingdoms of Great Britain, mid-eighteenth century).

H.LF 17 (Blue silk banner with a yellow saltire of the Stewarts of Ardsheal, said to have been carried at the Battle of Culloden, 1746).

H.NF 40 (Glazed oval pendant of copper with waist-length portrait of Prince Charles Edward Stuart in Highland dress, eighteenth century).

H.NJ 88 (Mourning ring for Lord Lovat. Gold, *c.* 1747).

H.NJ 154 ('Four Peers' ring, possibly made by Ebenezer Oliphant. Gold and enamel, 1747).

H.NT 241.21 A & B (A white cambric rose or cockade, worn by the artist Robert Strange in 1745).

H.NQ 616 (Highlander shop figure taking snuff, late eighteenth or early nineteenth century).

H.UI 3 (Jacobite fan of paper mounted on ivory, with its original case, depicting Prince Charles Edward Stuart surrounded by classical gods, probably designed by Robert Strange, *c.* 1745).

H.1950.722 (Silver touch-piece of Prince Charles (III), 1765).

K.2002.1031 (Tartan frock coat, comprising wool, velvet and linen. Mid-18th century).

K.2005.16.1-3 (Jacket, trews, and plaid, taken from a suit of fine, hard tartan faced with green silk, acquired by English Jacobite Sir John Hynde Cotton during a visit to Edinburgh in 1744).

M.1931.299.1 (Appin Stewart Regimental colour carried at Culloden, 1746).

X.2015.105.5.1 & 2 (Gold and diamond finger ring containing cameo of James Francis Edward Stuart. Gifted to Andrew Lumisden in Rome. Accompanied by original box, containing a written note of provenance. Mid-eighteenth century).

- *National Records Scotland*

RH19/36/2 (A piece of Bonnie Prince Charlie's plaid, 1746).

- *The National Trust*

852870 (Hand-painted paper fan fashioned in imitation of the fans attributed to Sir Robert Strange, *c.* 1745).

- *New York Historical Society*

1878.5 (Fragment of the equestrian statue of King George III, *c.* 1770-6).

1937.592 (Cake board, carved by John Conger and belonging to William Farrow of New York, *c.* 1825–35).

- *Royal Collection Trust*

RCIN 441923 (Order of the Thistle: Badge, the 'St Andrew Jewel'. Late seventeenth or early eighteenth century, belonging to the House of Stuart in exile).

- *Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College*

Marquis de Lafayette Memorabilia Collection (*ca.* 1780 -)

Series IV: 'Textiles'

Series V: 'Personal Accessories'

Series VI: 'Medals and Ribbons'

Series IX: 'Miscellaneous'

- *Stirling Museum and Art Gallery*

20720 (Fan depicting the 'Siege of Stirling Castle'. Hand-coloured, printed paper with carved wooden sticks, *c.* 1746).

- *Victoria and Albert Museum, London*

255-1906 (Fireback, cast iron, showing an oak tree with three crowns and the initials CR, England (probably Weald), mid-seventeenth century).

3618-1901 (Punchbowl of lead glaze stoneware painted with blue enamels. Liverpool, second half of eighteenth century).

414:784-1885 (Mug of soft-paste porcelain, transfer-printed in black over the glaze with the bust portrait of Major General Wolfe, probably made at the Longton Hall porcelain factory, printed at Sadler and Green, Liverpool, 1758-1760).

414:942-1885 (Mug of salt-glazed stoneware. Made in Staffordshire, *c.* 1740).

414:984/&A-1885 (Teapot and cover of salt-glazed stoneware. Probably made in Burslem, *c.* 1740).

414:1109/&A-1885 (Teapot and cover of earthenware transfer-printed in back enamel. Liverpool, *c.* 1774).

414:1304-1885 (Abolitionist medallion of white jasper, with a black relief and mounted in gilt-metal. Etruria, *c.* 1787).

898-1904 (A 'Boscobel Oak' locket, later seventeenth century).

1682-1899 (Valance of copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1792).

B.3-2009 (Christening pincushion, late eighteenth-century).

B.4-2009 (Christening pincushion, late eighteenth-century).

C.20-1951 (Porcelain punch bowl. Chinese, *c.* 1770-75).

C.40-1955 (Jug of salt-glazed stoneware painted with enamels and with a portrait of Prince Charles Edward Stuart, probably made in Staffordshire, *c.* 1755-60).

C.49-1939 (Punchbowl of tin-glazed earthenware. London, *c.* 1764).

C.52-1938 (Delftware bowl, tin-glazed earthenware with transfer-printed decoration in black, possibly Harrington Street pottery, Liverpool (John Sadler), ca. 1763).

C.360:1&2-2009 (Delftware plaque showing Charles II, with the crowns of England, Scotland and Ireland, in the branches of the Boscobel oak. Contained within a frame made from the bark of an oak tree. British, probably London, *c.* 1660-70).

C.426-1915 (Dish of tin-glazed earthenware, painted, probably made by J. Flower, R. Frank, at Redcliff Back pottery, Redcliff Back, *c.* 1740).

CIRC.90-1960 (Copperplate-printed cotton in purple/sepia colourway, *c.* 1780-5).

CIRC.93-1960 (Red variation: Furnishing fabric, *c.* 1780-90).

CIRC.534-1927 (Court dress coat, embroidered silk. English or French, *c.* 1780-1800).

IS.370-1992 (Jacket made of resist-dyed and printed cotton chintz. South-East India, ca. 1780).

M.152-1962 (Gold commemorative ring, the oval bezel set with an enamelled miniature of the politician John Wilkes. Behind, the inscription 'Friendship / without / interest'. English, *c.* 1770).

T.12-1957 (Woman's riding jacket of blue camblet lined with blue silk. English, *c.* 1750-59).

T.17-1914 (Portions of a wall-hanging or furnishing fabric, on coarse hand-woven canvas, printed from wood blocks. English, later seventeenth century).

T.42-1955 (Early eighteenth-century garter).

T.56-1933 (Engraved and hand-coloured paper fan, designed by Pietro Antonio Martini and made by Antonio Poggi. Depicts the Royal Family attending the Royal Academy exhibition, *c.* 1790).

T.60-1935 (Satin damask pin cushion stuck with hand-made pins. English, 1745).

T.63-1936 (Valance of plate-printed cotton in purple colourway, *c.* 1790).

T.96-1959 (Chinoiserie furnishing fabric in a red colourway, *c.* 1775).

T.98-1959 (Furnishing fabric of block-printed cotton, made by John Bury, Lancashire, *c.* 1806-7).

T.107-1938 (Pair of woven silk Jacobite garters inscribed 'GOD BLESS THE PRINCE AND SAVE THE KING' and the other 'WHILE WHIGGS AND RUMPS IN HALTERS SWING', *c.* 1745).

T.114:1-1999 (Embroidered casket, top depicts Rebecca at the Well. English, *c.* 1660s).

T.114:3-1999 (Travelling case for embroidered casket. English, *c.* 1660s).

T.115-1999 (Stamped silk ribbon commemorating the defeat of the Jacobite rebellion, embossed maxims reading 'CRUSHED REBELLION' and 'GLORIOUS WILLIAM', *c.* 1746).

T.120-1931 (Silk tartan pin cushion with a woven silk garter ribbon, inscribed in white letters on a blue ground with maxim 'GOD BLESS P.C. AND DOWN WITH THE RUMP', *c.* 1745).

T.121-1931 (Loom-woven garter ribbon of green, blue, yellow, orange and white chequered silk tartan, inscribed 'OUR PRINCE IS BRAVE OUR CAUSE IS JUST', *c.* 1745).

T.160-1970 (Fan, *c.* 1715-30).

T.202-1959 (Fan of painted vellum with gouache and ivory sticks and guards. British, *c.* 1751).

T.204-1959 (Overpainted, printed paper fan, made *c.* 1745 and altered later eighteenth century).

T.205-1959 (Fan depicting the 'Surrender of the Jacobite leaders to the Duke of Cumberland after the Battle of Culloden'. Hand-coloured, printed paper with wooden sticks. British, *c.* 1746).

T.215-1992 (Banyan, cotton chintz from the Coromandel Coast of South-East India, painted and dyed, lined with a European block-printed cotton. Tailored in England, *c.* 1750-75).

T.219-1973 (Album with textile samples and fashion plates, compiled by Barbara Johnson. England, *c.* 1746–1823).

T.281-1991 (Man's frock coat of grey striped wool. English, *c.* 1790).

T.285-1977 (Fichu of embroidered muslin. England, 1780s).

T.377-2009 (Double-breasted banyan made of repurposed copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1830. Repurposed textile is French, *c.* 1820).

T.428&A-1985 (Patchwork quilt of block printed cottons commemorating the victory of the Duke of Wellington at Vittoria, *c.* 1829).

T.433-1970 (Garter inscribed with maxim: 'I love not this world in which thou must not stay, but love that treasure that abides away', eighteenth century).

T.487-1919 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1783-9).

T.527-1985 (Chair seat cover of plate-printed cotton in China blue colourway, *c.* 1770-95).

- *West Highland Museum*

63 (Eighteenth-century belted plaid made of tartan in green, blue and white stripes on red ground in a twill-weave with hemmed edges. Embroidered in one corner are the initials 'I F' with a star stitch).

647 (Hand-coloured, printed paper fan, *c.* 1745).

- *Winterthur Museum*

1952.0012 (Cast iron fireback bearing the likeness of General James Wolfe alongside the monogram of George III, c.1759).

1952.0306.003 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1790-1800).

1952.0348.002 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.*1785. Used in a wholecloth quilt, probably made in America *c.* 1785-1810).

1955.0063.001-009 (Purple variation: Bed hangings and bedcover, *c.* 1780-90).

1955.0103.003-004 (Pair of white leather gloves, printed with a dual portrait of Washington and Lafayette surmounted by the maxim 'IMPERISHABLE THEIR FAME'*, c.* 1824–5).

1956.0038.101 (Cotton mourning handkerchief for George Washington, plate-printed in Glasgow, *c.* 1795–1805).

1957.0073.003-009 (Set of yellow damask bed hangings with homespun backing, mid-to-late eighteenth century).

1957.0820 A (Wax picture depicting mourners gathered at Washington's tomb, *c.* 1800).

1957.1392 (Porcelain figure of John Wilkes. Derby Porcelain Works, Derby, *c.* 1764-70).

1958.0605.001-006 (Block-printed linen bed furniture, manufactured in Philadelphia by Walters & Bedwell *c.* 1775-6).

1959.0026.003 (Copperplate-printed cotton in purple colourway, *c.* 1785-90).

1959.0570 (Silk, plate-printed pincushion. Possibly English, *c.* 1800-25).

1959.0958 (Plate-printed handkerchief in red colourway, *c.* 1785-95).

1959.0960 (Blue variation. Plate printed handkerchief, *c.* 1800-25).

1959.0961 (Red variation. Plate printed handkerchief, *c.*1800-25).

1959.0963 (Quilt centre, featuring a block-printed cotton handkerchief made in Philadelphia, *c.* 1775-90).

1959.0970 (Block-printed cotton handkerchief made in North America, *c.* 1808-9).

1959.0957 (Plate- and block-printed handkerchief in blue colourway, *c.* 1792).

1960.0008 (Quilt centre, block printed using Prussian blue, *c.* 1790-1800).

1960.0030.001 (Copperplate-printed bed furniture in brown colourway, *c.* 1785-90).

1969.0064 (Man's cravat of loom woven silk bearing 'LAFAYETTE' pattern, French, *c.* 1824–5).

1960.0166 (Wholecloth quilt, *c.* 1780-1800).

1960.8 (Quilt centre, block printed using Prussian blue, *c.* 1790-1800).

1960.1015 (Plate-printed handkerchief memorialising the death of George Washington, *c.* 1820).

1961.0031.001-025 (Ex-bed furniture comprising twenty-five pieces, including bed hangings and valances. Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

1962.0035.001 (Copperplate-printed cotton featuring the design 'The Death of General Wolfe' in a red colourway. English, *c.* 1785).

1961.0058 (Valance. Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

1962.0208 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.*1785).

1964.0046 (Fragment. Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

1964.0551.001-013 (Chest containing tools used by the Waterman Family in South Scituate, MA, late eighteenth/early nineteenth century).

1964.1485 (Plate-printed handkerchief memorialising the death of Alexander Hamilton, *c.* 1819).

1965.0010 A (Block-printed cotton handkerchief made in Philadelphia, *c.* 1775-1785).

1965.0086 (Cotton counterpane – or table cover - block printed using Prussian blue and vermillion, *c.* 1782-1810).

1967.0144 (Roller-printed cotton handkerchief depicting the arrival of Lafayette into Philadelphia, attributed to the German-town Printworks *c.* 1824–5).

1967.0145 (Quilted valance. Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1785).

1969.0436 A (Plate-printed handkerchief in a red colourway. Scotland, *c.* 1810-20).

1969.0575 (Pieced quilt, composed of block-printed textiles by the Waterman family *c.* 1780-1815).

1969.0576 (Wholecloth quilt, composed of block-printed textiles by the Waterman family *c.* 1780-1815).

1969.1274 (Detail of appliqued quilt attributed to Pennsylvania region, backed with roller printed commemorative fabric produced in Fall River, *c*. 1876).

1969.3058 (Pieced quilt *c.* 1830-40. Backing fabric was printed in England *c.* 1820).

1969.3060 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.*1785. Used in a wholecloth quilt).

1969.3179.001 (Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1780-90).

1969.3182 (China blue variation: Printed textile, *c.* 1780-90).

1969.3187 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a blue colourway, *c.* 1790-1800).

1969.3322.001-004 (Copperplate-printed cotton in purple/sepia colourway, *c.* 1780-5. In four fragments.)

1969.3326 (Fragment of block-printed cotton in red and purple colourway, *c.* 1785-90).

1969.3327 (Panel of copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1785).

1969.3833.001-002 (Copperplate-printed cotton in a red colourway, *c.* 1790-1800. Used in a wholecloth quilt and associated bed furniture, *c.* 1790-1800).

1969.3843 (Plate-printed cotton in a brown colourway, pieced. Scotland, *c.* 1810-20).

1969.8394.001-015 (Fifteen pieces of ex-upholstery fabric featuring 'The Apotheosis of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington' pattern. Copperplate-printed cotton in red colourway, *c.* 1780–90).

1974.0135.002-010 (Bed hangings, *c.* 1780-90).

1975.0112 ('The Death of General Wolfe' earthenware, lead-glazed mug, *c.* 1800).

1982.0325 (Textile fragment in purple colourway, *c.* 1789-90).

2015.0002 (Chest of drawers made by John Shearer. American, 1809).

- *University of Aberdeen Museums, Scotland*

ABDUA: 17618 (Set of eleven silver buttons with looped backs engraved with the Jacobite rose, c.1745).

ABDUA: 17969 (Pin cushion of plate-printed cream satin with blue tassels, *c.* 1746).

ABDUA: 63392 and ABDUA: 63394 (Gold pin and tartan of Prince Charles Edward Stuart, gifted to Lady Anne Mackintosh at Moy Hall, 1746).

Manuscripts

- *The British Library*

Add MS 33050 (Papers relating to the Scotch Jacobites; 1745-1755).

- *Carl A. Kroch Library, Cornell University*

Archives 4116 Bd. Ms. 13, 6 (Lafayette – Letters, etc. Rec'd: Group of poems and songs dedicated to, or inspired by, Lafayette, in French and English; dating from the period of his American Tour, 1824-5).

Archives 4116 Bd. Ms. 14 (Lafayette American Tour Scrapbook, 1824-5).

- *John D. Rockefeller Jr. Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation*

MS.36.3 (John Norton & Sons Papers, 1750-1902).

MS.39.8 (Dr James Carter's invoice book, *c.* 1752-74).

MS.1966.1 (Andrew Shepherd account book, 1773-90).

- *The Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Winterthur Library*

Doc. 1604 (Weaver's and carter's account book, *c.* 1755-1797).

- *Massachusetts Historical Society*

Ms. N-586 (John Newhall's commonplace book and diary, 1825).

- *The National Archives, Kew*

SP 54/39

SP 54/40

- *The National Archives, Washington DC*

595257 (Charles Thompson's design for the Great Seal, 1782).

- *The National Library of Scotland*

Adv.MS.32.6.16-25 (Robert Forbes, The Lyon in Mourning manuscript collection compiled *c.* 1746-75).

- *New York Historical Society*

Mss. Col. AHMC Backus, Mary (Letter to Mary Buckus, 19 September 1824).

Mss. Col. AHMC Thomas, Ann (Ann Thomas's book of poems from children to welcome the Marquis de La Fayette to New York, Sept. 16, 1824).

PR.022.9 (Invitation to the fete held at Castle Garden, 1824).

- *New York Public Library*

MssCol 17967 (Lafayette Ball records, 1824).

- *North Yorkshire County Record Office*

Z.371/1 (The Weaver's Guide: linen designs of Ralph Watson of Aiskew, eighteenth century).

Newspapers and Magazines

The Aberdeen Journal

Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine

The Caledonian Mercury

The Daily Advertiser

The Delaware Gazette

The Derby Mercury

The Edinburgh Courant

The Gazette of the United States

The Inverness Courier

The Ipswich Journal

La Belle Assemblée

The London Evening Post

The National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser

The Newcastle Courant

The Scots Magazine

The Stamford Mercury

The Virginia Gazette

The Westminster Journal

Printed: Pre-1850

Anon, *The Chester Miscellany. Being a Collection of Several Pieces, both in Prose and Verse, Which were in the Chester Courant from January 1745, to May 1750* (Chester, 1750).

Anon., *A Catalogue of Household Furniture, Plate, Linen, China, and Other Valuable Effects, Late the Property of Mrs. Hoardley, deceased, Which will be Sold by Auction, by Mess. Hookey and Son, on the Premises, No. 169, High Street, Southampton, on Wednesday Dec. 10th, 1794, and following Days* (Southampton, 1794).

Anon., *A Catalogue of the Genuine Household Furniture, China, Brewing and Garden Utensils, of Otterden Place, near Feversham, Kent. […] Which will be Sold by Auction, by Mr. Whitcomb, On Monday the 26th of June, 178-, and the three following Days* (London, 1780).

Anon., *Rules of the Highland Society of London. February 1ˢᵗ, 1783* (London, 1783).

Anon., *The Historical Register, Containing an Impartial Relation of all Transactions, Foreign and Domestick. Volume II. For the Year 1717. Publish'd at the Expence of the Sun Fire Office* (London, 1718).

Anon., *The Tryal of George Earl of Wintoun, Upon the Articles of Impeachment of High Treason Exhibited against him By the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses in Parliament Assembled, in the Name of Themselves and of all the Commons of Great Britain, In Westminster-Hall, on Thursday the 15th, Friday the 16th, and Monday the 19th Days of March 1716; on the last of which Days Judgement of High-Treason was given against him. Together with several Orders of the House of Peers in course of Time preparatory to the said Tryal* (London, 1716).

Arbuthnot, Archibald, *A Brief Account of the Life and Family of Miss Jenny Cameron, the Reputed Mistress of the Pretender's Eldest Son. Containing Many Very Singular Incidents* (London, 1746).

Baker Holroyd, John, *Observations on the Commerce of the American States […] A New Edition, Much Enlarged. With an Appendix, Containing Tables of the Imports*

and Exports of Great Britain to and from all Parts, Also, the Exports of America, &c. With Remarks on those Tables, and on the late Proclamations, &c. (London, 1784).

Boyse, Samuel, *An Impartial History of the Late Rebellion in 1745. From Authentic Memoirs; Particularly, The Journal of a General Officer, and Other Original Papers, yet unpublished. With the Characters of the Persons Principally concerned. To which is prefixed, By Way of Introduction, A Compendious Account of the Royal House of Stewart, from its Original to the Present Time* (Dublin, 1748).

Brotherton, J., *Essays and Letters on Various Subjects* (London, 1739).

Davidson, T., *Wakefield's Merchant and Tradesman's General Directory for London, Westminster, Borough of Southwark and Twenty-Two Miles Circular from St. Paul's, For the Year, 1794* (London, 1794).

Douglas, F. and W. Murray, *The History of the Rebellion in 1745 and 1746, Extracted from the Scots Magazine: With an Appendix, Containing An Account of the Trials of the Rebels; the Pretender and His Son's Declarations, &c.* (Aberdeen, 1755).

Hepplewhite, Alice, *The Cabinet-Maker and Upholsterer's Guide […] The Third Edition, Improved* (London, 1794).

Hibbert, S., *History of the Foundations in Manchester of Christ's College, Chetham's Hospital, and the Free Grammar School*, (London & Manchester, 1834), Vol. II.

Hill Burton, John and David Laing, eds., *Jacobite Correspondence of the Atholl Family, During the Rebellion, M.DCC.XLV- M.DCC.XLVI. From the Originals in the Possession of James Erskine of Aberdona, Esq* (Edinburgh: The Abbotsford Club, 1840).

Levasseur, Auguste, *Lafayette in America in 1824 and 1825: Or, Journal of a Voyage to the United States*, 2 vols., translated by John D. Goodman (Philadelphia: Carey and Lea, 1829).

Lockhart, George, *The Lockhart Papers: Containing Memoirs and Commentaries upon the Affairs of Scotland from 1702 to 1715, by George Lockhart, Esq. of Carnwath, His Secret Correspondence with the Son of King James the Second from 1718 to 1728, And his other political Writings; Also, Journals and Memoirs of the*

Young Pretender's Expedition in 1745, by Highland Officers in his Army. Published from Original manuscripts in the Possession of Anthony Aufrere, Esq. of Hoveton, Norfolk, 2 vols. (London, 1817), Vol. II.

Nicholson, J., *A Genuine Account of the Behaviour, Confession, and Dying Words, of Francis Townly (Nominal) Colonel of the Manchester Regiment, Thomas Deacon, James Dawson, John Barwick, George Fletcher, and Andrew Blood, Captains in the Manchester Regiment; Thomas Chadwick, Lieutenant, Thomas Sydall, Adjunct in the Same, and Counsellor David Morgan, a Volunteer in the Pretender's Army. Who were Executed the 30th Day of July, 1746, at Kennington Common for High Treason, In levying War against his most Sacred Majesty King George the Second* (London, 1746?).

Ray, James, *A Compleat History of the Rebellion from its First Rise, in 1745, to its Total Suppression, at the Glorious Battle of Culloden, in April 1746* (London, 1759).

Russell, James, *Letters from a Young Painter Abroad to His Friends in England. Adorned with Copper Plates*, 2nd edn (London, 1750), Vol. I.

Scott, Walter, *Tales of a Grandfather; Being Stories Taken from Scottish History. Humbly Inscribed to Hugh Littlejohn, Esq. Third Series,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1830).

Sheraton, Thomas, *The Cabinet-Maker and Upholsterer's Drawing Book: In Three Parts*, 2 vols (London, 1793-4).

Simitière, Pierre Eugène du, *Heads of Illustrious Americans: Containing Portraits of General Washington, Henry Laurens, Esq., John Jay, Esq., S. Huntingdon, Esq., Charles Thompson, Esq., J. Dickinson, Esq., Silas Deane, Esq., General Read, Governeer Morris, Esq., Maj. Gen. Baron Steuben, W. H. Drayton, Esq., Maj. Gen. Gates* (London, 1783).

Sinclair of Ulbster, Sir John, *An Account of the Highland Society of London, From its Establishment in May 1778, to the Commencement of the Year 1813* (London, 1813).

Tustin, Josiah P., *A Discourse Delivered at the Dedication of the New Church Edifice of the Baptist Church and Society, in Warren, R. I.* (Providence RI, 1845).

Walpole, Horace, *Private Correspondence of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford. Now First Collected*, 4 vols. (London, 1820).

Wilkinson, W., *A Compleat History of the Trials of the Rebel Lords in Westminster Hall; and the Rebel Officers and Others Concerned in the Rebellion in the Year 1745, at St. Margaret's Hill, Southwark, and at Carlisle and York. With the Lives, Behaviour, and Dying Speeches of those Executed Pursuant to their Sentences* (London, 1746?).

Printed: Post-1850

Adams, Charles Francis, ed., *The Works of John Adams, Second President of the United States: With a Life of the Author, Notes and Illustrations, by his Grandson Charles Francis Adams*, 2 vols (Boston, 1850), Vol. II.

Allardyce, James, ed., *Historical Papers Relating to the Jacobite Period, 1699-1750* (Aberdeen: The New Spalding Club, 1886), Vol. II.

Armes, Ethel, ed., *Nancy Shippen: Her Journal Book, The International Romance of a Young Lady of Fashion of Colonial Philadelphia with Letters to Her and About Her* (Philadelphia & London: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1935).

Brown, Iain Gordon, and Hugh Cheape, eds., *Witness to Rebellion: John Maclean's Journal of the 'Forty Five and the Penicuik Drawings* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1996).

Coley, W. B., ed., *Henry Fielding: The Jacobite Journal and Related Writings* (Oxford, 1974).

Dennistoun, James, ed., *Memoirs of Sir Robert Strange. Knt., Engraver, Member of Several Foreign Academics of Design; And of his Brother-in-Law Andrew Lumisden, Private Secretary to the Stuart princes, and Author of "The Antiquities of Rome"*, 2 vols. (London: Longman, 1855).

Earwaker, J. P., ed., *The Constables' Accounts of the Manor of Manchester: From the Year 1612 to the Year 1647, and from the Year 1743 to the Year 1776* (Manchester, 1892), Vol. III.

Franklin, Benjamin, *Autobiography and Other Writings*, ed. Ormond Seavey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

Moore, Frank, *Diary of the American Revolution. From Newspapers and Original Documents* (New York, 1858), Vol. II.

Parkinson, Richard, ed., *The Journal of Elizabeth Byrom in 1745* (Manchester: The Chetham Society, 1857).

Parkinson, Richard, ed., *The Private Journal and Literary Remains of John Byrom: Vol. II – Part I* (Manchester: The Chetham Society, 1857).

Paton, Henry, ed., *The Lyon in Mourning: or, A Collection of Speeches, Letters, Journals, etc. Relative to the Affairs of Prince Charles Edward Stuart by the Rev. Robert Forbes, A. M. Bishop of Ross and Caithness, 1746-1775*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1895).

Seton, Bruce Gordon, and Jean Gordon Arnot, eds., *The Prisoners of the '45. Edited from the State Papers* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1928), Vol. I.

Twohig, Dorothy, ed., *The Papers of George Washington, Presidential Series, Vol. 1: 24 September 1788 – 31 March 1789* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1987).

United States Centennial Commission*, International Exhibition, 1876: Official Catalogue* (Philadelphia, 1876).

Wells, William Vincent, *The Life and Public Service of Samuel Adams, Being a Narrative of his Acts and Opinions, and of his Agency in Producing and Forwarding the American Revolution. With Extracts from his Correspondence, State Papers, and Political Essays*, 3 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1865), Vol. II.

Visual Sources: Paintings and Prints

- *The British Museum*

1868,0808.3861 (Anon. 'Great Britain's Union; Or Litchfield Races Transpos'd', line engraving on paper broadside, c. 1747).

1868,0808.10059 (Anon., 'The able doctor, or America swallowing the bitter draught', line engraving on paper, 1774).

1880,1113.3456 (Anon., 'The Beheading of the Rebel Lords on Great Tower Hill', etching on paper, c. 1746).

1898,0520.172 (Anon., 'Scotch Female Gallantry', hand-coloured etching on paper, c. 1745-6).

1907.1018.54 (Sir William Charles Ross, 'The Union', watercolour, strengthened with gum, over graphite on paper, c. 1790–1860).

1935,0522.2.120.c (Carington Bowles, 'A New Method of Macarony Making, as Practised at Boston in North America', hand-coloured mezzotint, 1774).

2010,7081.3247 (R. Sayer and J. Bennet, 'A Society of Patriotic Ladies at Edenton in North Carolina', hand-coloured mezzotint, 1775).

- *Metropolitan Museum of Art*

24.109.88 (John Trumbull, 'George Washington', oil on canvas, 1780).

- *Museum of Fine Art, Boston*

L-R 30.76c (John Singleton Copley, 'Samuel Adams', oil on canvas, *c.* 1772).

- *National Army Museum*

1962-06-13-1 (Unknown artist, 'Captain James Gorry, 87th Regiment of Foot, or Highland Volunteers, 1760', oil on canvas, 1760).

- *National Galleries Scotland*

PG 1510 (William Mosman, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788. Eldest son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart', oil on canvas, *c.* 1750).

PG 1597 (Domenico Duprà, 'John Drummond, 4th titular Duke of Perth, 1714-1747. Jacobite', oil on canvas, 1739).

PG 1162 (Richard Wilson, 'Flora Macdonald [Fionnghal nighean Ragnaill 'ic Aonghasis Òig], 1722-1790. Jacobite heroine', oil on canvas, *c.* 1747).

PG 2895 (Sir Joshua Reynolds, 'John Murray, 4th Earl of Dunmore', oil on canvas, 1765).

PG 3762 (Allan Ramsay, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788, Eldest Son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart', oil on canvas, *c.* 1745).

SP III 13.4 (P. Griffin, 'Jenny Cameron, c.1700-1790. Adventuress; supporter of Charles Edward Stuart', line engraving on paper, date unknown).

SP IV 123.20 (Robert Strange, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788', line engraving on paper, *c.* 1745).

SP IV 123.23 (J. Williams, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788. Eldest son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart', mezzotint on paper, *c.* 1746).

SP IV 123.49 (Richard Cooper, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788. Eldest Son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart ('Wanted Poster')', hand-coloured etching on paper, 1745).

SP IV 270.1 (S. Hooper, 'An officer and sergeant of a Highland Regiments', line engraving on paper, *c.* 1786).

- *The National Gallery of Art*

1984.2.1 (Charles Willson Peale, 'John Beale Bordley', oil on canvas, *c.* 1770).

- *National Gallery of Canada*

8007 (Benjamin West, 'The Death of General Wolfe', oil on canvas, 1770).

- *National Library of Scotland*

Blaikie.SNPG.9.16 (Anon., 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart with Miss Cameron and Miss MacDonald. Oval portraits of Miss Cameron, Prince Charles, and Miss MacDonald (in that order) with text "How happy could I be with Either, Were t'other dear Charmer away. Beg. Op.", etching on paper, mid-eighteenth century).

Blaikie.SNPG.15.3 A (Anon., 'Miss Jenny Cameron in a Military Habit', etching on paper, mid-eighteenth-century).

Blaikie.SNPG.15.7 (Anon., 'Jenny Cameron, c. 1700-1790), mezzotint on paper, mid-eighteenth century).

Blaikie.SNP.15.8 (Anon., 'The Jiltmegant', etching on paper, mid-eighteenth century).

EMS.s.786 (William Edgar, 'Plan of the city and castle of Edinburgh', 1765).

- *National Portrait Gallery, London*

5848 (Richard Wilson, 'Flora Macdonald', oil on canvas, *c.* 1747).

- *National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institute*

NPG.76.54 (Valentine Green (after John Trumbull), 'General Washington', mezzotint on paper, 1781).

- *National Museums Scotland*

M.1966.109 (I.S. Muller, 'A Highland Piper / A Highlander in his Regimentals / A Highland Drummer', etching, published by John Bowles, mid-eighteenth century).

M.1989.112 (Unknown artist, 'Le Repas du Chat', coloured engraving, published by Boedlieu in Paris, 1815).

- *The National Trust*

987423 (Sir George Chalmers, 'Mary Macdonald, Mrs John Chichester (1738-1815), oil on canvas, 1780).

- *National Trust for Scotland, Culloden Battlefield & Visitor Centre*

207.132 (Cosmo Alexander, 'Portrait of a Jacobite lady', oil on canvas, c. 1745).

- *Royal Collection Trust*

RCIN 401208 (Louis Gabriel Blanchet, 'Prince Charles Edward Stuart (1720-88)', oil on canvas, *c.* 1739).

- *Sir John Soane's Museum, London*

P56 (William Hogarth, 'An Election II: Canvassing for Votes, oil on canvas, *c.* 1754–55).

- *Traquair Charitable Trust*

PCF20 (Cosmo Alexander, 'John Drummond, 5th Duke of Perth', oil on canvas, mid-eighteenth century).

PCF75 (Cosmo Alexander, 'Lady Winifred Maxwell Constable', oil on canvas, late eighteenth century).

- *Winterthur Museum*

1953.0178.002 A (John Lewis Krimmel, 'The Quilting Frolic', oil on canvas, *c.* 1813).

1957.0816 A (Amos Doolittle (Engraver) and Peter Lacour (Draftsman), 'FEDERAL HALL / The Seat of CONGRESS', etching on paper, New Haven c.1790).

Secondary Sources

Abrams, Jeanne E., *First Ladies of the Republic: Martha Washington, Abigail Adams, Dolley Madison, and the Creation of an Iconic American Role* (New York: New York University Press, 2018).

Alexander, Hélène, 'The Prince and the Fan', *Fan Association of North America Quarterly*, 6: 2 (1987), 8-19.

Alexander, Kimberley S., *Treasures Afoot: Shoe Stories from the Georgian Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018).

Allan, Stuart, and Allan Carr, *The Thin Red Line: War, Empire and Visions of Scotland* (Edinburgh: NMSE Ltd, 2004).

Anderson, Clarita S., *American Coverlets and their Weavers: Coverlets from the Collection of Foster and Muriel McCarl* (Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation in association with Ohio University Press, 2002).

Anishanslin, Zara, *Portrait of a Women in Silk: Hidden Histories of the British Atlantic World* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2016).

Archer, Richard, *As If an Enemy's Country: The British Occupation of Boston and the Origins of Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Auslander, Leora, *Cultural Revolutions: Everyday Life and Politics in Britain, North America, and France* (Berkley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2009).

Auslander, Leora, *Taste and Power: Furnishing Modern France* (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996).

Baird, Ileana, and Christina Ionescu, eds., *Eighteenth-Century Thing Theory in a Global Context: From Consumerism to Celebrity Culture* (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2013).

Bangs Bickford, Charlene, and Kenneth R. Bowling, *Birth of the Nation: The First Federal Congress, 1789-1791* (Lanham MD: Madison House, 1989).

Bank, Rosemary K., *Theatre Culture in America, 1825-1860* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Bannister, Jerry, and Lam Riordan, eds., *The Loyal Atlantic: Remaking the British Atlantic in the Revolutionary Era* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012).

Barber, Tabitha, and Stacy Boldrick, eds., *Art Under Attack: Histories of British Iconoclasm* (London: Tate Publishing, 2013).

Barnett, Teresa, *Sacred Relics: Pieces of the Past in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 2013).

Bartoloni-Tuazon, Kathleen, *For Fear of an Elective King: George Washington and the Presidential Title Controversy of 1789* (Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 2014).

Batchelor, Jennie, and Cora Kaplan, eds., *Women and Material Culture, 1660-1830* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

Baumgarten, Linda, 'Plains, Plaid and Cotton: Woolens for Slave Clothing', *Ars Textrina*, 15 (1991), pp. 203-22.

Baumgarten, Linda, *What Clothes Reveal: The Language of Clothing in Colonial and Federal America* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2002).

Baxter, Stephen B., ed., *England's Rise to Greatness, 1660-1763* (Berkeley, LA & London: University of California, 1983).

Bennet, Helen, 'Sir John Hynde Cotton's Highland Suit', *Costume*, 14 (1980), pp. 95-109.

Beresford, Laura, and Katherine Hebert, *Classic Quilts from The American Museum in Britain* (London: Scala, 2009).

Berg, Maxine, and Elizabeth Eger, eds., *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century: Debates, Desires and Delectable Goods* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

Bingham, Caroline, *Beyond the Highland Line: Highland History and Culture* (London: Constable, 1991).

Bird, William L., *Souvenir Nation: Relics, Keepsakes, and Curios from the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2013).

Black, Jeremy, *Crisis of Empire: Britain and America in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Continuum, 2010).

Blackstock, Allan, and Frank O'Gorman, eds., *Loyalism and the Formation of the British World, 1775-1914* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2014).

Bolton, Betsy, *Women, Nationalism, and the Romantic Stage: Theatre and Politics in Britain, 1780-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Bourne, Russell, *Cradle of Violence: How Boston's Waterfront Mobs Ignited the American Revolution* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2006).

Brackman, Barbara, *Clues in the Calico: A Guide to Identifying and Dating Antique Quilts* (Lafayette, CA: C&T Publishing, 2009).

Brédif, Josette, *Toiles de Jouy: Classic Printed Textiles from France, 1760-1843* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1989).

Breen, T. H., *George Washington's Journey: The President Forges a Nation* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2016).

Breen, T. H., *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Brewer, John, and Roy Porter, eds., *Consumption and the World of Goods* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 1993).

Brogan, Stephen, *The Royal Touch in Early Modern England: Politics, Medicine and Sin* (Woodbridge & Rochester: The Boydell Press, 2015).

Brown, Ian, ed., *From Tartan to Tartanry: Scottish Culture, History and Myth* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010).

Brown, Stephen W., and Warran McDougall, eds., *The Edinburgh History of the Book in Scotland. Volume II: Enlightenment and Expansion, 1707-1800* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012).

Brush Kidwell, Claudia, 'Are Those Clothes Real? Transforming the Way Eighteenth-Century Portraits are Studied', *Dress* 24:1 (1997), pp. 3-15.

Buckroyd, Julia M., 'Mercurius Caledonius and its immediate successors, 1661', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 54: 157 (1975), 11-21.

Butler, Jon, *Becoming America: The Revolution Before 1776* (Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 2000).

Campbell Orr, Clarissa, ed., *Queenship in Britain, 1660-1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynasty Politics* (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2002).

Cannadine, David, ed., *Admiral Lord Nelson: His Context and Legacy* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

Carr, Rosalind, 'The Gentleman and the Soldier: Patriotic Masculinities in Eighteenth-Century Scotland', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 28: 2 (2008), pp. 102-21.

Carr, Rosalind, *Gender and Enlightenment Culture in Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014).

Carson, Barbara, *The Governor's Palace: The Williamsburg Residence of Virginia's Royal Governor* (Williamsburg, VA: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1978).

Cheape, Hugh, *Tartan: The Highland Habit*, 3rd edn (Edinburgh: NMSE Ltd, 2006).

Chorlton, Thomas Patrick, *The First American Republic, 1774-1789: The First Fourteen American Presidents* (Bloomington, IN: Author House, 2011).

Chrisman-Campbell, Kimberly, *Fashion Victims: Dress at the Court of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2015).

Christie, Christopher, *The British Country House in the Eighteenth Century* (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2000).

Clark Smith, Barbara, *The Freedoms We Lost: Consent and Resistance in Revolutionary America* (New York & London: The New Press, 2010).

Clark, J. C. D., *Revolution and Rebellion: State and Society in England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

Clary, David A., *Adopted Son: Washington, Lafayette, and the Friendship that Saved the Revolution* (New York: Bantam Books, 2007).

Clyde, Robert, *From Rebel to Hero: The Image of the Highlander, 1745-1830* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1998).

Coffman, D'Maris, Adrian Leonard and William O'Reilly, eds., *The Atlantic World* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2015).

Cogliano, Francis D., *Revolutionary America, 1763-1815: A Political History*, 2nd edn (New York & Abingdon: Routledge, 2009).

Cohen, Joanna, *Luxurious Citizens: The Politics of Consumption in Nineteenth-Century America* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017).

Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, 2nd edn (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2005).

Coltman, Viccy, 'Party-Coloured Plaid? Portraits of Eighteenth-Century Scots in Tartan', *Textile History*, 41: 2 (2010), pp. 182-216.

Colville, Quentin, and James Davey, eds., *Nelson, Navy and Nation: The Royal Navy and the British People, 1688-1815* (London: Conway, 2013).

Corp, Benjamin L., *Defiance of the Patriots: The Boston Tea Party and the Making of America* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2010).

Corp, Edward, *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689-1718* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Corp, Edward, *The King Over the Water: Portraits of the Stuarts in Exile after 1689* (Edinburgh: Scottish National Portrait Gallery, 2001).

Corp, Edward, *The Stuarts in Italy, 1719-1766: A Royal Court in Permanent Exile* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

Cotner, Shron, Kris Dippre, Robin Kipps and Susan Pryor, *Physick: The Professional Practice of Medicine in Williamsburg, Virginia, 1740-1775* (Williamsburg, VA: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 2003).

Craig, Maggie, *Damn' Rebel Bitches: The Women of the '45* (Edinburgh: Mainstream Press, 1997).

Crill, Rosemary, *Chintz: Indian Textiles for the West* (London: V&A Publishing, 2008).

Cruickshanks, Eveline, and Jeremy Black, eds., *The Jacobite Challenge* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988).

Cummins, Joseph, *Ten Tea Parties: Patriotic Protests That History Forgot* (Philadelphia, PA: Quirk Books, 2012).

Dalzell, Jr., Robert F., and Lee Baldwin Dalzell, *George Washington's Mount Vernon: At Home in Revolutionary America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Daughan, George C., *1812: The Navy's War* (Philadelphia, PA: Basic Books, 2011).

Davey, James, and Richard Johns, *Broadsides: Caricature and the Navy, 1756-1815* (Barnsley: Seaforth Publishing, 2012).

Davis, Susan G., *Parades and Power: Street Theatre in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1992).

Davison, Elizabeth A., *The Furniture of John Shearer, 1790-1820: "A True North Britain" in the Southern Backcountry* (Plymouth: AltaMira Press, 2011).

De Bruyn, Frans, and Shaun Regan, eds., *The Culture of the Seven Years' War: Empire, Identity, and the Arts in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014).

De la Haye, Amy, and Elizabeth Wilson, eds., *Defining Dress: Dress as Object, Meaning, and Identity* (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 1999).

Destler, Chester McArthur, 'The Hartford Woolen Manufactory: The Story of a Failure', *Connecticut History Review*, 14, (1974), pp. 8-32.

Donald, Diana, *The Age of Caricature: Satirical Prints in the Reign of George III* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1996).

Donald, Moira, and Linda Hurcombe, eds., *Gender and Material Culture in Historical Perspective* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000).

Duffy, Christopher, *Fight for a Throne: The Jacobite '45 Reconsidered* (Solihull: Helion & Company, 2015).

DuPlessis, Robert S., *The Material Atlantic: Clothing, Commerce, and Colonization in the Atlantic World, 1650-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

Dyer, Serena, 'Trained to Consume: Dress and the Female Consumer in England, 1720-1820' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Warwick, 2016).

Dziennik, Matthew P., 'Whig Tartan: Material Culture and its Use in the Scottish Highlands, 1746-1815', *Past and Present*, 217: 1 (2012), pp. 117-47.

Dziennik, Matthew P., *The Fatal Land: War, Empire, and the Highland Soldier in British America* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2015).

Eacott, Jonathan, *Selling Empire: India in the Making of Britain and America, 1600-1830* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2016).

Eaton, Linda, *Printed Textiles: British and American Cottons and Linens, 1700-1850. Based on the 1970 classic by Florence M. Montgomery* (New York: The Monacelli Press, 2014).

Eaton, Linda, *Quilts in a Material World: Selections from the Winterthur Collection* (New York: Abrams, 2007).

Epstein, James, 'Understanding the Cap of Liberty: Symbolic Practice and Social Conflict in Early Nineteenth-Century England', *Past & Present*, 122 (1989), pp. 75-118.

Faiers, Jonathan, *Tartan* (Oxford & New York: Bloomsbury, 2008).

Feeser, Andrea, Maureen Daly Goggin and Beth Fowkes Tobin, eds., *The Materiality of Color: The Production, Circulation, and Application of Dyes and Pigments, 1400-1800* (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2012).

Feeser, Andrea, *Red, White, and Black Make Blue: Indigo in the Fabric of Colonial South Carolina Life* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2013).

Fennetaux, Arianne, and Amélie Junqua and Sophie Vasset, eds., *The Afterlife of Used Things: Recycling in the Long Eighteenth Century* (New York & Abingdon: Routledge, 2015).

Firth, Raymond, *Symbols: Public and Private* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge Revivals, 2011).

Fladmark, J. M., ed., *Heritage and Museums: Shaping National Identity*, 2nd edn (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2014).

Floud, Peter C., 'The English Contribution to the Development of Copper-plate Printing', *Journal of the Society of Dyers and Colourists*, 76: 7 (1960), pp. 425-34.

Forsyth, David, ed., *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (Edinburgh: NMSE Ltd, 2017).

Fowkes Tobin, Beth, and Maureen Daly Goggin, eds., *Women and the Material Culture of Death* (London & New York: Routledge, 2016).

Fowkes Tobin, Beth, *Picturing Imperial Power: Colonial Subjects in Eighteenth-century British Painting* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1999).

Foyster, Elizabeth, and Christopher A. Whatley, eds., *A History of Everyday Life in Scotland, 1600 to 1800* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010).

Fysh, Stephanie, *The Work(s) of Samuel Richardson* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997).

Germany, Jennifer G., and Heidi A. Strobel, eds., *Materializing Gender in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2016).

Gerritsen, Anne, and Giorgio Riello, eds., *The Global Lives of Things: The Material Culture of Connections in the Early Modern World* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2016).

Gerritsen, Anne, and Giorgio Riello, eds., *Writing Material Culture History* (London & New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015).

Gestrich, Andreas, and Michael Schaich, eds., *The Hanoverian Succession: Dynastic Politics and Monarchical Culture* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2016).

Gibson, John G., *Traditional Gaelic Bagpiping, 1745-1945* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998).

Gibson, John Sibbald, *Edinburgh in the '45: Bonnie Prince Charlie at Holyrood* (Edinburgh: The Saltire Society, 1995).

Gilje, Paul A., *Liberty on the Waterfront: American Maritime Culture in the Age of Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).

Gill, Jr., Harold B., *The Apothecary in Colonial Virginia* (Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia, 1972).

Giloi, Eva, *Monarchy, Myth, and Material Culture in Germany, 1750-1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Glickman, Gabriel, 'The career of Sir John Hynde Cotton (1688-1752)', *The Historical Journal*, 46, 4 (2003), pp. 817-41.

Glynne, Jonathan, Fiona Hackney and Viv Minton, eds., *Networks of Design: Proceedings of the 2008 Annual International Conference of the Design History Society (UK) University College Falmouth 3-6 September* (Boca Raton, FL: Universal Publishers, 2009).

Gobel, David, and Daves Rossell, eds., *Commemoration in America: Essays on Monuments, Memorialisation, and Memory*, (Charlottesville & London: University of Virginia Press, 2013).

Gold, Susanna W., *The Unfinished Exhibition: Visualising Myth, Memory, and the Shadow of the Civil War in Centennial America* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2017).

Goodman, Dena, and Kathryn Norberg, eds., *Furnishing the Eighteenth Century: What Furniture Can Tell Us About the European and American Past* (New York & Abingdon: Routledge, 2007).

Goodwin, George, *Benjamin Franklin in London: The British Life of America's Founding Father* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2016).

Grainger, John D., *The Battle of Yorktown, 1781: A Reassessment* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005).

Grant, Sarah, *Toiles de Jouy* (London: V&A Publishing, 2010).

Gray, Edward G., and Jane Kamensky, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the American Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Greene, Susan, *Wearable Prints, 1760-1860: History, Materials, and Mechanics* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2014).

Griffey, Erin, ed., *Sartorial Politics in Early Modern Europe: Fashioning Women* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2019).

Guthrie, Neil, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Habib, Vanessa, Jim Gray and Sheila Forbes, eds., *Making for America: Transatlantic Craftsmanship: Scotland and the Americas in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* (Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2013).

Hackett Fischer, David, *Liberty and Freedom: A Visual History of America's Founding Ideas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Hague, Stephen, *The Gentleman's House in the British Atlantic World* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

Hallet, Mark, *The Spectacle of Difference: Graphic Satire in the Age of Hogarth* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1999).

Hamling, Tara, and Catherine Richardson, eds. *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and its Meanings* (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2010).

Hannan, Leonie, and Sarah Longair, *History Through Material Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017).

Harding, Deborah, *Stars and Stripes: Patriotic Motifs in American Folk Art* (New York: Rizzoli, 2002).

Harrow, Sharon, ed., *British Sporting Literature and Culture in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2016).

Hart, Avril, and Emma Taylor, *Fans* (London: V&A Publications, 1998).

Hartigan-O'Connor, Ellen, *The Ties That Buy: Women and Commerce in Revolutionary America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

Harvey, Karen, ed., *History and Material Culture: A Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources* (London & New York: Routledge, 2009).

Harvey, Karen, *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Haulman, Kate, *The Politics of Fashion in Eighteenth-century America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011).

Heal, Felicity, *The Power of Gifts: Gift Exchange in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Henshaw, Victoria, *Scotland and the British Army, 1700-1750: Defending the Union* (London & New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014).

Higgins, Padhraig, *A Nation of Politicians: Gender, Patriotism, and Political Culture in Late Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Madison & London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2010).

Houston, R. A., *Bride Ales and Penny Weddings: Recreations, Reciprocity, and Regions in Britain from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Hume, Ivor Noël, *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1969).

Hunter, Robert, ed., *Ceramics in America* (Hanover & London: The Chipstone Foundation in association with the University Press of New England, 2006).

Hurst, Neal Thomas, '"kind of armour, being peculiar to America:" The American Hunting Shirt' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of William and Mary, 2013).

Hussey, David, and Margaret Ponsonby, eds., *Buying for the Home: Shopping for the Domestic from the Seventeenth Century to the Present* (Aldershot & Burlington: Ashgate, 2008).

Idzerda, Stanley J., Anne C. Loveland, and Marc H. Miller, *Lafayette, Hero of Two Worlds: The Art and Pageantry of His Farewell Tour of America, 1824-1825* (Hanover & London: University Press of New England, 1990).

Irvin, Benjamin H., *Clothed in Robes of Sovereignty: The Continental Congress and the People Out of Doors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Isaac, Rhys, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1982).

Isaacson, Walter, ed., *A Benjamin Franklin Reader* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003).

Janaway, R., and P. Wyeth, eds., *The Scientific Analysis of Ancient and Historic Textiles* (London: Archetype Publications Ltd, 2005).

Jones Lapsansky, Emma, and Anne A. Verplanck, eds., *Quaker Aesthetics: Reflections on a Quaker Ethic in American Design and Consumption* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003).

Jones, Colin, and Dror Wahrman, eds., *The Age of Cultural Revolutions: Britain and France, 1750-1820* (Berkley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002).

Kahler, Gerald E., *The Long Farewell: Americans Mourn the Death of George Washington* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008).

Kaminski, John P., *Abigail Adams: An American Heroine* (Madison, WI: Parallel Press, 2007).

Katz-Hyman, Martha B., and Kym S. Rice, eds., *World of a Slave: Encyclopaedia of the Material Life of Slaves in the United States. Volume 1: A-I* (Greenwood: Santa Barbara, 2011).

Kelly, Catherine E., *Republic of Taste: Art, Politics, and Everyday Life in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016).

Kerber, Linda A., *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1980).

Kermes, Stephanie, *Creating an American Identity: New England, 1789-1825* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

Kiemer, Cynthia A., *Beyond the Household: Women's Place in the Early South, 1700-1835* (Ithaca, NY: Cornel University Press, 1998).

Klamkin, Marian, *The Return of Lafayette, 1824-1825* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975).

Knott, Sarah, *Sensibility and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009).

Knouff, Gregory T., *The Soldiers' Revolution: Pennsylvanians in Arms and the Forging of Early American Identity* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004).

Korshak, Yvonne, 'The Liberty Cap as a Revolutionary Symbol in America and France', *Smithsonian Studies in American Art*, 1: 2 (1987), pp. 52-69.

Kramer, Lloyd S., *Lafayette in Two Worlds: Public Cultures and Personal Identities in an Age of Revolutions* (Chapel Hill & London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

Kuchta, David, *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity: England, 1550-1850* (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 2002).

Lakwete, Angela, *Inventing the Cotton Gin: Machine and Myth in Antebellum America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).

Lambert, Miles, '"Small Presents Confirm Friendship": the 'Gifting' of Clothing and Textiles in England from the Late Seventeenth to the Early Nineteenth

Centuries', *Text: For the Study of Textile Art, Design and History*, Vol. 32 (2004/5), pp. 24-32.

Lander Horwitz, Elinor, *The Bird, the Banner, and Uncle Sam: Images of America in Folk and Popular Art* (Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 1976).

Layne, Darren Scott, 'Spines of the Thistle: The Popular Constituency of the Jacobite Rising in 1745-6' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St Andrews, 2016).

Lemire, Beverly, *The Business of Everyday Life: Gender, Practice and Social Politics in England, c. 1600-1900* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005).

Lemmings, David, ed., *Crime, Courtrooms and the Public Sphere in Britain, 1700-1850* (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2012).

Leonhard, Jörn, and Christian Wieland, eds., *What Makes the Nobility Noble? Comparative Perspectives from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century* (Göttingen: Vandenhoech & Ruprecht, 2011).

Livesey, James, *Making Democracy in the French Revolution* (Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 2001).

Livingstone, Alastair, Christian W. H. Aikman and Betty Stuart Hart, eds., *No Quarter Given: The Muster Roll of Prince Charles Edward Stuart's Army, 1745-46* (Glasgow: Neil Wilson Publishing Ltd, 2001).

Longman, D. and Sophy Loch, *Pins and Pincushions* (London & New York: Longmans, 1911).

Loscalzo, Anita B., 'Prussian Blue: The Development of a Colorant and Its Use in Textiles', *Uncoverings: The Research Papers of the American Quilt Study Group*, 31 (2010), pp. 65-104.

Loveland, Anne C., *Emblem of Liberty: The Image of Lafayette in the American Mind* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University, 1971).

Lubar, Steven and W. David Kingery, eds., *History from Things: Essays on Material Culture* (Washington & London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993).

Lynch, Michael, ed., *Jacobitism and the '45* (London: The Historical Association, 1995).

Lynn, Catherine, *Wallpaper in America: From the Seventeenth Century to World War I* (New York & London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1980).

Lynn, Eleri, *Underwear Fashion in Detail* (London: V&A Publishing, 2010).

Maass, John R., *The Road to Yorktown: Jefferson, Lafayette and the British Invasion of Virginia* (Charleston, VA: The History Press, 2015).

Macdonald, F., *"Colonel Anne": Lady Anne MacKintosh, 1723-1784* (Edinburgh: Scotland's Cultural Heritage, 1987).

MacDonald, Peter Eslea, *The 1819 Key Pattern Book: One Hundred Original Tartans* (Chippenham: Antony Rowe Ltd, 1995).

Macinnes, Allan I., Kieran German, and Lesley Graham, eds., *Living with Jacobitism, 1690-1788: The Three Kingdoms and Beyond* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2014).

MacLeod, Anne, *From an Antique Land: Visual Representations of the Highlands and Islands, 1700-1880* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2012).

Maggs Fede, Helen, *Washington's Furniture at Mount Vernon* (Mount Vernon, VA: The Ladies Association of the Union, 1966).

Mansel, Philip, *Dressed to Rule: Royal and Court Costume from Louis XIV to Elizabeth II* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2005).

Marshall, Rosalind K., and George R. Dalgleish, eds., *The Art of Jewellery in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Scottish National Portrait Gallery, 1991).

Marshall, Rosalind K., *Virgins and Viragos: A History of Women in Scotland from 1080-1980* (Chicago: Academy Chicago, 1983).

Mather Kelley, Brooks, *Yale: A History* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1999).

Mather, Ruth, 'The Home-Making of the English Working Class: Radical Politics and Domestic Life in Late-Georgian England, c.1790-1820' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Queen Mary University of London, 2016).

Matikkala, Antti, *The Orders of Knighthood and the Formation of the British Honours System, 1660-1760* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2008).

Maxwell, Alexander, *Patriots Against Fashion: Clothing and Nationalism in Europe's Age of Revolution* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

May, Edith, ed., *American Material Culture: The Shape of Things Around Us* (Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1984).

McClelland, Peter D., *Sowing Modernity: America's First Agricultural Revolution* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997).

McConville, Brendon J., *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

McCormack, Matthew, *Embodying the Militia in Georgian England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

McCreery, Cindy, *The Satirical Gaze: Prints of Women in Late Eighteenth-century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004).

McDonnell, Michael A., Clare Corbould, Frances Clarke, and W. Fitzhugh Brundage, eds., *Remembering the Revolution: Memory, History, and Nation Making from Independence to the Civil War* (Amherst & Boston: University of Massachusetts Press: 2013).

McKendrick, Neil, John Brewer and J. H. Plumb, *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-century England* (London: Europa, 1982).

McLynn, Frank, *1759: The Year Britain Became Master of the World* (London: Vintage Books, 2008).

McLynn, Frank, *Crime and Punishment in Eighteenth-Century England* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 1989).

McNairn, Alan, *Behold the Hero: General Wolfe and the Arts in the Eighteenth Century* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997).

McNeil, Kenneth, *Scotland, Britain, Empire: Writing the Highlands, 1760-1860* (Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press, 2007).

Mercantini, Johnathan, ed., *The Stamp Act of 1765: A History in Documents* (Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2018).

344

Merritt, Jane T., *The Trouble with Tea: The Politics of Consumption in the Eighteenth-Century Global Economy* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017).

Messing, Christine H., John B. Rudder, and Diane Windham Shaw, *A Son and His Adoptive Father: The Marquis de Lafayette and George Washington* (Mount Vernon, VA: The Mount Vernon Ladies Association, 2006).

Mida, Ingrid, and Alexandra Kim, *The Dress Detective: A Practical Guide to Object-based Research in Fashion* (London & New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015).

Miles, Ellen G., ed., *American Paintings of the Eighteenth Century: The Collections of the National Gallery of Art* (Washington & New York: National Gallery of Art & Oxford University Press, 1995).

Miles, Ellen G., ed., *The Portrait in Eighteenth-Century America* (Newark: The University of Delaware Press, 1993).

Mitnick, Barbara J., ed., *George Washington: American Symbol* (New York: Hudson Hills Press, 1999).

Mohanty, Gail Fowler, *Labor and Laborers of the Loom: Mechanization and Handloom Weavers, 1780-1840* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2006).

Monod, Paul, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Monod, Paul, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi, eds., *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Monsky, John R., 'From the Collection: Finding America in Its First Political Textile', *Winterthur Portfolio*, 37: 4, (2002), pp. 239-264.

Montgomery, Florence M., and Linda Eaton, *Textiles in America, 1650-1870: A Dictionary Based on Original Documents, Prints and Paintings, Commercial Records, American Merchant's Papers, Shopkeepers' Advertisements, and Pattern Books with Original Swatches of Cloth. Foreword by Linda Eaton* (New York & London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007).

Montgomery, Florence M., *Printed Textiles: English and American Cottons and Linens, 1700-1850* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1970).

Moores. John Richard, *Representations of France in English Satirical Prints, 1740-1832* (London & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

Moreno, Barry, *Castle Garden and Battery Park* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia, 2007).

Morgan, Gwenda, and Peter Rushton, *Banishment in the British Atlantic World: Convicts, Rebels and Slaves* (London & New York: Bloomsbury, 2013).

Mori, Jennifer, *The Culture of Diplomacy: Britain in Europe, c. 1750-1830* (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2010).

Murdoch, Steve, and A. Mackillop, eds., *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience, c. 1550-1900* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

Murphy, Kevin D., 'A Printed Map Case for the Marquis de Lafayette: Memory and Geography in the Early Republic', *West 86th: A Journal of Decorative Arts, Design History, and Material Culture*, 20: 1 (2013), pp. 92-109.

Nash, Gary, *First City: Philadelphia and the Forging of Historical Memory* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002).

Navickas, Katrina, '"That sash will hang you": Political Clothing and Adornment in England, 1780-1840', *Journal of British Studies*, 49: 3 (2010), pp. 540-65.

Nelson, Eric, *The Royalist Revolution: Monarchy and the American Founding* (Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 2014).

Nenadic, Stana, *Lairds and Luxury: The Highland Gentry in Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2007).

Neufeld, Matthew, *The Civil Wars After 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013).

Newman, Simon P., *Parades and the Politics of the Street: Festive Culture in the Early American Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997).

Nicholson, Robin, 'From Ramsay's *Flora MacDonald* to Raeburn's *MacNab*: The Use of Tartan as a Symbol of Identity', *Textile History*, 32: 2 (2005), pp. 146-67.

Nicholson, Robin, 'The tartan portraits of Prince Charles Edward Stuart: identity and iconography', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 12: 2 (1998), pp. 145-60.

Nicholson, Robin, *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Making of a Myth: A Study in Portraiture, 1720-1892* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2002).

Nicholson, Robin, *The Drambuie Collection: The Art Collection of the Drambuie Liqueur Company* (Edinburgh: The Drambuie Liqueur Company, 1995).

Nixon, Mark, Gordon Pentland and Matthew Roberts, 'The Material Culture of Scottish Reform Politics, c.1820-1884', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 31: 1 (2012), pp. 28-49

Norton, Mary Beth, *Liberty's Daughters: The Revolutionary Experience of American Women, 1750-1800* (Boston, MA: Little Brown, 1980).

Novotny, Jennifer L., 'Sedition at the supper table: the material culture of the Jacobite wars, 1688-1760' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Glasgow, 2013).

O'Gorman, Frank, *The Long Eighteenth Century: British Political and Social History, 1688-1832*, 2nd edn (London & New York: Bloomsbury, 2016).

Oates, Jonathan D., *Sweet William or the Butcher? The Duke of Cumberland and the '45* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword, 2008).

Oates, Jonathan D., *The Jacobite Campaigns: The British State at War* (London & New York: Taylor & Francis, 2011).

Olsen, Kristin, *Daily Life in Eighteenth-century England* (Westport & London: Greenwood Press, 1999).

Olson, Lester C., *Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004).

Orcutt, Kimberly, *Power and Posterity: American Art at Philadelphia's 1876 Centennial Exhibition* (Philadelphia, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2017).

Ouellette, Susan, *US Textile Production in Historical Perspective: A Case Study of Massachusetts* (Abingdon & New York, Routledge, 2007).

Paret, Peter, *Imagined Battles: Reflections of War in European Art* (Chapel Hill & London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

Parkins, Wendy, ed., *Fashioning the Body Politic: Dress, Gender, Citizenship* (Oxford & New York: Berg, 2002).

Parry, Linda, ed., *British Textiles: 1700 to the Present* (London: V&A Publishing, 2010).

Patterson, Richard S., and Richard Dougall, *The Eagle and the Shield: A History of The Great Seal of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976).

Paulson, Ronald, *Hogarth: Art and Politics, 1750-1764* (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 1993).

Peck, Amelia, *American Quilts & Coverlets in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art in association with Dutton Studio Books, 1990).

Peck, Amelia, ed., *Interwoven Globe: The Worldwide Textile Trade, 1500-1800* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2013).

Pentland, Gordon, '"We speak for the ready": Images of Scots in Political Prints, 1707-1832', *Scottish Historical Review*, 90 (2011), pp. 64-95.

Peskin, Lawrence A., *Manufacturing Revolution: The Intellectual Origins of Early American Industry* (Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).

Phipps, Elena, *Cochineal Red: The Art History of a Color* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2010).

Pittock, Murray H., *Culloden: Great Battles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Pittock, Murray H., *Jacobitism* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998).

Pittock, Murray H., *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1760: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

Pittock, Murray H., *Poetry and Jacobite Politics in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Pittock, Murray H., *The Invention of Scotland: The Stuart Myth and the Scottish Identity, 1638 to the Present* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 1991).

Pittock, Murray H., *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans: The Jacobite Army in 1745*, 2nd edn, (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 2009).

Plank, Geoffrey, *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the British Empire* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

Plowden, Alison, *Women All on Fire: The Women of the English Civil War* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998).

Pointon, Marcia, *Hanging the Head: Portraiture and Social Formation in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1993).

Potter, Tiffany, ed., *Women, Popular Culture, and the Eighteenth Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012).

Prebble, John, *Culloden* (London: Pimlico, 1961).

Pritchard, Sue, ed., *Quilts, 1700-2010: Hidden Histories, Untold Stories* (London: V&A Publishing, 2010).

Prown, Jules David, 'Mind in Matter: An Introduction to Material Culture Theory and Method', *Winterthur Portfolio*, 17: 1 (1982), pp. 1-19.

Purcell, Sarah J., *Sealed with Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002).

Raeder Gutzman. Kevin, *Virginia's American Revolution: From Dominion to Republic, 1776-1840* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2007).

Ragsdale, Bruce A., *A Planter's Republic: The Search for Economic Independence in Revolutionary Virginia* (Madison, WI: Madison House, 1996).

Raphael, Ray, *A People's History of the American Revolution: How Common People Shaped the Fight for Independence* (New York: Perennial, 2002).

Reich, Sue, *Quilts: Presidential and Patriotic* (Atglen, PA: Schiffer Publishing, 2016).

Reid, Stuart, *The Scottish Jacobite Army, 1745-46* (Oxford & New York: Osprey Publishing, 2006).

Reynolds, Anna, *In Fine Style: The Art of Tudor and Stuart Fashion* (London: Royal Collection Trust, 2013).

Ribeiro, Aileen, *Dress and Morality*, 2nd edn (Oxford & New York: Berg, 2003).

Ribeiro, Aileen, *Fashion in the French Revolution* (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1988).

Ribeiro, Aileen, *The Art of Dress: Fashion in England and France, 1750-1820* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1995).

Richter, David H., *Reading the Eighteenth-Century Novel* (Oxford: Wiley, 2017).

Ridgeway Collins, Herbert, *Threads of History: Americana Recorded on Cloth, 1775 to the Present* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1979).

Riding, Jacqueline, *Jacobites: A New History of the '45 Rebellion* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016).

Riello, Giorgio, and Tirthankar Roy, eds., *How India Clothed the World: The World of South Asian Textiles, 1500-1850* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2009).

Riffel, Melanie, and Sophie Rouart, *Toile de Jouy: Printed Textiles in the Classic French Style* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2003).

Rivard, Paul E., *A New Order of Things: How the Textile Industry Transformed New England* (Hanover & London: University Press of New England, 2002).

Roberts, John L., *The Jacobite Wars: Scotland and the Military Campaigns of 1715 and 1745* (Edinburgh: Polygon, 2002).

Rogers, Nicholas, *Crowds Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

Ross, Peter, *A History of Long Island: From its Earliest Settlement to the Present Time* (New York: Lewis Publishing Company, 1903), Vol. II.

Rudy, Willis, *The Campus and a Nation in Crisis: From the American Revolution to Vietnam* (London: Associated University Presses, 1996).

Russell, David Lee, *The American Revolution in the Southern Colonies* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000).

Sadako Takeda, Sharon, Kaye Durland Spilker, and Clarissa M. Escuera, *Reigning Men: Fashion in Menswear, 1715-2015* (Munich: Prestel and Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 2016).

Sankey, Margaret, *Jacobite Prisoners of the 1715 Rebellion: Preventing and Punishing Insurrection in Early Hanoverian Britain* (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2005).

Schoeser, Mary, and Celia Rufey, *English and American Textiles: From 1790 to the Present* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1989).

Schoeser, Mary, and Kathleen Dejardin, *French Textiles: From 1760 to the Present* (London: Laurence King, 1991).

Schuchard, Marsha Keith, *Emanuel Swedenborg, Secret Agent on Earth and in Heaven: Jacobites, Jews, and Freemasons in Early Modern Sweden* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2012).

Schwartz, Barry, *George Washington: The Making of an American Symbol* (New York: The Free Press, 1987).

Scranton, Philip, *Proprietary Capitalism: The Textile Manufacturers at Philadelphia, 1800-1885* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Seddon, Geoffrey B., *The Jacobites and their Drinking Glasses* (Woodbridge: Antique Collector's Club, 1995).

Selby, John E., *The Revolution in Virginia, 1775-1785* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia, 1988).

Seton, Bruce, 'Dress of the Jacobite Army: The Highland Habit', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 25: 100 (1928), pp. 270-81.

Sharp, Richard, *The Engraved Record of the Jacobite Movement* (Aldershot: Scholar Press,1996).

Shaw, Robert, *American Quilts: The Democratic Art, 1780-2007* (New York & London: Sterling, 2009).

Sheumaker, Helen, and Shirley Teresa Wajda, eds., *Material Culture in America: Understanding Everyday Life* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, 2008).

Smart Martin, Ann, *Buying into the World of Goods: Early Consumers in Backcountry Virginia* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008).

Smith, Lawrence Bartlam, *Spain and Britain 1715-1719: The Jacobite Issue* (New York & London: Garland, 1987).

Smith, Merril D., *Women's Roles in Eighteenth-Century America* (Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood, 2010).

Spencer, Charles, *To Catch a King: Charles II's Great Escape* (London: William Collins, 2017).

Spiers, Edward M., Jeremy A. Crang and Matthew J. Strickland, eds., *A Military History of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012).

Springett, Christine and David Springett, *Success to the Lace Pillow* (Rugby: Apex, 1988).

Stabile, Susan M., *Memory's Daughters: The Material Culture of Remembrance in Eighteenth-Century America* (Ithaca, NY & London: Cornell University Press, 2004).

Standen, Edith A., 'English Washing Furnitures' *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, 23: 3, (1964), pp. 109-24.

Stapelbroek, Koen, and Jani Marjanen, eds., *The Rise of Economic Societies in the Eighteenth Century: Patriotic Reform in Europe and North America* (Basingstoke & New York, 2012).

Staples, Kathleen A., and Madelyn Shaw, *Clothing Through American History: The British Colonial Era* (Santa Barbara: Greenwood, 2013).

Stobart, Jon, and Bruno Blondé, eds., *Selling Textiles in the Long Eighteenth Century: Comparative Perspectives from Western Europe* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

Sturtz, Linda, *Within Her Power: Propertied Women in Colonial Virginia* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2002).

Styles, John, and Amanda Vickery, eds., *Gender, Taste, and Material Culture in Britain and North America, 1700-1830* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2006).

Styles, John, *The Dress of the People: Everyday Fashion in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2007).

Styles, John, *Threads of Feeling: The London Foundling Hospital's Textile Tokens, 1740-1770* (London: The Foundling Museum, 2010).

Suzuki, Mihoko, *Subordinate Subjects: Gender, the Political Nation, and Literary Form in England, 1588-1688* (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2003).

Szechi, Daniel, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2006).

Szechi, Daniel, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788*, 2nd edn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019).

Taylor, Emily, 'Personality in Fashion: Case Studies of Localism in Eighteenth-century Scotland', *Fashion Practice: The Journal of Design, Creative Process & the Fashion Industry*, 10: 2 (2018), 213-35.

Taylor, Lou, *The Study of Dress History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).

Taylor, William, *The Military Roads in Scotland*, 2nd edn (Colonsay: House of Lochar, 1996).

Telfer Dunbar, John, *A History of Highland Dress* (Edinburgh & London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962).

Thom, Danielle, ''William, the Princely Youth': The Duke of Cumberland and Anti-Jacobite Visual Strategy, 1745-6', *Visual Culture in Britain*, 16: 3 (2015), pp. 249-66.

Thomas, Peter D. G., *John Wilkes: A Friend to Liberty* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

Tucker, Lewis Leonard, *Connecticut's Seminary of Sedition: Yale College* (Salisbury, CT: The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission of Connecticut, 1974).

Tucker, Spencer and Frank T. Reuter, *Injured Honor: The Chesapeake-Leopard Affair, June 22, 1807* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1996).

Tuckett, Sally, 'National Dress, Gender and Scotland: 1745-1822', *Textile History*, 40: 2, (2009), 140-151.

Tuckett, Sally, 'Reassessing the Romance: Tartan as a Popular Commodity, *c.* 1770-1830', *Scottish Historical Review*, 95: 2, (2016), 182-202.

Tuckett, Sally, 'Weaving the Nation: Scottish Clothing and Textile Cultures in the Long Eighteenth Century' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2011).

Ulrich, Laurel Thatcher, *The Age of Homespun: Objects and Stories in the Creation of an American Myth* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001).

Van Horn, Jennifer, *The Power of Objects in Eighteenth-Century British America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2017).

Vickery, Amanda, *Behind Closed Doors: At Home in Georgian England* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2009).

Vickery, Amanda, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1998).

Victoria & Albert Museum et al, *Catalogue of a Loan Exhibition of English Chintz: English Printed Furnishing Fabrics from Their Origins until the Present Day* (London: H.M.S.O., 1960).

Ward, David C., *Charles Willson Peale: Art and Selfhood in the Early Republic* (Berkley & London: University of California Press, 2004).

Warrack, Alexander, *A Scot's Dialect Dictionary, Comprising the Words in Use From the Latter Part of the Seventeenth Century to the Present Day [...] With an Introduction and a Dialect Map by William Grant* (Edinburgh, 1911).

Weatherill, Lorna, *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain, 1660-1760*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 1996).

Weber, Caroline, *Queen of Fashion: What Marie Antoinette Wore to the Revolution* (London: Aurum Press Ltd, 2007).

Webster, Sally, *The Nation's First Monument and the Origins of the American Memorial Tradition: Liberty Enshrined* (Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, 2015).

Westerweel, Bart, ed., *Anglo-Dutch Relations in the Field of the Emblem* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

Whatley, Christopher A., *Scottish Society, 1707-1830: Beyond Jacobitism, Towards Industrialisation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000).

Wheatley, Ivison, *The Language of the Fan* (York: Fairfax House, 1989).

Whye, Ian D., *Scotland Before the Industrial Revolution: An Economic and Social History c. 1050- c.1750* (Abingdon & New York: Longman, 1995).

Wigston Smith, Chloe, *Women, Work, and Clothes in the Eighteenth-Century Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Wills, Rebecca, *The Jacobites and Russia, 1715-1750* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2002).

Wilson, G. S., *Jefferson on Display: Attire, Etiquette, and the Art of Presentation* (Charlottesville & London: University of Virginia Press, 2018).

Wilson, Kathleen, *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715-1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Wilson, Rachel, *Elite Women in Ascendancy Ireland, 1690-1745: Imitation and Innovation* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2015).

Wood, Adrienne D., *The Weaver's Craft: Cloth, Commerce, and Industry in Early Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003).

Woolf, Noel, *The Medallic Record of the Jacobite Movement* (London: Spink, 1988).

Wright, Angela, *Britain, France and the Gothic, 1764-1820: The Import of Terror* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Wright, Meredith, *Everyday Dress of Rural America, 1783-1800* (New York: Dover Publications, 1992).

Wrigley, Richard, *The Politics of Appearances: Representations of Dress in Revolutionary France* (Oxford & New York: Berg, 2002).

Yokota, Kariann Akemi, *Unbecoming British: How Revolutionary America Became a Postcolonial Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Young, Alfred F., *Liberty Tree: Ordinary People and the American Revolution* (New York & London: New York University Press, 2006).

Young, Alfred F., *The Shoemaker and the Tea Party: Memory and the American Revolution* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1999).

Zacek Bassett, Lynne, *Massachusetts Quilts: Our Common Wealth* (Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England, 2009).

Zagarri, Rosemarie, *Revolutionary Backlash: Women and Politics in the Early American Republic* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

Zakim, Michael, *Ready-Made Democracy: A History of Men's Dress in the American Republic, 1760-1860* (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003).

Zeman, Theodore J., ed., *The Greenwood Encyclopaedia of Daily Life in America: Volume 1: The War of Independence and Antebellum Expansion and Reform, 1763-1861* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2009).

Zimmermann, Doron, *The Jacobite Movement in Scotland and in Exile, 1746-1759* (Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Web Articles

Eaton, Linda, 'Winterthur Primer: Nothing to Sneeze At: Commemorative Handkerchiefs for the American Market', <https://www.incollect.com/articles/winterthur-primer-nothing-to-sneeze-at-commemorative-handkerchiefs-for-the-american-market> [accessed 30 April 2016].

Hix, Lisa, 'True Kilts: Debunking the Myths About Highlanders and Clan Tartan', <https://www.collectorsweekly.com/articles/debunking-the-myths-about-kilts/> [accessed 4 April 2018].

MacDonald, Peter Eslea, 'A Plaid given to Lady MacKintosh by Prince Charles Edward Stuart' <https://www.scottishtartans.co.uk/Moy_Hall_Plaid.pdf> [accessed 11 April 2018].

MacDonald, Peter Eslea, 'Act of Proscription 1746: The Tartan Ban – Fact or Myth?', <https://www.scottishtartans.co.uk/Act_of_Proscription_1746_-_The_Tartan_Ban_-_Fact_or_Myth.pdf> [accessed 4 April 2018].

MacDonald, Peter Eslea, 'Isabella Fraser's Wedding Dress c.1785: A Reappraisal' <http://www.scottishtartans.co.uk/Isabella_Fraser_-_Wedding_Dress_c1785.pdf> [Accessed: 23 March 2016].

Miller, Phil, 'Historic 'lost' portrait of Bonnie Prince Charlie secured by National Galleries of Scotland' <http://www.heraldscotland.com/news/14391862.Historic__lost__portrait_of_Bonni e_Prince_Charlie_secured_by_National_Galleries_of_Scotland/> [accessed 11 April 2018].

Web-based Catalogues and Repositories

The British Museum Online Catalogue

http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/search.aspx

The British Newspaper Archive

https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/

Chronicling America: Historical America Newspapers

https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/

The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Online Catalogue

http://emuseum.history.org/

Historical Texts

https://historicaltexts.jisc.ac.uk/

The Metropolitan Museum Online Catalogue

https://metmuseum.org/

Mount Vernon Online Catalogue

https://www.mountvernon.org/preservation/collections-holdings/browse-the-museum-collections

Museum of Fine Art, Boston Online Catalogue

https://www.mfa.org/collections

National Museums Scotland Online Catalogue

https://www.nms.ac.uk/explore-our-collections/search-our-collections/

Smithsonian Institution Collections Search Centre

http://collections.si.edu/search/index.htm

The Victoria And Albert Museum Online Catalogue

http://collections.vam.ac.uk/

The Winterthur Museum Online Catalogue

http://museumcollection.winterthur.org/