CULTURE WAR COMMONALITIES

Personal Appearance in Commonwealth England

by

Andrew Sedge

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Program in History

In conformity with the requirements for the

Degree of Master of Arts

Queen's University

Kingston, Ontario, Canada

Final (QSpace) Submission: May, 2019

Copyright ©Andrew Sedge, 2019

Abstract

The swift social, political, and religious changes that encompassed England's Civil Wars, and later the Puritan-dominated Commonwealth, during the seventeenth-century led to a surge of moralist literature, published during a period with little to no press censorship. Against a backdrop of social upheaval and failing moral reformation, commentators increasingly perceived personal appearance as a source of moral failing throughout England. While the campaign of moral reformation at the time can most strongly be attributed to Puritan influences, on the interconnected questions of hair, dress, and cosmetics, political and religious fault-lines appear relatively few. While writers waged a propaganda war against one another through the press, when it came to the topic of appearance, their proscriptions appear have been largely similar. Though significant differences did still appear on a handful of key issues, it becomes apparent that few writers, regardless of how permissive or restrictive their ideologies may otherwise have been, were able to stomach the perceived, rising tide of subversive practices in self-presentation. Though these subversive practices could be leveraged as political insults in attempts to associate opposition with illicit fashion, this was not exclusive to any one side, nor did these insults necessarily reflect their intended target's actual outlook. Fashion was a site of significant cultural tension and appeared as one battleground in the ongoing culture war of the time, but it was one in which moralists, pamphleteers, and other writers shared a familiar fear: that the age they were living in had become licentious, permissive, and morally backwards.

Acknowledgements

I received a great deal of support over the course of this project and owe a debt of gratitude to all involved. First, to my family for all their invaluable assistance over the years, and for always being willing to help whenever I needed it. Second, to the faculty who helped to guide me through this process. I want to thank Dr. Jeffrey Collins for agreeing to supervise, and for his crucial support in helping see this thesis through from beginning to end. I would also like to thank Dr. Jane Errington and the thesis writing group for their constant feedback, as well as those professors whose classes helped guide my thinking throughout: Dr. Andrew Jainchill, Dr. Rosanne Currarino, as well as Dr. Jeffrey Collins once again. Finally, I would like to thank my undergraduate supervisor Dr. Tim Stretton for all his work in preparing me to pursue this topic to begin with.

Table of Contents

Abstract ii
Acknowledgements iii
Table of Contents iv
Introduction 1
Chapter One: The Wearing of Hair 29
Chapter Two: Dress & Adornment 50
Chapter Three: Cosmetics 77
Conclusion 103
Bibliography 110

Introduction

Personal appearance has rarely been viewed as a private matter. Fashion has been used to display wealth or status, emphasize modesty, highlight spirituality, as well as conform to ever-changing notions of beauty. During the seventeenth-century, appearance was viewed as a very public issue, and the concerns centered around it only grew more urgent as the English Civil War(s) and subsequent revolution unleashed a series of social and economic changes, and the Puritan-dominated Commonwealth that followed became embroiled in a culture war waged across the medium of popular print. But while this culture war is usually framed as one of opposition between competing groups, striking commonalities appeared on the subject of personal appearance. Moralist outrage against modes of self-presentation was nothing new to England during this period, and the tumult of the Civil Wars did little to change attitudes towards fashions viewed as subversive or illicit. However, as commentators began to perceive social and moral breakdown all around them, courtesy of a "world turned upside down", the moral questions connected to personal appearance grew even more important. Writers increasingly clamoured to establish modesty, piety, and perhaps simply normalcy, in one of the most visible categories for concern. Though the turmoil of this period did not lead to significant changes in standards around personal appearance, save for the advent of specific new fashions and some variation within religious groups, the context through which these attacks were conceptualized did shift noticeably.[1] These attacks against subversive fashion and self-presentation became increasingly framed as an attempt to restore an orderly past that seemed to have been long since lost in the face of the series of crises that marked the early to mid-seventeenth-century.

---

[1] One example of a variation was the Puritan standard of hair, which was cropped much shorter than the norm. In practice, this mostly applied to clergy.

Though personal appearance had always been a public issue, the sense that society itself had fallen increasingly into question helped to exaggerate this, thrusting issues of sexual morality and self-presentation to the forefront within popular print. This is perhaps even more evident due to the breakdown in censorship throughout this period, which allowed for a more diverse range of critique than might otherwise have been possible. This breakdown was one feature of the sometimes-contradictory picture of the Commonwealth: it saw at once a strict moral climate fostered by religious fervour, and at the same moment the weakening of traditional institutions such as the church courts that may in fact have led to a more permissive atmosphere on a personal level. Regardless, religious figureheads, writers, and other officials waged a campaign of moral reform aimed at "maintaining high standards of personal and public morality."[2] This did not lead to any direct impositions against the problematized appearance practices, but the issue was consistently taken up through the medium of popular print, as one small but important piece of the overarching culture war. The objective of this thesis is to examine the issue of personal appearance as a site of cultural tension, recognizing the various religious, moral, and political concerns that revolved around it, while fitting it into the broader cultural changes that occurred throughout the Civil Wars and Commonwealth. With social norms and boundaries breaking down in plain sight, pressure to maintain high, moral standards in personal appearance only grew from writers experiencing a world made unfamiliar. Despite the ongoing culture war, the literature produced throughout this period about personal appearance was typified more by commonality and shared values than by concrete differences, even between voices which were in opposition to one another – and even when these texts were targeted as political attacks. Their political motivations and religious ideals were certainly different, but their texts came to share noticeable common ground.

---

[2] Christopher Durston, "Puritan Rule and the Failure of Cultural Revolution", in Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales eds. *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*, (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1996), 217.

This thesis will be arranged into three central chapters, each dealing in depth with one of the main categories of personal appearance. The first chapter will deal with the wearing of hair during this period, examining how men and women were targeted for issues such as length and style, something that was inherently gendered. While men were expected to wear their hair in a short, modest style (though not necessarily in the Puritan standard for short hair), women were in reverse meant to treat their hair as a kind of natural covering, in reference to Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians.[3] The fashions of the time also led to an increase in the use of wigs for men, a practice that came under heavy attack from puritan commentators in particularly. Due to just how pointed the contradictions are between men and women in the case of hair, this chapter will necessarily attempt to uncover both the substance of what was being said in the literature of the times, as well as come to grips with the religious background that led to this seeming disconnect, such as the noted epistle and contemporaneous commentaries surrounding it. Throughout this chapter, it begins to become apparent that many of the core ideas and suggested impositions were reflective of a surprising degree of common-ground across political and religious divisions. Though it may seem simple to portray the period as morally strict, reflective of a broader trend towards Puritanism, the harsh outlook through which personal appearance was filtered appears as a rare piece of common ground.

The second chapter of this thesis will build upon these familiar themes, while beginning to move into the issue of dress. Although much of the proscriptive and prescriptive literature focused on worn fashions is shared with that of the wearing of hair, and indeed with cosmetics, there remain significant differences between these topics. As with the wearing of hair, men and women were both placed under considerable pressures to seek modesty in their appearance, and again, the exact proscriptions levelled against them varied wildly – as did their justifications. The element of personal appearance as a sort of performance becomes more evident in the case of dress, with consistent concerns raised around individuals increasingly "dressing up" and "dressing down" in society. With individuals of a growing "middling sort" increasingly able to afford more luxurious clothing, the fear of a visual inversion between apparent social statuses grew. This fear of inversion spread, perhaps more vigorously, to the subject of gender, where commentators routinely criticized men and women for dressing inappropriately. This was not a simple trespass, as some began to fear a process of metamorphosis with men growing increasingly effeminate. Naturally, this connected intricately to broader fears of social breakdown.

---

[3] Anne Laurence, "Women, Godliness and Personal Appearance in Seventeenth-Century England," *Women's History Review,* Vol. 15, No. 1. (New York: Routledge, 2006), 76.

The third and final chapter of this thesis will examine cosmetic practices. Though most of the literature from the period seems to focus on women's cosmetic use, it was not an exclusive practice – nor did the outrage fall neatly along gender lines. However, it must be noted that the cosmetic practices that appeared most commonly within the moralist literature appear to have been those primarily employed by, or at least primarily associated with, women. These included face-painting, tincturing, and the wearing of black patches, although on a practical level many of the cosmetic recipes themselves put a great deal more focus upon the use of washes and medical treatments rather than the 'covering' cosmetics that moralists envisioned.[4] However, it must be noted that while these practices were most commonly attributed to women in specific, men also appear to have used these types of cosmetics. Moreover, they were active in the cosmetic industry as publishers and printers: as Edith Snook noted, many of the collections of cosmetic practices were written by “surgeons, physicians, and apothecaries.”[5] As noted in particular on the topic of dress, personal appearance could largely be viewed as a performance: though individuals were expected to be modest and godly in their appearance, something that often meant avoiding alterations that could be considered too extreme, through various practices they were capable of claiming authority over themselves. This became a serious issue of contention, as it was viewed as stripping authority out of the hands of the creator. Cosmetics were also attached heavily to notions of sexual impropriety, with their usage often connected to women falling under a stereotypical ‘seductress’ archetype, as well as with prostitution more explicitly.

---

[4] Edith Snook, *Women, Beauty and Power in Early Modern England: A Feminist Literary History*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 24.

However, before these three topics can be dealt with at any satisfactory length, the relevant context and historiography on the period must be considered. Perhaps the most pressing issue that must be grappled with are the often-intense religious divisions that existed throughout the early seventeenth-century, and to acknowledge how difficult it can be to delineate between their philosophies on a subject which, as noted, these different groups had much more common ground than genuine debate. As noted, England was a society very much in flux during this period, and though there were obvious political allegiances to note for many writers, the debates that emerged around personal appearance cannot be easily narrowed down as existing between a couple of set factions. While the dynamic of Parliamentarian versus Royalist certainly has a great deal of merit, treatises focused on issues of personal appearance appear remarkably similar from both sides of the ongoing culture war. There were differences, and those deserve to be noted, but it would be unsatisfactory to attempt to suggest that either 'side' represented a specific mode of thought on the topic, or to ignore the common ground they shared. As Aileen Ribeiro states, "It was a general belief among all Christians that the outward appearance of a person was indicative of their spiritual state."[6] This applied to the English during the whole of the seventeenth-century, but arguably intensified during the Commonwealth years. Ribeiro continues, explaining that there was a "growing feeling by the Puritans that they were God's chosen people, and contemporary events were to be seen in the light of biblical revelation."[7] This is perhaps one of the more notable fault-lines between these different groups: for Puritans, there was an overriding urgency for moral reform, including in personal appearance, that was grounded firmly in their unique spiritual outlook. Although moralist literature was often framed as a reaction to the times, Puritan tracts were perhaps more pointed in this respect.

---

[5] Ibid, 24.

Although Puritans wrote with a sense of urgency and immediate necessity, the terms they usually laid out for personal appearance were far from radical. Religion was a crucial component in treatises on personal appearance, but despite significant differences in theology and practice, there remained more similarity than difference when it came to the exact criticisms raised, and proscriptions offered. As Ribeiro states, religion was used "at both a serious and frivolous level to underline the moral and mortal implications of dress."[8] The separation between the Civil Wars and subsequent Commonwealth years, and the society that preceded it is thus largely one of scope rather than outright difference. The moral implications of dress had long been in question, and that was one tradition that found itself strengthened rather than overturned by the revolution. It was no small matter either, as Edith Snook explains: "For men and women in early modern

---

[6] Aileen Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction: Dress in Art and Literature in Stuart England*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005), 159.
[7] Ibid, 159.
[8] Ibid, 159.

England, getting dressed – putting on clothes and making the skin and hair appropriate – was far from trivial. It required one to understand one's place within the social order and, on occasion, allowed one to demonstrate one's understanding of the body, its physiology and its cultural meanings."[9] Snook, however, identifies a common issue in research into (female) beauty practices: the tendency to use critics of these practices as the primary evidence, such as satire and proscriptive treatises.[10] She wrote in reference to cosmetic practices, "With these resources at hand, scholars have detailed how women who painted were derided for being vain, deceptive, seductive, and akin to prostitutes..."[11] Instead, Snook points to accounts such as recipe books and receipts that draw closer to the reality of cosmetic usage of the time, on the terms of whose who used them..[12] Although this thesis does focus largely on the largely negative accounts from moralists and pamphleteers, it is important to recognize their limitations: they reflect the concerns and views of their writers, more than the reality of cosmetic practices on an individual level. It is also important to recognize that within this 'censorious' literature, the outrage was rarely levelled evenly across gender lines. Men were frequently the targets of moralist literature, but personal appearance was often treated with more direct spiritual, moral, and especially sexual importance for women. Ignoring the similarities that existed in favour of a more focused approach would obscure the larger picture, but so too would painting with too broad a brush and ignoring the shared framework that these ideas were based in. By considering beauty practices and the oft-gendered attacks against them, it will be possible to recognize both the startling similarities and stark contrasts that existed across gender lines.

---

[9] Snook, *Women, Beauty and Power,* 7.
[10] Ibid, 21.
[11] Ibid, 21.
[12] Ibid, 22.

Given that most of the proscriptive literature focusing on appearance during the seventeenth-century was, at least in part, motivated by religious concerns, it is important to attempt to reconstruct the religious climate of the period. While the Commonwealth was dominated by a sort of Puritanism in a political sense, it would be a mistake to assume they were the only active and influential group at the time. If anything, they were a minority with sway over a much more moderate population. If they were a minority, however, then they were a minority which was particularly active and arguably central in the public discussion on morality – a discussion which was broad in nature and encompassed sources from across the political and religious spectrum. Considering that, it is important to note that Puritans were not a uniform group, but rather a disparate and often disconnected category unified mainly by a central desire to "complete the purification of the Church of England begun in Elizabeth's day."[13] For Puritans, the reformation of the English church had been largely incomplete and needed to be continued. As Crawford Gribben writes, "The hierarchy as a whole had moved beyond the ambiguity of the early Reformation to embrace the Calvinist theology that had become normative across the church by the end of the sixteenth century. But Puritans wanted to move beyond that ideological consensus to promote further reform within the church's liturgy, sacraments, and practice."[14] The exact form they wanted this reformed church to take varied, but Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales note that they showcased a "peculiarly severe yet vibrant spirituality" and shared a "common spiritual and cultural outlook".[15] Among Puritans, the overriding importance of the sermon also appears as a commonality. Everett Emerson notes that this resulted in “excellence in Puritan preaching” – in particular, ‘beauty’ was considered to be “essential” to a good sermon.[16] Predictably, the content of these sermons varied wildly from preacher to preacher, and from sermon to sermon, but they almost always followed a particular school of thought: one which placed the Bible first and foremost, ahead of and contrary to “tradition and to merely human ideas.”[17] Thus, while considerable pressure has been placed on very label of Puritanism, there is enough common ground between identifiable Puritan voices to warrant its continued usage in research.

---

[13] Everett Emerson, *English Puritanism from John Hooper to John Milton*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1968), 46.
[14] Crawford Gribben, *John Owen and English Puritanism: Experiences of Defeat*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 25.
[15] Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales eds, *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*, (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1996), 8-9.

While the label of Puritanism may appear rather imprecise through much of its usage, that confusion may in part stem from the manner in which the term was leveraged as an insult, even before the seventeenth-century. Durston and Eales explain that, “very early on in their linguistic careers the words ‘puritan’ and ‘puritanism’ became loose and indiscriminate terms of abuse.”[18] This led to a number of voices whose ideals and practices may have appeared to reflect conventionally Puritan ideals, to instead reject the label in favour of more neutral terms such as ‘the godly’, ‘professors,’ ‘true gospellers,’ and ‘the elect’.[19] This confusion is furthered by way the term developed over time. As Nicholas Tyacke illustrates, Puritanism at the turn of the seventeenth-century century was “thought of in terms of either a refusal to conform with the religious rites and ceremonies of the English Church, or as a Presbyterian rejection of church government by bishops.”[20] Though this refusal to conform wasn’t necessarily inaccurate to the Puritanism of the Civil War, this arguably wasn’t its primary feature. Tyacke suggests that it was Calvinist principles, especially revolving around the concept of predestination, that helped to

---

[16] Emerson, *English Puritanism,* 45.
[17] Ibid, 46.
[18] Durston and Eales, *The Culture of English Puritanism,* 2.
[19] Ibid, 3.
[20] Nicholas Tyacke, “Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter Revolution,” in W.R. Owens eds. *Seventeenth-century England: A Changing Culture*, (New Jersey: Barnes & Noble Books, 1981), 131.

"reconcile the differences" between differing non-conformist groups.[21] Through this reconciliation, something more concrete formed. Bernard Capp summarized puritan beliefs: "they were fighting to banish ignorance, superstition, and profanity, and transform England into a second Israel."[22] By the 1620s and 1630s, Puritanism had solidified enough that we can begin to see what Emerson identified as a "common style" amongst identified Puritans, through preachers such as "Richard Sibbes, John Cotton, and John Preston."[23] Even so, Emerson cautions against generalization as to just what this style entailed, as even with the apparent rise of a more concrete Puritanism, differences were still abound in both ideas and delivery.[24] It is also worth noting that the divisions existing within the broader Parliamentarian movement, a movement by no means exclusively (or even majority) Puritan, further confuse this picture. In examining Pride's Purge, David Underdown highlighted the existence of "two contradictory elements, one moderate and reformist, the other radical and revolutionary."[25] According to Underdown, this dichotomy is responsible for some of the issues that exist in grasping "the central meaning of the Puritan Revolution."[26] While the more revolutionary group, that which eventually won out thanks to the Purge in question, aimed for a complete reformation of the Church, most Parliamentarian supporters were more modest in their desires.[27]

---

[21] Ibid, 131.

[22] Bernard Capp, *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 3.

[23] Emerson, *English Puritanism*, 46.

[24] Ibid, 46.

[25] David Underdown, *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan* Revolution, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 8. Although Underdown highlights the many complexities of Pride's Purge, a simple summary of the event is that as a result of political divisions in the Long Parliament as well as a potential attempt to bring an end to the revolution, Colonel Thomas Pride "arrested or turn away a majority of the members (Presbyterians) trying to get in." The practical result of this was the political victory of the more revolutionary wing of Parliament, and the establishment of the Commonwealth. (Ibid, 1-2.)

[26] Ibid, 8.

[27] Ibid, 7.

At the heart of this 'Puritan Revolution' was religion: this hardly needs to be mentioned. However, the centrality of religion to the Civil War that preceded it has been a topic of debate for historians in the past, with some going so far as to label the period as the last of England's wars of religion.[28] Despite this, Glenn Burgess indicates that the Revolution itself was "too multi-faceted to be encapsulated by any single label."[29] While there is limited value in debating these sorts of labels within the confines of this thesis, it is important to note that there was a conception that the war was, at least on some level, a war of religion at the time. This comes out most clearly through the Royalist perspective: as Burgess explains, from a Royalist perspective the Civil War was viewed as such in two ways: "a war against Puritan zealots, who threatened church and state for religious motives; and a war about ecclesiology, involving dimensions both legal and theological."[30] This focus on religion extended into the revolutionary period itself, wherein Parliament made a telling claim, stating that it "took up defensive arms for the preservation of his Maiesties person, the maintenance of the true religion, the lawes and liberties of this kingdome, and the power and privilege of Parliament."[31] Although the Civil War is certainly more complicated than simply a dispute centered around religion, its importance within the conflict leads naturally into its dominance as an issue throughout the later (and, admittedly, concurrent) culture war. It is also worth noting that the Revolution had some unintended consequences for the Church of England itself, as royalist clergymen found their lack of worldly authority paradoxically allowing them the time and motive to "instead focus on theology and devotional writing, and on building up a body of 'Anglican' spirituality which would regain popular support for the established church."[32]

---

[28] Glenn Burgess and Charles W.A. Prior eds., *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*, (New York: Routledge, 2016), 1.

[29] Ibid, 169.

[30] Ibid, 192.

[31] Sarah Mortimer, "Natural Law and Holy War in the English Revolution", in Burgess and Prior eds. *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*, 193.

Though historians may often struggle to come to grips with the exact form Puritanism took, and how far that term can or should be stretched, what is evident is that the establishment of a Puritan-dominated Commonwealth led by that more revolutionary group, set the stage for a much-expanded campaign for moral reform. Durston writes that as a result of the Parliamentary victory in the Civil War, "the country fell under the control of a succession of godly regimes, and puritanism was presented with the perfect opportunity to use the full power of central government to impose its cultural values upon the English nation."[33] This campaign was rather broad in scope, and personal appearance was only one of many topics. Overall, it was concerned with "improving the moral calibre of the nation with a characteristic confidence and energy."[34] This included the famous shutting of the London theatres, the Adultery Act which focused heavy punishments upon prostitutes and brothel-keepers as well as permitted the death penalty for adultery (a harsh imposition to be sure, but one which does not appear to have been practiced in reality), as well as proscriptions against cursing.[35] Within this broader set of proscriptions, personal appearance was often a secondary concern bound up in concerns around sexual morality or spirituality. This can have the effect of obscuring its prevalence in the mind of moralists but should not be taken as evidence that it was negligible in the minds of commentators on either side of the noted culture war. For a brief period, a number of Major-Generals were assigned to "encourage and promote godliness, and discourage and discountenance all profaneness and ungodliness" in various localities.[36] Although many of the concerns raised by Puritan moralists were quite old, in practice this appeared as an attack on traditional values as a whole, especially when seen hand-in-hand with the efforts to stamp down on seasonal festivals and other public rites.[37] This was, as Durston points out, "nothing less than an attempt to bring about wholesale cultural revolution."[38]

---

[32] Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 146.
[33] Christopher Durston, "Puritan Rule and the Failure of Cultural Revolution, 1645-1660", in Durston and Eales eds. *The Culture of English Puritanism*, 211.
[34] Ibid, 217.
[35] Ibid, 217.

This cultural revolution did not come unopposed, however. While Puritanism maintained a position of political dominance, the religious disputes that preceded the Revolution continued well into the Commonwealth period itself. Royalist clergymen and sympathizers, as well as a more diverse array of opponents to strict moral reformation, would remain a constant feature in popular print throughout the period, often contradicting and disputing Puritan objectives. This was in part one of the main fault-lines that formed the critical binary that Bernard Capp explores through his work. He explains, "The two sides in England's culture wars stood for incompatible values and ideals. The puritan ethos of godly discipline and moral reformation, reinforced by humanist values (…) was pitted against a rival ethos of 'good fellowship' and festive traditions."[39] However, while we may identify two primary 'sides', in practice the situation was much more complex, with a dizzying array of religious factions springing to prominence. Among these were groups such as the Diggers, Dippers, Levellers, Quakers, Ranters and Seekers, all of whom found themselves as the targets of attack in print in their own right.[40] As David Finnegan explains, the Dippers and Anabaptists were depicted as “blasphemous” and confused, the Levellers were “accused of seeking to abolish social distinctions and private ownership”, while Quakers were “mocked for trembling before the secular authority of magistrates,” and Ranters were “associated with revelling, roaring, drinking, whoring, swearing, and all manner of wickedness.”[41] Finally, he explains that Seekers and Expecters were “likened to libertines who had scandalously defected from the bosom of the Church.”[42] Though these groups may have had limited influence on their own, their doctrines were made palpable in this culture war through the outpouring of anxieties they inadvertently incited.

---

[36] Ibid, 218. The Major-Generals had a number of responsibilities upon being assigned to their respective provinces, which included "local security arrangements and the regulation of the moral behaviour of the people." Some of these Major-Generals reported successes, prosecuting "moral transgressors" and shutting down establishments that violated the terms of this moral reformation. However, this system would prove to be short-lived, limiting its overall impact. (Christopher Durston, "'Settling the Hearts and Quieting the Minds of All Good People': The Major-Generals and the Puritan Minorities of Interregnum England', (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), 247-248.)

[37] Ibid, 217-218.

[38] Ibid, 218.

[39] Capp, *England's Culture Wars*, 3.

[40] Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan eds., *Varieties of Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context*, (New York: Routledge, 2016), 3.

Of these groups, the Levellers appear as the most important as it pertains to the topic of personal appearance. They were not, as noted, a dominant force: however, their impact can be read clear through much of London’s print culture. A number of authors have expanded upon the concept of the Commonwealth years as being the “world turned upside-down”, a common sentiment at that time.[43] It was within this context, of a society overturned by revolution and social change, that the Levellers were able to gain some traction. They never rose to be much more than a small minority, but as John Rees argued, they were “a minority sufficiently bold in their ideology and effective in organization that they could make the difference between revolution and counterrevolution.”[44] Though their exact political goals are not often featured in the proscriptive literature dealing with fashion, they provided one key, visible example of a society which had its old conventions broken down, and then struggled to re-establish itself in a concrete form. As a movement seeking, in its most basic form, expanded democracy within the Commonwealth, they posed an inherent threat to old systems of status and social standing. The uncertain, revolutionary spirit of the times also gave rise to significant disruption of the existing gender hierarchy, perhaps the most important connection between revolution and any increase in the amount of proscriptive literature aimed at women's dress and behaviour. Though the Levellers were not necessarily responsible for this, they are a part of this conversation: there was the notable example of Katherine Chidley, a female Leveller leader, as well as numerous examples (not exclusively amongst Levellers or Leveller-supportive groups) of female preachers and activists.[45] Female activity in popular politics wasn't new to this period by any extent, but the extent to which it occurred does warrant mention. Additionally, as David Underdown and Susan Amussen explain in their own work on the subject, the early modern English were a people "obsessed by the need for gender order as for social order."[46] The importance of gender order seemingly only grew as social order deteriorated, and fashion would become one of the key sites of tension in the following struggle for order.

---

[41] Ibid, 3.
[42] Ibid, 3.
[43] John Rees, *The Leveller Revolution*, (London: Verso, 2016), xvi.
[44] Ibid, xix.

Another important religious force which must be accounted for is that of antinomianism. As with the Levellers, its most distinctive impact on the topic of personal appearance arguably had less to do with any specific doctrines applied to any of the three categories of appearance dealt with in this thesis, and more to do with its presence as a potentially destabilizing force in the perception of prominent moralists. Although antinomianism, like Puritanism, can appear a rather imprecise term, its most important usage in this context is its appearance as a "radical permutation of puritanism."[47] This imprecision, David R. Como argues, should not "blind us to the fact that those accused of antinomianism evinced a set of very particular traits and characteristics…"[48] For Como, the most important of these tendencies was the argument that Mosaic Law had been "abolished" or "superseded" for Christians: in doing so, they "(negated) a particular version of pastoral divinity that had come to dominate the puritan community."[49] Where the dominant strain of Puritanism generally promoted a "rigorous and disciplined mode of piety", including "self-examination" as well as fierce opposition to worldly sins, including sexual immorality (and by extent modes of appearance which were assumed to provoke lust), antinomians generally promoted "free grace and justification by faith."[50] This apparent freedom from Mosaic Law appears particularly important on the topic of moral reformation. Although antinomians did not endorse an abandonment of moral principles due to their freedom from these religious laws, their hostility to Puritan moral reformation and self-examination, ideas that would become mainstream during the Commonwealth, made them an obvious ideological obstacle, and one which no doubt contributed to the sense of moral degradation that many Puritans identified within England.[51] Certainly, this would have had its own profound effects on the ongoing culture war, even if antinomianism did not exist as a dominant strain of religion in itself. As Como writes, "(it) thus set forth a message calculated to exploit the deepest fears, doubts and insecurities of godly lay people, to tap into dissatisfaction within the strenuous, unforgiving nature of mainstream Puritan piety."[52]

---

[45] Ibid, 40. Ibid, 63.

[46] Susan Amussen and David Underdown, *Gender, Culture and Politics in England, 1560-1640: Turning the World Upside Down*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 2-3.

[47] David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 24.

As Kevin Killeen argues, the "polemical importance of antinomianism (…) far exceeded any numerical count of its adherents, and evidence of antinomian thought frequently persists most fully in its polemical refutations, of which there are many."[53] In a similar fashion to the Levellers, its effects were made evident through London's print culture, and the perceived need to counter it through publications may well have outstripped whatever threat it posed to mainstream Puritanism on a practical level. Samuel Rutherford, a Presbyterian who found himself as one of the leading Scottish covenanter theorists, vocalized the kind of anxieties that antinomianism could invoke, when he stated that "Antinomians and Anabaptists now in England joyne hands with Pelagians, Jesuits, and Arminians."[54] Here, as Nicholas McDowell indicates, Rutherford attempts to frame two different theologies in antinomianism and Arminianism as "two sides of the same coin and both heretical inversions of true Calvinist doctrine."[55] Though the extent to which mainstream Puritanism stood in opposition to antinomianism may be clear, its effect on attitudes towards personal appearance is more difficult to unearth. In terms of theology, there may well be little to distinguish antinomianism from other religious groups on the topic of proscription towards personal appearance. Though their theological and moral arguments would almost certainly have been shaped through different texts, given their aversion to the strict, self-examination, moral reformation, and legalistic thinking of mainstream Puritans, it is doubtful that they would have been much more permissive of then-subversive modes of appearance. However, their presence only contributed to the broader story of anxiety and perceived moral breakdown, which in turn fed into the seeming importance of reformation in outward appearance. Though direct links are difficult to assess, its importance to the context of London's popular print and ongoing culture war must be recognized.

---

[48] Ibid, 33.
[49] Ibid, 34.
[50] Ibid, 34.
[51] Ibid, 36.
[52] Ibid, 37.

---

[53] Kevin Killeen, *The Political Bible in Early Modern England,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 46.

[54] Nicholas McDowell, "The Beauty of Holiness and the Poetics of Antinomianism: Richard Crashaw, John Saltmarsh and the Language of Religious Radicalism in the 1640s", in Hessayon and Finnegan eds., *Varieties of Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context,* 32.

[55] Ibid, 32.

The polemical importance of religious groups with seemingly little concrete influence was a constant theme throughout the seventeenth-century, and Catholicism is no different, although it may have enjoyed more influence on its own terms within popular print. As Frances Dolan stated in her book on the subject, "at the national as well as the domestic level, English culture located threat in the familiar as much as in the strange, and in those who were (apparently) least powerful."[56] Catholics were one of the central groups which appeared frequently as both the subject of attacks, and as actors or references in proscriptions against other behaviours. They were a useful kind of 'other' within the popular consciousness, but Dolan warns that we cannot constrain them simply to this role: she writes, "Catholics were not only the central bogey-women of Protestant England's print culture but producers and consumers of print as well. (…) Catholics, while most often the objects of representation, sometimes represented themselves in court and in print; they used litigation and publication."[57] The very real presence of Catholics, however small a minority they became, had once encouraged significant action on the part of the crown, with statues and proclamations aimed at preventing non-attendance, Catholic mass, the harbouring of priests and study at Catholic schools abroad.[58] Both Dolan and Arthur Marotti highlight the conflation of religion and gender in the case of attacks on Catholics, with a particular fear for recusant women: Catholicism was, as Marotti stated, "the religion of the 'Whore of Babylon.'"[59] Though this has a particular religious context, this sort of language was often used in literature attacking or criticizing women's attire as foreign: an allusion to Catholicism from a Puritan or other protestant writer was, almost invariably, an insult.

---

[56] Frances E. Dolan, *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture*, (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press 1999), *1.*

[57] Ibid, 13.

[58] Arthur E Marotti, "Alienating Catholics in Early Modern England: Recusant Women, Jesuits, and Ideological Fantasies", in Arthur E. Marotti eds. *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts.* Early Modern Literature in History. (London: Palrgrave Macmillan, 1999), 1-2.

[59] Ibid, 4.

As noted, religious strife was an important factor in the perception of breakdown in the social and moral order. This breakdown, in turn, stands as one of the most important features of the period, albeit one that is particularly difficult to trace. Undoubtedly, the revolutionary period unleashed significant social change, but the degree of this change often proves challenging to assess. Importantly however, these ongoing changes were noted by a host of commentators during the period. In his influential (if debated) work on the Civil War, Christopher Hill writes, "Men so diverse in their political outlook as Winstanley, Harrington, Hobbes, Baxter, Clarendon, all explained the civil war in terms of social forces…"[60] He draws upon one of these names, Lord Clarendon, who wrote that "Religion was made a Cloak to cover the most impious designs (of the Long Parliament)."[61] Although Hill places class at the center of his understanding of the Civil War, adopting a Marxist approach to history, this is certainly not the only force that should be taken into account. Though it does appear that, in at least some part, divisions between Parliamentarians and Royalists occurred along class boundaries (if that term can be applied without anachronism), social change did not necessarily center upon the question of class or even status.[62] Furthermore, David Underdown warns against the oversimplification of class divisions, writing that "There was no absolute divide between the elite and 'the people', but a spectrum on which a good many intermediate positions existed."[63] He draws upon the concept of 'two nations', between these two broadly defined groups, arguing that they were actually much more alike before the civil wars than after.[64] He wrote, "The radical forces unleashed by the war destroyed the gentry's confidence that their inferiors shared their priorities."[65] This broken confidence may well be a factor in many of the publications which decry an increasingly subversive population, when it came to the issue of appearance. Solidarity amongst the classes, though such a term may indeed be anachronistic for this period, was one of the many victims of the Civil War, and may have also played into the broader story of social upheaval and social change that both accelerated and exacerbated the culture war, and by extent, the role of appearance in popular print.

---

[60] Christopher Hill, *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century*, (London: Secker & Warburg, 1958), 3.
[61] Ibid, 199.
[62] Ibid, 208.
[63] David Underdown, *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-Century England*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 10.

It is this accelerated social change that appears both most important to the shifting attitudes of the time, and at times, the most difficult to accurately measure. Although the roots of the Revolution itself have been and continue to be debated, it is apparent that tumult of the Civil Wars, combined with the distinct form society took during the Commonwealth, did much to unleash and exaggerate forces of social, cultural and even economic change. This is crucial to understanding the culture war, as well as any change or uptick in anxieties around personal appearance that emerged as a result. In addition, it may be one key area connecting the Commonwealth and the debate over fashion to the later luxury debates. Arguably, this period set the groundwork for England's later prosperity, seen most clearly through the history of improvement. As Paul Slack argues, "The abolition of the monarchy and advent of a republic (also) produced institutions vital for England's subsequent economic performance and the character of its political economy."[66] Much of this, he explains, continued to exist even after the Restoration in 1660.[67]

---

[64] Ibid, 10.
[65] Ibid, 10.

The shifting economy may not seem directly connected to the topic of personal appearance, but it is worth noting that although the fashions and practices may occupy space as cultural artifacts, they were also a part of the larger economy. On the one hand, clothing was a "key determinant of economic identity", and on the other, clothing was itself a commodity.[68] An example of this is provided by Sue Vincent on the topic of glove purchases. She writes, "Along with other rich clothes, gloves had here an iconic function. They signaled position, class, wealth, and the presence of a particular family history."[69] Rich clothing had a stake in both the social and economic credit of an individual, in the very period in which an expanding economy led to greater ease of access into the realm of fashion for the growing 'middling sort', especially in London. Though greater spending was a product of a more robust economy, the perception of excess that came along with this was increasingly viewed as a threat to said economy. As Eleanor Hubbard writes on the subject of London women, "Women's desire to 'hunt after new fashions' was not only frivolous, commentators thought, but a threat to economic order."[70] The spread of 'fine clothing' to women outside the court led to the perception of competition among them, which commentators envisioned as requiring their husbands and fathers to waste "their substance and shut their ears to the pleas of the hungry poor."[71] Greater ease of access to new fashions and new modes of self-presentation would thus converge with social change and a fear of moral degradation to create the unique atmosphere in which old ideas around fashion were imbued with new meaning, and perhaps more importantly, new urgency.

---

[66] Paul Slack, *The Invention of Improvement: Information and Material Progress in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 257.
[67] Ibid, 257.
[68] Sue Vincent, "To Fashion a Self: Dressing in Seventeenth-Century England," Fashion Theory: 3:2, (New York: Routledge, 2015), 204.
[69] Ibid, 213.
[70] Eleanor Hubbard, *City Women: Money, Sex, and the Social Order in Early Modern London,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 176.
[71] Ibid, 176.

Social upheaval was nothing new, and certainly would not be sufficient reason to raise the issue of personal appearance to the forefront in this manner on its own. However, the implications and consequences of the revolution were far-reaching, even if the Commonwealth itself was short-lived. For Christopher Hill, one of these consequences was that the sexual revolution, a process that had been taking place over an expanse of time, saw “significant acceleration” and “attempts to transcend it.”[72] Hill locates the strict moral climate around sexuality as part of a broader battle against the tradition of property marriage, at least in part. He also argues that despite much of the extant law placing women in an inferior position to men, said position was “much better in fact than it was in theory” with “law not having caught up with economic change.”[73] He described the Protestant (and Puritan) ideal in marriage as follows: …a monogamous partnership, ostensibly based on mutual love, and a business partnership in the affairs of the family. The wife was subordinate to her husband, but no slave. The abolition of the monasteries and nunneries symbolizes the replacement of the celibate ideal (…) by the concept of chastity in marriage.”[74] This was not, however, a sexually permissive period as some have suggested, and Hill did not attempt to over-exaggerate this improvement in status.[75] While he notes that some Puritans did attempt to do away with old double standards, he accepts that sexual freedom “tended to be for men only,” – in part due to the lack of birth control.[76] However, improvement in women’s status and the potential for women to claim even more independence for themselves did not come without controversy, and that is perhaps where Hill’s “Puritan sexual revolution” most closely connects to the broader question of fashion. The perception that old standards were being flouted drew an almost inevitable counter-attack, and with sexual morality viewed as such a real and visible quantity, personal appearance became the site for that attack.

---

[72] Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English* Revolution, (London: Penguin Group, 1991), 307. Originally published in 1972.
[73] Ibid, 308.
[74] Ibid, 306.
[75] Though the period may not have been permissive in practice, it is worth noting that there was a general conception on the part of moralists that it had become dangerously so, at least in terms of the popularity of subversive or illicit fashions. The perception of a problem remains significant, even if it was exaggerated.

This fear for the safety of old norms and institutions, though pronounced during the revolutionary period, was not an entirely new story, and when it comes to the subject of personal appearance perhaps the most important site of anxiety rested in accepted gender roles and divisions. As Susan Amussen and David Underdown note, “A pervasive anxiety about unruly women and their male counterparts, failed or ineffective patriarchs, haunted early modern society.”[77] Of note to Amussen and Underdown were such problems as illegitimate children, subverting notions of deference and submission, as well as witchcraft.[78] Though not directly related to anxieties around women’s dress during the Commonwealth, they do share some common ground: most importantly, the perception (whether real or imagined) that there was a “collapsing patriarchal order” which in turn led to “a prevailing uneasiness about gender relations in early modern England.”[79] Furthermore, Amussen and Underdown note that the civil war and the revolution “literally turned the world upside down”, recognizing the unique nature of the period: “The challenges to the social and political order meant that an upside down world was not a metaphor, but a reality to be experienced."[80] They also raise an important point regarding the deadline of these long-running fears of inversion: though they were never banished entirely, fears around a "world upside down" were stripped of much of their power following the Restoration.[81] The Commonwealth thus represents something of a peak for concerns around a breakdown in gender hierarchy and behaviour, understandable given the convergence of so many complicating factors: the revolution and its legal and social consequences, the rise of radical, or at least alternative, religious sects, as well as the changing nature of the economy must all be recognized as key factors.

---

[76] Ibid, 319.
[77] Amussen and Underdown, *Gender, Culture and Politics in England,* 5.
[78] Ibid, 5.
[79] Ibid, 5.

Perhaps the best place to start in attempting to bring all of this together is merely to examine John Taylor's famous pamphlet, the very same invoked by Amussen, Underdown, and Hill for its imagery of a world upside down. Here, Taylor makes no secret of his disdain for the rapid change upon England. "The Picture that is Printed in the front / Is like this Kingdome, if you look upon't / For if you well doe note it as it is / It is a Transform'd Metamoprhasis. This Monstrous Picture, plainely doth declare / This land (quite out of order) out of square."[82] The picture in question is naturally an extreme exaggeration, but it does help to provide an illustration of just how tumultuous, and no doubt confusing, this period was.[83] For Taylor, the problems plaguing England were many: rebellion, murder, sin, confusion, and inversion throughout. It is also blatantly political: "When men more Brutish then the Horse or Mule / Who know not to obey, presume to Rule / Thus Church and Common-wealth, and men, all are / (Much like the

---

[80] Ibid, 8.
[81] Ibid, 8.
[82] John Taylor, *Mad fashions, od fashions, all out fashions, or, The emblems of these distracted times*, 1642. A2.
[83] This picture depicts a man with his clothes worn upside down, with the world upside-down: fish roam the sky, and a horse stands up on two legs. It is deliberately exaggerated and bizarre, but provides a good representation of the sense of disorder Taylor was writing about.

Picture) out of frame or square."[84] It is important to recognize that this was in part a political document, and Taylor was certainly of a mind to reject the new government, viewing the initial revolt as an immense wrong and an inversion in itself. However, the most important feature of the pamphlet is the profound sense of uncertainty and unfamiliarity he was left with towards England itself. He continued, "For *England* hath no likelihood, or show / Of what it was but seventy yeeres agoe / Religion, manners, life and shapes of men / Are much unlike the people that were then / Nay England's face and language is estrang'd / That all is Metamorphis'd, chop'd and chang'd."[85] The very face of England had been transformed, inverted and corrupted until, as he indicated, "*Great Britanne turn'd to Amsterdam*."[86] This inversion was political, social, and religious, and extended to the realm of gender and by extent into personal appearance. If, as Taylor contended, "The Picture is the Emblem of the Times," then the anxieties made evident in popular print throughout the Commonwealth period are even more understandable.[87]

The seventeenth-century was thus a period of rapid change throughout England, and the revolutionary years which encompassed both the Civil War and the subsequent Commonwealth marked a unique and tumultuous period. It was within this context that old concerns came to the forefront in new ways, and seemingly standard arguments gained new meaning. As Taylor's pamphlet emphasized, and no doubt exaggerated, it seemed as if society itself was being transformed into something new and unfamiliar. Old norms were subverted and old ideas turned on their head. There was the sudden breakdown of old political hierarchies, and the fear that the same had occurred within the social order. There was religious uncertainty, the rise of a more radical strain of Puritanism, the appearance of numerous sects in dispute with one another, some of which would go on to fan the flames of inversion and change. Through it all, the ever-present threat of Catholicism continued to haunt the imaginations of many writers. With significant social change, legal change, economic growth and the perception of consistent moral breakdown, it is clear why to so many the world around them would seem to unfamiliar. Even where this breakdown didn’t exist in practical terms, the perception of a society being swept up until uncertainty had major implications for the moral debates that formed the backbone of the culture war. Taylor no doubt exaggerated, but exaggeration was standard in the print culture of the Commonwealth – and even if moralists and pamphleteers can be accused of having an unfair or even inaccurate estimation of the times they were living in, those attitudes remained a driving force in their writing.

---

[84] Ibid. A3v.
[85] Ibid. A3v.
[86] Ibid. A3v.
[87] Ibid. A4v.

It is in this context, of a society mired in uncertainty, change, and turmoil that the issue of personal appearance came to occupy an important place in the ongoing discourse, and in the process, gained new relevance. These interconnected issues will thus be considered together in order to provide the lens with which to examine contemporary sources, from moral tracts and proscriptive literature, to poems, sermons, and recorded plays. These sources were diverse and plentiful throughout the period, but do not come without their own weaknesses: while ballads and pamphlets may have been experienced by a broader portion of society, moralist literature may not have been quite as widely read. This is difficult to gauge, but no doubt some sources can be regarded as more ‘popular’ than others. However, even longer tracts directed more towards the ongoing conversation than the general public remain important when considering the ongoing culture war, and the position of personal appearance within it. Many of these sources will be narrowly focused on the question of appearance, but in most cases it appeared as one small piece in a larger critique against the direction of society. Though personal appearance was not always the central issue in the eyes of moralists and pamphleteers, its importance to the ongoing culture war should not be understated.

By the time of the seventeenth-century, critiques against personal appearance on the grounds of modesty or godliness were well-trodden. These were tired and familiar topics which might not merit much interest at first glance. However, with questions of morality pushed to the forefront, so too were questions of behaviour, performance, and self-presentation. Though the critiques that appeared throughout the Civil Wars and Commonwealth were often familiar in content to those that preceded them, it would be incorrect to view them as a mere continuation. Rather, the attitudes displayed towards the connected topics of dress, cosmetics, and the wearing of hair must be considered in accordance with the unique atmosphere of the period. Many of these publications were framed within the ongoing political disputes between Parliamentarians and Royalists, but this dynamic does not accurately capture the nature of the debate – nor do the religious divisions that came alongside it. Throughout the period, commentators grew increasingly concerned around appearance, recognizing it as an important reflection of morality and behaviour. Undoubtedly, Puritans appear as some of the most important voices due to their focus on moral reformation, and that undoubtedly had an effect on the trajectory of the discourse as a whole.[88] However, this was not a Puritan moment, nor do attitudes towards personal appearance during this period merely reflect this campaign of moral reformation, or the strict moral climate it aimed to foster. Rather, despite a culture war waged between multiple sides, there emerged a sort of unity in outrage about subversive fashions. Though commentators may have pictured themselves as being in constant disagreement, in practice they shared a desire to restore order and similar moral values where they had been perceived as lost, and to solve the problem of a social climate that seemed to have become far too permissive and illicit.

---

[88] Randall J. Pederson, *United in Diversity: English Puritans and the Puritan Reformation, 1603-1689.* (Leiden: Brill Academic, 2014), 71.

I. The Wearing of Hair

Hair was a long-standing source of concern in early modern England, with roots well before the religious and social change that marked the seventeenth-century. Men and women alike were expected to meet specific standards for the length and style of their hair, consistent with the religious and moral context of the period. The perception that there existed widespread failure to meet these standards naturally led to chastisement in popular literature, along with instructional tracts and sermons. The Civil War and the Commonwealth that followed saw an outpouring of moralist literature across almost every topic, and fashion trends that subverted the religious ideal continued to be a source of consternation for writers. While much of the extant secondary literature on the period was focused on the debates between Parliamentarians and Royalists, imagining their publications as part of a larger conflict, the picture becomes much muddier when one examines personal appearance. Religious ideology and interpretation continued to take centre stage as writers sought to cope with the period's social issues, arguably more-so than political divisions or affiliations. However, despite the apparent objective of the new government to engage in a campaign of moral reform, the nature of these documents remained largely consistent with the earlier seventeenth-century. In addition, the arguments contained within popular print around the subject of hair were remarkably consistent across writers from different political and religious motivations. These prominent divisions were no doubt a primary concern for many writers throughout the period, yet their arguments on the topic of personal appearance suggest that much of their anxiety was genuine. Despite the ongoing culture war, it was an urgency to counteract social breakdown and fear of a (perhaps imagined) permissible moral climate that most defines the attitudes towards hair in popular print throughout the Commonwealth.

In order to properly examine the topic of hair, it is first necessary to contextualize the religious background around which most moralists framed their arguments. Undoubtedly the most important single passage for moralists at the time on this subject came from Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians. Here, he wrote: "Judge in your own selves; is it comely that a woman pray to God uncovered? Doth not even nature teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is shame unto him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering."[89] The importance of Paul's first epistle in the Commonwealth period should not be understated: it is through his passages that many of the arguments around hair standards find their basis. This most obviously connects to the standard of men wearing their hair short and women wearing their hair long, but these ideas steadily transformed with the context of the times. In the Commonwealth period, the stylings applied to hair became increasingly connected to these earlier conceptions around length. One example of this can be seen through the writings of Thomas Hall a Presbyterian minister with specific loyalties to Puritan rule, who provided an altered version of a passage in Isaiah.[90] Here, he described the punishment of the daughters of Zion with specific detail of the stylings of their hair, which resemble those same styles that frequently appeared as problematized practices in contemporary literature. These included, "frizzling, crisping, curling, laying out their haire, their perukes, the hanging down of their lockes or tuftes…"[91] These were only a handful of the practices that were viewed as distasteful to moralists and religious commentators alike, and along with such issues as false hair, dyed hair and adorned hair, form practices that were increasingly perceived as markers of immodesty and lust. Paul's epistle also likely helped inspire the more extreme Puritan ideal in male hair, which was cut "round and plain."[92] However, while many Puritans did indeed adopt this style, Aileen Ribeiro notes that throughout the 1640s and 1650s, men's hair in fact grew "even longer and more luxuriant."[93] This forms one of the defining aspects of this period, as it relates to personal appearance: at the same moment as expectations of high moral standards and modest appearance grew from a society that had only recently experienced revolution, the practical reality of the situation seemed to chart a different course: fashion was shifting at its usual, feverish pace, without regard to the concerns made clear in popular print. This likely only helped to further agitate moralists, already concerned with the social breakdown they perceived around them.

---

[89] 1. Cor. 11:13-15.

[90] C.D. Gillbert, "Thomas Hall," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2015).

[91] Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, 171. Frizzling, crisping and curling all imply curling of the hair. The main difference is that frizzling indicates "small crisp curls," crisping indicates "short stiff curls", while curling appears to have been a more general term. The practical differences between these are usually unimportant for contemporary moralists.

While both men and women found themselves routinely chastised for inappropriate hair styles and length, the exact proscriptions they faced were – as noted – considerably different. Consequently, they were often contrasted against one another within larger arguments around personal appearance. John Trapp, a clergyman and writer active in some Puritan circles[94], echoed Paul's epistle when he drew his own comparison in his 1647 work: "Long hair in women is a token of modesty. But modesty grows short in men, as their hair grows long."[95] Here, he acknowledged the seemingly reversed standards and connects them to the pervasively-important quality of 'modesty'. Thomas Hall corroborated this connection between hair length and modesty in a 1654 publication. He identified hair as a marker of excess pride, noting that it was "very predominant in this licentious age."[96] This notion of a 'licentious age' connects to the broader perception of social breakdown, whether or not the period really could be defined as such in any fair terms. John Bulwer, a writer and medical practitioner, joined the array of voices in argument against long haired men and short haired women, imagining the issue as one of distinction between the sexes, in one of his key publications from 1653, noted for having a more pointed moral focus than his other works.[97] For Bulwer, there was a very clear delineation between what was acceptable for men and women, and to blur these lines would risk a situation where "one Sex cannot be known or distinguished from another." [98] Furthermore, he described the wearing of long hair by men as, "repugnant to Nature, against her Law (…) and against the order of Nature."[99] Bulwer also opted to take his argument in a distinctly racial direction as part of this broader description of what was and was not 'natural', writing that, "The Getae also and Barb'rous Indians, are condemned for never cutting nor regularing their Haire, as suffering themselves to enter into a nearer alliance with Beasts than ever Nature intended, who hath made Man more smooth and nothing so hairy as they are." [100] While these arguments fused together racial and religious elements, there were practical considerations raised as well. Of note, there was a fear that long hair would lead to the growth of lice and dandruff – although there does not seem to be much consideration for whether the same would be true for women.

---

[92] Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, 185.
[93] Aileen Ribeiro, *Dress and Morality*, (Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2003), 86.
[94] Ann Hughes, "John Trapp", (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2016). Trapp is noted by Hughes as having discussed sermons and exchanged manuscripts with other important figures in Warwickshire, namely Samuel Clarke and Thomas Dugard.
[95] John Trapp, *A commentary or exposition upon the four Evangelists, and the Acts of the Apostles*, 1647, 161.
[96] Thomas Hall, *Comarum akosmia*, 1654, sig. B.

Although it is helpful to be able to consider the position of the author in many publications, the Commonwealth period saw an abundance of anonymous literature as well, much of which cannot be reasonably ignored. In one example, an anonymous pamphleteer attempted to explain the differences between long hair in men and women by holding them in contrast to one another. In a work entitled *Seasonable Advice from the Ancient Separation to All*, originally released in 1650, the writer drew upon Paul's ever-important first epistle in order to connect standards around hair in with a broader argument about men and women's respective roles in the perceived, natural order. The pamphleteer wrote, "there was nothing in the body or souls whereof the Man or his Wife might be ashamed: for the Man was the glory of God, the Woman the glory of the Man, because she was created in subjection to him, and her hair was given her as the sign thereof."[101] By framing long hair as a sign of a woman's subjugation to her husband, the writer then argued that for men to wear long hair was a "breach of God's Order" and a "sinful shame", as to wear the hair long would be an attempt to make it "serve for the use God gave Woman's long hair for, to wit, to cover Her Face."[102] This again reiterated the importance of hair as a sort of natural covering for women, so much so that it should be the only use of long hair – and thus, only worn by women. This pamphleteer took it a step further by suggesting that due to the Fall, women were in fact responsible for covering their hair with a veil. They wrote, "… So that it becomes not modest Women to have their hair uncovered; but if they regard not the habit of civility, and will go with their Hair uncovered, by their so doing they declare to all that see them, that they are of the number or rank of such Women who are under their Husbands charge for dishonesty."[103] As with most publications on this topic, these arguments were made with constant reference to biblical passages, and in this respect reflect the degree to which fashion and appearance was always held in strict regard to religious principles. This is far from unique: rather, most proscriptive and prescriptive literature targeted against modes of personal appearance were based upon, or at least leveraged, religious arguments. This might lead one to assume that the conflict between different, competing religious sects during the

---

[97] Graham Richards, "John Bulwer", (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2015).
[98] John Bulwer, *The Artificall Changling*, 1653, 60.
[99] Ibid, 60-61.
[100] Ibid, 59-60. The Getae were Thracian tribes around present-day Romania. Invoking them in this argument is likely meant to connect long hair to the conception of "barbarians" in ancient Greek and Roman sources.

---

[101] Anonymous, *Seasonable Advice from the Ancient Separation to all, especially to the professors of this backsliding age,* 1650, 1.
[102] Ibid, 2.
[103] Ibid, 3.

Commonwealth would appear commonly as a result, but this does not appear to be the case. Rather, arguments about personal appearance appear in lockstep with one another. When commentary targeted at religious or political divisions does appear, it usually offers little in the way of variation on the proscriptions themselves.[104]

With the understanding of a fundamental, spiritual difference between appropriate hair length and style for men and women appearing so widely accepted amongst writers, any attempt to subvert these expected standards could be viewed as dangerous. To that end, some publications attempted to highlight the threat of a sort of 'change' taking place for men who opted to wear styles deemed feminine. William Prynne was among the voices that weighed in on this topic. Although a somewhat complicated figure, Prynne was undoubtedly of Puritan sympathies during the Civil Wars and Commonwealth, and his moral commentaries appear particularly striking.[105] In work predating the period in 1628, he wrote: "our Masculine, and more noble race, are wholy degenerated at metamorphosed into women; not in Manners, Gestures, Recreations, Diet and Apparel lonely, but likewise in the Womanish, Sinfull, and Unmanly, Crisping, Curling, Frounding, Powdering, and nourishing of their Lockes, and Hairie excrements, which they place their corporall Excellencies, and chiefest Glory."[106] The implication here is clear: that hairstyles considered excessive (described as "Effeminate, Proud, Lasciuous, Exorbitant, and Fantastique") draw the wearer dangerously close to the female.[107] Although any long hair could be viewed as a problem on its own, Prynne's attention is especially on the practice of wearing a love-lock, something which drew particular ire at the time. This usually implied wearing the hair long enough that one side could be draped over the shoulder so that it would rest over or near the heart For Prynne, this is not only effeminate, as already described, but distinctly foreign and unchristian. To this effect, he wrote, "What, did ever any of our English Ancestors; did ever any Christians in former Ages; did ever any Saints of God, that wee can heare, or read of, weare a Locke? Or Frizzle, Powder, Frounce, Adorne, or Deck their Haire?"[108] This appears, in part, to be a call to tradition against an encroaching sense of social change, something which ties in rather clearly to the broader sense of social breakdown and uncertainty prevalent throughout the period.

---

[104] There were some variations such as greater permissiveness towards shows of wealth, and conversely hostility to the practice of 'dressing up' on the part of Royalists, as well as a stricter tone and sense of urgency on the part of Puritans. However, the moral failings that moralists identified during this period appear to be largely shared, even when called upon during political attacks.

[105] William Lamont, "William Prynne," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2011).

[106] William Prynne, *The unlovelinesse of love-lockes*, 1628, 3.

[107] Ibid, 7.

Of course, tradition is only one side to Prynne's argument, as he went on to frame it more directly as a religious one when he highlighted excess concern for one's hair as a sign that the wearer was too devoted to worldly concerns. Most importantly, he stated, "all things are not yet sincere, and right within them, because their out-sides are so Vaine, so Proud, Fantastique and Unchristian: and that their claime to Christ, is merely counterfeite, because his Graces, Stampe, and Image shine not in them, but the Worlds alone."[109] As with many Puritan writers in the early and mid-seventeenth-century, Prynne did not only argue that these spiritual issues carried deeply personal consequences, but took this argument to a greater extreme. In concluding his work, he called for those partaking in these fashions to be "recalled from these ways of Sinne" which are likely to "lead both them, and us, unto destruction."[110] This sense of urgency on a large scale may be one of the most significant differences between what may be identified as Puritan works and those from other religious sects. It is worth noting that in the conduct book *Youths Behaviour*, hair was originally noted only briefly as a topic in itself, focused on the wearing of bands in the hair or beard.[111] However, in the translator's additions to the work in 1650, an entire section was added on the wearing of wigs and powdered hair. This is noteworthy as, despite appearing to be a relatively standard conduct book, *Youths Behavior* was originally a French work, translated by Francis Hawkins, an English Jesuit. [112] Furthermore, Hawkin's own additions to the 1650 edition of the work include an entire section on the wearing of wigs and powdered hair. This section, described as a letter to a friend, argues for a "honest course linen" covering for the head, but there is no serious proscription against the practice: it is problematic, but not for the same spiritual reasons as seen commonly in other moral tracts of the period.[113] More often, works fell in line with the general tone of Prynne, though not always with the prevailing sense of urgency with which he wrote. It is apparent through a writer like Prynne that there was a distinct Puritan style, even on the topic of personal appearance, but this style does not necessarily imply a significant difference in the actual content of their arguments. There were differences, but they were usually of scale or style, with room for minor variation on certain social elements such as wealth. As if to illustrate this point, the second edition of *Youths Behaviour* was published by Robert Codrington, a noted Puritan.[114]

---

[108] Ibid, Preface.
[109] Ibid, Preface.
[110] Ibid, Preface.

Despite the consistency between writers of different religious and political backgrounds, there was some sense that speaking out against the problematized hair practices would be enough to mark one as a Puritan in the period prior to the Commonwealth. Certainly, this was Prynne's viewpoint as he wrote in his earlier work *Histriomastix,* published in 1632: "To speake or write against means wearing of perewigges, Love-lockes, and long haire, together with the effeminate frizzling, pouldring, and accurate nice composing of it (…) are eminent characters of a branded Puritan."[115] This statement was one small portion of a much larger critique against the theatre, and potentially the court, during which he outlined a number of different areas of critique that led to the labelling of 'Puritan' by critics. These includes other practices such as abstaining from stage plays, to condemning mixed dancing, gambling, drunkenness, prostitution, and other perceived social ills. While in some instances these practices were already looked down upon, certainly in the case of the last three, distaste for ongoing fashion trends was arguably more widespread, at least outside of the court. He also made comment on women's hairstyles in the same statement, including the "whorish" practices of "frizzling, broydring, pouldring, dying, plaiting, with their late impudent mannish, that I say not monstrous cutting and shearing of their haite; and their false borrowed excrements."[116] Although his arguments may not have been as unpalatable as he seems to have believed, at least until coupled with the broader political implications of his publication, he attempted to contrast this with what he views as the more positive traits that typified those that were "branded" Puritan: these included: "…to live righteously, soberly and godly in this present evill world, crucifying the flesh with the affections and lusts thereof; avoiding, destesting all sinne and wickedness whatsoever in ones self…"[117] Within this argument, he highlighted many of the ills he viewed as plaguing England as working alongside eachother: "sinfull fashions, customes, disorders, lusts or courses" to "Pagan rites."[118] Prynne's work was undoubtedly laced with political arguments, and it was certainly perceived in this light at the time. However, while he leveraged personal appearance as a political attack, it remains noteworthy that the actual content of his attacks against lust and 'sinful fashions' remained largely consistent with those throughout the rest of the moralist literature – as did his concern over the spiritual health of the nation.

---

[111] Francis Hawkins, *Youths Behaviour,* 1644.
[112] Roberta Anderson, "Francis Hawkins," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004).
[113] Hawkins, *Youths Behaviour,* 52. Although Hawkins' argument isn't as directly religious as most other examples provided, it isn't easy to separate any notion of modesty from its spiritual context.
[114] Roberta Anderson, "Francis Hawkins," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004). Although this second edition was published after the Restoration, it remains significant given the stark religious divide between Catholics and Puritans.

---

[115] William Prynne, *Histriomastix: The Player's Scourge, or Actor's Tragedy*, (1632). 799-800. Prynne was well-aware that the term Puritan has largely been leveraged as an insult during this period. This is one major reason why the term has been somewhat disputed in the past, but Prynne's defense seems to turn the insults around to frame those branded as Puritan as being largely in the right on moral issues, including those pertaining to personal appearance. In practice, non-Puritan moralists spoke out against many of the practices Prynne noted here.

[116] Ibid, 799-800.

[117] Ibid, 801.

[118] Ibid, 801.

The political slant to Prynne's commentaries on personal appearance is also evident in the form of his poem, *A Gagge for Long Hair'd Rattle-Heads*. Published in 1646, this work targeted Cavalier culture much more pointedly through highlighting the popular length and stylings of their hair. As with his previous comments on the wearing of hair, he drew a direct association to both religious principles as well as tradition. He wrote, "…that Ruffians should poli'd be // So that part of their ears might visibly // Appeare, and lockes not overcloud their eye. // Hence our Archbishop Anselme in the dayes // of William Rufus did deny alywaes // His blessing, Ashes, the Sacrament // To long-haired youngsters, till they did repent // And cut their wanton lockes…"[119] . By focusing on the figure of Archbishop Anselme and his supposed denial of the sacrament to the long-haired, Prynne does appear to make comment on the actual practice of religion, seemingly celebratory towards the figure of Anselme. Whether or not his claims about the Archbishop were accurate or not isn't overly important: rather, Prynne's seeming praise of denying basic religious rites on the basis of hair length and style provides a stark example of just how serious a problem this presented in his estimation. In addition, this work provides a good example of how Prynne and others tended to fuse political, moral, and spiritual issues together into a single critique. As per the norm, religion forms the most important component of his argument, but this cannot be easily removed from the social and political context of the time. Prynne himself may be a rather extreme example of this, but it is evident that he was taking aim at his opponents quite directly throughout his work. Another instance of this was when he wrote: ‘Rattle-heads’ had “more haire than wit” and “pride their Locks above their heads, Soules.”[120] Clearly, this statement was direct and political, along with most of the poem itself. However, it is noteworthy that he took aim at the perceived immorality and trespasses committed by the Cavaliers: he leveraged common, and quite unremarkable sentiment around the wearing of hair, in order to make both a political attack and a moral statement. He also reaffirmed the gendered aspect to the subject, something which also remained constant throughout much of the contemporary literature, by referring to them as having “hair like women, to their infamy.”[121] This echoed the common fear that men’s beauty practices were too feminine, and thus ultimately an affront to nature itself.

---

[119] William Prynne, *A Gagge for Long-Hair'd Rattle-Heads who revile all civill Round-Heads*, 1646, 1.

It is worth noting that the rise of concerns around men somehow becoming more female, or the reverse, may have resulted in part from the uncertainty that the period cast upon standard gender norms. David Underdown notes this in his discussion of *The Man on the Moon*, a deeply conservative text which he describes as consisting of mostly “unoriginal ideas.”[122] While *The Man on the Moon* isn’t a piece centered on personal appearance, it does share some similarities to the texts discussed throughout this chapter. Namely, that it offered long-standing ideas in the face of upheaval. As Underdown stated, the arguments within that publication were made within “the context of assumptions about an eternal, divinely ordained frame of cosmic order, at a time when those assumptions were being challenged by an armed, revolutionary minority, and by women as well as men who had broken free from traditional patriarchal constraints.”[123] The minority to which Underdown is most directly referencing here are the Levellers, a group that he warns should not be ignored: to do so, he stated, is to "miss the very essence of the English revolution."[124] In a later work, Underdown and Amussen further build upon this, highlighting the period as "the world turned upside down", consistently threatened by various forms of inversion, "in theatre, carnival, and festive activities, but also in daily life and in politics."[125] Fear of "unruly women" and "ineffective patriarchs" was a constant fear in early modern England, as they note.[126] However, it was the Civil Wars and the subsequent Commonwealth which gave rise to this "world turned upside down."[127] In these uncertain and tumultuous times, the threat of inversion and (at least for Prynne) metamorphosis appeared to be particularly threatening.

---

[120] Ibid, 2.
[121] Ibid, 2.
[122] David Underdown, *A Freeborn People*, 111. *The Man on the Moon* is a fairly early text and not directly related to the topic of this thesis, but it does stand as a good example of the general process outlined here.
[123] Ibid, 111.

Although it is apparent that many of the contemporary concerns raised around proper behaviour and personal appearance were deeply-rooted and familiar by the time of the Commonwealth, that shouldn't be taken to mean that there was no change. As noted, fashion trends changed quickly – this, in turn, provoked new responses. Perhaps the most important new addition to debates around hair came in the form of the wig as popular fashion. For example, Thomas Hall saw fit to include an attack against the wearing of wigs in the very same publication in which he railed against long hair more generally. In this publication, he wrote that "Periwegs of false colour" were "condemned by Christ himself."[128] The anonymous 1650 pamphlet *Seasonable Advice* attempted to frame wigs with much the same negative connotation as it did long hair for men: just as long hair was meant as a cover for women, and thus unsuited for men, wigs were pictured as little more than a workaround for that rule. Here, the pamphleteer wrote, “But Professors instead of obeying the Lord in forsaking the vain conversation of the shame of Nature, that if their own Long Hair please them not, they can wear Perriwigs made of Womens Hair.”[129] Through this passage, wigs were connected to women’s intended styles not just through length, but through the insinuation that they were in fact fashioned from women’s hair themselves. The pamphlet continued, “How can such Preachers that adorn their Heads with the Hair or Excrements of Women, possess their Vessels in fancification and honour (…) Yea, how can such call God Father, when they fulfill the works of the flesh, and of the Devil.”[130] While this is just one pamphlet, it draws together a fair few trends that were ongoing in popular print at the time: the connection of long hair with women, already discussed, the sense that popular fashions were connected both to vanity and a kind of ‘falseness’, and perhaps more unique to the time, anxieties around hypocrisy in the personal appearance of religious leaders – in particular, Puritans.

---

[124] Ibid, 111.
[125] Amussen and Underdown, *Gender, Culture and Politics in England,* 1.
[126] Ibid, 5.
[127] Ibid, 5.
[128] Ribeiro, *Dress and Morality,* 86.

This sense of hypocrisy appeared frequently in critiques of Puritan leaders and preachers. As noted, there was a ‘Puritan standard’ for hair which called for it to be cut short and worn in a modest style. While there were several extreme voices on the subject of hair, some of which have been detailed already, others took a more modest stance. As Ribeiro indicates, while excessively long hair was not tolerable in any circumstance for men, few were expected to cut their hair to that Puritan standard.[131] Even many Puritans, including ministers and political leaders, bucked that expected standard and kept their hair at collar length, opting to follow popular fashion trends rather than the strict standards many of their peers promoted. They were largely able to escape critique for this, but as historian Bernard Capp notes, they could face greater condemnation if they allowed it to grow much longer or adorned it too much.[132] John Gauden, a preacher, pointed out the hypocrisy of some ministers. It is worth noting that Gauden was known to be a political moderate, having defended the Church of England and argued for compromise with Presbyterianism throughout the 1650s. This provides some context for his work throughout this period.[133]

---

[129] Anonymous, *Seasonable Advice from the Ancient Separation to all, especially to the professors of this backsliding age,* 1650, 6.
[130] Ibid, 6.
[131] Ribeiro, *Dress and Morality,* 86.

> They sometimes wast that glasse and fill up their hour, with bitter invectives against Ladies painting, patching, curling, powdering, perfurming, and complexioning, which may have lesse evill in them than some authors they study, and not so much vanity attending them, as doth the long haire, the loose cuffes, the large bandstrings, and other fine things, which which some of these so rigid, yet very spruce and Ladylike preachers, think fit to gratifie as their own persons.[134]

While there may have been political reasons to raise this complaint, hypocrisy was the central issue at play and the focus of his attack, and in this he was not alone. Thomas Hall's work also attempted to emphasize the importance of religious leaders in setting an example, as he wrote: "We ministers are to be blamed for many of the exorbitances of our people; wither we reprove them not, or else by our evill example we harden them in their finne."[135] While the role of ministers in leading their communities is emphasized, he stated that his 'thesis' was to show that it is "unflawfull for any man ordinarily to wear Long Haire."[136] In this sense, he connected his rather broad attacks on hair, wigs and (as will be outlined later) other forms of fashion together as one coherent argument - that these forms of fashion are ultimately an offense against God, as it was "his word that condemnes" these practices.[137]

---

[132] Capp, *England's Culture Wars*, 177.
[133] Bryan D. Spinks, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. (2008)
[134] John Gauden, *A discourse of auxiliary beauty. Or artificiall handsomeness. In point of conscience between two ladies.* 1656. 178-179.
[135] Thomas Hall, *Comarum akosmia*, 1654, sig. B1v-B2.
[136] Ibid, sig. B3v.
[137] Ibid, sig. B4.

As noted, hair standards were effectively reversed between men and women. While men were expected to keep their hair short, usually meaning collar-length despite some efforts to go further than that, women were expected to keep their hair long in accordance with Paul's epistle. However, that was only one aspect: even with long hair, women could face constant disdain in popular print for a host of different, popular practices in hair styling. One such practice was the curling of hair, which literary scholar Edith Snook identifies as having been given a distinctly upper class meaning by authors such as Mary Wroth and Margaret Cavendish.[138] She writes, "hair can convey individual and cultural attitudes about class, gender, religion, age, politics and aesthetics. (…) it is a site of artificial intervention – colouring, curling, cutting, covering, and sculptural rearrangement."[139] While different practices were used to convey a certain social status, styles deemed excessive were not immune from criticism regardless of the social background of the wearer. One ballad provided an example of these critiques, albeit one meant to be humorous: "Curled locks are daily sold / to women for to wear / An ugly sight for to behold / to see them wear false hair."[140] Here, curled hair was mocked as false, in a broader ballad which ranted against a host of different practices, for men and women alike. This attack also drew similarities to attacks against wigs, through this invocation of falseness. There were considerable differences to note, however. Perhaps the most important once was the connection between personal appearance and sexual morality. Thomas Fuller, an author and historian from the period with links to the Church of England and the royalist cause, provided an example of this.[141] In his work from 1642, he connected the practices of crisping and curling, which he described as "making her (a woman's) hair as winding and intricate as her heart" alongside other practices such as painting and revealing clothing as indicating “whorish attire.”[142] For Fuller, this came as part of a broader description of what he identifies as a “harlot”, and represented just one of many examples of how women’s sexual morality was viewed as both public and immediately visible.

---

[138] Snook, *Women, Beauty and Power*, 115.
[139] Ibid, 178.
[140] Humphrey Crouch, *The downfall of pride*, 1656.
[141] W.B. Patterson, "Thomas Fuller", (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004).

Although many women were chastised for their choices in personal appearance, there are some examples of publications which attempted to highlight what could be considered exemplary behaviour in this area. One example of this was a ballad originating in the 1630s by Lawrence Price. On the subject of hair, it read, “First is her haire like threds of golden wyre / Upon her head is set a seemly tyre / Which doth protect / Which doth protect / Which doth protect her crimson cheeks from wind / From Titans heate and Boreas blasts unkinde.”[143] Though the connection here was not made implicit, it did reflect the broader expectation that women would wear their hair long. Though the argument here was that her hair was meant to ‘protect’ her from the weather more than cover her for clear, spiritual reasons (as seen in the more proscriptive moral tracts of the time) it does provide some comment on how these ideas could be come intertwined with the broader beauty standards of the period. While men’s fashion largely trended towards long hair, especially with the growing popularity of wigs and love-locks, fashionable hair for women was almost always long. Perhaps the main point of contention was in its stylings, with practices such as crisping and curling described earlier. Although much of the ballad was focused solely on her appearance, with each verse detailing a different part of this identified ‘compleate gentle-woman’, the connection between appearance and sexual morality was made clear near its conclusion. “Her will to chastite is so applid / Shee scornes ambition, lust, and hatefull pride / Whereby shee gaines / Whereby she gaines / Whereby she gaines good wil of great and small / Strong weak, high low, rich poore, they love her al."[144] Thus, while the ballad is intended to laud its pictured woman for her proper appearance, even this idealized figure cannot escape having her sexual morality described through her appearance choices. It was, regardless of perceived merit, a constant reality of how sexual morality was connected to personal appearance for women of all backgrounds.

---

[142] Thomas Fuller, *The holy state*, 1642, 358.
[143] Lawrence Price, *A Compleate Gentle-woman, Described by her Feature,* 1633. British Library – Roxburghe.

Another anonymous pamphleteer provided a good example of contemporary attitudes towards women's practices in hair wearing. Through a 1644 publication, this pamphleteer highlighted many of the noted, problematized practices through an argument that appears narrowly religious, even when compared with other moralists. Here, the writer made no qualms about how they viewed the period in which they were living, highlighting it as a time of numerous sins and ills:

> I have a long time sate down in my thoughts, to admire a while, to see the strain of the world, how that there is nothing wanting in them to make up their destruction, they will take paines to be drunk, to whore, to cozen, to lie, to steal, to murder, to be proud, and a thousand sins more, which they are faithfull unto him to do who raignes in them as a Prince, in all the Children of disobediences, yea, they would rather sink down presently into hell, then to leave one sin; and the reason is, because they walk according to the principles which rule in them.[145]

This implicated many residing in England at the time as irrefutable sinners, and provides yet another clear example of writers viewing the times they were in as somehow extraordinary, even before the onset of the Commonwealth proper. This does not, however, form the key of their argument. Rather, they stated that one of their main motivations in writing the pamphlet to begin with was that, "any godly man or woman would not live in known sin, if they knew it."[146] It was the view of this pamphleteer that godly men and women simply had not taken much notice to the "unflawfull" adorning of hair as a sin as such, and thus may be swayed away from it upon the revelation that it forms a sin in itself.[147] To this note, they targeted their work to "such whom it may concern, to accept these few lines, or short epitome, as the tenderings and earnings of my love unto all those that desire to live godly in this present evil world, and in their willing acceptation of it, will my love be requited."[148] Despite its harsh tone, this pamphlet is somewhat unusual in its positivity, leaning towards a mindset of being able to somehow rescue those participating in problematized practices, rather than simply condemning them.[149]

---

[144] Ibid.

[145] T.H., *A looking-glasse for women, or, a spie for pride*. 1644. Preface.

[146] Ibid, Preface.

Of course, while the pamphleteer may have framed their argument in more positive terms than other moralists, their justifications remained remarkably consistent. In the opening to their pamphlet proper, they described the adorning of hair as being a subversion of hair's intended purpose for women. They stated that it was unlawful for "any woman to go in any outward adorning of attire of haire, in laying it forth in any fashion whatsoever, under that seeming pretence of a covering, and that it was given to them for an ornament to deck themselves withal, which to say plainly, is but pride, and cometh from him who is the anchor of all sin."[150] However, this pamphleteer broke from some of the earlier sources in that they do not focus their argument around Paul's epistle (though it is certainly brought up, both implicitly and explicitly), but rather on a passage from Peter, which read, "Whose adorning, let it not bee that outward adorning, of plaiting the haire, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparell."[151] For the pamphleteer, this is a "direction by the Apostle, setting forth the carriage of a Christian woman in her outward adorning toward the gaining of an unbelieving husband."[152] Through this connection to marriage, the writer clearly indicated an understanding of the connection between sexual morality and personal appearance, and in fact leveraged it in the argument, where they described a scenario in which "those godly women that do use this outward adorning of (and) laying forth of the haire, a man can hardly know them from the women of the world."[153] Rather than being able to view a woman as 'godly,' the writer rather argued that such practices in hair provoked lust. This is drawn in direct opposition to this notion of godliness: "laying for the of the haire, or any such like outward adorning, it is a vain attire, it is of no substantiall use, but to please the fancy, it is so far from drawing men to see God in you by it, as it provokes them more to lust, by seeing such wear it."[154] Through this notion of godliness in appearance, the writer again returned to the standard fare of such proscriptive literature: though they forwarded some unique elements, their text retained the same traditional concerns that typified attitudes throughout popular print.

---

[147] Ibid, Preface.
[148] Ibid, Preface.
[149] In part, the absence of this sort of language from other moralist literature may have less to do with the redeemability of individuals engaging in illicit appearance practices, and more to do with the scope and intention of the publications themselves.
[150] Ibid, 1
[151] 1. Peter 3:3.

These constant references to scripture makes it clear that personal appearance was viewed as a religious issue almost unilaterally by moralists, preachers, and pamphleteers. This is perhaps an obvious point given the historical context of the period. However, it was also inherently gendered in its conception – something that cannot be divorced from the topic of religion itself. Though modern distinctions between gender and sex weren't made in the same way in the seventeenth-century, literary scholar Will Fisher noted the manner in which hair length was viewed to be a biological (natural) process for some writers.

---

[152] T.H., *A looking-glasse for women, or, a spie for pride*. 1644, 2.
[153] Ibid, 2.
[154] Ibid, 3.

Thomas Hall, for instance, highlighted that men could never grow their hair to the same length that women were capable. Fisher explains, “This does not preclude the possibility that some individual men might have longer hair than some individual women, but rather, it means that as a group, men’s hair would be shorter. In modern terms, we might say Hall is insisting that hair length is a sexual characteristic rather than a gendered one.”[155] While Fisher connects this to humoral theory, explaining that hair was believed to be grown from “moisture arising out of the body”, it was also the case that the natural world and the religious world were not always perceived to be separate in any meaningful way.[156] In this sense, descriptions of what was “natural” in men and women often fused with scripture to form an argument over the way things were and should be. Attempting to subvert this was thus a crime against nature, as noted in *The Artificall Changling*.[157] Through this, there was a notion that the problematized fashion trends in hair were in some way an example of the creation rebelling against the creator. *Youths Behaviour* reaffirmed the importance of going in accordance with nature in, with the passage, “Ever be modest in thy apparel, rather seeking to accommodate Nature, than curious(?) by Art to procure admiration: Cloaths may give thee ornament, but the judicious will never seek thy perfection on thy outside.”[158]

The concerns around the wearing of hair during the Commonwealth were long-standing, and aside from the introduction of wigs and some changing styles, appear to have remained largely consistent with earlier periods. As a result, much of the literature on the subject can appear highly repetitive. Despite differences arising between writers on specific interpretations of religious texts, on political grounds, or even mere styles, the proscriptions they offered remained largely consistent. Debates existed on the subject, but they were rarely related to the appearance practices themselves. It was a topic which had to be discussed, in part due to the perception of social and moral breakdown, and one which came to be included in political discourse: but it was not one which had much substantive disagreement. It was, however, viewed as vitally important. Through the lens of a commentator during the Commonwealth, it is apparent that practices around the wearing of hair were indicative of a person's standing, morality, and modesty, as well as their broader spiritual status. The most clearly political aspect to the subject came in the form of men's hair, such as with the connection between Cavaliers and long hair made by William Prynne. But even when these connections were drawn, writers frequently brought the discussion back to religion, positioning their arguments around the same sorts of doctrines, and arriving at very similar – or even the same – conclusions. The wearing of hair was a feature in England's culture war, but the exact proscriptions and arguments forwarded by writers were indicative of long-standing beliefs that far pre-dated the Commonwealth itself. The unique context of the period and fears around social and moral breakdown allowed concerns around the wearing of hair to form one small, but important part in a battle for England's soul: yet, in practical terms, this battle was marked by general agreement on many of the practical terms. As much as many of these publications can be connected to the contemporary culture war, to attempt to divide them into neat categories would do little but shroud the true complexity of the period's print culture.

---

[155] Will Fisher, *Materializing Gender in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 132.
[156] Ibid, 132.
[157] John Bulwer, *The Artificall Changling*, 1653, 60-1.
[158] Francis Hawkins, *Youths Behaviour*, 1644, 20.

II. Dress & Adornment

England had long been mired with contradictions when it came to personal appearance, and this hardly changed in the early seventeenth-century. The Civil War and the subsequent social and political turmoil that followed did much to set the tone for discussions around appearance in popular print but did little to change the exact expectations set upon individuals. Men and women alike were expected to present themselves as appropriately 'godly', while also dressing to their particular social status. For the rich, this could imply a need to display wealth through the visual of rich garments and adornments. However, this could in turn sabotage any attempt to adhere to the expectations of the time, as questions of vanity took center stage.[159] These displays of wealth could, in themselves, incite moralist outrage and contribute to the broader sense of social breakdown. This story is not unique to England, either: as Simon Schama indicates in his work on Dutch culture, "riches seemed to provoke their own discomfort, and affluence cohabited with anxiety."[160] This moralist outrage was, predictably, leveled towards both men and women, though the pressures placed upon them were different and noticeably inequal. It is rather clear that, almost without regard to status, women were placed under a greater degree of pressure to appear modest and godly in their appearance, ideas which contained inherent contradictions when compared to other expectations. For women, martial status played a particularly important role. However, as noted, these contradictions had a long life that stretched back well before the Revolution. The change here appears to be less in the form and nature of moralist critique against dress and adornment, but rather in severity and urgency, as in other modes of appearance. Dress was indeed an important focus for moral reformation, but the voices calling for this reformation were both numerous and diverse. The period can thus be typified more by the significant anxieties it unleashed in popular print, than by any specific shift in the norms and morals being promoted.

---

[159] Laurence, "Women, Godliness and Personal Appearance in Seventeenth-Century England, 71.

[160] Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 326.

While the expectations placed upon women were by no means new, care should be taken not to suggest that they were entirely uniform. Anne Laurence argues that women faced what she identifies as a “double bind”. This double bind is readily apparent in contemporary print, but she also highlights that this bind was particularly powerful in the case of Puritan women, who themselves faced particularly strict moral expectations. This double-bind relates most clearly to the issue of marriage, something which often dominated attitudes and expectations around women’s dress. She writes, “Excessive concern for personal appearance was reprehensible, but it was a wife’s duty to present herself in a way which would be a credit to her husband. Attitudes to women’s personal appearance in seventeenth-century England were informed by notions of godliness, comeliness, and fear of excessive display and pandering to men’s lust.”[161] The need to appear comely and godly, well-groomed and attractive for one’s husband, without appearing to be drawing other men into lust, could often present a rather difficult line to tread. With concerns around dress aggravated across all levels of society, the issue of lust appeared was raised with increasing prominence. This is most clear when it comes to the use of the disparaging term “whore”, which had long been a method for levying accusations of immorality against women.[162] Accordingly, it cannot be disconnected from any discussion of women’s dress in this period. Certainly, at the time, some variant of the phrase “whorish attire” was regularly levelled in critiques of women’s dress, only serving to highlight the greater burden placed on women in terms of their perceived sexual morality. However, both men and women would find themselves the targets of moral tracts decrying the fashions of the day, and as with the subject of hair, these critiques were often steeped in religious literature and biblical citation. The religious differences at play in popular print frame perhaps the most important divisions within the literature, yet it was the uncertainty and anxiety of a society still recovering from revolution, and seemingly in the midst of moral breakdown, that framed much of the discussion.

---

[161] Laurence, “Women, Godliness and Personal Appearance in Seventeenth-Century England, 71.

[162] It is worth noting that the term ‘whore’ was somewhat imprecise at the time. Although it was often used to refer to prostitution, it also served as a catch-all term to be levied against women perceived of participating in some form of sexual immorality.

According to historian Bernard Capp, "Dress was perhaps the most obvious site of conflict between reformation and wordly values."[163] At the same time that authorities had a clear conception of what sorts of attire were appropriate for certain individuals, usually predicated on gender and status, practical regulation was made "almost impossible to enforce" due to the "rapid pace of social mobility."[164] As Capp illustrates, the Commonwealth and its leadership "represented, at one level, a repudiation of styles deemed extravagant, foreign, or effeminate."[165] But attacks on dress came from both sides of the contemporary political debate: while Puritans featured temptresses and harlots as examples of female immorality, and railed against excess and vanity in men, Royalists had their own grievances. Much of the moralist literature from authors in general opposition to parliament is, at face value, remarkably similar in both tone and content to Puritan examples. However, there is an important difference to note here. Royalists tended to focus more on questions of social mobility: individuals across the political spectrum would have loathed to see a lower or middling individual dressing above their station, but their motivations for this were grounded in different, often opposing worldviews.[166] However, the results of these varied motivations were often arguments that possessed remarkable similarity in practice. In practical terms, much of the fashion throughout the Commonwealth borrowed heavily from the earlier seventeenth-century: while the popular image of the period features Puritans in pointedly underemphasized garb, this was not always an accurate representation.[167] As C. Willet and Phillis Cunnington outline in their description of seventeenth-century fashion, the reign of Charles I "encouraged greater refinement" with braid and lace replacing the "crude decorations of slashing and paning."[168] Though common conceptions might point to the rise of Puritanism swinging in the opposite direction with bleak fashions, Parliamentarians and other Commonwealth leaders often wore clothing which was "rich but grave."[169] Velvet, lace and expensive collars remained staples of fashion amidst the wealthy and influential throughout the period: though plainer styles of dress were certainly encouraged, and the popularity of more muted colours such as black did signal some change.[170]

---

[163] Capp, *England's Culture Wars*, 173.
[164] Ibid, 173.
[165] Ibid, 173.
[166] Ibid, 176.

The discourse around 'whorish attire' is perhaps one of the most important to grapple with, but this first requires context for the term 'whore'. Although this term was often used to refer to prostitution, that wasn't its sole definition during the seventeenth-century. Or at least, that wasn't its sole use. Rather, it featured commonly in arguments and attacks meant to highlight perceived problems in women's dress and behaviour. James Turner, a scholar of English literature and culture, described the effects of the term: he argues that applying to a woman the identifier of 'whore' "breaks down the exterior shell or honour and good fame that every citizen needed to maintain her social standing."[171] This is certainly nothing new in itself.

---

[167] C. Willet Cunnington and Phillis Cunnington, *Handbook of English Costume in the 17th Century*, (Boston: Plays, 1972), 11.
[168] Ibid, 11.
[169] Ibid, 11.
[170] Ibid, 11-12.
[171] James Turner, *Libertines and Radicals in Early Modern London: Sexuality, Politics, and Literary Culture, 1630-1685,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 5.

As historian Bernard Capp stated, building upon the work of Laura Gowing and Keith Thomas, "Men and women lived by different moral codes, their sexual behaviour 'incommensurably different' in its significance. Thus, it was quite common for a man to brand a female adversary not simply a whore, but *his* whore, confident that she alone would be damaged by his 'revelation'."[172] Both men and women would often leverage this sort of sexual language as part of attacks against other women. As Capp indicates, many of these attacks came during disputes that had little or nothing to do with sexual behaviour whatsoever.[173] In effect, female sexual honour was simply the easiest target available. While Capp and Gowing disagree on the subject of male sexual reputation, the purposes of the term whore are little debated.

It is evident through its frequent use in dispute that commentators were keenly perceptive of its strength as an insult, as well as a rhetorical device. That may in large part help to explain its frequent appearance in moralistic literature targeting female appearance. One writer at the time, Margaret Cavendish, identified the term as unique by contrasting it with the brand of "coward" for men: an insult which, though itself can be damaging, can hardly be said to possess the same damning connotations. Cavendish herself stands as a somewhat remarkable example as a writer who frequently published on topics including sex, gender, and politics. Her marriage to a Royalist commander suggest her political allegiance, though this is not necessarily crucial in understanding her viewpoint on personal appearance.[174] In her noteworthy 1651 work, completed during her time in Antwerp, she wrote:

> It is the greatest Dishonour for a Man to be called a Coward, for a Woman to be called a Whore; and nothing will satisfie a Man that is called a Coward, but the Life of him that doth it, so Tender is he of his Honour, and so Revengefull doth the Loss

---

[172] Bernard Capp, "The Double Standard Revisted: Plebian Women and Male Sexual Reputation in Early Modern England", *Past and Present* No. 162, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 70.
[173] Ibid, 70.
[174] James Fitzmaurice, "Margaret Cavendish", (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004).

> make him: But a Woman can give no Honourable Revenge; if she be disgraced with Words, she must onely mourn over her Loss of Honour; she may weep Funeral-tears over it, or curse or sigh for it; but when it is once Dead, it hath no Resurrection.[175]

While Cavendish argued for this comparison by stating that both represent the greatest possible dishonour to their respective sex, she identified that unlike men, women could not take any real revenge to correct the insult. This claim was certainly mostly true when Cavendish published this work, but this was not always the case – at least, not in all circumstances. In certain circumstances, the dissolved church courts noted earlier could allow women to bring suits to defend themselves against the accusation.

Martin Ingram argues that notions of "honesty" were of particular importance to women in the legal area, notions which were inextricably conflated with chastity at the time.[176] He highlights the prominence of female plaintiffs in sexual slander cases, which he explains as occurring due to two main reasons: firstly, the more serious stance on sexual morality, including adultery and fornication, taken with regards to women, and secondly, due to the "conventionally assigned passive, dependent, home-based roles" that women were allotted.[177] The accusation of 'whore' was one instance of sexual slander that women could have, at least in some circumstances, attempted to deal with through legal means. However, despite the fears of inversion and breakdown in the gender hierarchy pervasive throughout the period, this was likely untrue by the time of the Commonwealth itself. With the dissolution of these church courts, this recourse would no longer be available. That, along with the broader climate of moral reform, may have served to exaggerate the damaging nature of the term ‘whore’, to the extremes that Cavendish highlighted.

---

[175] Margaret Cavendish, *The World's Olio*, 1651. 148.

[176] Martin Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570-1640*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 303.

[177] Ibid, 302.

At the same time that legal recourse against sexual slander was becoming more difficult, moralists seemed increasingly concerned with this notion of ‘whorish attire’. In one case, this came as part of a larger call for sweeping new laws, mostly aimed as part of this larger campaign of moral reform. William Sheppard, himself a legal consultant to then-Lord-Protector Oliver Cromwell, envisioned the situation trending in the opposite direction, towards a more licentious moral climate. Rather than noting a lack of recourse against sexual slander, he aimed to harshen penalties against what he perceived as ‘whorish attire’. His primary grievance on this topic was: “… That there is no Law against lascivious gestures, wanton and filthy dalliance and familiarity, whorish attire, strange fashions, such as are breasts, bare shoulders, powdering, spotting, painting the Face, curling and shearing of the Hair, excels of Apparel in Servants and mean people.”[178] For this problem, he offered up a legal solution: Justices of the Peace would be able to bind those in offense to good behaviour, and those guilty of wearing “whorish attire” would be shamed through a notice posted on the door of her home until she reformed enough to wear “sober attire”.[179] It is worth noting that this was by far the only subject that Sheppard problematized. Rather, as Nancy Matthews explained, this work (*England’s* Balme) was in fact the “most comprehensive reform of English law and society published in the seventeenth century.”[180] This desire for greater legal restriction against women’s clothing was not unique, either. In discussing Sheppard’s text, Bernard Capp draws upon a “censorious journalist” who argued to a similar point.[181] The journalist in question advocated for a law preventing women from wearing jewels and gold or silver lace, and further wanted to give men "the legal right to brand as a whore any woman flouting that law."[182] Though neither Sheppard, nor this anonymous journalist's imagined new laws would ever be put into place, it is nonetheless noteworthy that they were argued for at all, particularly in the case of someone in a position of clear influence – even if Parliament as a whole may have been more hesitant. The sheer scale of Sheppard's suggestions for legal reform also hint to the broader sense of breakdown that permeated throughout the period, as well as to the sense that moral reformation was failing and thus required legal enforcement.

---

[178] William Sheppard, *England’s Balme: or, Proposals by way of grievance & remedy*, 1657, sig. M1v.

[179] Ibid, sig. M1v. Although Sheppard is vague on what he means by “sober attire”, he is likely referring to dress in a typical ‘modest’ style, possibly with the more muted colours that grew in popularity around this period.

[180] Nancy Matthews, *William Sheppard: Cromwell’s Law Reformer*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 145.

Perhaps predictably, much of the language around women's attire stems in part from interpretations of scripture. One example comes from the poet Richard Brathwaite. In a work published in 1652, resembling a conduct book in style, he identified the origin of 'impurity' and 'necessity' with the story of the Fall, and criticizes what he views as apparel not designed for practical purposes: "Was Apparell first intended for keeping in natural heat, and keeping out accidentall cold? How comes it then that you weare these thinne Cobweb attires, which can neither preserve heat, nor repell cold? Of what an incurable cold would these Butterfly-habits possess the Wearer, were pride sensible of herself?"[183] He continued, arguing that these shorts of thin attires and "Pye-coloured fopperies" were introduced purely out of vanity.[184] He argued that it was only after the Fall that humans ever felt necessity towards anything, and that this need was in itself turned to vanity. He wrote, "There is nothing in its owne nature so absolutely good, but it may bee corrupted: what was at first intended for some good use, if perverted, declines into some apparent abuse."[185] For Brathwaite, women should endeavor to dress themselves in comely and godly attire, something which would then reflect well upon them and in turn improve their lives. To that end, he wrote:

---

[181] Capp, *England's Culture Wars*, 173.
[182] Ibid, 173.
[183] Richard Brathwaite, *Times Treasury, or, Academy of gentry laying downe excellent grounds, both divine and humane, in relation to sexes of both kindes*, 1652. 272.
[184] Ibid, 272.

> Choice ornaments you cannot have to adorne you; nor any fashion that will better seem you. Where you walke, you may enjoy your selves freed from light eyes, gazing and admiring your vanity: your very habit is your Testate to witness for you: loose thoughts nestle not in your bosome, nor doe wandring distractions surprise your breast: you have learned to your highest solace, even in every motion, action, posture, gesture, to observe modesty, as an ornament of honour.[186]

But while some women may have adhered to Brathwaite's standards, the connection of what was seen as inappropriate dress to sexual immorality (and to the broader concept of 'whorish attire') remained constant. If one's dress was informed by, and possibly even a primary force in dictating, one's morality in the case of 'comely attire', then the reverse was certainly also the case. To that end, he wrote, "Unvaile many of our light Curtezans, whose brothel practice hath reft them of the ornament of a woman, and you will fine a strange Metamorphasis: *Venus armata* turn'd to *Venus calva*: Wee say there is no good congruity in a proud heart and a beggar's purse."[187] Clearly, for Brathwaite – and many of his contemporaries – women's attire was a source of consternation, and one which provoked a strong response.

The importance of utilizing clothing for purely practical purposes also featured into the works of Samuel Clarke, a puritan clergyman and philosopher. In the past, Clarke had found himself at odds with Church of England ecclesiastical authorities by refusing to wear the surplice in an early example of his developing non-conformist ideology.[188] This early stance connects rather cleanly to his later position on personal appearance, as he argued that the only apparel necessary was that which could "decently cover our nakednesse", "fence our bodies from the injury of the weather, and to put us in minde of sin."[189] In his publication, released in 1659, he contrasted this ideal against the sins that men and women alike perform with their clothing. First, he problematized wearing "which is not skins as Adams, but stately and costly beyond their rank."[190] This was a rather clear criticism of rich apparel donned by those of a lower social status. Although a well-established complaint in this sort of literature stretching back long before his period, economic change and social mobility in the city of London itself may have caused this to become an even more prevalent concern at the time – certainly, many of these publications were centered in, and distributed throughout, the city. His next complaint draws back more closely to this idea of sin and trespass. He wrote, "…while they take the liberty to disguise themselves in strange attire, and monstrous fashions, shewing no other hidden man of the heart but lightnesse, vanity, wantonnesse, and thralldom to every new-fangled fashion, for which the Lord threatened to visit the King's children."[191] Vanity and wanton behaviour are inextricably linked to concerns around excess in spending, and Clarke pointed out that much of the wealth spent on clothing might well be put to better use in providing clothes for "a number of the poor servants of Jesus Christ."[192] Excess in appearance was never particularly tolerable, at least outside of the bounds of royal courts, but it is through Puritan-minded writers like Clarke that the emphasis on godliness and "sobrietie" become the clearest.[193] It would be fair to suggest that many of the ideas espoused by Puritan writers on this topic were, in effect, continuations of old ideas funneled through a slightly different lens. According to Aileen Ribeiro, women "feature into Puritan demonology as a kind of satanic temptation, snares for unwary men."[194] These ideas, focused heavily on both the ability of dress to reflect the moral standing of the wearer, as well as on its supposed power to tempt into sin, form important pieces of contemporary Puritan thinking.

---

[185] Ibid, 273.
[186] Ibid, 273-274.
[187] Ibid, 272.

---

[188] Ann Hughes, "Samuel Clarke", (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004). The 'surplice' was a religious vestment worn by some clergy-members.

[189] Samuel Clarke, *Medulla Theologiae*, 1659. 2. This is a good example of how Puritan writers could appear more extreme than other moralists. Though his arguments against vanity and wantonness appear rather standard, he takes a particularly strict approach towards the purpose of apparel generally.

[190] Ibid, 2.

[191] Ibid, 2.

[192] Ibid, 2.

Other authors were more implicit in their association of different forms of attire with sexual immorality. Thomas Fuller, whose work was discussed with regards to hair, provided an entire chapter describing "the harlot" as part of a famous 1642 publication. He described this figure as "one that her self is both merchant and merchandise, which she selleth for profit, and hath pleasure given her into the bargain, and yet remains a great loser."[195] Though this may seem at first to be a passage targeted rather pointedly at prostitution, his description of the style of dress of these individuals (labelled under the familiar category of 'whorish attire') falls in line with broader complaints against contemporary fashions. Fuller makes no distinction between hair, dress and cosmetics in his own work, identifying 'whorish attire' as: "crisping and curling … painting, wearing naked breasts. The face indeed ought to be bare, and the haft should lie out of the sheath; but where the back and edge of the knife are shown, 'tis to be feared they mean to cut the fingers of others"[196] He conceded that not all who dress in this manner are who they, in his eyes, appear to be, but warned them away from these fashions all the same: "…yet the modesty and discretion of honest Matrons were more to be commended, if they kept greater distance from the attire of Harlots."[197] The risk of being mistaken for a 'harlot' also featured into the works of Arthur Jackson, a Presbyterian and royalist. In attempting to explain what appeared to be a disconnect between scripture and contemporary fashion, he described the use of the veil as a sign of modesty.[198] This was necessary as a verse in Genesis described a situation where a woman was mistaken for a prostitute because her face was covered.[199] The need to defend the veil in this way is telling in itself.

---

[193] Ibid, 2.

[194] Ribeiro, *Dress and Morality*, 171. These sorts of archetypes may appear with noted frequency in Puritan texts, but this is by no means exclusive: moralists and pamphleteers of other religious affiliations often called upon these tropes as well.

[195] Thomas Fuller, *The holy state*, 1642, 357.

[196] Ibid, 358.

In a later work released in 1658, Jackson was more specific about what he views as "wanton whorish attire" and it falls in line with the common tune: "crisped hair & naked breasts, an attire fit to entice men to uncleannesse, and which none therefore but harlots would wear."[200] In this work, Jackson also closely connected this perceived sexual immorality to specific sorts of fashions, as well as to a broader theme of disruption of gender hierarchy. He continued, writing: "She is loud and stubborn, her feet abide not in her house. By her loudnesse may be meant in generall, that she is ordinarily bold & free in talking, and that her tongue will be heard above all wherever she comes."[201] Thus, the 'harlot' upsets both social and religious norms by inappropriate dress, sexual immorality, and subsequent rebellion "against God & her husband."[202] This builds off of earlier interpretations of scripture in his work, one in which he described his imagined "whorish woman" in particularly strong terms: "the harlot, or whorish woman; whose heart is said to be snares and nets, because her heart is continually intent upon the designe of intangling mens affections, and is always full of manifold cunning frauds and devices, whereby to deceive, insnare and destroy men."[203] These sorts of critiques were rather common throughout the period, and fall under a rather old archetype: though the exact descriptions vary, women's dress was often envisioned as being harmful to men, usually through temptation and deception. This was not unique to religious literature either, and can be seen multiple times in the well-known pair of pamphlets, *The Nights Search*, by Humphrey Mill.[204] Here, the description is provided in verse: "With wanton postures, and with whorish tire // Unsav'ry speeches, stirring foul desire // In all their gestures. Some with lustful singing // Striv'd to enchant him, while their Lutes were stringing."[205] For the author Humphrey Mill, it was the almost enthralling designs of the immoral woman that tricked her partner into sexual trespass: the man largely lays blameless. This is a common theme throughout this sort of literature. In most cases, the worst crime the men in this equation will be charged with is a sense of foolishness in being tricked to begin with. It is also worth noting that in this description, which describes this sort of behaviour as sin without any room for error, Hell itself is identified as female: "Hell has her own again, with labour lost // And all her Factors are as often crost."[206]

---

[197] Ibid, 359.

[198] Arthur Jackson, *A Help for understanding the Holy Scripture*, 1643. 80.

[199] Ibid, 80.

[200] Arthur Jackson, *Annotations upon the five books immediately following the historicall part of the Old Testament*, 1658. 761.

[201] Ibid, 761.

[202] Ibid, 761.

Though these descriptions were generally targeted towards women of average means, the sort of common Londoners that readers would be able to easily imagine, critique was not restricted across status lines. It was also not devoid of weight in religious disputes at the time. Rather, the term 'whore' had become commonly applied to Catholics well before the

---

[203] Arthur Jackson, *A Help for understanding the Holy Scripture*, 71.

[204] George Thorn-Drury and Joanna Moody, "Humphrey Milll", (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004.) Thorn-Drury and Moody point out that *A nights search* is a "valuable contemporary discourse communicating several anxieties, all of which were essential concern to early modern society." These anxieties were no less pronounced by the time his work was given a second edition during the Commonwealth proper.

[205] Humphrey Mill, *The second part of The Nights Search*, 1649. 108.

[206] Ibid, 108.

Commonwealth period, and this was something that extended well into (and indeed, after) the revolutionary period. In her work, historian Frances Dolan describes the manner in which some notable Catholic women were attacked for being “Whores of Bablyon.” These included Catherine of Barganza, (importantly) Henrietta Maria, and Elizabeth Cellier, part of the “Whore of Babylon’s regime.”[207] In a similar vein to critiques against women disrupting gender hierarchy by being ‘unruly’ and ‘rebellious’ to their husbands, Catholic women were feared in public discourse for a similar reason. Dolan explains: “…stateswomen provoked anxiety not because they were unheard of but because they seemed to be on the rise. Their ascendance was associated with Catholicism; anticipating the restoration of the Whore of Babylon’s regime, bossy women were coming into their own.”[208] Additionally, Catholic women were perceived as being a threat to “lead their uxorious husbands astray through curtain lectures or wheedle them into deathbed confessions…”[209] Between censorious literature around ‘whorish attire’ and critiques of Catholic women, it is rather clear that women somehow shirking, circumventing, or becoming authority featured as common fears within the seventeenth-century, and especially during the turmoil of the Commonwealth.

Although there was no real comparative term to ‘whore’ to level as an insult against men, as Margaret Cavendish pointed out, it would be unfair to suggest men were not themselves under pressure with regards to dress. Although critique on grounds of sexual immorality was a primary feature of the discourse around women’s dress, men were focused on much more narrowly for issues of pride, vanity and excess.[210] To that end, conduct books were a popular form of print throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and men were frequently the targets (and the target audience). Although these were highly varied, they could include topics ranging from "dress, address and demeanour, table manners, modes of conversation, and, sometimes, letter writing."[211] A good example of a conduct book aimed towards a male audience was the previously-noted *Youths Behavior*. Originally published in the 1640s, it was republished in 1651 with an epilogue added to turn the attention of its argument towards women. However, at its inception it was almost solely focused on male behaviour. It combined the topics of dress and hygiene, emphasizing the need for clean clothing, bodily hygiene, in addition to rather predictable arguments about dressing in accordance with one's social status. A good example of this argument is the following section: "For what concerneth Cloathes, accomdate thyself to the fashion of thy equals, civill and orderly men, according to the use of times, and places. Yet thy Cloathes ought to be rather more plain and grave, regard hat to others, than richer and better."[212] It goes on to further emphasize the need to be "modest in thy apparel", and not to "seek thy perfection on thy outside".[213] To some extent, the text may be seen as contradicting itself depending upon an individual's social status: someone from a wealthier background might well find their equals dressing in the sorts of bright colours and 'strange fashions' that moralists routinely raged against. However, given the conduct book was likely aimed at a more middling sort, this may not have presented a problem on a practical level.

---

[207] Frances Dolan, *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture,* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 217.

[208] Ibid, 217.

[209] Ibid, 219.

[210] Aileen Ribeiro, *Dress and Morality*, 182.

Hawkins' work is also worth noting as an example of how conceptions around personal appearance during the Civil Wars and Commonwealth largely reflected those that had already gained acceptance prior, as well as how many of the anxieties that bubbled to the surface in the period’s popular print had already been raised as issues long prior. Historian Andy Wood drew comparisons in one article between the “radicals of the 1640s” to earlier anxieties around class and social standing, while other historians such as David Underdown have noted the continuity of old and familiar ideas through the Commonwealth.[214] As has been explored, this was certainly true in the case of personal appearance and behaviour. Given the tendency of popular literature throughout this period to revive and give new meaning to old, well-trodden topics, the rather unremarkable nature of a conduct book of seemingly Catholic origins is much more understandable. Wood’s analysis on the topic is useful as he focused on the role of dress as a marker of social status, specifically through the eyes of the lower classes. He argues that it “called forth an angry plebeian critique”.[215] Yet at the same time, he emphasizes that that subordinates were “partially responsible for the maintenance of early modern England’s profoundly unequal social system.”[216] The stress placed upon reflecting one’s social status is explicable in this light: these were deeply held beliefs that, in some ways, transcended traditional religious and political divides. That both a Catholic conduct book and Puritan moralists might find such easy agreement is a good indication of just how integral these ideas were viewed to be.

---

[211] Anna Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 4-5.

[212] Francis Hawkins, *Youths behavior, or, Decency in conversation amongst men*, 1651, 19.

[213] Ibid, 20.

While the lower and middling classes were undoubtedly the target audience of much of the popular literature on the subject of dress, these standards were of great importance across all levels of society. Virtually no social group was spared from criticism as old standards around dress and behaviour were perceived as being broken on a widespread scale, which in turn provoked anger, complaint, and ridicule. One pamphlet from 1646 poked fun the extravagant nature of men’s dress, listing twenty-six different ‘habits and gestures’, with the subtitle, “Maids, where are your hearts become? Look you what here is!" Among the points listed included "a feather in his hat, hanging downe like a Fox taile", "His beard on the upper lip compassing his mouth", "Little skirts", and "His breeches unhooked, ready to drop off."[217] This was clearly intended as a sort of parody, but some of the points do ring true with actual contemporary concerns, such as "long haire, with ribands tied in it" and "his face spotted."[218] Another example of this can be found in the ballad *The Maidens Delight* from 1656, in which a man describes his wealth in dramatic terms, including through a description of his clothing. "My hat is made of Beaver brave / My band of Flaunders Lace / My golden Belt about my neck / my person for to Grace / My silver hauncehd Rapier / doth make a gallant show / And I am well accounted of / by all that do me know."[219] He continues, describing his ribbons, gold rings, perfumed gloves and other "costly things", attempting to charm the "maiden" after whom the ballad is named. Naturally, she rejects him in favour of a tradesman, over the notion that a man like him will spend his money on extravagances and not be able to earn any back, whereas a tradesman at least knows how to earn his living. She ends the ballad with a farewell, stating: "Rather then such a jack as thou / shouldst be my company keeper / Ile marry with a Beggar-man / or with a Chimney-Sweeper."[220] By identifying him as a "prodigal", the man's extravagant fashion is connected to financial irresponsibility as well as disproportionate concern with worldly possessions, whereas the woman, portrayed favourably, is more concerned with finding a man who is capable and modest, even to the point of marrying a beggar. This reflects the wider concerns around luxury, and provides one example of how a wealthy individual might be criticized for going too far with their dress. These types of print are important as they not only corroborate the types of attacks visible within larger tracts by moralists, but help to illustrate something close to 'popular' attitudes at the time. As historian Eleanor Hubbard states, "Couched in bouncing verse and set to well-worn tunes, ballads straddled the divide between print and oral culture. (…) Ballads reflected popular attitudes in ways that more expensive printed books might not: cheap and popular, they were written to appeal to ordinary people."[221] It is important to note, then, that these popular attitudes were largely in sync with those of the more 'elite' publications appearing around the same time.

---

[214] Andy Wood, “Fear, Hatred and the Hidden Injuries of Class in Early Modern England”, *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 39, No. 3, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 815.
[215] Ibid, 816.
[216] Ibid, 817.

---

[217] Anonymous, *The picture of an English antick, with a list of his ridiculous habits, and apish Gestures,* 1646.
[218] Ibid.
[219] Laurence Price, *The Maidens Delight,* University of Glasgow Library, Euing Ballads 205, 1656.
[220] Ibid.

While *Youths Behavior* may not be reflective of popular attitudes directly, it is worth returning to in order to consider the manner in which it treats women. The original publication was solely concerned with the behavior of men, but as noted, its 1651 release featured an added epilogue which shifts the focus away from women, and onto men. Here, the author writes directly about England, moving away from the French translation. He highlighted England as unique due to it being the "scorn of several nations due to the "itch of running after fashions, a vanity peculiar unto us."[222] Against this backdrop of 'scorn', he begins to discuss women directly, stating: "It must not be denyed, but that the indulgence of Nature hath left a greater liberty to women, than unto men in point of curiosity in Apparell."[223] Yet, while the author gave the impression that women are at liberty to take more care in their appearances than their male counterparts, he emphasizes that this privilege comes with "strict lawes", a violation of which is an offense against nature – which in turn, he stated, "is to offend her highest author, that is God himself."[224] The seriousness with which commentators looked upon the problem of women's dress is clear, given that either the publisher or the author found the need to amend a publication aimed at men with a series of proscriptions targeted at women. This was reaffirmed through the release of a second book bearing the same name, albeit after the Commonwealth had been replaced in the Restoration. Published in 1664, *The Second Part of Youths Behavior* shares in tone with most of its Commonwealth (and earlier) predecessors.[225] Codrington argues that women have a natural "inclination" towards "sumptuous apparel" to a degree that men do not, to the extreme that he makes the claim that some women have had their "ornaments" placed with them in their coffins.[226]

---

[221] Eleanor Hubbard, *City Women: Money, Sex, and the Social Order in Early Modern London*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 14.
[222] Francis Hawkins, *Youths behavior, or, Decency in conversation amongst men*, 1651, 54.
[223] Ibid, 56.
[224] Ibid, 56.

One of the key themes in both editions of *Youths Behavior*'s treatment of women was the extent to which they were depicted as offending nature itself due to their choices in self-presentation. This was not necessarily unique to women, as men were also attacked on these grounds. One example of this was when in 1650, noteworthy Puritan nonconformist Richard Baxter accused 'well-dressed gallants' of being more beholden to their tailors than to God – but it was certainly much more prominently featured in texts specifically targeting female practices.[227] The epilogue to the original edition of the text primarily discussed immodest clothing, but this line of critique appears with particular frequency in popular print when it comes to cosmetics, such as face-painting, tincturing, or the wearing of patches. Codrington highlights the danger of these beauty practices, stating that they are an example of how women "disesteem our souls, preferring the flesh above them."[228] In a larger publication dealing with St.

---

[225] Roberta Anderson, "Francis Hawkins", (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004). Despite the original translation having been provided by Hawkins, an English Jesuit, Robert Codrington himself was noted to be a Puritan. This is a good example of the similarities shared on the topic of personal appearance, and perhaps moral behaviour more generally, across religious and political divisions.

[226] Robert Codrington, *The Second Part of Youths Behavior*, 1664, sig. C2.

[227] Richard Baxter, *The saints everlasting rest*, 1650, 317.

[228] Robert Codrington, *The Second Part of Youths Behavior*, 1664, sig. C4v.

Peter's first epistle, John Rogers, another nonconformist minister who would find himself ejected after the Restoration, offered some defense of common beauty practices in 1650, but he set clear limits to this: costly apparel, styling of the hair, and even the use of gold, silver, pearl, silk and velvet were all permitted.[229] For Rogers, the problem was not these practices in specific, but rather "the setting of their minds so much theron, as that it causeth a neglect of decking the soul."[230] In practice, the line between an acceptable use of cosmetics or 'ornaments' could be difficult to make out, but it is clear that for many writers there was more at stake than simple immodesty or extravagance. To moralists at the time, women's appearance was undeniably a religious matter. Frances Dolan examines these ideas in some depth in his own work, looking at treatises attacking the practice of face-painting throughout the seventeenth century, such as the 1616 publication *Treatise against Painting and Tincturing of Men and Women* by Thomas Tukes.[231] He writes:

> While predictably censuring women as vain, wasteful, and deceptive, the moralists most forcefully and exhaustively chastise them as agents and blasphemers who challenge the cosmic and social order by redefining their own value. Although these writers acknowledge women's disturbing creative power, they repeatedly warn that women who attempt to remake and relocate themselves achieve only debasement.[232]

At the same time, he points out that some authors allowed for the practice of face-painting in a limited fashion, as Rogers did. Dolan recognizes this, stating that there was some "recognition of the contradictory requirements that women face".[233] That is, while women were chastised for putting too much time or money into their appearances, or for dressing immodestly, they were also required to meet a standard of beauty – a very particular standard: “they must be sexually attractive without seeming ungovernable or overwhelming.”[234]

---

[229] John Rogers, *A godly & fruitful exposition upon all the First epistle of Peter by that pious and eminent preacher of the word of God, John Rogers*, 1650, 392.

[230] Ibid, 392.

[231] J.F. Merritt, "Thomas Tukes", (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2008). It is worth noting that Tukes would go on to oppose the Parliamentarian cause throughout the Civil Wars, though this occurred a much later date than his initial publication on painting and tincturing.

[232] Frances E. Dolan, "Taking the Pencil out of God's Hand: Art, Nature, and the Face-Painting Debate in Early Modern England," *PMLA*, Vol. 108, No. 2, (Modern Language Association, 1993), 229.

[233] Ibid, 232.

While many of the standards around dress were divided by gender, one constant criticism that appeared against men and women alike was the trespass of wearing attire deemed too “rich.” This connects in part to the concept of needing to dress according to one’s social status but can also be framed in vaguer terms and applied across class boundaries. One tract, written by the Royalist clergyman Richard Allestree in 1660, appears as both a defense and critique of the gentility.[235] It opened by criticizing those forces threatening to rob gentlemen of their birthright, “degrading him from those privledges, which belong to his quality, and of moulding him again into that vulgar Mass, from which divine Providence and humane Laws have distinguished him.”[236] At the same time that it argued against the appearance of a “levelling” project, it seemingly ridicules nobility at the same time. One passage reads, “Tis sure a far less deplorable spectacle to see a Gentleman spoiled of his Fortune by his Consience, then his Luxury, & to behold him under the stroke of a Headsman, then under those more infamous Executioners, his Lust, or Intemperance.”[237] Here, Allestree openly acknowledged the trespasses of lust and intemperance amongst those of a higher social status. The same can be said for women, as he continued, writing, “… I fear if the Matryologie even of these suffering times were scanned, *Venus* and *Bacchus* would be found to have had many more Martyrs, then *God* and *Loyalty*.”[238] Although it is difficult to identify exactly what Allestree aimed to argue throughout this text, it certainly appeared that part of his lament was that, during the stricter moral climate of the

---

[234] Ibid, 232.
[235] John Spurr, “Richard Allestree”, (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004).
[236] Richard Allestree, *The gentleman’s calling*, (1660), Preface.
[237] Ibid, Preface.
[238] Ibid, Preface.

Commonwealth, it was impositions (or at least pressure) against various vices that saw more resistance from those of a higher standing, than the concrete religious or governmental changes that marked the times. These criticisms also appear as it pertains to personal appearance, with vanity and excess attached directly to clothing: "Pride, the most flie and treacherous of all the rest, is perpetually laying ambushes for him in the adorations of his Flatterers, the vanity of Attire, and the innumerable kinds of Excesses."[239] Though not named specifically as "rich attire" or "rich apparel", the insinuation throughout his work is that many of these gentlemen have found themselves ruined through sin and vanity, one part of which is the usage of excessive and expensive attire.[240]

This opposition to rich attire is not universal, however: though most arguments do seem to follow a familiar trend, a somewhat different take appears in the work of Francis Osborne. A writer perhaps best-known for his popularity following the Restoration, wherein his works gained greater attention, he notably published a pair of conduct books entitled *Advice to a Son* (in two parts.)[241] Here, Osborne forwarded a statement that appears to tacitly endorse rich dress, at least amongst those of appropriate status. He wrote, "Weare your Cloaths need; exceeding, rather then coming short of others of like fortune; a charge borne out by Acceptance wherever you come: Therefore, spare all other waires, rather than prove defective in this."[242] This is not an entirely subversive statement, upholding the social divisions which other writers seem to have shown particular anxiety towards, but does go further in actually encouraging spending on attire than the moralist literature it was published alongside. For Osborne, it was of greater concern for an individual of status (namely, a 'gentleman') to appear beneath their particular station than to be trending on the side of excess. His arguments are not all out of line with moralist critiques, however: further on in his work, he reiterates gendered notions of lust and responsibility when he described women ('daughters of Eve') as being "foundered by the heat of Lust and Pride, and unable to beare the weight of so much of our reputation, as Religion and Custome hath loaded them with."[243] Though Osborne's work may appear more important in its later Restoration context, it does provide a good example of some of the differences visible in popular print at the time. Though the similarities between moralists and other writers on the subject of personal appearance are striking, Osborne's work provides an example of the types of differences that continued to exist. The degree of commonality that moralists and pamphleteers found on these issues should not detract from the existence of dissenting voices, or specific variations.

---

[239] Ibid, 71.

[240] This sort of sentiment can in part be connected to the idea of anxieties emerging alongside greater wealth, and the subsequent display of that wealth, noted by Simon Schama in *The Embarrassment of Riches.*

[241] Marie Henson, "Francis Osborne," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: 2004).

[242] Francis Oosborne, *Advice to a Son,* (1656), 17.

Richard Baxter fell more narrowly into the category of criticizing excess displays of wealth – perhaps predictably so, given the stricter tone taken by many Puritans. In a tract from 1658 directed pointedly at "the nobles, gentlemen, and all the rich" with the objective of "directing them how they may be richer", he criticized those of upper status in England through rather strong terms. He wrote, "As you have and would have the precedency in worldy matters, here also you shall have the precedency. Its pitty that you shall be first in Hell, that are first in a Christian State on earth; or that you should be least in the Kingdom of Heaven, that are Greatest in which is esteemed in the world."[244] Throughout this critique, the question of clothing appears multiple times, often following the familiar trend of vanity and excess. In one passage, he attempts to exaggerate the degree to which clothing is a 'wordly' concern by contrasting it to eventual death: "… You see their beauty and glittering attire, but you see not the pale and ghastly face that death will give them, nor the skulls that are stript of all those ornaments."[245] If rich attire and adornments were, as Baxter seems to suggest, worldy and excessive, then modesty is the appropriate course. He argued this much later on in the preface, when he wrote, "If you fare the hardlyer and go the plainer in your attire, and deny your selves that which is for any needless pomp or ostentation, or splendor in the world; that you may have so much more to do good with; you deal then like good husbands for God and your souls, and faithful Stewards."[246] For Baxter, a more appropriate use for wealth is to devote it towards "the Church and poor" for the sake of godliness and charity.[247] As with many other publications at this time, it isn't merely Baxter's arguments that make his work important: it is also in the implicit conception that there was some problem or another that needed to be rectified. In this case, it was the supposedly-permissive atmosphere that enabled vanity in attire.

---

[243] Ibid, 38.

[244] Richard Baxter, *The crucifying of the world by the cross of Christ with a preface to the nobles, gentlemen, and all the rich, directing them how they may be better,* (1658), Preface.

Baxter also connected rich attire to a sense of effeminacy, and by extension sinfulness, in a manner similar to the arguments against love-locks and long hair seen earlier. He wrote, "Have you comely apparel for the adorning of your bodies? Glory not in it. This is childish that its below a man, and therefore so sinfull as to be unbeseeming a Christian. The emptiest person may have the best attire. It is not your outside that shews your worth."[248] In a sense, this connects standards of personal appearance targeted towards women with the literature identified earlier: it appears that, even in attempting to problematize the practices of wealthy men, women are implicated in at least some form. For Baxter, they appear as a sort of living warning due to their supposed nature. Phrasing his statement as an answer to the question of why women were

---

[245] Ibid, Preface.
[246] Ibid, Preface.
[247] Ibid, Preface.
[248] Ibid, 248.

‘addicted to look after neat attire’, he wrote, “…nature is conscious of their want of inward worth, it seeks to make it up with somewhat that is borrowed. It may make a man suspect that somewhat is amiss within, when there needs all this ado without. They are not always the best horses, that have the neatest trappings.”[249] Though it may be rather obvious that women were perceived by moralists as being more interested in their appearances than men throughout this period, it is perhaps notable that critiquing women was seen as a useful tool in attempting to speak to (wealthier) men, Baxter’s apparent target audience. This is not unique to his passage on attire, as he again attempts to connect effeminacy (and by extent, women) to sin on the question of lust and desires. He likened the rise of lust from “gazing upon beauty” with the sight of a sight of a cup for a drunkard and the site of meat for a glutton.[250] Men who succumb to desire in this way are marked as something less than: “It is by the sight of gawdy fashions, and curious apparel, that the minds of vain effeminate persons are provoked to desire and the like. (…) See therefore that you always keep a watch upon your eyes. Let them not run up and down like a master-less dog, nor roul as the eyes of the lascivious, that are hunting after the prey of lust.”[251] Through this, sexual immorality is made to remain a female domain, even when men are explicitly implicated: they are critiqued much more for perceived weakness and vanity than lust itself.

As noted, many of the concerns that appear within popular print in the Commonwealth largely reflected earlier critiques. However, while significant changes in attitudes towards personal appearance from moralists themselves may not have appeared in any meaningful way, these critiques should not be dismissed as somehow unremarkable. Rather, it is noteworthy in itself that commentators from across political and religious divides continually raised old, even traditional, lines of critique against seemingly subversive modes of dress. But this was not a mere continuation of tradition, nor was it simple retreading. The Commonwealth period was, as Underdown, Amussen, Hill and others have argued, a time in which the world had been figuratively 'turned upside down'. Sexual morality had long featured as a primary consideration in discourse around women's dress, and men had long been chastised for excess or for dressing outside of their social status: certainly, attempts at sumptuary legislation in previous centuries are indicative of this. But these concerns became even more pointed during the Commonwealth, reflecting a period in which old norms had been overturned and religious experimentation became increasingly commonplace. Dress was just one of the many topics which fell into focus for moralists, preachers, and other writers. Indeed, London's print culture has attracted a great deal of attention from historians due to the sheer volume of publications, many of which contained incendiary arguments around moral issues, similar to those discussed in this chapter. Social breakdown, whether it was real or simply perceived, led to this remarkable outpouring, and while dress was just one topic amongst many, its importance should not be understated. Dress was both an 'obvious site of moral reformation', as noted by Capp, as well as a site of greater agency on the part of Londoners as greater means on the part of the lower and middling sort opened up luxuries previously out of reach. At the same time, a harshening of the moral climate and increasing disdain for worldly vanities on the part of a country swept by Puritan dominance meant that dress would have come under attack almost inevitably. The revolution and subsequent Commonwealth thus provided the unique context which imbued these ideas with renewed importance, even without the kinds of substantive differences between different religious and political groups that one might have expected given the culture war being waged throughout popular print.

---

[249] Ibid, 249.

[250] Drunkenness was, among other concerns, another pressing issue that Puritan moralists grappled with through popular print. It would have made a great deal of sense to a Puritan reader at the time that these two issues could be compared: aside from the analogy itself, both were frequently targeted as areas for greater moral reform.

[251] Ibid, 171.

III. Cosmetics

Although there were significant commonalities between the three categories of personal appearance discussed in this thesis, each of these categories carried with them unique concerns for contemporary onlookers. Cosmetics appear to have been treated as particularly subversive, looked at with great mistrust by moralists and preachers throughout the seventeenth-century. Men and women can both be counted as frequent users of different cosmetic items, but women are undoubtedly the more frequent targets of proscriptive literature as a result of their usage. This is another reflection of the gendered lens through which these issues were perceived at the time and may also be related to the frequency and visibility of cosmetic usage. As with other modes of personal appearance, there were consistent concerns around women potentially going too far with their own appearances: stepping outside of the boundaries of generally accepted practice and straying too close to some form of immodesty. But cosmetics carried with them separate concerns, tried intrinsically to notions of deceit, as well as to trespass against the natural order. There are clear commonalities here with the gendered restrictions placed upon hair, but the exact nature of the proscriptions and prescriptions outlined in moralistic literature vary in both content and context. While hair was viewed as having been mandated as a kind of natural covering for women, cosmetics were much more routinely viewed as an illicit alteration of one's natural form. Consequently, cosmetic usage was often viewed as an outward reflection of one's moral failings and carried with it a tone of deliberate subversion or deception. While it may be the most difficult category to identify changing fashion trends in, pervasive fears around the supposed permissiveness of the period and subsequent moral decay ensured that it would remain a popular topic for moralists and preachers throughout the duration of the Commonwealth period.

Historian Farah Karim-Cooper provides a clear summary of the three main, traditional oppositions to cosmetic usage in her work, focusing mainly on Renaissance and Shakespearean drama. These are: "the belief that alteration of the body is a crime against God; the ethnocentric fear of foreign ingredients and commodities of a cosmetic nature; and the necromantic effect of face paint, which suggested not only the physical unreliability, but also the poisonous and contaminative nature of women and even art."[252] While her work is focused on the period preceding the tumult of the Civil Wars and the Commonwealth, her assessment remains largely accurate when examining the later stages of the seventeenth-century. She writes, "[a]nti-cosmetic diatribes unearth a deeply rooted fear not just of cosmetic paint and its potential toxicity, but rather of what it signifies: gender, theatricality, race, and the performative nature of political power."[253] Attitudes towards cosmetics following the Civil War were largely a continuation of the old, as with other forms of personal appearance. However, this continuity should be not be taken at face value. The shift that occurred within the discourse on personal appearance was one of context and urgency, more than one of substance. As with other elements of personal appearance, the commonalities between religious and political groups that were otherwise in opposition to one another appear more frequently than any concrete differences. The perception of widespread social breakdown amongst moralists, as well as the ongoing culture war, remained one of the key factors in Commonwealth-era literature on cosmetics usage.

Perhaps predictably, concerns around cosmetic usage appeared just as frequently during the Commonwealth as they did in the years prior. The various concerns levelled against cosmetic practices were often combined in oppositional literature. One such example came in the form of a noteworthy publication in 1656 by the political moderate, John Gauden. Here, Gauden leveraged routine arguments around modesty, deception, and the trespass of physical alteration, in order to figure painting as a sort of self-adultery. He does offer some minor defense of cosmetics, for a rather limited usage: "some little change of the complexion from a greater degree of pallor, to a lesse, possibly to some little quickening of redness," this allowance only goes so far.[254] However, he goes on to argue against "any greater change on the face, or cheeks, than is frequently made by the blushing of those, that are of more modest looks and tenderest foreheads." [255] For Gauden, and indeed many others of a similar mind, modesty and restraint are the key to acceptable cosmetics use. Anything which steps beyond that, into what the publication describes as an "alteration" of the "substance, fashion, feature, proportions, temper, or constitutions of nature" is highlighted as a problem. [256] Gauden continued, decrying in even harsher terms the "more gross and mechanic arts, which strive to by many ways to conceal, cover, and supply natures grosser deformities, and defects." The problem is thus not just the use of cosmetics, but those uses which constitute a break with "godly" behaviour: which render a woman immodest or in some way overly in control of her own appearance, often for the supposed purposes of vanity, lust, or worldly concerns. As historian Frances Dolan argues, this control was viewed as being wrested from nature itself. [257] For Gauden, the 'godly' approach is for the Christian to remember to be "as clay in the hands of the potter."[258] This sentiment stands in opposition to any notion of altering or reconfiguring one's outward appearance. In this, he is speaking to both a male and female audience, but there is little disputing that women were the recipients of inequal outrage along these lines. Similar critiques against men may be more obviously identified in the case of hair and dress.

---

[252] Farah Karim-Cooper, *Cosmetics in Shakespearean and Renaissance Drama*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 34.
[253] Ibid, 34.

---

[254] John Gauden, *A discourse of auxiliary beauty. Or artificiall handsomeness. In point of conscience between two ladies.* 1656. 42-43.

[255] Ibid, 42-43.

[256] Ibid. 43.

[257] Dolan, "Taking the Pencil out of God's Hand", 229.

[258] John Gauden, *A discourse of auxiliary beauty. Or artificiall handsomeness. In point of conscience between two ladies.* 1656. 51

While Gauden provided some small defense of cosmetic items in limited use, there were also more dedicated arguments in their favour, and in contradiction to the moralist standard on the topic. One of the more notable of these came from Margaret Cavendish, who directly contrasted the treatment of women and men with regards to their appearance, seemingly in an effort to highlight the hypocrisy at play. For Cavendish, cosmetic items existed as an important tool for "increasing lawfull affection." [259] She attempted to place these practices within the confines of acceptable, lawful romance, downplaying the connection to immoral behaviour that many critics attempted to construct. In general, this would refer to romance existing within the confines of marriage, or in anticipation of it. Far from an act of deceit or counterfeiting as moralists might suggest, Cavendish instead situates it as an important feature in the maintenance of proper relationships. She also attempted to highlight the double-standard at play through a direct contrast to men's practices. She wrote:

> If we must use no more than what Nature hath given us, we must go naked; and those that have a bald Head, not must wear a Peruick, or Cap to cover it; and those that are born with One leg shorter than the other, must not wear a high shoe to make them even, nor indeed wear any Shoes at all, especially with Heels, because they make them seem to go higher, but go with the Feet bare; and those that are Crooked, must wear no Bombast, and many such Examples may be brought.

The assertion Cavendish was making is quite clear: these common beauty practices, which she identified as "painting, curling, and other dressings" were of great importance to women, so much so that they are comparable to the use of warm clothing in winter, drawing the image of keeping “warm” existing romantic relationships.[260] The comparison to men’s hygiene practices appears particularly pointed, but it is important to note that Cavendish herself is something of an extraordinary example: her opinions, though valuable, would not likely have represented, for example, an average Londoner. In addition, even Cavendish admitted that there were limits to what sorts of practices were permissible, and by which people: for example, she noted that widows should not take part in any of these practices, and should instead “take the example of Judith” and remain unmarried for the remainder of their lives, which in turn would mean they would have no need of any practice to enhance “lawful affection.”[261] This focus on affection as ‘lawful’ keeps cosmetic practices grounded within an acceptable framework, grounded in scripture through the invocation of Judith as an example. This would likely have been an uncontroversial sentiment, even amongst Puritans: affection within the confines of marriage was not among the primary sources of concern for moralists of most alignments.

---

[259] Margaret Cavendish, *The Worlds Olio*, 1655, 85. Though lust was frequently warned against, very few at the time would have taken a strong stand against lawful affection, within the confines of, or part of, marriage.

Although Cavendish’ defense may appear strong, its actual influence is harder to assess. In part, she touches upon the hypocrisy at the center of moralist literature on personal appearance – and it was a hypocrisy that would live on well after the Commonwealth. While cosmetic items were viewed as an important method for retaining or enhancing affection within a lawful marriage, they would long remain a topic much reviled by moralists. Even in cases where cosmetics were intended as a part of developing such relationships, they could earn the ire of onlookers. As Amussen and Underdown note, men who chose wives for “beauty rather than their character” were warned that they would suffer financial losses, as well as have to deal with sexual infidelity on the part of their wives. Patricia Phillipy, an art scholar, highlights some of the usual critiques against painting: it is considered "a diabolical custom whose relationship to truth parallels that of the painted face to the unadorned visage."[262] This points to the limits of any acceptance of cosmetic practices of this nature: while Cavendish, and indeed others, may point to their necessity within a lawful relationship, or to the often hypocritical standards of beauty in place, it was 'unadorned' beauty that was most celebrated: and cosmetics, however necessary they may have seemed, were almost always met with a measure of suspicion. Within a culture in the midst of an attempted reformation of worldly values, these types of implements only grew more problematic. They were seen as worldly vanities, as well as potentially dangerous spiritual trespasses.

---

[260] Ibid, 85.
[261] Ibid, 85.

The primary difference between the years following the Civil War and those that preceded it, as noted, is that of scale and context. On this note, Gauden's work again appears valuable. As historian Bernard Capp argued, "[b]y the mid-1650s contemporaries recognized that the tide was flowing in a conservative direction. *A Discourse of Auxiliary Beauty* (1656) claimed that puritans had lost the culture war. Presented as a dialogue between two ladies, it shows one dismissing her formal scruples and vigorously defending the use of cosmetics and jewelry. She pokes fun at puritan forms and insists that in this 'case of conscience' every woman can decide for herself."[263] Considering Gauden's work within the political context of the time, it is noteworthy that the woman offering a defense of cosmetics repeatedly makes a point to dispute the validity of religious commentators' identifying various practices as sinful: "And now out of that nonage and minority, which kept me in the wardship and awe of mens names, and numbers, I considered, that these alone signify no more to make up any reason, or to prove any thing a sin,

---

[262] Patricia Phillippy, *Painting Women: Cosmetics, Canvases, and Early Modern Culture*, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006), 162.
[263] Capp, *England's Culture Wars*, 80.

(in point of conscience) than so many cyphers can make up a summe which have no figure before them."[264] Though the woman in question was meant to be an exaggerated character, this fear for England's religious morality is key, and is one of the points that arguably leads Commonwealth publications to carry a more urgent tone than earlier tracts.[265] Gauden also seemingly recognizes the appearance of hypocrisy that tracts, not unlike his own, gave off: "In matter of gidlinesse, as to intellectuall light and darkness, or morall good and evill, it is not to be regarded, who, or how, or when men affirme or deny any thing, but why? (…) on what grounds a thing so small, easy, cheap, safe (..) should merit so bitter and odious invectives, so as to be banished from all Christian society; which yet admits so many curiosities, elegancies, superfluities, ornaments, and delicacies of life."[266] The answer to this line of questioning is provided by Gauden in the very preface to his work, where he laments women's use of cosmetics "if God hath in Scripture or Nature and conscience forbidden them."[267] The primary issue at play, then, is that the Commonwealth itself was deemed a period of "audacious liberty".[268] Whether or not this was actually the case in practical terms is almost irrelevant: the perception of social and sexual permissiveness was enough to inspire greater resistance through popular print.

When they did appear in this popular print, cosmetics were almost always presented as a source of danger. In general, criticism of cosmetic practices far outweighed the limited justifications offered. Perhaps the most influential of these critiques came in the form of Thomas

---

[264] John Gauden, *A discourse of auxiliary beauty. Or artificiall handsomeness. In point of conscience between two ladies.* 1656. 109.

[265] The need to maintain the moral and spiritual health of the nation is by no means a new feature of the period, but there was arguably clearer sense of moral breakdown, largely as a result of the Civil Wars and the supposedly permissive atmosphere that followed in the wake of ineffective moral reformation.

[266] Ibid, 109.

[267] Ibid, Preface. This is posed as a rhetorical question, but the intent appears to be to suggest that cosmetic practices were indeed in violation of both scripture and nature.

[268] Ibid, Preface.

Tukes' aforementioned *A Discourse Against Painting and Tincturing of Men and Women*. Although it falls outside of the Commonwealth period, being released in 1616, it is reflective of the concerns that would persist and intensify later in the century. These were, after all, deeply held concerns on a broad scale, and Tukes' work was reflective of that. As is somewhat standard for moralist literature, Tukes presented the problem of cosmetics as widespread and prevalent, and thus somewhat urgent. In fact, he argued that it was "never so common as it is now amongst us."[269] This may well have been true on at least some level, with the rapid manner in which beauty practices changed and developed over time. However, even if the problem had apparently gained new importance, his critique appears largely predictable, centered around notions of deception and hypocrisy. For example, in one passage, he connected these practices to counterfeit money when he wrote: "Who is pleased with counterfet mony, with counterfet friendship, with counterfet stuffe? Who loves hypocrisies in religion? And what is a woman painted, by a certain kinde of hypocrite, resembling that in shew which she is not truly? (…) And what is this aritificall facing, but a true deceit, or a deceitful truth?"[270] In addition to this portrayal of deception, Tukes identified these practices as representing prostitution, in tune with many later commentators, as he wrote: "painting of the face, and borrowing of complection" are appropriate only for "whores and dishonest women."[271] This notion of deception carried on strong into the Commonwealth period. A lecture from 1651 struck a very similar note, using paint as an analogy with which to discuss voyages. This lecture, provided by Jeremiah Burroughs and Thomas Goodwin, two Puritan voices at the time, argued:,: "a good Voiage is no sign that there is not guiltiness: As sometimes I have told you, that a painted face is no sign of a good complexion; it may be that is the Curse of God upon thee that doth let thee so to prosper."[272] In this sense, women engaging in common cosmetic practices were seen as committing a kind of falsehood, lying to their male counterparts and concealing their true nature beneath cosmetics. Invariably, this true nature was negative: as if cosmetics served to both mask one's subversive nature as well as accentuate their beauty.

---

[269] Thomas Tukes, *A Discourse Against Painting and Tincturing of Men and Women*, 1616, sig. C.
[270] Ibid, sig. C4.
[271] Ibid, sig. C4.

Despite the overwhelmingly negative tone most publications took towards cosmetics, recipe and medicine books provide a somewhat different insight into beauty practices at the time. One of these, by Nicholas Culpeper, at once attacked the practice of painting while defending broader cosmetic practices. Culpeper himself can be identified as a radical during the period in his support of republicanism, and he made no secret of his distaste for Cromwell.[273] In this sense, his seeming repudiation of some of the more extreme tracts on cosmetics seems fitting. He wrote as part of his 1653 tract, "[b]eauty is a blessing of God, and every one ought to preserve it; they offend as much that neglect it, as they do that paint their Faces."[274] This corroborates to some extent Edith Snook's argument about women's collections of cosmetic recipes. She states that face painting "scarcely appears" in such documents, and instead one finds "face washes and ointments, (and) beautifying concoctions that transform the skin rather than cover it."[275] Although the notion of transforming the skin would no doubt come under the very same sorts of attacks that painting underwent, Culpeper made an effort in his section on 'adorning' medicines to delineate between the practice of painting and the practice of preserving one's natural beauty.

---

[272] Jeremiah Burroughs and Thomas Goodwin, *An exposition with practical observations continued upon the eleventh, twelfth, & thirteenth chapters of the prophesy of Hosea being first delivered in several lectures at Michaels Cornhill, London*, 1651, 328.
[273] Patrick Curry, "Nicholas Culpeper", (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004).
[274] Nicholas Culpeper, *Pharmocopoaeia Loondinesis*, 1653. 321.
[275] Edith Snook, *Women, Beauty and Power in Early Modern England: A Feminist Literary History*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 22.

He recommended the use of cleansing medicines to deal with spots and blackened teeth, along with “diverse” remedies for redness of the skin, ranging from cooling the blood to the use of “extenuating medicines.”[276] He also prescribed “laxative, lenient, and emollient medicines” for wrinkles and situates much of his section on humoral medicine.[277] Though his section on these medicines was far from extensive, offering little more than an overview of the types of treatments he would recommend, it did provide something of an example of the kinds of beauty practices that could have skirted past the moral outrage that painting and patching were subject to: cleaning and maintaining the body, after all, did not contain the same subversive context as covering, hiding or transforming the body.

Though these sorts of publications can appear drowned out by the staggering amount of proscriptive literature at the time, they remain an important part of the overall story. Edith Snook notes that most of the work done on female beauty practices in the sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries have used critiques and complaints of these practices of their main source of evidence.[278] For Snook, the question of how women themselves approached these practices deserves greater attention.[279] While it is necessary to place a heavy emphasis on these criticisms and critiques in any examination of the period’s discourse, it is also important to recognize the unique perspective that female practitioners of these oft-attacked modes of personal appearance offer. One important feature that Snook highlights provides some context for considerations such as race and class within contemporary conceptions of beauty. As she states, aristocratic women were often considered to be somehow more beautiful than their counterparts lower in the social order. This, in part, connected to their presentation of ‘whiteness’: as she wrote, “Whiteness divides women from each other and requires lower-class women (…) to accept that the white-skinned woman who controls her space is wonderful in her whiteness."[280] She continued, arguing that whiteness "colonizes the definitions of health and social legitimacy" for those higher up the social ladder, emerging through "political ideology, class conflict, and gendered insistence."[281] As much as commentators at the time railed against the use of cosmetics, the importance of acquiring this desired 'whiteness' for an aristocratic woman is clear. This showcases the importance of paint as a cosmetic item at the time, but also provides yet another wrinkle to the 'bind' that women faced at the time: as much as these cosmetics were looked upon with distrust, they were an important piece in managing one's self-presentation to societal standards – especially for those of higher status. The racial aspect to this has been the subject of some debate, but Kimberly Poitevin argues that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, England became increasingly concerned with its relation to foreigners. She wrote, "As they literally (and liberally) applied whiteness to their skins, early modern English women encouraged the identification of race with skin color—and the association of race and color with nation."[282] Though it is difficult to ascertain in practical terms how average practitioners would have grappled with these ideas, if indeed they did at all, they remain an important feature of the shifting culture of the period.

---

[276] Nicholas Culpeper, *Pharmocopoaeia Loondinesis*, 1653. 321.
[277] Ibid, 321.
[278] Snook, *Women, Beauty and Power in Early Modern England*, Ibid, 21.
[279] Ibid, 21.

Perhaps predictably, while whiteness increasingly became a trait to be desired, the use of cosmetics in the pursuit of this ideal remained a point of contention. As can be seen time and time again, desired beauty or fashion standards rarely existed without a host of anxieties swirling around them. A lecture by Jeremiah Burroughs in 1650 touched upon this directly. He wrote,

---

[280] Ibid, 61.
[281] Ibid, 61.
[282] Kimberly Poitevin, "Inventing Whiteness: Cosmetics, Race, and Women in Early Modern England," *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies, 11.1.* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 82.

"Many are proud of their fair Necks and Skins, so proud as they grow extream wanton by reason of it, they must lay open therefore their fair necks that others may see them, see how white they are, what fair Skins they have, and put black patches likewise to set out their beauty and whiteness of their fair Skins…"[283] At the same time as foreign contact may have led to an increase in the concept of whiteness as a form of beauty, those practices intended to exemplify it continued to be viewed through the lens of wantonness and excess. Burroughs in particular attempted to emphasize the degree to which those in tacit pursuit of these beauty standards lived in unproductive idleness: "and if that (patches) will not serve, even laying over a paint to make it fair if it be not otherwise so; nothing but Ease and Delicacy and pleasure is for them, as if they came into the world for no other end but to live bravely and be look'd upon, as if man-kind and all creatures must work and suffer to provide for these nice and delicate wantons…"[284] They were, according to his argument, "no use at all in the world", and yet required wealth and work on the part of others to hold their position. While Burroughs argued from a decidedly Puritan perspective, this appears as a somewhat intensified example of a more long-standing critique. While this notion of whiteness appears to exist on its own, divorced from racial considerations, the racial connection is made more clearly in other works. Peter Heylyn, a contemporary author and Royalist who faced significant opposition from the Puritan-dominated Parliament, published a geography in 1652.[285] Here, he wrote: "from Ur-appa, which signifieth in that language, a beautifull countenance, because the Europaeans much exceld the Africans in whiteness of skin, and clearness of complexion." [286]

---

[283] Jeremiah Burroughs, *An exposition with practical observations continued upon the eighth, ninth, & tenth chapters of the prophesy of Hosea being delivered in several lectures at Michaels Cornhil, London*. 1650. 434.

[284] Ibid, 434.

[285] Anthony Milton, "Peter Heylyn", (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2015).

[286] Peter Heylyn, *Cosmographie*, 1652. 32.

The association between whiteness and beauty had roots stretching back well beyond the Commonwealth, and the Jacobean court provides an interesting window into this mindset. Court masques, a form of entertainment taking place among the court's exclusive circle, seem to represent the antithesis of the political culture that emerged during the Commonwealth years. Yet, they carried with them many of the same concepts and concerns that appear in much more popular and accessible literature throughout the seventeenth century. One of the most well-known masques also connects rather directly to the question of whiteness and beauty, that being the *Masque of Blackness*. In this masque, Anne of Denmark and her court ladies performed as a group of twelve 'nymphs' in what would be recognized today as black-face. This was no small point, either: race was one of the primary focuses of the masque, and their race is set up from the outset as something contrary to beauty: "Fair Niger, son to great Oceanus / Now honoured thus / With all his beauteous race / Who though but black in face / Yet are bright / And full of life and light / To prove that beauty best / Which not the colour, but the feature / Assures unto the creature."[287] This appears as something of a backhanded compliment, as it sets up the twelve nymphs as beautiful in their own respect, but makes it clear that this beauty comes in spite of their skin tone. Invoking classical conceptions of race, the masque positioned the nymphs and their race ('Ethiopians') as having been beautiful in the past, prior to Phaeton's scorching of the Earth: "As of one Phaeton, that fired the world / And that before his heedless flames were hurled / About the globe, the Ethiops were as fair / As other dames, now black with black despair." The conclusion of the masque reinforces the desirability of whiteness by having the nymphs' complexions be transformed: Britannia's light shines on them, for the following effect: "Whose beams shine day and night, and are of force / To blanch an Ethiop and revive a cor'se / His light sciental is (past mere nature) / Can salve the rude defects of every creature."[288] It is likely no coincidence that such a focus on whiteness as a desirable quality appeared in greater strength in direct contrast to blackness at around the same period that foreigners were becoming increasingly visible, as Poitevin argued. This is perhaps one of the better examples of how cosmetic practices were in contact with broader cultural and worldly concerns.

---

[287] Ben Jonson, *The Masque of Blackness*, 1605. v80-85. Retrieved from David Lindley eds. *Court Masques: Jacobean and Caroline Entertainments, 1605-1640.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 3. These court masques stand as a particularly 'elite' form of culture, having been held within the confines of the court itself. However, as seen in the texts by Burroughs and Heylyn, some of the ideas contained within this masque did appear in more popular forms of print, at least during the Commonwealth period.

Critiques against cosmetics also appeared in ballads, an important and much more popular form of cultural expression. As noted, although moralist literature was by no means inaccessible, ballads could reach individuals of all social statuses, including (in their verbal form) the illiterate. One ballad presented a bizarre and exaggerated story of a man who was supposedly tricked by a woman who, through the use of paint and other supposed falsehoods, went from looking like an "Angel by Candle-Light", to a "Lankashier Witch of four score and ten."[289] This was obviously intended to be a humorous take on the issue, circulated more for entertainment than out of a desire to formulate a clear argument – but this is part of why ballads can be telling. This particular example helps to reveal the degree to which the idea of the 'counterfeit' woman had been established in society. Enough, certainly, to be a humorous reference in song. The reveal at the end of the ballad provides a much-exaggerated example of this supposed counterfeiting, when the woman removes her false hair and a false eye, before finally washing "all the paint from her visage."[290] This leaves the hoodwinked man in a difficult position, having accompanied this woman into private on the belief that her previous 'angelic' appearance was genuine. This simplified these cosmetic practices into a simple covering to put on a falsified face, but in doing so, played upon the broader cultural concerns that swirled around these issues. It is perhaps also noteworthy that though the man in question would have been committing a trespass of his own, blame is placed mainly on the woman for her part in luring the man to begin with. In this sense, responsibility for sexual immorality was generally thrust upon the woman, and the overuse of cosmetics to alter her appearance would have made it clear to the audience that she was to blame: a temptress with a false appearance.

---

[288] Ibid v225-230. 6.

[289] Anonymous, *Newes from Hide-Park*, National Library of Scotland, Crawford. 1647-1665.

[290] Ibid.

It is also revealing that these cosmetic practices were recognized on such a widespread scale that they could be used as a point of analogy to make broader, political or religious arguments. For example, one text from 1652 that attempted to instruct the reader on how to give oneself to God properly made an effort to liken "popery" to painting. In this text, theologian Nathaniel Culverwell wrote "And this is the vanity of Popery, it does not give God the heart. That spiritual Jezabel gives him only a painted face, and she does not give him the heart. She is clothed in Scarlet, but she embraces a Dunghill. She puts on an outward meretricious bravery, but within her there is nothing but rottenness."[291] Reinforcing the idea of painting as a falsehood, he used the term 'painted face' as shorthand to describe an act of deception before God. In large part, this reinforces the concept of falsehood in much the same manner that Tukes had prior to the onset of the Commonwealth. Although the practice of painting appeared most frequently in these types of commentaries, other beauty practices received similar treatment. For example, one poem highlighted the use of black patches to cover marks or spots on the face as deceptive in much the same manner. Poet John Collop wrote: "Black patches do betray defects / Beauty's best seen in her neglects."[292] Here, he not only critiqued the practice on principle, but also argued that these patches achieved the exact opposite to their intended effect by making these hidden "defects" all the more obvious.

---

[291] Nathaniel Culverwell, *An elegant and learned discourse of the light of nature, with several other treatises*, 1652, 54.

This critique of patches extends beyond Collop. In *A nights search*, Humphrey Mill's oft-cited pamphlet, he accused women who used patches of being somehow foolish, on top of attacking their supposed immorality. This pamphlet appears to have been well-read, or at least well-received, as it warranted a second edition in 1652. Here, he wrote, "Nay, I say, the patches on thy face / Doe shew thy folly, speak to thy disgrace. / What, do'st thou think them to be ornmanets? / Or that they're like to further thy intents?"[293] Thus, patches were a target for ridicule on the grounds that they achieved the opposite effect of making whatever mark or blemish they were meant to cover more obvious through their use. However, their use is not the only target of this ridicule, as Mill continued: "thy furrow'd cheeks are yellow; Thy beetle browes are colour'd just like tallow. The graceless crew, and all the roaring Sparks / Know black, and yellow, are not beauties marks. / I am afraid (but take it as a wipe) / Thy patches shew that thou art rotten ripe. / Pull off thy playsters, for they cover scabs / Which are the marks (oft-times) of lust-full drabs."[294] Although Mill's pamphlet is a somewhat extreme example, this does illustrate the manner in which patches placed women in something of a bind: at the same time that marks on the face, such as scabs, would be viewed as evidence of sexual immorality, attempting to conceal them in such a manner only drew more negative attention. After all, to a writer like Mill, they were "the spots of sin."[295] Laurence Price reiterated this connection in a 1650 poem. He wrote, "Farewell black patches / and farewell powdered locks, / And farewell

---

[292] John Collop, *Poesis redviva*, 1656, 41.
[293] Humphrey Mill, *A nights search*, (1646), 240-241.
[294] Ibid, 241.
[295] Ibid, 241.

Luthner's Ladies / for they have the pox."[296] Edmund Elys, a writer who would layer become a clergyman, used black patches as a form of contrast: "Thy *santifi'd Miniva*, that sweet See / *Jove's* brain sublim'd to holy Poetry / Puts on her Sunday's dresse, and humbly comes / Without black Patches of Ecomiums."[297]

Though published a couple years after the Restoration, John Donne also attempted to connect the wearing of black patches to sexual immorality as part of a document styled in the form of questions and answers. He was presented with the following question: "What are those females like, who on their faces wear small black patches sixt in divers places?"[298] To this, he responds by suggesting they are prone to adultery: "They're like to spotted shepards who're great rangers, which wrong their males by coupling oft with strangers."[299] Aside from the rather predictable association drawn between patches and immorality, it is also somewhat noteworthy that he considers this in strong enough terms to liken these women to animals, something which he did in similar fashion just a couple pages earlier, referring to "female wantons" that wear "loose, light, black hoods" as "gentles who've black heads and wagging tails."[300] In general, attacks on patches tended to follow these same trends: accusing their uses of sexual immorality, disease, and sinful behaviour more generally. This could often be in particularly strong terms, such as in *Mercurious Venerus* where they are referred to as "the marke of the beast."[301] It is worth noting however that patches served other purposes than to merely to conceal imperfections or disease, as writers seem to suggest. One publication, originally in French but translated and reproduced in London well into the Restoration, highlighted their purpose: "… as our Ladies and Courtiers lay black patches upon their Faces, to heighten or set off its whiteness the more."[302] This writer also provided some defense of cosmetics practices as a whole then they wrote, "Tis injurious to blame the Artificial Handsomness of Ladies, since nothing can please us in any other things without it: Natural Beauty being light a rough Diamond, unless Art polish it, and give it a foil."[303]

---

[296] Laurence Price, *The Merry Mans Resolution*, 1650.
[297] Edmund Elys, *Dia Poemata*, 1655. "To his honest Cousin, E. E. on his Dia Poemata; or, his setting Feet on Holy ground."
[298] John Donne, *Donne's Satyr*, 1662, 110.
[299] Ibid, 110.
[300] Ibid, 106.
[301] Borealis De la Garde, *Mercurius Venerus*, 1649. 12.

In one anonymous 1649 pamphlet, the writer highlighted some of the uses of patches, albeit with a rather sarcastic tone. They wrote, "…here are most exquisite black patches for the face, to illustrate & make the beautie the more conspicuous; here they are in the forms of Flyes, Fleas, Monkeys, and Mag-Pyes, Sun, Moone, Starres, Owles and Polecats…"[304] Though there were prints of patches designed in strange shapes, the pamphleteer was likely exaggerating the variety here in order to highlight them as an example of excess in appearance. In doing so, they wrote that one of these fancifully-designed patches cost a gentle woman "100 li", for a product the size of a "Scotch three-pence."[305] The writer goes on to ridicule this by stating that, for such a price, they would have "bought some Honestie, Modestie; and Chastite, for my self, and for my Daughters and Maid-servants."[306] However humorous the pamphlet was intended to be taken, it does appear that the writer consciously attempted to set up the practice of patching as something of an antithesis to these listed qualities. Jeremiah Burroughs, a previously mentioned mainstream Puritan, provided a more moralistic attack on patches in a 1650 tract. Here, he identified patches as being used "over a layer of paint" to "set out their beauty and the whiteness of their fair

---

[302] Theophraste, Renaudot. *Another collection of philosophical conferences of the French victurosi upon questions of all sorts for the improving of natural knowledge,* 17. 1665.
[303] Ibid, 17.
[304] Anonymous, *What Will You Have? A Calfe with a White Face*, 1649. 8.
[305] Ibid, 8.
[306] Ibid, 8.

Skins."[307] He stated that the users of these patches appeared as if their only purpose in the world was to be looked upon, "as if all man-king and all creatures must work and suffer to provide for these nice and delicate wantons, who yet are of no use at all in the world, certainly."[308] Predictably, he chastised these women for having "skin-deep beauty", for being "filthy and abominable in the eyes of God", and for having "foul souls."[309] Burroughs' attention to this notion of idleness may reflect a somewhat more unique outlook on these practices, but his more direct attacks against false beauty and spiritual trespass stand as more traditional and common criticism.

As a symbol of unlawful lust, black patches were a source of consternation for more than just moralists. Margaret Cavendish, despite having offered some defense of cosmetic practices in her other work, she made it clear that this defense had some fairly clear limitations. In a poem from 1653 entitled *Natures Cabinet*, she detailed a number of beauty practices including "colour'd ribbons of fancies new", "hair of lovers true", as well as "gloves of remembrance" and "veils of forgetsulnesse."[310] As part of this brief exploration, she concludes on patches: "*Black Patches* of *Ignorance*, to stick on / The *Face* of *Fooles:* this *Cabinet* is shewn."[311] Although not the strongest repudiation of patches, in a mock parliament dialogue recorded in the same collection, she further problematized patches along with other practices: "Mr. Speaker, There are light wenches of vanity, and craft Bawds, ought to be whipt, Black patches, Sweet Powders, Periwigs, Braclets made of their Lovers Haire, fancy-colour'd Ribbons, to resemble the several passions, looking-glasses to hang by their sides, Love-Posies in Rings, Love-Posies in Rings,

---

[307] Jeremiah Burroughs, *An exposition with practical observations continued upon the eighth, ninth, & tenth chapters of the prophesy of* Hosea, (1650), 433.
[308] Ibid, 433.
[309] Ibid, 434.
[310] Margaret Cavendish, *Natures Cabinet*, 1653.
[311] Ibid.

Love-Letters wrought in Handkerchiefs, Valentines worne on sleeves, and to discourse by signes."[312] It must be noted that this view of parliament is at least in part meant as a sort of parody, showcasing the zeal with which the Commonwealth operated, as a political adversary. Earlier in this section, she highlights the parliament as making an Act, "that the Stomack should be cleaned every spring and fall with Purges."[313] Though this may seem to suggest that placing such comments from the perspective of parliamentarians might, in fact, be a way of demeaning them rather than the practices themselves, her earlier poem problematized this. Furthermore, it is worth noting that at the conclusion to this parliament, the King delivers a speech thanking them for their service, bringing them to tears. Though this is no doubt a political document through and through, it isn't quite singularly-targeted. Rather, it appears that it is the frenzy of the parliamentarians which is meant to be mocked, more-so than the moral assessments they make. She was certainly far from the only writer to include patches as a part of broader political commentary, with a play by John Tatham having a character named "Mrs. Cromwell" insulting another woman along those lines: "…I could finde in my heart in the mean time, to claw thy Eyes out, and make thee wear black patches, for something, thou proud Imperious Slut thou."[314] Patches were also made the target of ballads, a much more popularly accessible source: in perhaps typical fashion, one example of this (printed in 1656) featured the telling line, "Some women sometimes use to wear / black Patches on their face / Whatever else of themselves they think / 'Tis but to their disgrace."[315] Thus, even when both religious and political connotations were stripped from commentaries on patching, the practice remained a source of ridicule.

---

[312] Margaret Cavendish, *Poems, and fancies written by the Right Honourable, the Lady Margaret Newcastle*, 1653. 210.

[313] Ibid, 210.

[314] John Tatham, *The Rump, or, The Mirrour of the Late Times, A New Comedy*, 1660. 17.

[315] Humphrey Crouch, *The Downfall of Pride*, 1656.

It is worth returning here to the popular conduct book, *Youths Behaviour*. Although originally a French publication, the section added with its translation and subsequent release in English contains an extensive critique of the practice of patching: one it frames, at least partially, on the basis of patches being a French invention. Here, Hawkins (an English Jesuit) described the French as inventing patches out of need rather than ornament: "in this we may excuse that Nation, as having taken up the fashion rather for necessity, than novelty, inasmuch as those French pimples have need of a French Plaister."[316] Though this may be intended to carry a sarcastic tone, Hawkins argued that most fashions began out of necessity, only to be abused afterwards. He certainly connected the use of patches to a kind of treachery, invoking the Roman example: "Yet in the language of another mighty Emperour, even Iulius Cesar himself, I shall not fear to pronounce, that a chaste woman ought to avoid not only fault, but the suspition too: and why should a Lucrece of Penelope appear in the dresse of a Cleopatra or Messallina."[317] Though it is highly doubtful such a statement could truly be attributed to Caesar, the attempt to attach opposition to these sorts of practices to notable historic figures (the other being King James) is noteworthy in itself. In order to forward this idea that this opposition was somehow long-lived, Hawkins argued that patches were in-fact a copy of an older fashion practice: "that Pagan usage of printing the volume of their bodies all over with Apes & Monkies."[318] As with other authors, he points to the supposed permissiveness of the Commonwealth, lamenting the "Luxury and loosenesse of these times."[319] He also made it clear that he believed significant action should have been taken, arguing that if patches can not be discouraged through honour alone, then it should be done by law: again, drawing upon the Roman example: "And no lesse commendable was the care of the old Romanes in appointing their Censores morum, whose office it was to punish and restraine all excesses and exorbitances in Fashions, Habits, and Behaviours."[320] Again, the historicity of his commentary may be suspect, but this call to a supposed old tradition does not come without purpose. Despite his religious, and likely political, differences with the Puritan-dominated parliament, he largely echoes their calls for greater reformation of personal behaviour, and by extent, appearance.

---

[316] Francis Hawkins, *Youths Behaviour*, 1652. 58.
[317] Ibid, 58.
[318] Ibid, 58.
[319] Ibid, 59.

Most of these targeted practices are rather narrowly focused on women, but this does not present a full picture. John Donne's sermons, originally preached in 1624 but republished in print form in 1645, provide an example of the types of critiques levelled against men. Here, Donne's argument is remarkably similar to those focused on women. He wrote, "Where the Organs of the body are so indisposed, as that this soule cannot exercise her faculties, in that man, there, there is a curtaine drawn over this image, but yet this Image is, the Image of God."[321] By arguing that men exist in the image of God, it then naturally problematizes cosmetic practices which would alter that image: the aforementioned notion of 'taking the pencil out of God's hand.' He continued: "wordly men draw other pictures over this picture, other images over this image: The wanton man may paint beauty, the ambitious may paint honour, the covetous wealth, and so deface this image, but yet there the image is, and even in hell it selfe it will be, in him that goes down into hell."[322] The idea that cosmetics were used to allow the practitioner to present the face they wanted to the world was fairly commonplace, but Donne takes the practice of painting to be both a literal and a spiritual action: by altering God's image, a man not only changes his outward appearance, but in fact alters his status or worth in way that is inevitably a trespass. Thus, they may pursue beauty if they are ‘wanton’, perhaps the most common avenue of attack against cosmetics, but may also attempt to portray themselves as honourable or wealthy, depending on their desired outward projection. It is difficult to argue that this was not the case, at least on some level: fashion was, almost inevitably, a kind of performance occurring on a daily basis. But the degree to which this appears subversive to Donne is noteworthy: it is an act not just of deceit or lust, but of outright betrayal. “The image of God may burne in hell, but as long as the soule remains, that image remains there too: And then, thou who wouldest not burne their picture, that loved thee, wilt thou betray the picture of the Maker, thy Saviour, thy Sancitifer, to the torments of hell?”[323]

---

[320] Ibid, 59.

[321] John Donne, *Fifty sermons. The second volume preached by that learned and reverend divine*, 1649. 283. Donne was a Church of England clergyman and poet, known largely for a metaphysical poet. His work became more popular after his death. (David Colclough, "John Donne", (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004)

[322] Ibid, 283.

The negative association of men with excessive grooming is, as with most aspects of personal appearance, a continuation from earlier periods. In the Jacobean period, playwright Ben Jonson highlighted men of Rome as particularly effeminate due to being “More kemb’d and bath’d and rub’d and trim’d / More sleek’d, more soft, and slacker limb’d / As prostitute; so much that kind.”[324] As Frances Dolan explains, the men in question are rendered “indistinguishable” from prostitutes in this.[325] For Dolan, this connects largely to the ability of women to take part in a broader conspiracy in this play.[326] However, this association between excessive concern for one’s appearance and effeminacy also speaks to the concept of men somehow ‘transforming’ into women, as seen most clearly in the discourse around men wearing their hair too long.[327] Samuel Gott, a parliamentarian who would later find himself as one of those ejected during Pride's Purge, provided a fairly good example of contemporary views on men's cosmetic use, along with a critique on fashion more generally, as part of a 1650 work. He began by highlighting the men in question, those vain enough to possess inordinate interest in their own appearances, in rather harsh terms: "But vain men, having set their hearts upon and Earthly Beauty, Idolize it with a Divine Love; and we may observv them in their courting and dallying, still to run out into Deifying Complements and Divine Adoration."[328] The insinuation that this was an 'earthly' form of beauty connects to broader moralist critiques around worldly concerns and vanities, and it is likely that the association between fashion and idolatry here is an intentional one. He also insists on connecting these fashions with a notion of lust, reiterating the connection between vanity and sexual morality clearly.[329] Though this connection was undoubtedly most strongly applied to women throughout the early modern period, when it came to a full range of subversive fashion choices, men could find themselves sharing in this manner of scorn.

---

[323] Ibid, 283-284. The notion of men and women betraying their creator by utilizing cosmetics was rather commonplace for moralists, but Donne puts this in particularly strong terms.

[324] Dolan, *Whores of Babylon*, 57.

[325] Ibid, 57.

[326] Ibid, 57.

Gott's criticism did not go into detail as to the problematized cosmetic uses, instead honing in on the moral side of the argument. When he did deal with cosmetics, it was rather vague and sweeping: "…this created Beauty is a chief excellency of Nature, and a Beam of that Infinite Brightness. As the erect Posture of a Mans Body, so his Face, which is the chief part thereof, being composted of a greater variety of curious Lineaments, and fairer Colors, is more excellent than any Beasts, Generally all kind of Beauty is of great esteem."[330] This reference to color and 'lineaments' likely refers to the practice of painting directly, though the exact nature of this is left up to speculation. Though the association of cosmetics as a form of 'cover' for the purposes of deception is largely absent, that particular issue perhaps narrowly confined to female archetypes in moralist literature, the dangers associated with these practices is stated in strong terms. "But the vanity thereof doth sufficiently appear in it self, being but a meer Superficies of the Body, which is the far meener part of Man, and not so much as skin deep, as some allow it, for turn the skin outward, and it will appear to be the Reverse of all Beauty, and a most horrid Spectacle of Bloud and Rawness."[331] Whether or not the notion of purposeful deception as a kind of sexual threat is present, Gott makes it clear that cosmetics are merely a form of false, worldly beauty. It may be something that reaps wordly rewards, such as "the favor of others", but it reflects a "wanton spirit."[332] Men were also expected to, within the confines of marriage, ensure that these basic morals were followed by their wives. Daniel Rogers, a Puritan clergyman, emphasised this: "No man shall need to paint an exact beautifull face: nor teach her thait is faire, to shew it forth, it shewes it selfe to all naturaly without trouble."[333]

---

[327] John Bulwer's *Artificial Changeling,* William Prynne's *The unlovelinesse of love-lockes*, and John Taylor's *Mad Fashions*, all discussed previously, provide good examples of this sort of concept at work.
[328] Samuel Gott, *An Essay of the True Happiness of Man*, (1650), 42.
[329] Ibid, 43.
[330] Ibid, 43.

Overall, the popular literature produced throughout the Civils Wars and Commonwealth on cosmetics use largely resonated with earlier prescriptions on the subject, as well as with discussions on the other modes of personal appearance discussed within the confines of this thesis. Although there were examples of variation and some notable differences between different religious backgrounds, namely between Puritan moralists and more moderate sources, as a whole sources on cosmetics use appear to be largely in agreement with one another on a variety of topics. Although some writers, such as Cavendish and Culpeper, offered more room in their interpretations for the use of either mild cosmetics or washes, excessive cosmetics use, including the practice of applying black patches, was almost uniformly viewed as subversive in some way. These interpretations were rooted in religious thought, as with hair and dress, and carried with them accusations of sexual impiety and moral degradation based upon outward appearance and performance. However, cosmetics increasingly carried a more distinctly racial aspect, with notions of female beauty relying upon ideas of whiteness. These views were undoubtedly widespread throughout popular literature, and though cosmetics did indeed appear in political tracts meant to attack one side or the other as part of the ongoing culture war of the period, conceptions of cosmetics largely elude easy categorization as part of one political tradition or another. Cosmetics use, particularly for women, was undoubtedly a serious issue in the eyes of many moralists, perhaps increasingly so as a result of societal change in the wake of the Civil Wars. However, despite the ongoing Puritan campaign for moral reformation, it is difficult to support the notion that the revolutionaries had distinctly restrictive outlooks when compared to their political counterparts. Cosmetics were an important feature in much of the literature that can be associated with the period's culture war, but it was a subject to be either feared, or raised as an insult – not a subject for significant debate.

---

[331] Ibid, 44.
[332] Ibid, 45-46.
[333] Daniel Rogers, *Matriomoniall Honour*, (1642), 312. To some degree, Rogers' assertion here also supports the idea that proper love, within the confines of marriage, does not require outside cosmetics, and that beauty stems most from the 'natural' image as opposed to from cosmetics such as paint or powder.

Conclusion

The Civil Wars and subsequent Commonwealth undoubtedly pose a challenge on the topic of personal appearance. Although moralist literature, pamphlets, sermons, and other publications appear with almost startling frequency, much of the content can appear painfully repetitive and reflective of old ideas and earlier periods. In addition, the issues surrounding person appearance were both diverse and interconnected, leading to a complex picture overall. Personal appearance practices were often targeted within censorious literature for very specific reasons, such as the fear of false faces and temptation that came to be associated with cosmetics, or the conception of hair as a sort of natural covering for women. Despite this, while some anxieties were extremely specific, they could often blend together as part of larger concerns around lust, vanity, immodesty, or spiritual and moral decay more generally. There is an argument to be made that the moralist literature is quite unremarkable, in large part due to the clear continuity between moralists through to the end of the Commonwealth period and those that were publishing earlier in the Jacobean period. There were certainly some notable changes, namely the advent of wigs, a move towards more sober colours in clothing, and the apparent growth in popularity of black patches. However, the types of arguments that moralists made at the height of the Commonwealth appeared at least very similar to those raised earlier. Other influential works that cannot be easily discarded in examining the Commonwealth were in fact published, at least originally, prior to this period.[334] Despite this, attitudes towards personal appearance during the Civil Wars and Commonwealth should not be viewed as mere continuation.

---

[334] Thomas Tuke's famous tract on cosmetics is one of the most important of these, providing a good summary of the types of arguments that were made with regards to cosmetics throughout the early seventeenth-century. Another example would be the earlier works of notable Puritans such as William Prynne, which continued to be relevant well into the period examined here.

The culture war that raged during this period was undoubtedly a contributing factor for the sheer volume of sources available on this subject, though many sources were broadly targeted and only featured appearance as part of a larger argument. The debates and disputes that made up the culture war form one important context through which these issues must be framed. While on the whole, arguments around personal appearance were marked more by commonalties than by difference, there were some distinctions which must be noted. In terms of style, Puritan moralists usually wrote with a greater sense of immediate urgency, and often proscribed harsher terms in their work. A good example of this would be in the works of William Prynne, where he seemingly endorsed denying sacraments to those who wore their hair too long.[335] This argument also carried political overtones to it, targeted against "Long-Hair'd Rattle-Heads." This attack, which framed Royalists as being the more permissive of the groups, did likely have some truth to it. However, this should not be overstated: excessively long hair was almost never acceptable, and shoulder-length hair seems to have been the usual limit for men in the eyes of moralists, Puritan or not. This greater permissiveness also extended to wealth, where Royalists were more likely to argue in favour of individuals of a higher status being permitted to wear luxurious apparel. In addition to this, and as Bernard Capp points out, Royalist writers were more likely to focus their writings on the subject of social mobility.[336] However, these divisions did not typify the literature on personal appearance, in the way that they might have for other, more clearly political topics. These fault-lines are noteworthy and should not be dismissed, but appear as exceptions to the general rule: that moralists largely shared in concerns and values on the subject of personal appearance.

---

[335] William Prynne, *A Gagge for Long-Hair'd Rattle-Heads who revile all civill Round-Heads*, 1646, 1.

[336] Bernard Capp, *England's Culture War*, 161.

It is thus necessary to account for these shared values briefly, as they were depicted in the preceding chapters. Hair may appear to be the most obvious topic for disagreement along political lines due to the stricter Puritan standard for hair, but as noted, this standard primarily applied to clergy and expectations for the general public would not have been quite so strict. However, most moralists grounded their arguments on the subject of hair around a couple of primary biblical passages. The most important of these is undoubtedly Paul's first epistle, which originated (at least for these writers) the basic conception that long hair was a "shame" for men, while women were to have long hair as a natural covering.[337] Some writers also aimed to highlight these ideas as being part of a sort of natural law, and the contrast between short and long hair in men and women respectively forms one of the important distinctions between gender in this period. This is not a small point, by any means: moralists seemed increasingly concerned throughout the period with the prospect of difficulties in distinguishing between men and women, and with the possibility of one gender 'transforming' into the other. These sorts of concerns may have had as much to do with the supposed-permissive atmosphere as with changing fashion standards. While there was some general agreement on these sorts of standards, one recurring theme was a sense of hypocrisy on the part of some Puritan ministers: while Puritans generally advocated shorter hair, there was a perception that many failed to live up to this standard. Wigs also appeared as a relatively new source for anxiety, though arguments around them often fell under familiar terms, such as the notion that they were somehow too female for their male wearers.

The second mode of personal appearance discussed in this thesis was dress. Although there were similarities between dress and the wearing of hair, as can be stated for the third topic of cosmetics, there were also unique concerns which appeared fairly frequently – and as with hair, these concerns were largely shared between a variety of religious and political alignments. Although dress was one of the most clearly contested areas of personal appearance, it was a difficult one to regulate in practice. The historic failure of sumptuary legislation in recent memory likely had something to do with the lack of any concrete effort on the part of Puritan governance, but that lack of regulation did little to ease the pressure for moral reform seen clearly within the period's popular print.[338] In fact, the opposite may have been true, with new fashions and individuals dressing 'up' from their supposed social status undoubtedly helping to contribute to the sense that the period had an unusually permissive society. Although Puritans arguably focused more on "sober attire", as seen in William Sheppard's famous legal tract, excess in clothing was considered unacceptable on all fronts. Some more extreme voices, such as Samuel Clarke, argued for clothing to be used exclusively for the purpose of covering – but the most common concerns were those around excess, either in the form of rich garments, or patently impractical ones, such as the "thin cobweb attires" that Richard Braithwaite complained of.[339] Dress was also targeted for its association with sexual immorality, usually in the form of revealing attire worn by women. It is through this association that subversive forms of dress were given the damaging level of "whorish attire", something that found little acceptance from any side in the ongoing culture war.

---

[337] 1. Cor. 11:3-15.

The third and final topic that this thesis engaged was, as noted, the use of cosmetics. The association between the practices of painting and patching with sexual immorality were clear, and often connected to the very same concerns around dress within the literature of the period. However, cosmetics carried their own unique connotations as well. One of the most obvious lies in the conception that cosmetics were an illicit alteration to the body. As Farah Karim-Cooper identifies, any alteration of the body was considered to be a "crime against God."[340] While there was significant common ground on the topic of cosmetics for moralists and pamphleteers from across religious and political divides, there wasn't necessarily uniformity either. John Gauden, for example, wrote in defense of some very minor cosmetic usage, namely in augmenting the complexion somewhat. At the same time, he followed in the example of other writers by refusing any use of cosmetics that could appear as a direct alteration of the body.[341] When problematized, painting was often viewed as an act of deception, and one which could conceal true danger lurking behind a beautified complexion. Most often, this was through stereotypical depictions of women attempting to tempt men into sexual immorality through their cosmetics usage. These sorts of depictions had the effect of laying most of the blame for immorality upon women, as men were more often chastised for a sort of moral weakness for being tempted, rather than for falling into lust itself – though this is not a universal rule. Black patches also appeared connected to the issue of sexual immorality, with their usage usually connected by their detractors to diseases such as pox. At the same time, cosmetics became increasingly important for women of a higher status, with the notion of whiteness growing in prominence as a beauty standard, intricately connected to notions of race. Men were also practitioners of cosmetics, and were criticized within the popular literature for this, often under the previous notion of an illicit alteration against God’s creation. It must be stated, however, that women appear to have been much more frequently targeted for cosmetic usage throughout the Civils Wars and the Commonwealth.

---

[338] Jane MacRae Campbell, "Dress, Ideology, and Control: The Regulation of Clothing in Early Modern English Utopian Texts, 1516-1656," *Utopian Studies*, Volume 28, No 3. (Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press, 2017). The last of these sumptuary laws were repealed in 1574, but some writers continued to advocate for them well into the Commonwealth period. There was a recognition on the part of many writers that access to clothing was an important part of social status. Thus, heightened access to rich apparel could lead to the notion of a breakdown in these hierarchies.

[339] Richard Braithwaite, *Times Treasury*, 1652. 272.

---

[340] Farah Karim-Cooper, *Cosmetics in Shakespearean and Renaissance Drama*, 34. Karim-Cooper identifies the other primary concerns around cosmetics as "the ethnocentric fear of foreign ingredients and commodities of a cosmetic nature; and the necromantic effect of face paint." The religious side of this appears to have been the most prominently featured throughout the Civil Wars and Commonwealth period itself, although all of these conceptions remained strong throughout.

[341] John Gauden, *A Discourse of Auxiliary Beauty*, 1656. 42-43.

Although the shared context of a world made increasingly unfamiliar and unstable seemed to frame commentator’s attitudes towards personal appearance throughout the period examined in this thesis, it is much more difficult to assess any significant shifts in the nature of censorious literature compared to the earlier seventeenth-century. Aside from the tendency of some writers to frame their moral arguments in political terms, such as the previous example of Prynne, little seemed to change in terms of actual, concrete proscriptions. The sheer volume of literature may have also been at least in part influenced by the breakdown in censorship, as well as with the ongoing debates in the unnamed culture war, which necessitated constant debate through the medium of popular print. It is however clear that commentators found the need to publish strong arguments against perceived trespasses in the three, primary forms of personal appearance noted, and that many of these arguments were framed as an attempt to return to an orderly past, to support the spiritual health of the nation, or simply due to the perception that standards around personal appearance were being flouted routinely. While it remains true that Puritans often took the strongest stance against perceived moral failings, it would be inaccurate to consider the strict, moralistic tone they often employed as an indication of a unique, Puritan-dominated period in the reformation of dress. Puritans were certainly concerned with the notion of moral and spiritual decay, which they perceived all around them, but so too were political and religious moderates, as well as the fiercest adversaries of the Puritan turn.

It is worth returning to John Taylor’s famous pamphlet, alluded to by historians such as Christopher Hill and David Underdown in their work on the period. Here, Taylor helped to identify the sentiment that seemed only to grow as the Civil Wars progressed: “To Brittaine back again my Muse repaires / Where I perceive a Metamorphosis / Is most preposterous, as the Picture is / The world turn’d upside downe, from bad to worse.”[342] There were countless reasons for writers throughout the period to share this sentiment, that the world had been turned upside down, and the familiar rendered unfamiliar. There were the Civil Wars themselves, destructive and divisive, the overthrowing of the monarchy, as well as the rise of a number of religious minorities. Some of these minorities would go on to have a powerful affect on the period’s moralists, whether it was through the fear of antinomianism on mainstream Puritans, or the broader concerns around the Levellers and the ‘levelling project’ that many associated to them. Though not always mentioned by name, these undoubtedly had a great impact on some of the period’s key writers. In addition, there was the notion that the period had somehow become sexually permissive, along with associated anxieties around personal appearance. Though these anxieties were a continuation from earlier periods, writers perceived a society in which appearance practices were seemingly spiralling out of hand, with excessive apparel, widespread paint and patch usage, and variously styled hair of inappropriate length on both men and women. Moralists identified the failure of their society to live up to principles of modesty and godliness and reacted according to that. As noted, personal appearance has rarely been a private matter: and when society seemed to be in a state of perpetual breakdown, its importance to the moral standing of the nation only grew more poignant.

---

[342] John Taylor, *Mad Fashions*, 1642. A3.

Bibliography

Secondary Sources

Amussen, Susan and Underdown, David. *Gender, Culture and Politics in England, 1560-1640: Turning the World Upside Down*. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.

Bryson, Anna. *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Burgess, Glenn and Prior, Charles W.A. eds. *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Campbell, Jane McRae. "Dress, Ideology, and Control: The Regulation of Clothing in Early Modern English Utopian Texts, 1516-1656," *Utopian Studies*, Volume 28, No 3. Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press, 2017.

Capp, Bernard. *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Capp, Bernard. "The Double Standard Revisted: Plebian Women and Male Sexual Reputation in Early Modern England", *Past and Present* No. 162. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Como, David R. *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.

Cunnington, C. Willet and Cunnington, Phillis. *Handbook of English Costume in the 17th Century*. Boston: Plays, 1972.

Dolan, Frances E. *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999.

Dolan, Frances E. "Taking the Pencil out of God's Hand: Art, Nature, and the Face-Painting Debate in Early Modern England," *PMLA*, Vol. 108, No. 2. Modern Language Association, 1993.

Durston, Christopher and Eales, Jacqueline eds. *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1996.

Durston, Christopher. "Puritan Rule and the Failure of Cultural Revolution, 1645-1660", in Durston, Christopher and Eales, Jacqueline eds. *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1996.

Durston, Christopher. "'Settling the Hearts and Quieting the Minds of All Good People': The Major-Generals and the Puritan Minorities of Interregnum England," *History* 85, no. 278. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Emerson, Everett. *English Puritanism from John Hooper to John Milton*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1968.

Fisher, Will. *Materializing Gender in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Gribben, Crawford. *John Owen and English Puritanism: Experiences of Defeat*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Hessayon, Ariel and Finnegan, David eds. *Varieties of Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Hill, Christopher. *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1958.

Hill, Christopher. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*. London: Penguin Group, 1991.

Hubbard, Eleanor. *City Women: Money, Sex, and the Social Order in Early Modern London*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Ingram, Martin. *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Karim-Cooper, Farah. *Cosmetics in Shakespearean and Renaissance Drama*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.

Kileen, Kevin. *The Political Bible in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Laurence, Anne. "Women, Godliness and Personal Appearance in Seventeenth-Century England," *Women's History Review*, Vol. 15, No. 1. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Marotti, Arthur E. "Alienating Catholics in Early Modern England: Recusant Women, Jesuits and Ideological Fantasies", in Marotti, Arthur E. eds. *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts*. Early Modern Literature in History. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999.

Matthews, Nancy. *William Sheppard: Cromwell's Law Reformer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

McDowell, Nicholas. “The Beauty of Holiness and the Poetics of Antinomianism: Richard Crashaw, John Saltmarsh and the Language of Religious Radicalism in the 1640s”, in Hessayon, Ariel and Finnegan, David eds. *Varieties of Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Milton, Anthony. *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Mortimer, Sarah. “Natural Law and Holy War in the English Revolution,” in Burgess, Glenn and Prior, Charles W.A. eds., *England’s Wars of Religion, Revisited*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Pederson, Randall J. *United in Diversity: English Puritans and the Puritan Reformation, 1603-1689*. Leiden: Brill Academic, 2014.

Phillippy, Patricia. *Painting Women: Cosmetics, Canvases, and Early Modern Culture*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Poitevin, Kimberly “Inventing Whiteness: Cosmetics, Race, and Women in Early Modern England,” *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, 11.1. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

Rees, John. *The Leveller Revolution*. London: Verso, 2016.

Ribeiro, Aileen. *Dress and Morality*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2003.

Ribeiro, Aileen. *Fashion and Fiction: Dress in Art and Literature in Stuart England*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005.

Schama, Simon. *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Cultur*e. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Slack, Paul. *The Invention of Improvement: Information and Material Progress in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Snook, Edith. *Women, Beauty and Power in Early Modern England: A Feminist Literary History*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Turner, James. *Libertines and Radicals in Early Modern London: Sexuality, Politics, and Literary Culture, 1630-1685*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Tyacke, Nicholas. “Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter Revolution,” in W.R. Owens eds. *Seventeenth-century England: A Changing Culture*. New Jersey: Barnes & Noble Books, 1981.

Underdown, David. *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Underdown, David. *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Vincent, Sue. "To Fashion a Self: Dressing in Seventeenth-Century England," *Fashion Theory*: 3:2. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Wood, Andy. "Fear, Hatred and the Hidden Injuries of Class in Early Modern England," *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 39, No. 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, Roberta. "Francis Hawkins," 2004.

Colclough, David. "John Donne," 2004.

Curry, Patrick. "Nicholas Culpeper," 2004.

Fitzmaurice, James. "Margaret Cavendish," 2004.

Gilbert, C.D. "Thomas Hall," 2005.

Henson, Marie. "Francis Osborne," 2004.

Hughes, Anne. "John Trapp," 2016.

Hughes, Anne. "Samuel Clarke," 2004.

Lamont, William. "William Prynne," 2011.

Merrit, J.F. "Thomas Tukes," 2008.

Milton, Anthony. "Peter Heylyn," 2015.

Patterson, W.B. "Thomas Fuller," 2008.

Richards, Graham. "John Bulwer," 2015.

Spinks, Bryan D. "John Gauden," 2008.

Spurr, John. "Richard Allestree," 2004.

Thorn-Drury, George and Moody, Joanna. "Humphrey Mill," 2004.

Primary Sources

Allestree, Richard. *The gentleman's calling*. 1660. *Early English Books Online.*

Anonymous. Seasonable *Advice from the Ancient Separation to all, especially to the professors of this backsliding age*. 1650. *Early English Books Online.*

Anonymous. Newes from Hide-Park. 1647-1665. Broadside Ballad Archive: National Library of Scotland, Crawford.

Anonymous. *The picture of an English antick, with a list of his ridiculous habits, and apish Gestures*. 1646. *Early English Books Online.*

Anonymous. *What Will You Have? A Calfe with a White Face*. 1649. *Early English Books Online.*

Baxter, Richard. *The crucifying of the world by the cross of Christ with a preface to the nobles, gentlemen, and all the rich, directing them how they may be better*. 1658. *Early English Books Online.*

Baxter, Richard. *The saints everlasting rest*. 1650. *Early English Books Online.*

Brathwaite, Richard. *Times Treasury, or, Academy of gentry laying downe excellent grounds, both divine and humane, in relation to sexes of both kindes*. 1652. *Early English Books Online.*

Bulwer, John. *The Artificall Changling.* 1653. *Early English Books Online*.

Burroughs, Jeremiah and Goodwin, Thomas. *An exposition with practical observations continued upon the eleventh, twelfth, & thirteenth chapters of the prophesy of Hosea being first delivered in several lectures at Michaels Cornhill, London*. 1651. *Early English Books Online.*

Cavendish, Margaret. *Natures Cabinet*. 1653. *Early English Books Online.*

Cavendish, Margaret. *The World's Olio*. 1651. *Early English Books Online.*

Clarke, Samuel. *Medulla Theologiae*. 1659. *Early English Books Online.*

Codrington, Robert. *The Second Part of Youths Behavior.* 1664. *Early English Books Online.*

Collop, John. *Poesis redviva*. 1656. *Early English Books Online*.

Crouch, Humphrey. *The Downfall of Pride*. 1656. *Early English Books Online.*

Culpeper, Nicholas. *Pharmocopoaeia Londinesis.* 1653. *Early English Books Online.*

Culverwell, Nathaniel. *An elegant and learned discourse of the light of nature, with several other treatises.* 1652. *Early English Books Online.*

De la Garde, Borealis. *Mercurius Venerus*. 1649. *Early English Books Online.*

Donne, John. *Donne's Satyr*. 1662. *Early English Books Online.*

Donne, John. *Fifty sermons. The second volume preached by that learned and reverend divine*. 1649. *Early English Books Online.*

Fuller, Thomas. *The holy state*. 1642. *Early English Books Online.*

Gauden, John. *A discourse of auxiliary beauty. Or artificiall handsomeness. In point of conscience between two ladies*. 1656. *Early English Books Online.*

Gott, Samuel. *An Essay of the True Happiness of Man.* 1650. *Early English Books Online.*

Hall, Thomas. *Comarum akosmia*. 1654. *Early English Books Online.*

Hawkins, Francis. *Youths behavior, or, Decency in conversation amongst men*. 1651. *Early English Books Online.*

Hawkins, Francis. *Youths Behaviour, or, Decency in conversation amongst men*. 1644. *Early English Books Online.*

Heylyn, Peter. *Cosmographie*. 1652. *Early English Books Online*.

Jackson, Arthur. *A Help for understanding the Holy Scripture.* 1643. *Early English Books Online.*

Jackson, Arthur. *Annotations upon the five books immediately following the historicall part of the Old Testament*. 1658. *Early English Books Online.*

Jonson, Ben. *The Masque of Blackness*. 1605. Retrieved from David Lindley eds. *Court Masques: Jacobean and Caroline Entertainments,* 1605-1640. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Mill, Humphrey. *A nights search.* 1646. *Early English Books Online.*

Mill, Humphrey. *The second part of The Nights Search*. 1649. *Early English Books Online.*

Osborne, Francis. *Advice to a Son.* 1656. *Early English Books Online.*

Price, Laurence. *The Merry Mans Resolution*, 1650. *Early English Books Online.*

Price, Laurence. *A Compleate Gentle-woman, Described by her Feature,* 1633. Broadside Ballad Archive: British Library, Roxburghe.

Price, Laurence. *The Maidens Delight*. 1656. Broadside Ballad Archive: University of Glasgow Library, Euing Ballads.

Prynne, William. *A Gagge for Long-Hair'd Rattle-Heads who revile all civill Round-Heads*. 1646. Houghton Library, Harvard University.

Prynne, William. *Histriomastix: The Player's Scourge, or Actor's Tragedy.* 1632. *Early English Books Online.*

Prynne, William. *The unlovelinesse of love-lockes*. 1628. *Early English Books Online.*

Rogers, Daniel. *Matrimoniall Honour*. 1642. *Early English Books Online.*

Rogers, John. *A godly & fruitful exposition upon all the First epistle of Peter by that pious and eminent preacher of the word of God, John Rogers*. 1650. *Early English Books Online.*

Sheppard, William. *England's Balme: or, Proposals by way of grievance & remedy*. 1657. *Early English Books Online.*

T.H. *A looking-glasse for women, or, a spie for pride*. 1644. *Early English Books Online.*

Tatham, John. *The Rump, or, The Mirrour of the Late Times, A New Comedy*. 1660. *Early English Books Online.*

Taylor, John. *Mad fashions, od fashions, all out fashions, or, The emblems of these distracted times.* 1642. *Early English Books Online.*

Theophraste, Renaudot. *Another collection of philosophical conferences of the French victurosi upon questions of all sorts for the improving of natural knowledge*. 1665. *Early English Books Online.*

Trapp, John. *A commentary or exposition upon the four Evangelists, and the Acts of the Apostles*. 1647. *Early English Books Online.*

Tukes, Thomas. A Discourse Against Painting and Tincturing of Men and Women. 1616. *Early English Books Online.*