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Matchcoats: Cultural Conservatism and Change in One Aspect of Native American Clothing

Marshall Joseph Becker, West Chester University

Abstract. The English term matchcoat derives from an Algonquian root word relating to clothing or dress in general. During the seventeenth century matchcoat came to refer to European-made units of woolen cloth, generally about two meters (a “fathom”) long, that were traded to natives who wore them as loosely wrapped cloaks. Some English-speaking scholars have erroneously emphasized the word match, inferring that “matchcoats” were garments that were pieced together from small units, or matched in a way that resembled techniques used by natives to make cloaks from pelts. The common “blanket” worn by the stereotypical “Indian” of that period also was called a matchcoat. Native-made garments, often described in the early literature, were rapidly replaced by these pieces of trade cloth. The term matchcoat was being applied to “made up” or off-the-rack tailored sleeved coats by the 1680s. The use of increasingly elaborate trade-cloth coats reveals progressive adoption of European garments among all of the native peoples of the Northeast.

Of all the trade goods craved by Native Americans in the Northeast, cloth was the most universally desired and generally useful. Men, women, and children benefited from the warmth and flexibility of cloth, usually woolens of various types and qualities (Norton 1974: 30). Wool in particular was valued for its insulation and warmth, even when wet. While detailed ethnographic descriptions exist for the traditional clothing of numerous native peoples (see Paterek 1993), cloth trade goods were incorporated into native costumes from the earliest period of contact. Often authors consider all native-made matchcoats to be the same, and generalize on their form. Often the meaning of the term matchcoat is derived either from the surviving “Powhatan’s Mantle” or from comments on the mantle worn by the queen of Pamunkey (e.g., Gerard 1907: 95). Since at least the 1650s a cloak de-
scribed as “Powhatan, King of Virginia’s habit” has been in Oxford, now at the Ashmolean Museum (Bushnell 1907a: 38–41). The garment supposedly associated with Powhatan (chief of the tribe of the same name) lacks any trace of fringe and has no evident means of being fastened, according to Christian Feest (1983), leading him to suggest that this piece may not have served as an item of clothing. “Powhatan’s mantle” seems different from the presumably traditional mantle reportedly worn by the queen of Pamunkey in 1676, leaving us to wonder whether there was a norm for native-made garments in the region of the Powhatan (cf. Willoughby 1907: 68–70).

The transition each culture made during the acculturation process, as reflected by cloth use, requires additional investigation to document how specific groups, and sometimes individuals within those groups, signaled retention of their specific cultural identity. Matchcoats and/or their accessories came to provide native peoples with items of dress that were useful signifiers of native identity. The accessories may have identified each specific native culture, while use of the coats themselves indicated the degree to which individual natives within a culture were interacting with, or even joining with, colonial society. Study of the contexts in which the term matchcoat was used enhances our understanding of what was meant by the word and provides insights into the use of these European-made garments by various native populations.

Throughout the colonial period references are made to matchcoats. These occur in a variety of contexts that reflect different of types of interactions between Native Americans and colonists and/or traders. The contexts of these interactions also reveal the changes taking place through time. Modern studies relating to the interactions between natives and Europeans, recorded in various colonial documents, generally define the term matchcoat on the basis of inferences associated with a specific context, or on the modern author’s ideas regarding these very important objects of trade. Some recent writers provide unusual definitions that do not appear to be related to any known evidence. Since many of these modern inferences and “observations” are often contradictory, even in the ways in which they define “matchcoats,” the subject merits specific investigation. I have reviewed the literature to clarify what was meant when this term was used, and where it was used, in order to give meaningful life to these objects. The information reveals ways in which native peoples incorporated major items of European-produced material culture into their traditional lifeways without compromising their traditional systems of identity.


**Earliest Descriptions of Matchcoats: Native Clothing**

The earliest narrative descriptions of aboriginal clothing in the northeastern coastal areas of America do not identify the term that the natives used for their cloaks or mantles. The John White account from the 1580s (Hulton 1984: plate 34) notes only that the observed natives in the Carolinas used mantles and other garb, presumably of various skin types, worn with the fur on the inside during the winter. White also depicted a “priest” wearing a rabbit skin cape (ibid.: plate 42). Decades later, and further to the north along the middle Atlantic coast, Captain Cornelis Hendricksen reported (18 August 1610) that he had explored the area of “a bay and three rivers” where he made contact with the native population “and did there trade with the Inhabitants; said trade consisting of Sables, Furs, Robes and other Skins” (quoted in Linn and Egle 1877: 11). The reference to the purchase of “Robes” may well be the earliest written indication that these European purchasers of pelts literally bought the garments off the backs of native vendors. That used or worn pelt cloaks brought a higher price than fresh pelts is indicated consistently wherever price lists appear in the records. For example, an early account from Virginia lists the values for the pelts of various animals as well as the various qualities of beaver skins. “Old Bever skins in mantles, gloves or caps, the more worne, the better, so they be full of fur, the [value per] pound weight is 6s. The new Bever skins are not to be bought by the pound, because they are thicke and heavy Leather, and not so good for use as the old [skins]” (Force 1836: vol. 3, book 11: 52).

These “preprocessed” materials, in the form of used beaver and perhaps other pelts, had a higher value because their use by natives as clothing led to the loss of the longer, coarser guard hairs, leaving behind only the higher quality hair. By purchasing skins that had been used as clothing the buyer eliminated any need for a special process to remove the guard hairs from the fine hair. The remaining fine hair stripped from these pelts was used in European “factories” to make the high-quality and more valuable felt needed to manufacture hats. Since this differential value is seen only with regard to beaver pelts, from which the leather was the lesser by-product, the differential value must relate largely to the hair. By 1610 all native vendors recognized that their used cloaks were a more valuable product than the raw pelts commonly purchased by Europeans.

The Hendricksen account noted above reflects the development of a seventeenth-century pelt trade that today is known almost entirely through the archaeological record of the goods received by the native vendors. Nearly contemporaneous with Hendricksen’s writing is a recording of the
first known specific native term for any article of clothing. This word was first published by Captain John Smith (1607 [1612]: 44–46) in the vocabulary section of his “Map of Virginia,” where he defined “Matchcores” as “Skins, or garments.” This section of Smith’s text is dated by the editors of his Travels and Works to the years 1607–9. Smith also noted social distinctions in the dress of the people with whom he was interacting. While the commoners were attired less well, “the better sort [elite people] vse large mantels of deare skins not much differing in fashion from the Irish mantels. Some imbrodered with white beads, some with copper, others painted after their manner” (66).

William Strachey’s (1849 [1616]: 185) native word list provides another early definition for the simple cloak or garment, but one that may be derived from Smith’s 1612 publication: “A coat, jerkin, doublet, or ells what, mantchoor.” Other citations of Strachey’s dictionary suggest a variation, as “Matchkore, a stags skyn.” The use of the term stag for all deer was common in the early colonial period. Strachey’s definition appears to be a bit more elaborate than Smith’s but the essentials are the same. Other early accounts note bead decorated mantles, suggesting that “Powhatan’s” mantle in the Ashmolean Museum is not a unique piece and might derive from any one of the native elite, or “better sort” of people, in the Virginias encountered by Captain John Smith or his successors. How rapidly the use of these native skin cloaks was replaced by cloth garments for “formal” wear is not known, but this had probably occurred by 1650. When the queen of Pamunkey wore a traditional skin garment at a “state” occasion in the 1670s, her unusual use of an outmoded or “period” costume was noted, as will be discussed below.

Feathered capes, also identified as “matchcoats,” were worn by specific high-status natives in various true chiefdoms of the eastern woodlands. For example, during the earliest period of the Virginia colony, around 1611–12, George Percy (1922: 279–80) described an expedition sent “upp into the Cowntry neare unto the Falles” to erect Fort Henrico and to expand British control in that area: “Capteyne BRUSTER in his martche was dyvs tymes assawlted and encowntered by the salvages beinge sente from POWHATAN haveinge for their Leader one MUNETUTE comonly called amongste us Jacke of the feathers. By Reason that he used to come into the felde all covered over wth feathers and Swans wings fastened unto his showlers as thowghe he meante to flye.” The literature relating to feathered capes called matchcoats and their associations with specific high-status native leaders in the Virginias is discussed in detail elsewhere (Becker 2005c).3

The considerable range of garment types identified as Matchcore sug-
gests that the term was used for “clothing” in general. Native-made garments called by this Algonquian term generally were fashioned from animal skins, but feather capes and other wear were placed in the same terminological category. The number of references to native-made skin cloaks in the early literature is surprisingly small, but this is easily explained by the speed with which lengths of cloth and then tailored clothing replaced these native-made items. A 1634 account describing the Maryland Indians and their dress summarizes this transformation: “Their attire is decent and modest; about their waists, they wear a covering of Deares skinnes, which reacheth to their knees, and upon their shoulders a large mantle of skinnes, which comes downe to the middle of the legge, and some to the heele; in winter they weare it furred, in summer without; When men hunt they put off their Mantles, so do the women when they worke if the weather be hot.” The account continues with descriptions of the chains and bracelets of beads and pearls worn by these natives, but more important is the narration regarding the extensive changes that had taken place in their material culture:

And they and the young men use[d] to paint their faces with severall colours, but since the English came thither those about them have quite left it; and in many things they have great inclination to conform themselves to the English manner of living. The Werowance of Paschatoway desired the Governor to send him a man that could build him a house like the English, and in sundry respeckts, commended our manner of living, as much better than their owne; The Werowance of Patuxent, goes frequently in English Attire, so doth he of Portobac, and many others that have bought Clothes of the English. (Hall 1910: 87–88)

One of the few references to native costumes appears in the inventory of goods left in the estate of Leonard Leonardson of Maryland, who died on 18 April 1642. The fifteenth and last entry in his probate list notes the native products as “2. Rackoone matchcos & 15. Armes length ronoke 0/06/o” (Browne 1887: 94). These must have been native-made raccoon cloaks, probably with the hair remaining on the skin, but whether purchased for the decedent’s own use or as part of the pelt trade is unknown. I suspect that both natives and colonists living in the back country in the 1640s may have worn these warm cloaks. Colonel Henry Norwood’s account of travel on the Eastern Shore of Virginia about 1649–50 reveals the use of skin garments by the elite even at this late date: “I took that occasion to present the king with a sword and long shoulder-belt, which he received very kindly; and to witness his gracious acceptance, he threw off his Mach coast (or upper
covering of skin) stood upright on his bank, and, with my aid, did accou-
tre his naked body with his new harness, which he had no other apparel to
adorn it, besides a few skins about his loyins to cover his nakedness” (Force

After the 1640s descriptions and even mention of native-made cloaks almost disappear throughout the Northeast region, except in reference
to examples in museum collections. Woolen goods had quickly replaced
native-made skin garments. In addition to the licensed traders who had per-
mission to carry on the pelt trade with the natives, especially with major
wholesalers such as the Susquehannock, settlers throughout Maryland and
Virginia were conducting small-scale exchanges in which cloth was the
principal item sought by all the native peoples. In 1648 a published account
of the New World with advice to prospective colonists regarding what to
take to New Albion noted: “For trade with the Indians, buy Dutch or Welch
rugged cloth, seven quarters broad, a violet blew or red, at four or five
shillings a yard, small hooks and fishing lines, Morris bels, Jewes-harps,
Combes, trading knives, Hatchets, Axes, Hoesw, they will bring you Veni-
son, Turkeys, and Fowles, Flesh, &c. for a pennyworth of corn [that can
be had] at twelve pence a bushell” (Force 1963 [1836]: vol. 2, book 7: 32).

Twenty-five years later advice to prospective colonists was much the
same: “If you barely deſigne a Home-trade with neighbour-Indians, for
skins of Deer, Beaver, Otter, Wild-Cat, Fox, Racoon, &c. your beſt Trucx
is a fort of courfe Trading Cloth, of which a yard and a half makes a Match-
coat or Mantele fit for their wear; as allo Axes, Hoes, Knives, Sizars, and
all forts of edg’d tools” (Lederer 1672: 26). The extent of this home trade
and the ready access to European goods is among the several reasons why
chiefs in the Chesapeake region and up as far north as central Delaware
lost power by the 1680s. The ability of individual natives to trade pelts
for cloth and other valued goods completely undermined chiefly authority
(Becker 2004b).

As late as the 1730s some descriptive works, principally copied from
earlier publications, continued to identify native garments as “matchcoats,”
but these references are to trade goods that were worn by, but not made
by, the natives. There are several reports that date from after the decline
of chiefly power, around 1670–80, that mention cloth apparel worn in those
chieftoms located from central Delaware south. In all of these reports,
whenever native-made garments are noted, the authors appear to be de-
scribing clothing worn by natives in the “ethnographic present,” an imagi-
nary point in time when the native populations had first contacts with Euro-
peans, long before 1670. I suspect that a much earlier record is being copied
in an English ethnographic account purporting to describe the Cherokee
in 1788. This account appears in the same volume as a report on Captain Cook’s second voyage and states that the Cherokee wear “a bit of cloth over their private parts, a shirt of the English make, a sort of cloth-boots [leggings], and moccasins, . . . a large mantle or match-coat, thrown over all, compleats their dress at home” (Anonymous 1788:115).

During the early seventeenth century high-status natives in the true chiefdoms of Virginia wore elaborate native-made garments and may have continued to use them for ceremonial occasions long after the colonists had recovered from the native uprising of 1622. A document that offers significant insight into costume choice among native elites some fifty years later has been provided by Peter Force. It describes Cockacoeske, the queen of Pamunkey, making an impressive entry into a meeting in 1676, dressed in native-made garments and accoutrements, “having round her head a plat of black and white wampum pegaue three inches broad in imitation of a crown, and . . . cloathed in a mantle of dress’t deer skins with the hair outwards and the edge cut [a]round 6 inches deep which made strings resembling twisted frenge from the shoulders to the feet” (Force 1963 [1836]: vol. 2, book 7:14). Obviously Cockacoeske was making an important statement to her native constituents as well as to the English officials with whom she met. By the 1670s, all native persons of means in that area of Virginia had adopted the more flexible and warmer imported cloth garments for daily wear (see Potter 1989; also McCartney 1989:176–77). Cockacoeske’s selection of regal native garments to wear at a meeting with colonial officials, like her decision to communicate with them only through an interpreter, was a deliberate and careful act, similar to the sartorial statements made by Jackie Kennedy or Princess Diana in selecting items crafted by their respective couturiers. In Cockacoeske’s case an element of “nativism” in displaying her rank was deliberately intended. By wearing an elaborate native-made garment Cockacoeske reminded those with whom she conferred of her traditional rights as a native “chief.” Thus, in the 1670s, the garment took on a symbolic meaning. Aside from being a fashion statement, this “mantle of dress’t deer skins” took on a “ritual” meaning that it did not previously possess, harking back to what might be called the “good old days” and a time of native power.

The “native” costume selected by Cockacoeske may have been far different from the available “rich matchcoat” subsequently stolen from her by the followers of the rebel Nathaniel Bacon, along with vast quantities of other English goods. When an important peace treaty was signed in May 1677, Cockacoeske was singled out from among the other natives to receive a regal robe of scarlet cloth lined with purple “manto” [man-teau], an ermine-trimmed velvet cap, and a variety of other accoutrements
of the contemporary regal English fashion (see McCartney 1989: 181–82). Her son, the young “Captain John West,” was provided with an equally elaborate custom-made coat, stockings, and goods that included “a sword and pistols decorated with gold and silver.” Various interpreters who were employed for the treaty, native counselors, and other Indian rulers in attendance also received appropriate gifts.

Etymology of the Term Matchcoat

Nearly a century ago William Gerard (1907: 96) suggested that matchcoat derived from a word used by the “Renâpe of Virginia Mâtsb’kor,” a term that he translated as a garment made of skin. Gerard’s reference to the “Renâpe” people indicates that this is one of the Algonquian-speaking peoples, all of whom employ some variation of this term as a self-referent meaning “the people” or “human beings” (cf. Lenape, Lenopi, etc.). After he reviewed the linguistic evidence, Ives Goddard, a senior linguist at the Smithsonian Institution, pointed out that all the Algonquian speakers used some variation of the term commonly transcribed as “matchcoat” (personal communication 14 August 2000). The native term might best be equated with clothing or cloaks in general, as was indicated by John Smith’s definition some four hundred years ago, quoted above. The Oxford English Dictionary (OED, see Simpson and Weiner 1989: 461) provides a useful, brief review of the use of the term matchcoat, including note of the variant matchi-coat. The OED suggests that the term matchcoat derived from the Native American matchco, and offers the Ojibwa term matchigode, a petticoat or woman’s dress, as an example. The OED notes that the term also refers to a kind of mantle formerly worn by American Indians and originally made of fur or skins but afterward replaced by match-cloth. Thus the second definition focuses on the material of which such mantles were made. The English term match-cloth as used in the OED derives from the Algonquian term for garment, but the editors fail to indicate that many types of cloth could be used.

Goddard suggests that the two lines of evidence in the OED definitions are not reconciled, noting that this should be corrected in the next edition. He observes that the Proto-Algonquian (PA) term *ako:ta:y signified skirt, or women’s garb, and that this word has elements that survive in the modern Ojibwa term majigoode (“dress” as in garment or costume, earlier specifically a skirt or petticoat). Goddard suggests that the English usage of the term matchcoat came from a Virginia Algonquian (VA) word that contains PA *-skor- that may be translated as “robe.” I use the term gar-
ment as a translation for matchcoat to avoid possible confusion that might derive from using the now gendered term dress.

Aspects of the PA word *ako:tay can be noted in the Algonquian (Lenopi) term ochqueon that John Dyneley Prince (1912: 510) translates as “coat” using Gabriel Thomas (1698: 75) as his source. Prince also notes that the Salem Records (New Jersey) give the term for coat as aquewan. The Salem Records vocabulary derives from the Lenopi language of the seventeenth century (see Becker 1987a, 1998, 2003), a language that also forms the basis for the dictionary variations produced by Daniel Brinton (1888) and by David Zeisberger (1887). Prince (1912: 512) provides the following translations derived from Brinton (B) and from Zeisberger (Z).

40. aquewan “coate, cloak or wollen cloak”; B. achquiwanis “blanket”; Z. “achquiwanes.”
41. wepeckaquewan “a white match-coat”; the element wepeck “white” = B. wapsu “white”; Z. woapsu. “Matchcoat” meant “leather coat”; Z. machtschi-lokees = “leather string.”

Prince’s translation of matchcoat derives from the original native meaning of the word for leather (tanned hide) that was used for large garments in general (cf. Waselkov 1992: 37). Helen Rountree (1990: 8n) suggests that the Powhatan term meskote was applied to a native-made coat or robe of fur. Crestien Le Clerq (1910 [1691]: 891n. 41), commenting on matachias, notes that the modern Mi’kmaq still use the term metasiamogol to refer to “bright or vari-coloured clothes.” After European contact the various Algonquian terms used for these cloak-like garments came to be used by Europeans as a generalized term for the various types of trade-cloth garments worn by natives as well as for the pieces of fabric that were used for these articles of dress.

Associating the native Algonquian term majigoode, variously spelled, with the homonymous English words “matched coat” is a simple error. The inference derived from this error is that “matched” skins were used in the making of these cloaks or capes. The prime example is the native-made garment now called Powhatan’s mantle, a cloak formed by piecing together four tanned deerskins (Waselkov 1989b: 306–8, 336–37). The apparent “matching” of the tanned hides employed in fashioning this skin cloak leads some authors to infer that the “matching” process is somehow connected to the use of the term matchcoat. While skins were used in the native clothing, how “matched” they were is a matter of speculation. Those few possible surviving examples noted below provide no evidence of matching, other than in a most general sense. Native mantle production did
not assemble pieces in anything resembling the complex manner of color matching plus slitting and sewing (“letting out”) used in the fabrication of modern fur coats.

Native-Made Matchcoats in Museum Collections

Perhaps the best-known example of a native-made garment that might be identified as a matchcoat is “Powhatan’s mantle.” This item became part of Elias Tradescant’s seventeenth-century collections, now in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, England. Feest (1983: 133) offers an important review of this piece, suggesting that it is the “only surviving example of five ‘matchcoats’ and habits supposedly made by the Algonquian-speaking Indians.” Although this item has been dated to circa 1608 by Waselkov (1989b: 306-8), based on evidence from several early texts, it first appears in the written records only in 1656. The possible association with Powhatan implies that the Tradescant piece is the same as noted by John Smith (1667 [1612]), who describes Christopher Newport giving gifts in 1608 to Powhatan, who reciprocated with a “mantle” and other clothing.

Feest’s (1983) extensive and well-illustrated review of this piece also notes that the information associated with it cannot conclusively be linked with an original collector or with anyone who may have held this “mantle” before it reached Tradescant (see Feest 1978; Waselkov 1989a). All of the ethnographic data suggests that this garment in Oxford was an early “mantle,” but it may be an elite object of clothing collected at any time between 1608 and 1656. Nowhere in the pre-1656 accounts is this particular garment identified as a “matchcote.”

David Bushnell (1907a, 1908b; see also Holmes 1908) noted several important New World pieces listed in the original catalogue for this extraordinary cabinet (Tradescant 1656: 45, 47, 51, 53; see MacGregor 1983). Bushnell believed this to have been the first museum catalogue to be printed in the English language, as distinct from Latin. See figure 1 for the relevant entry from Tradescant (1656: 47; also see MacGregor 1983).

Bushnell’s transcription may derive from a different listing or catalogue of the Tradescant collection, or it may reflect problems in his records. There is another interesting problem raised by Bushnell’s texts. In his first publication Bushnell (1907a) omits an illustration of the “Match-coat from Virginia” or any other examples. In a note published the following year, Bushnell (1908b: plate 30, fac. 494) published a photograph of another matchcoat with a caption that reads “A Match-coat from Canada.” This garment (also see MacGregor 1983: plate 4) is not the item commonly referred to as “Powhatan’s mantle.” Of note are the sleeves, suggesting
Figure 1. Entry from Tradescant 1656, p. 47. Courtesy Arthur MacGregor
that Bushnell’s item indeed derived from a Canadian source, since tailored
skin clothing was essential to the survival of all the northern peoples (see

American Indian Items in Rome
By 1680 Athanasius Kircher had collected some sets of native-made gar-
ments for men and for women (“matchcoats”? ) for his museum in Rome.
These artifacts came either from New France, as Feest (1995: 339) believes,
or from that part of the New World then under British control gener-
ally identified as Virginia (Bonanni 1709). The items in the Museo Kir-
cheriano di Propaganda Fide may have been relocated to the collections
of the Vatican Museums around 1926 or 1927. Despite several attempts to
locate these examples in Rome (Becker 1997), the present locations of any
of the garments in the Kircher collection remain unknown. Quite possibly
these items have not survived, but other native items thought to have been
lost have been located in recent years (see King 1991; Becker 2001a).

The State Museum of Pennsylvan ia, Harrisburg
The collections of the State Museum include fragments of at least two
matchcoats, one of which was decorated with metallic elements that appear
to be remnants of buttons and possibly silver lace. Both were recovered
from excavations at Conestoga Town (Quanistagua, 36LA52) near the Sus-
quehanna River. This settlement was occupied from circa 1690 to 1763 by
the survivors of the Susquehannock confederacy who had been dispersed
by the Five Nations Iroquois during the winter of 1674–75. During the
years following 1690 some of these people, the remnants of the Susque-
hannock confederacy, were living near their ancestral habitation zone and
commonly were identified then as Conestoga or Conoy. Several bits of
perishable materials representing two elaborate coats were recovered dur-
ing excavations in that area (see Kent 1984: 65, 379–91). Specific details
relating to these finds have not been published, but slides were made of
these garments in November 1998. Scott Stephenson (2001) examined these
remains of clothing while a scholar-in-residence at the State Museum and
suggested they be subjected to extensive conservation efforts. A member of
the staff at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation has been collaborating
in the conservation of the cloth and buttons, and one of these garments had
been stabilized as of March 2003. The construction details and the materi-
als used have been analyzed, revealing a complex tailored coat with collar,
pocket flaps, and cuffs (see fig. 2; also see De Roche 2001).
The site or area called Conestoga Town was occupied for approxi-
mately seventy years. During this period an event took place for which
Figure 2. Drawing of the pattern used for tailored matchcoats of the period ca. 1700.
we have written records that document the presentation of similar coats to natives living in this general region. This type of garment was in use by colonists as well as natives, but documentation of their presence seems better for the native examples. During the early 1730s, the Lenape elder Sassoonan (Allummapies) was living along the upper reaches of the Brandywine River, to the east of Conestoga Town. He and other members of this Lenape band were presented with matchcoats “ed[d] with Silver Lace.” These coats will be described below in the context of matchcoats of the early eighteenth century.

The visual record for early use of matchcoats, whether of skin or cloth, is extremely poor. Skin garments are seen in the John White drawings of 1585, which depict the women all wearing short, fringed apron-like skirts (Hulton 1984: plates 33, 35, 37, 47) nearly identical to that worn by “A Cheife Herowan” (plate 46). The chief’s garment appears to be a simple apron, while those of the women appear to have an upper part that is folded over the waist, with the sole exception seen in plate 48. A “wynter garment” of an “aged man” of Pommeioocke (plate 34; see also p. 115, fig. 13) appears to be a large mantle assembled from two deer (?) skins (cf. Hulton 1984: 178) and worn over one shoulder. The simple sketch of a Susquehannock man and woman offered in De Vries 1911 (fig. 274) is too rudimentary to merit comment. Robert Beverley’s (1722: table 7) depiction of two Indian women and children is similarly crude, and the woman depicted on the right obviously derives directly from the etching in Harriot 1590 (see Hulton 1984: 116, fig. 14).

Native-Made Matchcoats Are Replaced by Trade Blankets

There are many more descriptions of matchcoats made of European-produced cloth than descriptions of native pelts. The kinds of cloth used in trade included many types and qualities (see appendix A). The records for use of these trade fabrics provide clues to the evolution of the trade in woolen matchcoats and to how the latter were used by various native populations. A review of the literature also reveals details about the lengths of the pieces of fabric used by natives as cloaks and also reveals an evolution of the trade from these simple lengths of cloth to loosely fitting but tailored coats.

The earliest reference yet identified to the general transformation from the use of skin garments to trade cloth appears in an account written in 1644. Johannes Megapolensis Jr. arrived at Beverwyck on the Hudson River on 11 August 1642. During the next two years he learned the Mohawk
language and then wrote an extremely useful ethnographic account of these people (Megapolensis 1857 [1651]). Included in that account of the Mohawk is the following:

In winter, they hang loosely about them an undressed deer’s, or bear’s, or panther’s skin; or they take some Beaver and otter skins, of wild cat’s, raccoon’s, martin’s, otter’s, mink’s, squirrel’s or several kinds of skins, which are plenty in this country, and sew some of them to others, until it is a square piece, and that is then a garment for them; or they buy of us Dutchmen two and an half ells of duffels [cloth], and that they hang loosely on them, just as it was torn off, without any sewing, and as they go away they look very much at themselves, and thin they are very fine. . . .

They call us Assyreoni, that is, cloth-makers, or Charustooni, that is, iron workers, because our people first brought cloth and iron among them. (ibid.: 154, 159)

A Swedish account from the Delaware Valley about 1654 describes the clothing of the Lenape and suggests that only a few years after Megapolensis observed the Mohawk all of the peoples of the eastern seaboard were wearing cloth garments. The fact that some of the coats worn by the Lenape in 1654 were tailored, and not just simple lengths of fabric, is of particular interest.

Around their waists they have tied a broad belt of money, strung in the form of [geometric] figures from which their pieces of cloth hang, which some of them use to cover themselves with, which are of red or blue frieze or deer skin, everywhere sewed on with their money, and around the edges which hang down, lightly fastened with hanging narrow strips, like thick long fringes on the ends of which they also have money strung. . . . Otherwise, while the savages grow up they go quite naked. . . .

Lately, however, the sachems or chiefs of the savages and some of the principal savages have begun to buy shirts from the Christians, reaching to the knees; but they do not know enough to let them be washed, but let them stay on unwashed as long as there is a single piece left. Lately the Christians have had a lot of coats, reaching to the knees, made of frieze for the savages living nearest [to themselves], the one side of the breast and back, red, the other side, blue, likewise on the arms, as the clothes of orphan children in Stockholm are made. These [coats] the principal sachems bought from the Christians and liked.
them very much. Otherwise, when they want to be well dressed they wrap around themselves an ell of red or blue frieze of the broad Dutch frieze, which they also buy from the Christians. (Lindeström [1654] 1925: 197–99)

A Dutch colonial account from the lower Hudson River Valley in June 1658 (Fernow 1881: 85) notes the presentation of goods to the local Esopus who were living where the Dutch built the fortified settlement that became Kingston under the English. The “present of two coats and two pieces of duffels, together about four yards” (of cloth) suggests that two tailored coats were given along with two pieces of duffels, each piece of duffels being two yards in length. If we were to assume that the “four yards” of cloth included the coats and the duffels, this would compute to only a yard of fabric for each of the four units, far too small to conform to what we know about these garments. We may infer that “each” of the duffels “was two yards in length,” an inference confirmed by Daniel Denton’s (1670: 12) description of native clothing on Long Island:

Their Cloathing is a yard and an half of broad Cloth, which is made for the Indian Trade, which they hang upon their shoulders, and half a yard of the same cloth, which being put betwixt their legs, and brought up before and behind, and tied with a Girdle about their middle, hangs with a flap on each side. They wear no Hats, but commonly wear about their Heads a Snake’s skin or a Belt of their money, or a kind of Ruff made with Deers hair and died of a scarlet colour, which they esteem very rich.

By 1670 these natives on Long Island, in addition to greasing their bodies and decorating their faces with paint, were wearing various items of clothing that had become common among all natives in the region, probably with specific cultural markers added to indicate tribal affiliation. I suspect that the “girdles,” or cloth belts (sashes) used to fasten the piece of cloth worn as a “matchcoat,” were elements of clothing incorporating identifying features that were culture-specific and applied by each culture (Becker 2002c). Of note is Denton’s mention of the use by these natives of a head gear formed from a dyed deer hair “Ruff.” This is one of the rare references to the ornamental use of items now called “roaches.” These have reemerged in recent years as a popular pan-Indian adornment. These items make use of a construction technique that I have called “hair-string”; elsewhere I have described the types found on several Susquehannock artifacts of the mid-seventeenth century now preserved in the Skokloster Museum in Sweden (Becker 1990b).
A reference from Virginia dating from 1661, a date that falls between the two citations just noted from New York, also indicates that these examples of “Matchcoats” were only simple lengths of woven goods (see also Bushnell 1907b). The term matchcoat had not yet been applied to tailored coats. Each “matchcoat” described here was a length of fabric, approximately “two yards” long. Thus the Virginian hired the services of these natives, “he paying . . . for the use of those Indians[,] thirty Matchcoats of two yards a piece” (Hening 1809–23: 2:36).

The many land purchases made from the Lenopi bands, by Quakers and others, in southern New Jersey and the area that became Delaware, prior to the 1681 initiation of William Penn’s colonial venture, involved the payment of impressive quantities of cloth as well as long lists of other goods (see appendices A and B). Some of these sales documents from Delaware, recently published for the first time (Becker 1998), specifically note that lengths of cloth were involved, not tailored coats. The term “Matchcoat” in these documents represents a length or piece of duffels or other cloth, as is made evident in the text of a sale of a small tract of land on 8 January 1675–76. (The Julian calendar began the year in March. Prior to the adoption of the Gregorian system in England in 1752, dates in January and February were written “old style” or as part of the previous year.) The vendors attest that they “doe accordingly hereby acknowledge the receipt of the Said piece of dufills or Matchcoat together with twoe Guns” (Becker 1998: 55, from the manuscript copy in the Delaware Archives).

Less than a month later, on 6 February 1675–76, the price paid to another band of Lenopi for a tract of their land in southern New Jersey included various lengths of fabric. I suspect that the cloth stipulated in the sale price included fathom lengths of matchcoat material, but the description appears to have been abbreviated in the text of the deed. The text reads “fouer Anchers of Rumm, twelve Matchcoates, and divers other pcells of Goods” (ibid.: 57, from the manuscript copy in the Delaware Archives).

From Blankets to Ready-Made Clothing,
Also Called Matchcoats

The considerable numbers of seventeenth-century land sales made by the native peoples in Pennsylvania, as in New Jersey, abound in references to matchcoats. Matchcoats, or lengths of fabric, and guns were the most sought after and valuable of the goods that the natives wanted in trade. Documents from the period between 1670 and 1680, however, reveal a shift from the use of lengths of fabric in the Indian trade to an increasing demand to include ready-made coats and shirts among the items provided.
The history of ready-made or off-the-rack clothing offers an interesting view of the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution and the democratic aspects of expanding capitalism. The labor-intensive activity of “industrial” garment production was reached 150 years before Thomas Saint first patented a sewing machine (1790) and 200 years before Elias Howe patented an advanced version (1846) that included principles still in use. Beverly J. Lemire documents the important transformation in clothing production, beginning with military needs for “uniforms.” The earliest documented transaction was a British navy contract from 1623 (Lemire 1997: 12). Another document from 1642 also records an order for military clothing. Thus by 1650 “uniforms,” called “Slop clothes,” were being mass-produced to contract, and the British navy carried these goods around the world. Clothing contractors, or dealers who purchased fabric and arranged the production and sale of standardized garments, were called “slopsellers” (ibid.: 18–25). Shortly after it formed in 1670, the Hudson’s Bay Company expanded the pelt trade to Canada, where it turned to the same suppliers from whom the military (10–11) secured the clothing already in great demand by Native Americans. Not surprising is Lemire’s (136n94) finding that slopsellers often were among the biggest investors in the Hudson’s Bay Company, an early example of vertical integration in industry. Production of ready-made garments reflects several early aspects of modern society, such as new outlets for women’s independent labor as well as the basic principals of modern sweatshops.

Calico and other shirts as well as coats in many styles were in big demand among most of the native groups participating in the pelt trade, and all participated to some degree. In addition to these normally traded garments, there were specially made coats of “quality wool or worsted fabrics and decorated with distinctive buttons and braid” called “Present coats” (ibid.: 36). Lemire also documents nine hundred assorted coats, for men and boys, exported from England in 1682, the year of Penn’s first big land purchases. Where these coats were sent is not clear, but the numbers and special sizes indicate that made-up garments were already in constant demand by native peoples (cf. Ray 1980 [1978]). Lemire (1997: 37–38, 157n97) also estimates that about four thousand coats were exported between 1684 and 1694. This is not a huge number, but it documents a steady flow that may be far below the actual numbers involved.

Bales of ready-made clothing were shipped to sailors and marines in foreign ports, and when not needed these goods were sold locally. By the “late seventeenth century, in particular, colonial settlers and trading adventurers resorted to English clothes dealers for goods they could not get at their final destination” (ibid.: 33). Seen from a producer’s viewpoint, how-
ever, native customers constituted only a limited part of the market for these goods (35–36), far less than the demand for slave clothing. Indian demand for these “ready-made” garments was not a major stimulant to the clothing trade in England (see Lemire 1994, 1997), but it is a subject meriting exploration.

The artifacts listed in the Lenape sales of land to William Penn during the period 1681–1701 (Kent 1979) also show the evolution in the types of coats in use by these natives. Long before Penn arrived in the New World, the lists of goods given to the natives in exchange for land almost invariably included clothing, such as the “twoo matcoats” included in payment for a small tract on 3 May 1681 (ibid.: 48–49). I cite Donald Kent’s important published editions of this and other documents because he examined original copies of these manuscripts and consulted the published versions in the Colonial Records and in the Pennsylvania Archives (e.g., Samuel Hazard 1852). Kent also offers useful commentary on these texts and various published versions of them. Many of the pre-Penn deeds do not specify the types or quantities of goods given for land, the native vendors simply affirming that they “have Already Received Ample satisfaction” (21 February 1682; Kent 1979: 49–50). The Laurence Cox petition cited in appendix A (from Becker 1987b: 116) is revealing. It indicates that by the time of Penn’s arrival in the New World, nearly two hundred years after the first European contacts in this region, the pelts-for-cloth exchange network had become so well regularized that everyone involved in the trade system understood the details of the process. This document also provides information on the native use of buttons on some of these coats tailored for the Indians as early as 1682.

Penn’s first purchase, actually negotiated by Deputy Governor William Markham on 15 July 1682, reflects some of the problems Penn had purchasing land that the Indians previously had sold to other Europeans. Also revealed are the high prices paid by Penn for this Lenape tract and others that he bought over the next two decades. Donald Kent’s (1979: 58–60) transcription of the deed of 15 July 1682, taken from Hazard 1852: 1:47–49, includes a simple list “of Goods, merchandizes, and utensills” paid, beginning with the following: “Three Hundred and Fifty Fathom of Wampum, Twenty white Blankits, Twenty Fathom of Strawd waters, Sixty Fathams of Duffields, Twenty Kettles, Fower wherof large, Twenty Guuns, Twenty Coates, Forty Shirts, Forty payre of Stockings.” There follows a considerable array of other goods in twenty-five distinct categories, most of them appearing in multiples of twenty, the number reflecting the numbers of adult males and adult females who were the recipients of these goods. On 1 August the list of goods included as payment in the 15 July 1682 deed
of sale was augmented by payment of an additional “10 guns” to other “owners” of this tract who were not present at the signing of this document some weeks before, perhaps including Okanikon and Matapis. Other clarifications of the terms on the original deeds were also made at the meeting of 1 August 1682, generously rewarding these absentee owners for their abandoned as well as already sold lands.

Included in the 15 July 1682 deed of sale are details that set a precedent for the careful drafting of documents for which Philadelphia lawyers subsequently became famous (Kent 1979: 60–61). Although matchcoats with buttons and sleeves were in use by 1680, the Penn purchase of 15 July 1682 specifically lists only the “40 Kersey Coates” as tailored garments plus the sixty shirts that also were part of the purchase price. The common use at that time of a length of fabric for both a mantle, or cloak, as well as a blanket is noted in Penn’s description of the Lenape that appears in his letter to the Free Society of Traders on 16 August 1683. Penn wrote that “In travail the lyeodge in the woods about a great fire, with the mantle of duffels they were by day wrapt about them” (quoted in Dunn and Dunn 1982: 449). Yet the documents reveal that by 1680, made-up shirts and coats were commonly used in trade with the Lenape and other native peoples in the Delaware Valley as well as among native groups along the Atlantic coast.

In Pennsylvania the Penn land purchase contracts (see Kent 1979) provide a great deal of information regarding the vast numbers of cloth goods and other items that went to native peoples, revealing much about material changes in native lives. On 30 July 1685, only three years after Penn drafted his letter noting native use of duffels, the Lenape land vendor Shakhoppoh and others selling land to Penn were paid with “Two hundred Fathom of Wampum, Thirty Fathom of Duffels, Thirty Guns, Sixty Fathom of Stroud Waters, Thirty Kittles, Thirty Shirts,” and a vast list of other goods (Kent 1979: 76–78). Here each piece of goods, or each “matchcoat,” was a fathom in length, or exactly the length (“two yards a piece”) that had been specified in the 1661 account, noted above, and in the sale of 15 July 1682 (as indicated by the Thomas Revell listing in Dunn and Dunn 1982: 265–66; see appendix A). By the 1680s shirts had become a common article in these sales. These shirts were loose-fitting linen garments commonly of knee length, similar if not identical to those worn by the colonists.

Before and during the period of Penn’s land purchases in his colony a great deal of similar activity on the New Jersey side of the river involved similar goods. These are, after 1680, usually listed in detail. For example, the sale of the Cape May area by its Lenopi owners on 30 April 1688 lists the considerable array of goods given for the tract. As is customary, the more expensive goods are listed first, beginning with “Ten script [striped?]:
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matchcoats, Twelve blew & red matchcoates, twelve strowied water match coates, twelve strize cotes, Ten Kettles, Twelve shirts” (Becker 1998: 59, from the manuscript copy). The matchcoats, of various types and different values, listed in this document were not simply lengths of fabric; by 1688 they were tailored garments, as were the shirts noted in this and other contemporary documents. By 1690 references to matchcoats in the Delaware Valley all appear to denote tailored garments with blankets listed as a separate category. For example, a deed from the Cohansey band of Lenopi in southern New Jersey of 9 June 1693 provides us with further “details” regarding the several “types” of coats used in these land sales: “For & in consideraone of the Sume of Twenty Guns Twenty blanketts Twenty Stroudwaters Red & Blew Coats [sic] Thirty Coats of Red & Blew Duffiels Ten Shirts Seaven pounds Ten Shillings in money [etc.]” (Becker 1998: 60, from the manuscript).

Regarding Lenape clothing in particular, in 1698 Gabriel Thomas (1912 [1698]: 334) follows, or paraphrases, Penn in noting that “in Travel they lodge in the Woods about a Fire, with the Mantle of Duffils they wear wrapt about them.” Thomas’s contributions to this subject are his important listing of four types of fabric then being woven in Pennsylvania (332) and his discussion of the costs of fabric and other goods in the colony. Thomas notes that these costs generally were very high as compared with English-made goods then being imported into Pennsylvania. Thomas (1912 [1698]: 327) specifies just how high the cost was for Pennsylvania woven goods, noting “and for Weavers, they have Ten or Twelve Pence the Yard for Weaving of that which is little more than half a Yard in breadth.”

Data from Maryland and Virginia in the first decade of the eighteenth century indicate that in general the same kinds of trade goods were in demand as were needed for the Indian trade in Pennsylvania. In 1706 a list of goods stolen from Asquash, the king of the Nanticoke in Maryland (see appendix D) indicates that different qualities of cloth as well as colors of matchcoats were in use. John Banister’s account of the natives in Virginia in the late 1660s indicates that since the arrival of the Europeans, “they cover their nakedness with a flap of red or blewe cotton, & wrap themselves up in a mantle or matchcoat of Duffields. Those that wear coats after the English fashion, are very desirous of having them of divers colours, like that Jacob made for his son Joseph, & therefore the traders have them cut partly from pale, gules, & azure [the colors off-white, red, and blue]” (quoted in Ewan and Ewan 1970: 373–74).

In Virginia, at nearly the same time, Robert Beverley (1705: book 3, chap. 1, n. 3) described the dress of the local Indians as follows: “Their Cloaths are a large Mantle, carelesely wrapped about their Bodies, and
sometimes girt close in the middle with a Girdle. The upper part of this Mantle is drawn close upon the Shoulders, and the other hangs below their Knees.” Note the plural use of “Shoulders” in this context. Beverley acknowledged that “because a Draught of these things will inform the Reader more” he chose to illustrate page 5 of book 3 with: “Tab. 3. Is two Indian Men in their Winter Dreſs.” Beverly’s captions provide additional information. “Seldom any but the Elder people wore the Winter Cloaks, (which they call Match-coats,) till they got a Supply of European goods. Fig. 1. Wears the proper Indian Match-coat, which is made of Skins, dreſt with the Furr on, fowed together, and worn with the Furr inwards, having the edges also gafhed for beauty’s sake.”

This cloth matchcoat, also identified by the natives as a majigoode, had completely replaced skin mantles by 1700. In paintings and other works of art the cloth blanket commonly is depicted as being worn over one shoulder, reflecting an artistic convention or visual style of the period. This style differs from Beverley’s 1705 account of the way a matchcoat was worn, or a more logical covering of both shoulders by garments such as Beverley depicts in “Fig. 2. Wears the Duffield Match-coat bought of the English.” Beverly’s account provides, in effect, an historical review describing how the natives dressed prior to the introduction of trade goods. “Ethnographic” depictions of natives wearing mantles at the beginning of the eighteenth century differ from the artistic renderings.

Felippo Bonanni’s (1709: 249–50, figs. 7–8) depiction of full “native” costume in New France shows both a male and a female wearing loose-fitting cloth matchcoats. Bonanni’s description of catalogue item 17 translates from the Latin as “Types of garments which both men and women wear in New France, or the region called Canada. . . . A man and a woman of this region we have shown in our plates numbers 7 and 8 [in which are] noteworthy the cuttings, or scars, [that appear to be tattoos]” (see Becker 2001a). In fact, by 1709 these natives, and probably all those along the eastern seaboard, generally were purchasing more upscale goods including ready-made shirts and tailored coats rather than simple lengths of fabric. Off-the-rack or out-of-the-bale “slop clothes” or “tailored” matchcoats had rapidly replaced simple lengths of fabric as many native populations began to make purchases that reflected subtle acculturative changes in this aspect of acquired material culture.

Men wore more traditional garb for warfare, but women may have worn the old styles of hide-based clothing on a regular basis. In 1715 John Fontaine described young men preparing for war by putting feathers in their hair and through their ears, and having “faces painted with blue and vermillion, their hair cut in many forms, some on one side of the head, and
some on both, and others on the upper part of the head, making it stand like a cock's-combe, and they had blue and red blankets wrapped about them. . . . they call it their war-dress." Young women he describes as having long black hair “which comes down to the waist; they have each of them a blanket, tied round the waist, and hanging down about the legs like a petticoat. They have no shifts, and most of them nothing to cover them from the waist upwards; and others of them had two deer skins sewed together and thrown over their shoulders like a mantle” (Fontaine 1872 [1715]: 274-75). Fontaine had only a short time before, on 12 June, come upon a square Indian cabin near the Mattaponny River where he found “the Indian women were all naked, only a girdle they had tied round the waist, and about a yard ofblanketing put between their legs, and fastened one end under the fore-part of the girdle and the other behind” (ibid.: 264; see also Lawson 1966 [1709]; Brickell 1737).

The concept of what were appropriate items for presentation by governments as gifts to each native group derived from the types of goods that “sold” best in the trade with that specific group. It is well known that the desire for specific colors of goods varied from tribe to tribe, but Wilbur Jacobs (1950: 46) suggests that the blankets provided “for women were a different size from those made for men.” Penn’s payments for land sold by the Lenape demonstrates that many categories of goods were intended for males, such as guns, and many others were specifically for women, such as needles, awls, and scissors. These goods commonly appear in separate parts of these lists. By the 1750s specific gifts were even intended for children, including specially sized “tailored” linen shirts. By the 1750s almost all natives had come to wear nightshirt-like linen “shirts” under their woolen matchcoats (see Jacobs 1950: 47).

The processes of culture change relating to woven fabrics used in trade, as well as the dates during which these changes take place, are revealed in a number of documents. From as early as 1683 we have documentary evidence from colonial Pennsylvania indicating the presence of upscale coats purchased by or presented to Native Americans. Earlier I noted that items at the State Museum in Harrisburg reflect the presence of fancy garments with elaborate, cloth-covered buttons at native archaeological sites dating from before 1763 (De Roche 2001). Such cloth-covered buttons may be like those described ninety years before in the Lawrence Cox (Lasse Cock) petition for reimbursement for expenses incurred from a period around 1682 or 1683. Among the many expenses listed in the Cox petition is one for “16 Stroud Water Coats” at the considerable price of 1 pound and four shillings each, followed by the costs of “making the Coats Buttons & thread” (HSP William Penn Papers, Reel 8; published by Becker
1987a: app. 1; see also Dunn and Dunn 1982: 242–43). Of note is that the considerable cost for the buttons and thread for these sixteen coats was a total of two pounds and eight shillings, or three shillings for adding buttons to each coat.

On 29 July 1709, one of the many delegations of Indians to visit Philadelphia received as gifts goods that included the following: “4 Stroudwater matchcoats. 1 Dozen good Linnen shirts. ½ Dozen of Stockins” (Kent 1979: 130). A clear distinction between tailored coats and blankets can be seen in a New Jersey deed of 7 April 1710 (Becker 1998). The text of this document, which records the sale of a small tract of land by three natives, indicates that they were given “one made up coate[,] two matchcoats” plus specified amounts of food and drink in payment. The specific listing of a “made up coate” suggests that these garments had recently become used in trade and indicates that they had a value in excess of the simple lengths of fabric here described as matchcoats. This reference from New Jersey, together with the earlier Lawrence Cox note (see appendix B) and the archaeological evidence, suggests that by about 1700 tailored coats had become a major part of the trade goods sought by natives along the northeastern coast.

Gregory Waselkov (1992: 38–39) documents the presence of “shirts” among trade goods in French Louisiana as early as 1701, when the earliest evidence for his study is available, and tailored “coats” soon after. In 1701 the sedentary Creek population was more acculturated than most of the northeastern foragers of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and by 1743 the Creek wanted a vast array of fine goods including “coats of fine materials, fine hats, fine and often decorated shirts, in a word everything that can flatter their imagination” (Rowland, Saunders, and Galloway 1984: 4.208–9; quoted in Waselkov 1992: 42).

In July 1727 a delegation of approximately fifteen natives attended a council in Philadelphia to petition the government for various goods, but clearly these Indians had rendered no services in return. The native delegates were mostly Cayuga but others of the Five Nations were represented along with some Conestoga and other cultures. All of the natives in this party were provided with food, drink, and lodging during their stay. “M. Montour, a french Woman, who had lived long among these People, and is now Interpretress” provided translations for the languages that she knew. At the conclusion of the meeting the governor gave the attending Indians “5 fine Guns, 50 lbs. of Powder, 15 Strowd Match Coats, 100 lbs. of Lead, 10 Blanketts, 2 dozen Knives, 10 Duffel Matchcoats, 12 Shirts [and] Ordered further: To the Interpretress 1 Strowd, 1 Shirt, 1 Matchcoat. To her Husband, Carondawana 1 Strowd, & another to her Niece. To Civility
[an Indian interpreter], 1 Strowd, 1 fine Shirt & 1 pair of Stockings.” The governor of Pennsylvania also included with these gifts given in July 1727 a vast quantity of goods “for their Journey” home (Colonial Records of Pennsylvania 1852: 3:271–74). Alison Hirsch (2000) uses this presentation to Isabelle Montour to describe women’s dress of that period. Note should be made that gender differences as well as cultural differences were added by individual native users, in the form of decorations applied to these basic trade goods. The term “Strowd” as it appears in this list refers to a quality or type of cloth used in these tailored garments and not a length of cloth (see appendix A).

At the council of 18 April 1728, less than a year later, the governor made a further award to Montour and two others whose good graces were of importance to the colony. “ORDERED, that three Matchcoats be given to James Letort & John Scull, to be by them delivered to Allummapeee, Mrs. Montour & Manawkyhickon” (Colonial Records of Pennsylvania 1852: 3:297). This formal order in April of 1728 was followed by James Logan’s letter to the two emissaries personally asking that when they “return to Chanasshy, [they] take with [them] the three strowd Matchcoats herewith delivered to [them], and in [Logan’s] name deliver one to Alamachpee, the Indian who sent [Logan] the Belt of Wampum” and the second to “M. Montour.” “Give the 3d Stroud to Manawkyhickon” (Hazard 1852: 1:120–11). The “Alamachpee” of this note is certainly Allummapees, also identified as Sassoonan, then the most respected elder of the Brandywine Band of Lenape. The members of this band in 1728 were summering at a fishing station located on the upper reaches of Brandywine Creek in the area above modern Glenmoore, Pennsylvania (Becker, ed. 1992). The bearers of these three matchcoats were planning to travel by the Brandywine headwaters on their way up to “Chanasshy,” up the Susquehanna beyond the Sunbury area where “Mrs. Montour & Manawkyhickon” then were living. Manawkyhickon, one of the Lenopi, from southern New Jersey, had just moved into Pennsylvania and only a few years later became famous as the first signatory to the confirmation treaty of 1737 commonly called the “Walking Purchase” (see Becker 2002b: 120). All of the supposed “vendors” signing that confirmation treaty were born among aboriginal bands in New Jersey and obviously had no land rights in Pennsylvania.

The Council Meeting of 17 May 1728: Preparation for a Meeting at Conestoga Town
The provincial council meeting in Philadelphia of 16–17 May was used as preparation for a treaty with the principal native groups then gathering at
Conestoga Town, near present-day Lancaster, Pennsylvania. The principle native group at the gathering on 26–27 May was the Conestogoe, whose members were the principal descendants of the once powerful Susquehannock. The other three groups were the Brandywine band of Lenape, who were then living near the headwaters of Brandywine Creek (Becker, ed. 1992), the Ganawese (a Susquehannock remnant then living on the Potomac), and the Shawnee. The Shawnee also had been part of the Susquehannock confederacy before 1675. The meeting with the natives held at Conestoga was planned for 26 May 1728, and the meeting of the provincial council was in preparation. On 17 May the council reviewed

the Consideration of the Presents proper to be made to the Indians at the ensuing Treaty, & 'TIS ORDERED, that the following Goods be provided by the Provincial Treasurer, and sent up to Conestogoe by the first Opportunity, vizt: twenty five Strowd Matchcoats, twenty Blankets, twenty Duffels, twenty five Shirts, one hundred wt. Gunpowder, two hundred wt. of Lead, five hundred Flints, & fifty Knives, with Rum, Bread, Pipes & Tobacco, together with such Provisions as may be necessary for the Governour & his Company. (Colonial Records of Pennsylvania 1852: 3:308–9)

There are notable differences between the record of goods that appears in the minutes of the council meeting in Philadelphia on 17 May and the “Several Parcels of Goods” that were presented to the fifteen named natives assembled at Conestoga on 26 May 1728, representing four distinct cultures. The items given were listed as follows: “20 Strowd Matchcoats, 1 Cwt. of Gunpowder, 20 Duffells, 2 Cwt. of Lead, 20 Blanketts, 500 Flints, 20 Shirts, 50 Knives” (ibid.: 3:312). Five matchcoats and five shirts are unaccounted for, but at the conclusion of this treaty at Conestoga, two of the three Indian interpreters, Civility and Shakawelin or Sam, received a matchcoat and a shirt each for their services while Pomapechtyaw was given only a shirt (3:314). This accounts for some of the “missing” goods and perhaps indicates the value of their services. The remainder of these goods may have been held in reserve should more interpreters than the colonists expected actually appear, or be needed. These listings of goods relating to the treaty at Conestoga in May of 1728 explain the discrepancy in the goods included in lists associated with the land sale of 15 July 1682 (see 17 May 1728 council order quoted above and appendix B).

The principal goal of the treaty at Conestoga in May of 1728 was to discuss the murder of two Lenapes, possibly by a small group of Shawnees. The names of the deceased are never noted, possibly in deference to the Lenape custom of never mentioning the names of the dead. Allumapees and
Opekasset of the Brandywine Band of Lenape could not attend, probably because their band had relocated to western Pennsylvania, but they met with Lieutenant Governor Patrick Gordon in Philadelphia a week later. On 3 June 1728 the provincial council provided “ten Stroud Matchcoats, five Blanketts, five Duffels, ten Shirts” and a vast array of other goods for the large contingent from the Brandywine band that met with the council on the following day. In addition, a long list of similar goods were set aside as a wergild payment “for the Relations of the Dead” (ibid.: 3:315–17). As usual, the list of goods presented appears twice in the record, first as a requisition and second when presented. A few years later the men of the Brandywine band again appear in the record as recipients of matchcoats and other goods. Details relating to that 1730s presentation are evidence that increasingly elaborate varieties of clothing were being offered to the Lenape who originally had lived in southeastern Pennsylvania. We can infer that this pattern of elaboration applied to native interactions throughout the Northeast.

Silver Lace: Continuing Elaboration in the Decoration of Trade Garments

The records of the meeting of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania on 9 August 1733, indicating that in 1731 Sassoonan, also known as Allummapies, and other elders of the Brandywine band of Lenape each were given at least one “Stroud Matchcoat edge[d] with Silver Lace” as well as handkerchiefs (Colonial Records of Pennsylvania 1852: 3:506). Subsequently, Allummapies, described in this document as a “chief” of the Lenape, was presented with “a Matchcoat laced with Silver, and a Silver-laced Hat” (ibid.: 4:310–11). The two examples known from an archaeological site in Pennsylvania were described above.

An extremely important set of documents from the early eighteenth century are the Philip von Reck drawings from 1736 that are now held in the Royal Library of Denmark in Copenhagen (Manuscript Department, cat. sig. Ny kgl. Sammling 565, 4°). These drawings made by von Reck, a Moravian visitor who was traveling among the Creek in Georgia, were rendered in pencil or in watercolor. They provide useful information about these native people. Axtell (2001: figure on 131) notes that one of these watercolors bears the caption “Indiens going a hunting” and also believes that the three Indians depicted reveal “change and persistence in native garb and equipment.” The figures in this detailed watercolor have ten numbers labeling details of equipment and dress. The two figures on the left are separated from the figure on the right, and the English caption quoted by Axtell is beneath them and apparently is an addition to von Reck’s German
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text. Kristian Hvidt (1990 [1980]: 126) transliterates von Reck’s first note, on the robe worn by the figure at the left, as “Eine lederne und bemalte Decke.” Although this can be translated as “a painted leather blanket” (Axtell 2001), “leather garment” might be more appropriate (see Becker 2001b). One may assume that such native leather garments were still in use in 1736 but as a mode of dress that had been largely superseded by “modern” imported garments.

Belts to Fasten Matchcoats

Before discussing the progression during the 1730s in types of trade goods in demand by the natives, and matchcoats in particular, a note on a single mention of a “Belt” may be of importance. Some type of belting was used to gather matchcoats, whether they were native skin garments, simple blankets, or the tailored but beltless coats traded in the period after 1670. The few early references to, or depictions of, these belts suggest that they were probably simple strips of hide or pieces of cloth, although I suggest that some finger-woven native-made belts may have been used this early (Becker 2002c). On 20 May 1728, just prior to leaving for the treaty at Conestoga, Lieutenant Governor Gordon sent an answer to a message received from Kakow-watchy of the Shawnee living on the Delaware River near the Durham Iron Works. The lieutenant governor also requested “that three Matchcoats be sent to Kakow-watchy as a present, together with the Matchcoat Belt and Hatchet which were left by their Indians, & that forty shillings be given to each of the said messengers for their trouble and expense, with their entertainment in Town for two Days” (Colonial Records of Pennsylvania 1851: 3:309). This is an early reference to a belt used with a matchcoat, and its return suggests that it was more than a simple bit of leather. Describing it as a “Matchcoat Belt” raises the possibility that it was woven from yarn stripped from a piece of fabric commonly used for matchcoats, using the finger-weaving technique well documented from the nineteenth century. Other examples, suggesting that belts as well as the coats themselves became more elaborate through time, will be noted below.

By 1750 only woven belts, moccasins, and perhaps a few other specific native-made dressed leather garments continued to be employed as part of native clothing in Pennsylvania. In general these were the only items not yet entirely replaced by trade goods among the eastern and southeastern native peoples. In 1753 when George Washington was on the Pennsylvania frontier he made a special call on Aliquippa, described as a queen of the “Delaware” (Lenopi). Aliquippa is sometimes said to have been a Seneca, but she was an important elder in the Pennsylvania region. Wash-
Washington (1925: 1:66) made a special visit and presented her with a matchcoat and a bottle of rum, the latter being considered by her as the more desirable (see also Jacobs 1950: 53). Washington was leading a military party and at that time was not provisioned for conducting trade or other intercourse with the natives. A similar situation is reflected in James Burd’s 1757 account of building Fort Augusta at Shamokin, in the heart of a trading and encampment area along the Susquehanna River used by a number of native peoples. Burd was well provisioned to erect and garrison this important fortification but not to treat with the considerable numbers of Indians in the area. Burd “gave Indian Peter a p’r of new shoes out of the Province store” only because these were a common military supply. On 26 January 1757, however, when Indian Peter and William Sack, two Susquehannock from Conestoga town, “demanded of [Burd] two matchcoats, two tomahawks, one Dear Skin for to make mockasons, & some flints—[he] told them [he] had neither matchcoats nor dear skins” (Burd 1896 [1756–57]: 651).

Both Washington and Burd were on the frontier to conduct military business, not to treat with the Indians. In these English frontier situations, as in contemporary American foreign affairs, the local populations often were not considered when planning military actions. By 1755 colonial envoys sent specifically to conduct business with the Five Nations were provided with lavish quantities of goods for gifts that were carefully selected to provide maximum satisfaction of the native recipients. Indian Peter and William Sack may have perceived Burd as dealing poorly with them, especially if they did not recognize the lack of contextual understanding built into military “planning.”

By the late 1750s the wealth of the American colonies was reflected in the quantities of goods being provided for the pelt trade and for gifts to native allies as well as payments for their various services. Conrad Weiser, backed by the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania, made constant and substantial payments to Shickalemy, basically keeping him on retainer as a native “consultant” (Colonial Records of Pennsylvania 1852: 5:138). After one consultation alone, Weiser paid Shickalemy ten stroud matchcoats and twelve shirts (Colonial Records of Pennsylvania 5:85) and also built him a shingle-roofed “cabin” measuring forty-seven by seventeen feet (Pennsylvania Archives, 1st ser., 1:661; see also Jacobs 1950: 96–97137). Jacobs (1950: 61–75) devotes an entire chapter to the “cost” of these Indian presents, but he does not comment on the vast increase in their volume over the early decades of the eighteenth century or on how this altered the dress of all the natives throughout this region.

Increases in the volume and variety of cloth and tailored goods pre-
presented to the natives did not end at the conclusion of the French and Indian War. Even after the American Revolution the early federal as well as the British government spent lavishly to attract native allies and trading partners. The amount of material or lengths of cloth used for “blankets” or matchcoats and the quantity of fabric used to fashion tailored coats increased during this period, as I noted earlier. The one and a half to two yards of material common around 1700 had increased considerably during the eighteenth century. In 1796–97 a Mohawk chief was presented with three and a half yards of “fine cloth” for a blanket (matchcoat?) and two and a half yards of linen for a shirt, in addition to “a large blanket of three points” (ibid.: 47, from the Wisconsin Historical Collections; see also n. 1 above).

At the time of the French and Indian War, around 1755–63, the English warned native travelers and diplomats to signal their peaceful intents with some type of visible emblem. Modern popular belief suggests that the wearing of a red cockade, or waving a Union Jack or piece of linen or red handkerchief (Hirsch 2000) signaled friendly intentions. However, the use of such “signals” is not supported by the evidence. The only contemporary reference that I have located refers to safe-conduct signals in 1758 (for safe-conduct passes of one hundred years before, see McCartney 1985: 67). At the encampment at Reas Town on 23 July 1758, Parole [patrolman, or watchman] Conway issued a written order including that “the troop . . . be Acquainted that our Indian Friends are distinguish’d by a Yellow Fillet or Yellow Ribband, & some carry their Matchcoats on a pole; Any Indians having the Above Marks and Signals are to be Receiv’d as Friends” (Bouquet 1951: 667).

The extent to which imported cloth goods were used by at least one native population in Pennsylvania is demonstrated by the impressive volume and variety of cloth goods presented to Teedyuscung and his kin as part of the Treaty of Easton in September of 1758. The extent and variety of goods given at a preliminary, and possibly unplanned, meeting in Philadelphia in the middle of July in 1758, plus the very long list of goods brought as gifts for the natives attending the September treaty only two months later, can only be termed noteworthy (see appendix C for both lists). Included among the gifts presented in July were fifty shirts plus huge quantities of uncut fabric. At the formal treaty in September large quantities of a wide variety of types of cloth were given to these Indians as were 160 matchcoats, 100 blankets, and over 400 shirts of several different styles. This array of goods is an impressive indication of what natives in that area were wearing during this period. If these well-dressed natives, living as trapper-foragers along the Pennsylvania frontier, were dressed in this fashion, it is difficult to
believe that the agricultural Cherokee in 1788, noted above, retained basic elements of dress even in their most simple modes.

Teedyuscung, the self-proclaimed leader of several native groups living along the Pennsylvania frontier in the 1750s, actually represented only the members of his extended family, or true kin group. His constituency included only members of the Toms River band of Lenopi who had left central New Jersey around 1733–34 and taken up residence in the Forks of Delaware (Becker 1987a, 1992c). After 1737 they moved further to the north and west into the orbit of the Six Nations. The participation of these immigrant Lenopi in the pelt trade, and their increasing dependence on colonial agricultural productivity enabled their numbers to grow. When the conflict with the French intensified in 1755 the potential threat of these natives to colonists living and trading on that frontier is reflected in the extent to which they were courted by members of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania. The extensive list of goods given to these Lenopi reflects the considerable value of maintaining good relations with these people as “allies” against the French and as partners in trade.

Of value in this research would be more information on the retail trade of the 1750s. A recent biography of Elizabeth Murray (1726–1785) provides useful insights into the life of a successful “shopkeeper” as well as the nature of commerce with England during the mid-eighteenth century (Cleary 2000). Unfortunately, the mundane details relating to purchases of English and other fabrics during this protoindustrial period have yet to receive the attention needed to understand the range of clothing styles worn by the colonists.

Belted, but Not Buttoned until the 1680s

The information provided by Denton (1670) indicates that the earliest tailored trade matchcoats were fastened by a belt rather than buttoned (cf. Becker 1992b). Native-made “finger-woven” belts probably developed as a culture-specific means of fastening these coats. Leather belts do not appear to have been used, as no buckles appear in the archaeological record. Native-made belts as well as sashes worn over the shoulder to suspend bandolier bags (cf. Gordon 1992) soon became important cultural signifiers among the various Five Nations Iroquois and presumably other cultures. Elizabeth Tooker (1978: 436, fig. 11) offers an 1838 portrait of Captain Cold (Ut-ha-wah), the “Onondaga keeper of the League council fire,” wearing a red yarn sash with green edges and white beads. He also appears to wear a second sash fastening his white linen shirt. These belts and sashes may have indicated specific cultural identity (cf. Weeden 1977) for members of each of the Five Nations who, by that time, were uniformly wearing European
trade garments (but see Casse 1984). No definitive study of sashes, belts, and garters has been undertaken, but I predict that these elements of native dress will be shown to have patterns, shapes, or designs specific to individual cultures. Natives could finger-weave or plait narrow sashes utilizing yarn stripped from trade fabrics. Examples are the arrow sashes or ceintures aux flèches (for a Mohawk example see Fenton 1978: 308, fig. 13). Examples of Osage belts said to be plaited around 1828 from “European” wool, not bison hair, are in the Bern Museum, Switzerland (Bushnell 1908a: 6). The term Assomption sash also is used in Canada for these native belts, possibly reflecting the area of Canada where many were manufactured (see Barbeau 1937). The “factory-made” examples of these sashes may date from only after 1800 and often are specifically associated with Métis traders, such as worn by a Chipewyan-Métis wearing an “Assomption Sash” depicted in an 1862 watercolor (Paterek 1993: 354). Details on this specific type and their relationship to sashes commonly worn, and perhaps only decorated by members of specific cultures, remain to be studied. Their popularity as a trade item led to copies being produced in Manchester, England.

Earlier in this article I noted the use of buttons on the tailored coats presented to, and commonly traded with, native populations. Three suspected pewter buttons from the Montgomery site (36CH60) indicate that at least one Lenape was wearing or was buried with a buttoned coat during the period around 1720–33 (Becker, ed. 1992). This archaeologically “recognized” coat with pewter buttons may have been received as part of a land sale made by the Brandywine band of Lenape, as in the purchase briefly noted for 10 September 1706 from “Sheehonickan the Chief of the Indn’s there” (Hazard 1852: 12:281). It also may have been purchased by the owner, or his descendants, as a funerary offering. The Brandywine band had sold a small piece of land to the Swedes in 1638, and over the years it made several other sales to Europeans including one in 1680 (Kent 1979: 45–46). Their last sale was to William Penn.

By the latter part of the seventeenth century small pewter decorative objects and some metal trade pipes were being used by various native groups in this region (Becker 1992a). Even a few pieces of sterling silver were being purchased as the rate of cultural change increased among those natives who continued to live in close proximity to the colonists. Thus the traces of a coat with pewter buttons may indicate payment for land, or any of several other mechanisms by which local Lenape acquired European goods. The cultural associations of specific colors of fabric may not have been as fixed as other markers or identifiers such as the native woven and decorated belts used to fasten these coats.

The importance of color symbolism has been recognized in the use of
trade beads, but color symbolism does not appear to be associated with any specific native culture during the contact period. The aspect of native life relating to colors and color symbolism among the individual tribes is becoming known through studies of bead use. This research suggests that specific colors may have served as cultural identifiers. The matter of color symbolism in native preferences for cloth, while less evident than in the choices made in glass beads, is a subject that Waselkov (1992: 44) mentions, but he directs readers to Nancy Surrey’s (1968: 356–57) more extensive review of the topic. A recent paper by Corey Silverstein (2000) addresses some of these questions.

Leggings
Among the Chippewa and other peoples living in northern region, skin “trousers” were in use long before contact (Paterø 1993: 353). Aside from moccasins, most natives in the aboriginal Northeast wore no leg coverings until some articles of European fashion were adopted by individual native nations. Leggings, often of thigh-high length (e.g., Paterø 1993: 64), provided another item of dress that distinguished natives from the colonists, who wore breeches. Natives generally wore leggings along with a blanket or tailored matchcoat. Stockings were also worn by many natives, but without the breeches of various types commonly worn by colonists. An 1814 issue of Sporting Magazine [44: 280] notes a native wearing “a matchicoat and leggins red” (Simpson and Weiner 1989). The garters or small belts that were used to fasten leggings were not as obvious to an observer as the sashes used for coats, but all these articles of clothing may have been decorated with designs that were culturally significant.

Colonists and Others Wearing Matchcoats:
Cultural Reciprocities
Although I have discussed here the process of increasing native use of European garb, as have many others elsewhere (e.g., St. George 2000), the reverse also should be noted. For a variety of reasons, colonists and other non-Indians, such as European visitors, often wore native garb. Their use of native attire generally related to negotiation of the frontier, but sometimes these costumes were worn when dealing with Indians at ceremonies concluding formal meetings, called “treaties.” Wimer (1842: page facing 243) offers an etching depicting “Col. James Smith’s encounter with the Indians.” In this illustration Smith wears a matchcoat, or a loosely fitting blanket. Only rarely did the colonists wearing native costume include simple matchcoats in their ensemble unless this was for utilitarian reasons. James Merrell (1999: 128) notes that some colonists traveling in the back
country came to prefer moccasins to shoes, and sometimes added other parts of “an Indian walking dress” to their outfits. Banister (in Ewan and Ewan 1970: 373) ambiguously notes that around 1678–92 Europeans (?) “wrap[ped] themselves up in a mantle or matchcoat of Daffields [duffels].” John Hayes’s journal of a trip made in 1760 (Post 1999 [1760]: 53) mentions a sleeping Indian “covered up with his Matchcoat.” For this native and European alike the matchcoat may have been both a blanket and a mantle, but colonists also wore many other items of clothing. During this same trip Frederick Christian Post (1710?–1785) notes giving an Indian “a Pair of Stockings & a Stroud & a Shirt” (82). Pants were not in common use among any traditional groups of Indians until after 1800, although fabric leggings held by bands or garters had been commonly worn for more than a century.

Cultural Conservatism: Continuities and Transformations in the Use of Native Skin Clothing

The early adoption of European cloth and then of tailored garments among all of the native peoples in eastern North America appears to reflect a rapid demise in the use of traditional skin clothing. However, several travelers’ accounts suggest that the clothing worn by eastern woodland natives “at home” or in casual contexts tended to be made of skin, reflecting continuities in the use of traditional categories of clothing. Skin garments commonly were made by women, and their continued production helped stabilize gendered roles embedded in various native cultures.

Research suggests that native use of European textiles, and later use of European clothing styles among eastern woodland peoples was significantly different from what has been recorded about those native peoples living in other parts of North America. Of particular interest are the many elements of “cultural persistence” in the native-made items worn and used by native groups in the area of the Great Lakes (see Gordon 1992). Interesting variations among different cultures in the adoption of European clothing appear in an important account of the trade routes to the “west” in 1718. At Detroit, then a regional hub in the trade networks and an area in which several native groups had separate encampment zones, observers reported watching the “Poutouatamies” playing lacrosse dressed only in breech cloth and moccasins, but also adorned with extensive and interesting body paintings. These decorations, applied obviously for the game during which they would be stripped for action, included painting, “with all sorts of colors. Some [players], with white clay, trace white lace on their bodies, as if all the seams of a coat, and at a distance it would be apt to be taken for silver lace” (O’Callaghan 1855: 887). Note that these Potowa-
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The Potowatomies were wearing this kind of “silver lace” body decoration more than a decade before we have the first record of the presentation of a matchcoat edged in silver lace to natives in southeastern Pennsylvania, in 1731. The women among these Potowatomies danced at night, wearing white shifts that I suspect were linen trade shirts, “and wear whatever wampum they possess” (ibid.: 887). Near these Potowatomies at Detroit there was an encampment of Hurons: “They are well clad; some of them wear close overcoats (juste au corps de capot).” Further to the west of the Detroit area in 1718 lived a group of Foxes, who are described as being like the “Poutouatamis, but differ in regard to dress, for the men wear scarcely any cloth clothing, and the major portion of them do not wear any [cloth?] breech clout.” The Fox women, however, all wore breech clouts and fawn skins; “they also wear blankets.” The observer also points out that at that late date these Foxes still made “considerable use of bows and arrows” (889). Still further to the west this traveler encountered the Illinois, who used bows even more frequently and who also were clothed (completely?) in animal skins. These Illinois also had tattoos all over their bodies (890).

Buckskin shirts, often with elaborate fringes, remained in common use among many Native American peoples throughout the eighteenth century (Brasser 1999). Full costumes, from cap to shoes and fashioned from skins, were produced in many native areas up until the end of the nineteenth century (Thompson 1999). Traditional skin shirts commonly retain the construction patterns and ornamental details of their makers’ cultures. Surviving examples of native skin garments incorporate design elements indicating that they were modeled after European prototypes (cf. Ganteaume 1998).

An elaborate Chippewa-made leather coat in the collections of the University Museum (cat. no. NA 3991, neg. no. 73785, storage case T8D1) was constructed on a pattern that resembles later European tailored trade coats. This Chippewa coat, which has a collar, was assembled from skin pieces that had been cut to the same patterns as the cloth elements used in archaeologically recovered examples (see fig. 2). Moreover, this Chippewa coat includes an inset of red trade cloth, perhaps an element of sympathetic representation. The University Museum nineteenth-century matchcoat in skin, which duplicates the form of elaborate trade coats of the eighteenth century, was purchased from W. O. Oldman, a London dealer who traded in ethnographic objects from around the world. During the early twentieth century Oldman issued monthly catalogues with photographs of the items that he had for sale (Oldman n.d.). To date only volumes 9 and 10 (nos. 107–23) of the Oldman catalogue series have been located, but neither depicts the coat noted here.
Discussion and Conclusions

The Ojibwa term *majigoode* and its many variations in the Algonquian languages all refer to skin or to fur mantles or cloaks worn by these peoples. These terms all coalesced or were glossed by the English as “matchcoat.” The use of this derivative term by Europeans persisted long after the natives had replaced pelt mantles with imported cloth goods. The term *matchcoat* continued to be widely applied to the garments worn by natives, including the loose-fitting, tailored trade coats that superseded simple lengths of cloth formerly used as cloaks. Just as I still use the term *icebox* more than fifty years after I last used a real icebox, throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries colonists and Indians alike applied the term *matchcoat* to a variety of fabric trade goods.

There appears to be only one small temporal variation in the meaning of the term *matchcoat*. This change involves the transition, before 1710, from the pieces of cloth that were traded as matchcoats (i.e., items of dress) to the providing of ready-made, sleeved garments that continued to be identified by the same term. These loose-fitting, simply tailored coats were America’s first off-the-rack clothing. At present we do not know if the clothes commonly traded to Indians differed in any way from those slop clothes sold to colonists (see Lemire 1997). During the 1730s the term *matchcoat* continued to be applied to fathom-long pieces of fabric as well as to tailored coats made from a comparable length of cloth of similar materials. The circumstances or contexts of the document are often helpful in determining which of these two possibilities was intended by the recorder. By the 1730s the use of tailored goods by some native peoples, such as the Lenape, was combined with the first use of silver ornaments made specifically for native customers, or what is commonly called “trade silver” (see Becker, ed. 1992). By 1760, the Creek and other sedentary peoples of the Southeast, as well as acculturated natives all along the eastern coast, are said to have purchased “Suits of Clothes” as well as “Waistcoats” (Waselkov 1992: 40). That each culture, or specific groups within each culture, had their own process and rates of acculturation as can be seen in detailed studies of the several peoples native to the lower Delaware River valley. The culture history of the Lenape of southeastern Pennsylvania indicates the extensive differences in the rate of acculturation among the various groups within this specific culture (e.g., Becker 1990a). In general the rate of cultural change among the Lenape differs considerably from that among the Lenopi, the natives living just across the Delaware River (Becker 1988). Differences also have been noted for other cultures of the New World (see St. George 2000). Not surprisingly, the greater the detail revealed for each of
these cultures, the greater complexity we find revealed within each of them. The adoption of tailored clothing by many native groups in the Northeast appears to represent a significant stage in the acculturation process.

The use of tailored matchcoats by native peoples in the Delaware Valley, as well as the use of silver ornaments produced by colonial silversmiths (Becker 1992a) and coffins made by local carpenters (Becker, ed. 1992) represented significant changes in native lifestyle. These changes were symptomatic of extensive alteration in the fundamental idea of what it was to be Lenape. By 1733 these changes prompted many members of the traditionalist bands of the Lenape, who had not yet moved west to become major players in the pelt trade, to abandon their ancestral homelands. Some joined their kin, some of whom had been moving west since at least 1661. Some members of these Lenape bands, like all of the Ciconicin peoples in central Delaware and most of the Lenopi in southern New Jersey, simply remained in areas still available to them in their traditional territories in southeastern Pennsylvania (e.g., Becker 1990a). In short, members of each of these native cultures became more and more like the colonists among whom they lived and worked (Becker 1990a). For those natives who remained among the colonists, the use of buttons on their coats implied, or reflected, a degree of acculturation not seen among the native traditionalists, who belted their coats with native-made or native-ornamented sashes.

When generic cloth garments slowly replaced leather and fur clothing among many cultures in the Northeast, members of each native “nation” may have used specific decorative modes to retain and express their unique cultural identity. Through the use of the specific details of dress or costume each native nation may have woven new elements into the fabric of its culture to retain cultural meaning. In the Northeast the presentation of self and of native cultural identity commonly depended on the incorporation of sashes or belts to fasten cloth matchcoats. These sashes, along with specific colors and/or patterns of beads and other decorations or ornamentation, reflected specific cultural traditions and identity. Although tailored coats became common among natives in Pennsylvania and New York by the 1750s, the use of unfitted wraps of skin or trade-cloth cloaks continued into the nineteenth century. Continuity in native identities may have been sustained by the use of specific cultural signifiers, such as sash type, that were only incidentally linked with the use of trade-cloth coats.

The leather or woven belts that were used by natives as bandolier straps or to fasten various items of traditional clothing evolved to provide fastening imported rectangular pieces of woven goods, and later to closing loose coats. I suspect that woven belts within each culture evolved on their own trajectories. I also infer that they had provided important cultural sig-
nifiers for those natives whose identifying costumes were literally wrapped around and added to garments that had been manufactured far beyond their traditional borders (cf. regional variations documented in Inuit parka styles; Oakes 1992: 48–49, fig. 2). These findings conform to the general rule that “local consumption of goods produced on the global market does not lead to a blanket cultural homogeneity. Indeed consumption can be both creative and culturally specific” (Forte 2001: 211).

During the long period when cultural anthropologists eschewed studies of material culture as a dated approach to anthropological goals, George Kubler (1962) offered some important insights into the meaning of “things” within a society. Kubler’s line of interest blossomed when Arjun Appadurai (1988) suggested that the transformation of things from basic commodities to elements of culture gives life to inanimate objects (see also Miller 1997). Joan Severa and Merrill Horswill (1989) provide an important focus for this study of matchcoats with their research on costume. They offer important interpretive modes that can be applied to made-up matchcoats as well as to native-made belts and other specific elements of native dress.

Imported fabric was one of the most valued aspects of the European economy sought by the cultures of the northeastern zone of the New World. How each of these peoples transformed these commodities into a vital aspect of their own society and still maintained their specific cultural identity was determined by the specific designs for living embodied in their unique system. While we may not be able to document the precise details for each of those cultures, we can be sure that the markers that they selected remained functional and vibrant for, in some cases, hundreds of years.

Appendix A. Cloth Types Used for Trade
Garments and Their Values

A number of authors have summarized the types, colors, or sizes of the fabrics that were commonly used in the pelt trade, which Kathryn Braund (1993: 122) points out “could have been termed the cloth trade as easily as the deerskin trade.” Each of the cloth units described as a matchcoat supposedly measured approximately 27 to 36 inches (0.69–0.91 m) wide and 1.5 yards (1.37 m) long, depending on the fabric used and other factors. Jacobs (1950: 47) cites a Provincial Records Office (PRO) document that includes an account describing “garliz” of “three-fourths size” (see below under “Garliz”). This order for cloth correlates with the twenty-seven-inch widths noted elsewhere, which appears to relate to the three-quarters of a modern yard that is equivalent to the old Flemish ell. I had assumed that most seventeenth-century cloth was woven in widths of thirty-six inches,
but the English ell of that period appears to measure forty-five inches, and
to this day fabrics sold in bulk are woven in a broad range of widths.

Braund ignores the important hair on the pelts traded by the natives,
reflecting her focus on the goods coming from Europe. Braund’s list of the
cloth types that appear in McDowell (1955: 82, 89, 127, 137, 142, 154, 174–
76; 1958: 238, 520; see also Norton 1974: 31; Plummer and Early 1969: 39,
196) depends on the secondary literature for its definitions and needs an
historical or chronological perspective (see Marks 1959).

Note should be made that the list of goods presented to the Indi-
ans at the Treaty of Easton (Pennsylvania) in 1758 includes more than a
score of clothing types for which there is no readily known correspon-
dence (but see Marks 1959). Cloth noted in the account book of Thomas
Hazard (1892) from Rhode Island during the period 1750–81 appears to
refer to entirely domestic, or locally woven, material. These types include
“Sarge Worsted, Half Duroy, Linnen, plain cotton and linen” (a mix?) as
as well as tow cloth, flannel, Caliminco, and “Double Fold Linen.” Not one
of these types appears on any of the lists of goods traded to the Indians.
Trade cloth appears to have been part of the huge “industrial” output of
England and other European states. The following is a summary of the data
regarding generally known trade-cloth types as presented by Braund 1993,
with additional notes from Marks 1959. Wäselkov’s (1992: 46–48) exten-
sive and important data from trade records dealing with French Louisiana
are not included.

• **Bengals**: any of a variety of “piece goods” (various lengths, rather
than uniform widths and lengths) that also could be derived from
various fibers, primarily silk, and cotton, exported from Bengal, now
India. Bengals came in plain or striped colors and were popular for
shaws and turbans among the southern Indians. Cf. Bengal, Benga-
line (Marks 1959: 59–60; also Jerde 1992: 17).

• **Caddis**: a worsted yarn or tape used for bindings and for garters.
Stephen Marks (1959: 94) notes that “Cadis” [sic] was a sturdy,
durable twilled woollen fabric woven in widths of about twenty-two
inches, and dyed with brazilwood, once used by the clergy in France
but now “obsolete.”

• **Camelot**: An inexpensive French-made cloth of wool and goat hair.
This was the English version of a cloth made from camel or goat hair
and silk or wool (Wäselkov 1992: 45, with references).

Wäselkov’s equating camel and goat hair does not appear logical
as goat hair is extremely rough unless derived from angora or
other specialized breeds, in which case the hair would not be inex-
pensive. Marks (1959: 99) notes that the British term camelot was applied to a coarse fustian used for work clothes.

- **Duffels:** Also “Duffel” or “Duffields.” This was a coarse woolen cloth originally produced at Duffel, which is near Antwerp, Belgium. Sometimes this is equated with frieze, a term now used for a thick nap or shaggy-piled woolen fabric (Marks 1959: 195). Duffels commonly was dyed red or blue, in a process whose evolution is summarized by Joseph and Nesta Ewan (1970: 387–88n9). The Ewans also provide the most detailed evaluation of this type of fabric, particularly noting that this coarse woolen material was made specifically for trade with the New World natives. They note that it was made in lengths of thirty yards but generally only three-quarters of a yard in width, whereas a full yard was the width of a standard weaving unit. The Gookin account (see n. 8) describes coarse wool “duffils, or trucking cloth, about a yard and a half” and in the colors blue, red, purple, and even white. Braund (1993: 122) suggests that “Blew Duffields for Match-coats’ appears on virtually every list of trade goods compiled.”

- **Frieze:** A heavy, coarse, worsted, or mohair pile overcoating with a rough wavy surface and a somewhat hard feel, often of mixed colors from incorporated used wool (see Marks 1959: 232; cf. Duffels).

- **Garliz:** Also “garlits,” a linen cloth originally said to come from Görlitz in Prussian-controlled Silesia. Jacobs (1950: 47) cites a Provincial Records Office document when he states that “ten pieces of garlix, a linen cloth imported from the Germanies, of three-fourths size, were ordered to make shirts for children of different ages.” Whether this “size” refers to the width of the bolt or the length of the piece to make these knee-length shirts is not clear. Garliz is one of the few terms not noted by Marks (1959).

- **Kersey:** A durable woolen fabric with a face finished with a highly lustrous, fine nap, shorter than beaver but about the same weight as melton and beaver (Marks 1959: 301–2). The name comes from Kersey, England, where this fabric has been made since the eleventh century. Other varieties of cloth also use or incorporate this name.

- **Limbourg:** Braund calls this material the French equivalent of recycled woolen cloth, noted as possibly better than the English strouds. However, Waselkov (1992: 41) cites several sources noting that this French-made cloth “was repeatedly singled out as being ‘superior,’ specifically in being heavier and more durable than English stroud.” This term is not noted by Marks (1959).
• Osnaburg: Also “Osnaburgh” or “ozenbrig,” etc. The name originally was applied to a coarse but lightweight cloth made from flax or tow, commonly from Osnabrück in what is now Germany. Marks (1959: 390) identifies Osnaburg as a coarse, strong, plain weave cotton fabric, although the term also was used for medium and heavy-weight cloth types of cotton as well. Originally this cloth was woven in blue and white stripes, but checks and other patterns were known.

• Plains: a worsted cloth, spun from long wool fibers. Marks (1959: 421, see also 420) states that the term Plains was used for medieval worsted cloth, but that at a later date it became applied to solid color cotton types. Probably the more common woolen cloth varieties associated with the Indian trade became generically known as Plains. Martha McCartney (personal communication) reports that the inventory of the estate of William Jones, dated 1 August 1694, lists goods including gunpowder, shot, a trading gun, gun locks, duffels, “plaines,” and blankets (from Henrico County [Virginia] Wills and Deeds 1688–97: 511). The total inventory is rather small, but the nature of the goods suggests that Jones was involved at least to some extent in the Indian trade, perhaps as an unlicensed, small-scale trader. The listing indicates that plains were distinct from duffels as well as from what was then identified as blanket material.

• Strouds: Inexpensive cloth made from recycled woolen rags. Manufacturers in Stroud, England, specialized in this “all-season trade cloth” (Braund 1993: 123). Braund also states that the standard width for strouds was about 18 inches (45.7 cm) and the usual colors were bright scarlet or deep blue. In addition to using strouds for lightweight matchcoats, natives used this fabric for breechcloths (“flaps”), women’s skirts, and men’s leggings. The origins or derivation and any special meaning of the expression “Stroud Water” (stroudwater), often used to refer to the fabric of matchcoats, also remains unknown. Marks (1959: 531) identifies “strouding” only as a coarse blanketing used in trade with North American Indians.

Flannel, calico, and silk came from a variety of places and in bolts as well as as binding or gartering strips. Silk ribbons later became particularly popular and were used for a wide variety of decorative functions. “Matchcoating” used to describe a quality of cloth, such as “French matchcoating,” as well as “French lettered matchcoating” and “English Matchcoating” has been noted by S. Stephenson (personal communication 27 February 2001). I have never encountered this usage, which may be regional.
Braund believes that even the “shavings” or shreds of fine scarlet cloth that was part of a trader’s pack lint could be sold in some areas. While Braund (1993: 123) suggests that Creek women purchased this material and boiled out the scarlet dye to mix with the juice of *Rubiaperegrina* in order to generate a brilliant scarlet dye for their own purposes, she also produces contradictory information (Braund 1993: 244n8). *Rubiaperegrina* may be the introduced version of the European *Rubiatinctorum*, but other plants native to the region may have been used.

Fluctuations in the costs of specific types of cloth, as well as the prices that traders were able to pay for pelts, often are noted in the records, but a systematic review of these variations remains to be made. The differing values of specific yard goods may be inferred from the order in which they are listed in various documents, but specific “retail” values are better gleaned from individual records. For example, Browne 1887: 90–91 offers values of various pieces of clothing in 1639 and 1640. Samuel Hazard 1892 includes some information from Rhode Island during the period 1750–81, during which period costs for weaving and for purchasing cloth fluctuated considerably. Richard and Mary Maples Dunn (1982: 265–66) include with their transcription of the Lenape land sale to Penn of 15 July 1682 a *price list* relating to the goods involved in that purchase. The importance of this list, written in the hand of Thomas Revell (ibid.: 268n33), lies in the values noted for specific goods (see appendix B).

The Lawrence Cox document from about 1682 that is noted above lists the value of what must be ordinary “Match Coat at 4/6 per” yard (four shillings and six pence), but the value of each of the “Stroud Water Coats pd ye Indians” was 1/4/0 (one pound, four shillings) before the addition of expensive buttons. Thus these “Stroud Water Coats” appear to have had a value of just over five times the value of the ordinary matchcoat, or yard of match cloth, noted in the same Cox document. The difference may reflect the greater yardage of material in each of the “Coats” but this cannot account for the considerable discrepancy in value. If, as Braund suggests, strouts were the cheaper types of woolens in the trade, then the puzzle is even greater. The variations may depend on the type of currency used. In eighteenth-century Rhode Island at least five types of money, both paper and metallic, were in use (cf. Hazard 1892).

A much later account, dating from after 1760, reflects Indian dress on the frontier (Zeisberger 1885). This note suggests that the term *stroud* (variously spelled) had come to indicate a type of mantle, or at least a more ample measure of cloth, that was worn in the native fashion, but that was less complex than a tailored and buttoned garment.
Their dress is light; they do not hang much clothing upon themselves. If an Indian has a matchcoat, that is a blanket of a smaller sort, a shirt and breech clout and pair of leggings, he thinks himself well dressed. In place of a blanket, those who are in comfortable circumstances and wish to be well dressed, wear a stroud . . . ie, two yards of blue, red, or black cloth which they throw lightly over themselves and arrange much as they would a matchcoat. (Zeisberger 1885)

Braund estimates that a matchcoat required 1.2 to 2 yards of material, but in fact the size of the fabric probably varied from trader to trader, depending on the type of cloth available. Braund’s (1993: 123) suggestion that a breechcloth, also called a flap, required one-quarter yard of material is only half of what Denton (1670: 12) gave as the size of this garment.

Appendix B. Values of Goods Available in Philadelphia in 1682

The following list of goods, in the hand of Thomas Revell, relates to the payment made for lands purchased from the Neshaminny Band of Lenape on 15 July 1682 (table B1). There are a number of discrepancies between the numbers of items on this list and the numbers that appear on the actual deed of sale (see Kent 1979: 58–60). Possibly not all the material listed here was given in payment for native lands. More likely these goods primarily went to pay the natives for their land and some went to pay interpreters, and possibly other funds were needed to buy out other Europeans who had previously purchased small holdings within these territories.

The text is provided here to indicate the value of cloth goods, and matchcoats in particular. As we can see from the eighty yards specified for the forty units identified as “stroud waters,” each was a fathom unit, or two yards long. A series of other figures follows this total, and a final number in the text of 21,644 is believed to be the value in guilders. As Dunn and Dunn (1982) point out, the actual total value of the items on this list is 250 pounds, 10 shillings. More significant is the variation in the numbers or quantities of various goods between this list and the deed. Not evident on this list are the “Three Hundred Gilders” mentioned at the end of the list of goods on the deed of sale. Obviously this is not a trade item, but it may be included in pounds sterling among those figures Myers notes at the end of this list. The three hundred guilders noted was used to buy out land holdings previously sold by the Neshamminy band to Europeans who had made purchases before 1681 (see Becker 1992a).
Table B1. Values of goods available in Philadelphia in 1682

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity and Type of Goods</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Shillings</th>
<th>Pence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Prizes of ye whole 600 fathom of wampum halfe white halfe black, white at 3 Gild[ers] p[er] fathom</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; black at 5 Gil p fathom is</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flalls phc [purchase?] 40 white Blanketts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 yds [or] 40 fathom stroud waters</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 [yards, or] 60 Fathom Duffields</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Kettles 4 whereof large</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Gunns</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Kersey Coates</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Shirts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 paiere Stockings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 20 mounteare Capps [a popular military hat]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Howes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Axes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150¹ [pounds] 3 halfe Anchors powder</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Small Barres Lead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Knives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Small Glasses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 pairs Shooses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Copper tob boxes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Tobacco Tongs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a small Barrell pipes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 paiere Sissers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Combs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12¹ [pounds] Red Lead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Aules</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 pistolls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two handfull flish hooks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Handfull needles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¹ [pounds] Duck Shott</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Bundles of small beads</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 20 Glasse bottles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 small Sawes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 drawing knives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Anchors Tobacco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Anchors Rumme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Anchors Syder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Anchors Beare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total value</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C. Lists of Goods Presented to Teedyuscung

The following is a list of goods presented to Teedyuscung at the Preliminary Meeting in Philadelphia on 12 July 1758 (Hazard 1853: 467). Of note is that the majority of items are cloth or pieces of made-up clothing.

1. Piece of Stroud
2. Piece of Red Stroud
3. Pieces of white halfthick
4. Pieces Purple ditto
5. 20 fine Tandem Ruffled Shirts
6. 30 good plain Shirts
7. 3 Groce Star Garters
8. 12 Strouds
9. 3 pieces Blankets
10. 3lb Vermillion
11. 2 fine laced Hatts
12. 2 doz. fine felt Hats

The term *piece* used here refers to an uncut bolt of cloth, greater than twenty-four yards in length (cf. “all of a piece” meaning “uncut”). Marks (1959: 414) defines *piece* as “a standard length of woven fabric varying from 24 yards to 100 yards according to the type of fabric.” Marks also defines “bolt” as “a length of woven or knitted cloth,” and directs readers to his definition for *piece*. Judith Jerde (1992: 19) notes that the amount of “yard-age on the bolt depends upon the texture and density of the textile.” Thus the rough trade goods of the colonial period probably came in bolts of closer to twenty-four yards in length. In the list of 12 July 1758 reproduced above only the length of the “pce” of “Callicoe” is given, at eighteen yards. The specificity of this length of “Callicoe” indicates that it is not a full “piece” or bolt of cloth (also see bracketed notes to the list below).

The following listing of the additional goods presented two months later at the Treaty of Easton in September 1758 (Colonial Records of Pennsylvania 1832: 8:214–15) appeared as a single column and are presented here as a paragraph, with commas separating the items:

3. Groce of narrow-starred Gartering, 4 Ditto of Broad Star, 2 Ditto of Middle Star, 4 Ditto of Narrow Scotch, 2 Ditto of Middle Turkey, 2 Ditto of broad Turkey, 4 Ditto of best Scotch, 5 Ditto of mixed figured, 2 Ditto of narrow Calimancoe, 2 Ditto of broad Calimancoe, 2 Ditto of spotted, 2 Ditto of Leaf, 1 Ditto of London lettered, 2 Ditto of Plad, 3 Ditto of middle Scarlet, 4 Ditto of broad Scarlet, 3 Ditto of
Superfine, 2 Ditto of Boys’ Lettered, 2 Ditto of broad white Lettered, 2 Ditto of Coulored pidgeon, 2 Ditto of Camblet, 33 Painted Looking Glasses, 8 Pieces of Red Stroud. [cf. comment on “piece” above], 4 Ditto, 14 Ditto of mazarine Blue, 1 Piece of mazarene Blue, 1 Ditto Black, 1 Ditto red and one blue, 2 Pieces of 6 qrs. Blue Duffil. [“6 qrs.” probably refers to the width of the bolt], 2 Ditto of 7-8ths Ditto. [another possible reference to bolt width], 1 Nap Ditto, 1 Piece of stamped Serge, 1 Piece of red Half thicks, 1 Piece of Brown Half thicks, 2 Pieces of white Ditto, 1 Piece of blue broad Cloth, 5 Laced Coats, 8 Plain Ditto, 50 Pair of Shoes, 3 Dozen and one pair of Womens’ worsted Stockings, 1 Ditto of yarn Ditto, 4 Pieces and 2 Bandanoe Handkerčfs, 1 Ditto Lungee Romals, 1 Ditto Cotton Romals, 4 Ditto of Nonsopretties, 8 lb Coloured Thread, 3 Dozen and ten Worsted Caps, 2 Ditto of Knives, 1 Ditto of Tobacco Boxes, 1 Ditto of coarse Linnen Handkerčfs, 4 Pieces of figured Gartering, 4 Ditto of blue and white flower’d Handkerchiefs, 3 Dozen and ten plain Hats, 2 Dozen of Tailors’ Shears, 6 Gun Locks, 1 Bunch of black Beads, 3 Groce and an Half of Sleeve link Buttons, 4 Dozen of Ivory Combs, 1 Groce of Women’s Thimbles, 100 Blankets, 160 Matchcoats, 246 Plain Shirts, 187 Ruffled Ditto.

The considerable variety of goods and the numbers of items such as coats, caps, stockings, and hats provides an indication that these natives dressed in a mode similar to that of the contemporary colonials (Becker 1995, 2005b). Most certainly the combinations of items, and the decorations added to these coats and other garments, not only served to define the wearers as natives but also indicated tribal affiliation.

Readers should note the numbers of cloth types listed in appendix A, which is far smaller than the types that appear on these two lists. The numbers of cloth types listed in these 1758 lists are far greater than can be easily identified in the present literature, but the thousands of entries in Marks 1959 provide clues to many of these types. The extent and variety of woven and other goods needed in this trade reflects the complexity of doing business with the various native peoples in the colonial Northeast.

Appendix D: List of Goods Stolen from the Nanticoke “King” Asquash in 1706

In 1983 Thomas Davidson found the following listing of goods stolen from “a certain Quiacason [sic] or Sepalche [Sepulcral] House belonging to Asquash King of the Nanticoke” (Maryland Provincial Court Judgements,
Liber PL no. 1, fol. 242). Asquash and his family, then resident at Chicone, were well-known Nanticoke royalty, with Asquash often addressed as the “emperor.” This reference to their mortuary rituals provides valuable ethnographic information as well as data of specific interest with regard to Nanticoke clothing at that time. The theft also was one of many stresses that led at least some Nanticoke to abandon this region in the 1720s and relocate into the orbit of the Six Nations Iroquois.

Two or more colonists by the name of Mallett broke into the Nanticoke mortuary house, or Quiancason, in 1706 and stole a considerable quantity of goods. The court proceedings resulting from a legal suit included this itemization of goods stolen:

8 ½ broad cloth matchcoats, red; 6 [?] matchcoats, blue; 109 Long Wampum [probably strings in standard fathom lengths used as currency]; 10 Short Wampum [short lengths of strung wampum used as formal items in presentations]; 6 Wampum wrist bands; 4 collars of Wampum; 12 new white shirts; 8 striped stuff gowns; 2 snuff petticoats; 3 pair worsted stockings; 9 pair yarn stockings; 12 yards printed calico; 190 mink skins; 1 looking glass; 2 dukh [?] knives; 2 pair tobacco tongs. Total value 100/-/- [100 pounds sterling]

Notes
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This article was written while I was a research fellow in anthropology and a special consultant at the University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology of
the University of Pennsylvania. Thanks are due the director of the museum, Jeremy Sabloff, for his encouragement and support of these projects relating to Native American studies.

Dunn and Dunn (1982: 243n4) unfortunately take their definition of matchcoat from C. A. Weslager’s (1972: 148–49) journalistic account of native life in the Delaware Valley. Among the more unusual definitions for matchcoat is “a coat made of thick fire-resistant wool originally worn when operating matchlocks ignited by long fire-lit fuses known as matches” (Grumet 1999: 53n10). Other odd definitions derive from individual interpretations of the visual record, an area that has not received extensive treatment. One interpretation of native garments is seen in William Hart’s (1999: 73, fig.1) interpretation of a map illustration from “Novæ Franciæ Accurata Delineatio,” a work identified for me by two perceptive reviewers. The illustration of a praying family of four appears as a very large inset filling much of the upper left corner of this map (Bressani 1657; see Trigger 1976: 2:plate 37; other insets from this map are reproduced in Heidenreich 1978: 371, 376, 383, 386, figs. 2–4, 7–8). Both the male and female in the large inset are depicted as wearing coats with fringes. While Hart suggests that these coats were pieced together from units that are eight to ten inches square, I suggest that the lines appearing in the material depicted represents a plaid fabric that may be ancestral to the Mackinaw fabrics sold in Canada.

Note also may be made of Jacobs’s (1950) discussion of a piece of fabric described in 1796–97, nearly 150 years after the Bressani map was engraved, as “a large blanket of three points.” Jacobs (1950: 47n13) believes that “points referred to the lines woven into the blanket. These lines determined the width, as in the Mackinaw blanket; and therefore the value of each blanket was determined by points.” Jacobs misconstrues the use of the term points as it refers to these blankets. The OED (11:1128) offers “a marking on a Hudson’s Bay or Mackinaw blanket indicating weight. It also suggests “a marking on a Hudson’s Bay or Mackinaw blanket indicating weight” (9:1128). E. E. Rich (1954: 371), referring to a journal entry from the period 1783–85, suggests that “originally the points and staves of the blankets were blue, but the colour was changed to red in 1786.” I find no such use of staves in the OED (vol. 16). Careful culling of Rich’s score of publications might yield a wealth of data from the Hudson’s Bay Company records.

Quotes in the OED referring to points, from various dates, are not consistent. From 1780 we have the “price of the pointed plankets [sic] as the points were known to evry Indian to be the price paid for each as 2 ½ points, 2 ½ beaver, 3 points, 3 beaver.” An 1818 citation referring to Northwest Company blankets states that they used “three points to measure six feet six inches long.” This two-meter length would thus be broken into units twenty-six inches long, which could reflect an earlier “ell.” In 1921, a century later, “Hudson’ Bay blankets run as follows: Three points, 60 × 72 inches, double, [sic] weight 8 ½ lbs; 3 ½ point, 63 × 81 inches, double, weight, 10 lbs.” Only after 1850 are markings of some type on the blankets identified as “points.” Prior to 1850, when these heavy blankets may have been all home loomed, the term points may have indicated the size and/or maker’s markings “to show size and weight. These points [were added] usually in colored wools and usually [were] about one inch long.”

The term plaid refers to any material having a multicolored cross-barred...
pattern, and I suspect that the figures in the Bresani inset are wearing plaid blankets. Regarding the elaborate fringes on the matchcoats worn by the figures in the Bresani map, Feest (1983: 134) notes that most early illustrations of “skin matchcoats” depict them as fringed. I suspect that this is one of the European artistic conventions used to denote American Indians (cf. Becker 2000).

2 A nearly contemporary context to Smith’s voyages in which an native word resembling matchcoat appears is as the name of a town in Powhatan’s domain. Following his detailed description of the story of Pocahontas and the Virginia colonists, Ralph Hamor (1615: 9) relates details of the continued exploration of the interior. Hamor notes that “vp the riuer we went, and anchored neere vnto the chiefest residenie Powhatan had, at a towne called Matchcot where were assembled (which we saw) about 400 men.” The description of this “town” may confuse it with a location at which meetings were held. An account from Maryland in 1634 provides some clarification: “In the most grave assembly, no man can expect to find so much time past with more silence and gravitie: Some Indians coming on a time to James Towne in Virginia, it happened, that there then sate the Councell to heare causes, and the Indians seeing such an assembly, asked what it meant? Answer was made, there was held a Match-comaco (which the Indians call their place of Councell) the Indians replied, that they all talke at once, but we doe not so in our Match-comaco” (Hall 1930: 87). How this place of meeting would be translated into English is not known, nor do we know if this term relates in any way to the garments worn by Algonquian-speaking Native Americans who lived in that area.

Another linguistic note from ca. 1715 relates to native words, presumably in the Algonquian language family, for two items of clothing provided by John Fontaine (1872 [1715]): The terms for coat (opockhe) and for breeches (lonoughte) do not appear to relate in any way to matchcoat.

3 In addition to the “Match-coat from Virginia of feathers” that was in the original Tradescant collection (1656: 47), but does not appear to have survived, feathered capes made by North American Indians are known from several other contexts (see Lurie and Anderson 1998, 1999, 2000). The publications of Nancy Lurie and Duane Anderson have generated some interest in what I identify as feathered matchcoats (Becker 2005a). Lurie and Anderson (1998: 83) identify five examples of feathered garments that they believe to have been made by Native Americans, plus another forty-six made in cultures from around the world. They also mention twelve other feathered garments. Jonathan King (2000: 94, 96n3) discusses and reviews these ideas and notes that many other feathered garments are known. King and others doubt a native origin for the items discussed by Lurie and Anderson, a subject taken up in detail elsewhere (Becker 2005a).

4 Cockacoeske’s “crown” of wampum was a post-1620 decorative innovation, possibly similar to that worn by the Narragansett chief Ninigret in his portrait painted in 1637 or 1647 (Simmons 1978: 195, fig. 4). Ninigret’s portrait may be the earliest of a Native American in the northeastern region known to have been painted from life. The shell beads known as wampum were being “invented,” or standardized in form, far to the north during the period 1610–20 (Becker 2001a, 2002a) and did not spread into the Powhatan region before the 1640s. Roanoke, an altogether different type of shell “bead” of flat shape, was an aboriginal product that may have been used in the precontact period.
5 A modern parallel to this native “revival” can be seen in the modern use of, and interest in, wampum belts and wampum strings in parts of the Northeast. The secular examples of wampum from past political contexts, as items used in negotiating treaties, have been transformed during the late twentieth century to items of ritual and pseudo-religious meaning (see Becker 2001a).

6 Although Waselkov (1989a) has made an impressive case for “Powhatan’s mantle” actually originating with Powhatan, there are a number of other possible sources that might be considered. The linkage of Tradescant as a collector with the names of any of these Native American players would provide more impressive confirmation of the origin of this particular mantle. Elsewhere I have suggested that the mantle worn by Munetute, Powhatan’s war leader, may also have been collected for the Tradescant collection (Becker 2005a). This interpretation would be consistent with Waselkov’s.

Martha McCartney, who also agrees with Waselkov’s interpretation, pointed me toward another interesting document referring to “queenly” garb among the Powhatan. After the impressive Powhatan uprising in 1622 the colonists launched a number of retaliatory raids to punish those natives in rebelling and to prevent them from launching further attacks. The document relevant to native dress is in a “Letter to Virginia Company of London. April 4, 1623. Manuscript Records Virginia Company 3, pt. ii, pp. 6, 6a (also C.O. 1, vol. 2, no. 22).” Kingsbury 1906: 4:98 provides the basis for the parts of this letter cited here. The letter notes that “since our last L[ett]re, there cam two Indians to m[artin]s Hundred . . . one of which Called (Chauco) who had lived much amost the English, and by revealing yt pl[ot] To divers vpon the day of Massacre, saued there lives, was sent by the great Kinge” to request an end to the hostilities and to allow the natives “to plante at Powmunkie, and there former Seates.” In return “they would send home our People (beinge aboute twenty) whom they saued alive” since the massacre.

Not at all clear is whether both of the natives mentioned arrived together, since the letter continues as follows: “The other (called Comahum) an Actor in the Massacre at Martin’s Hundred, beinge a great man and not sent by the greate Kinge [under diplomatic immunity], Wee putt in Chaines.” Chauco must have been given a positive answer, for within a week the natives “returned, with m’s [Boyce] (the Chiefe of the prisoners) sent home appareled like one of there Queens, wch they desired wee should take notice of.” McCartney notes that Mrs. Boyce was the wife of John Boyce, the “Warden” of Martins Hundred and probably the second-ranking colonial after headman William Harwood. Thus Mrs. Boyce was the ranking prisoner, and was dressed by the natives in a mode to convey the fact that she had been treated as befitted her station. The garments that she wore may have been among those pieces of clothing that Tradescant later acquired.

The remaining prisoners had not been sent home when the letter was written. The text continues with notes on the local politics and the treacherous intent of the colonial government to allow the natives to plant where they could be monitored and then their crops destroyed.

7 Only nine of the surviving North American items from the original Tradescant collection were identified at the Almolean Museum a century ago (Bushnell 1908b: 494). Five of these objects were illustrated in Bushnell’s (1907a) initial American publication. These five items included three bows, the item that he
called “Powhatan’s” habit, and one of the bags or purses originally listed in the
catalogue. Bushnell’s (1907a) quote from page 47 of the original Tradescant cata-
logue is a peculiarly flawed transcription (MacGregor 1983: fiche 3; Tradescant
1656: 47; see also fig. i above).

Bushnell (1908b: 494) describes Tradescant’s Canadian “Match-coat” as
“made up of rather thin, well-tanned deerskin, and the ornamentation is of un-
usually beautiful quill work that has retained the brilliant coloring of the native
dyes.” The question here is Bushnell’s further note that “several pieces have been
cut from it and it has become hard and stiff as a result of having been wet.”
Whether it was ever wet is not certain, and the stiffness may belie the idea that
it was “well-tanned.” Native dyes rarely are as brilliant as Bushnell suggests, but
modern aniline dyes were not yet in existence in 1656. Banister’s transformation
of data relating to these garments (in Ewan and Ewan 1970: 394) need not be
discussed, but is symptomatic of problems in this type of historical research.

8 Daniel Gookin’s (1806 [1792]: 152) account of clothing among several “Several
Nations” and their eagerness for cloth relates to natives in New England in the
latter part of the seventeenth century. The text merits quotation for several of
the points noted. Gookin indicates that they buy “a kind of cloth, called duffils,
or trucking [trade] cloth, about a yard and a half wide, and for matter, made of
coarse wool . . . [in] colours, as blue, red, purple, and some use them white. Of
this sort of cloth two yards make a mantle, or coat, for men and women, and
less for children. This is all the garment they generally use, with the addition of
some little pieces of the same, or of ordinary cotton, to cover their secret parts.
It is rare to see any among them of the most barbarous, that are remiss or neglig-
ent in hiding those parts. But the Christian and civilized Indians do endeavour,
many of them, to follow the English mode in their habit. Their ornaments are,
especially the women’s, bracelets, necklaces, and head bands, of several sorts of
beads, especially of black and white wompom, which is of most esteem among
them, and is accounted their chief treasure.

9 Monmouth caps are described by John Mollo (1972: 23) as “woollen stocking
caps.” Parallel terms for this English identity are not readily identified. Dunn and
Dunn (1982: 268n34) describe Monmouth caps as a type of hat popular with
sailors and soldiers in the eighteenth century, but McCartney (personal commu-
nication 2003) believes that they had been used since the early seventeenth
century.
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