Cornelia Aust, Denise Klein, and Thomas Weller

Introduction

Dress has always been one of the most obvious markers of difference. Very close to the body, “vestimentary signs” become part of the daily habitus and an unavoidable means of communication.¹ Whereas most material objects of symbolic communication and social distinction are distant from the body, dress constitutes a “second skin” and is thus more likely than any other item to be identified with its wearer.² Many languages capture this relationship in the proverbial expression “clothes make the man”.³ And many cultures have folktales in which the motif appears. For instance, there is that of Nasreddin Hoca, the witty and wise hero of hundreds of stories told for half a millennium from the Balkans to the Middle East and Central Asia, who once went to a banquet where nobody took notice of him. On the next occasion, he put on his best clothes and found himself being treated with the utmost respect, whereupon he fed his soup to what had earned him this honor, his coat, telling it, “Eat, my fur coat, eat!”⁴

1 Roland Barthes: *The Language of Fashion*. London 2005 [Système de la mode. Paris 1967]; Joanne Entwistle: *The Fashioned Body. Fashion, Dress, and Modern Social Theory*. 2nd ed. Cambridge 2015; Odile Blanc: Historiographie du vêtement. Un bilan, in: Michel Pastoureau (ed.): *Le vêtement. Histoire, archéologie et symbolique vestimentaire au Moyen-Âge*. Paris 1989, 7–33; Roland Eckert and Stefanie Würtz: Kleidung als Kommunikation, in: Dorothea Lüddeckens, Christoph Uehlinger, and Rafael Walthert (eds.): *Die Sichtbarkeit religiöser Identität. Repräsentation – Differenz – Konflikt*. Zurich 2013, 77–84. For an anthropological view of dress, see Terence S. Turner: The Social Skin, in: *Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 2:2 (2012), 486–504 [reprint of 1980].

2 André Holenstein et al. (eds.): *Zweite Haut. Zur Kulturgeschichte der Kleidung*. Bern 2010; Monika Glavac, Anna-Katharina Höpfinger, and Daria Pezzoli-Olgati (eds.): *Second skin. Körper, Kleidung, Religion*. Göttingen 2013; Joanne Entwistle: Fashion and the Fleshy Body. Dress as Embodied Practice, in: *Fashion Theory* 4 (2000), 323–347.

3 Harold D. Cordry: *The Multicultural Dictionary of Proverbs*. Jefferson 1997, 41; Martin Dinges: Von der “Lesbarkeit der Welt” zum universalisierten Wandel durch individuelle Strategien. Die soziale Funktion der Kleidung in der höfischen Gesellschaft, in: *Saeculum* 44 (1993), 90–112, here 90; id.: Der “feine Unterschied”. Die soziale Funktion der Kleidung in der höfischen Gesellschaft, in: *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 19 (1992), 49–76, here 51.

4 Nasreddin Hoca is his Turkish name, in other regions he is known as Molla Nasreddin, Juha, or by different names. On this literary figure and his tales, including the one cited above, see Pertev Naili Boratav: *Nasreddin Hoca*, 5th ed. Istanbul 2007, 168. For this and similar folktales from Western and Eastern Europe, see Hans-Jörg Uther: *The Types of International Folktales. A Classification and Bibliography Based on the System of Antti Aarne and Stith*

Dress tells stories about identity and belonging as well as about exclusion and stigmatization.⁵ An expensive fur coat allows for the display of its wearer's status and wealth, yet old and patched clothes also mercilessly display his or her poverty and indigence. Clothes, moreover, make it possible for people to play with identities and affiliations. For instance, donning certain forms of dress enables individuals to claim higher social status, experiment with gender roles, and display or disguise their religion. It is this ambiguity of dress that makes it open to manipulation by the wearer and misinterpretation by the observer. This issue of the *European History Yearbook* investigates the intricate character of dress in society, focusing on a number of different European regions and their global entanglements in the early modern period.

The way people dressed acquired a new significance but also became more deceptive amid the early modern world's increasing social complexity. The growth of urban populations in most of Europe led to a higher degree of social differentiation, a process that went hand in hand with new perceptions of the self and of the place of the individual in society. Since the Middle Ages people across the continent had come to consider themselves – and everyone else – to be part of a strictly hierarchical order in which everybody occupied a specific place according to his or her social status, gender, ethnic belonging, and religion.⁶ As symbolic communication and ritual were essential for the

Thompson, vol. 2. Helsinki 2004, 295–296; id.: *Kleider machen Leute* (AaTh 1558), *Welcome to the Clothes* (ATU 1558), in: *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, vol. 7. Berlin 1993, 1425–1429.

⁵ Social theory has questioned the concept of identity as too static to describe an increasingly dynamic and complex social reality in which individuals often develop multiple belongings. See Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper: *Beyond "Identity"*, in: *Theory and Society* 29 (2000), 1–47; Floya Anthias: *Identity and Belonging. Conceptualisations and Political Framings*, in: *KLA Working Paper Series* 8 (2013). URL: http://www.kompetenzla.uni-koeln.de/sites/fileadmin2/WP_Anthias.pdf (6 Feb. 2019); Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka: *Zugehörigkeit in der mobilen Welt. Politiken der Verortung*. Göttingen 2012, 10–12; Valentin Groebner: *Identität. Anmerkungen zu einem politischen Schlagwort*, in: *Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte* 12 (2018), 109–115.

⁶ Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger: *Die Wissenschaft der feinen Unterschiede. Das Präzedenzrecht und die europäischen Monarchien vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert*, in: *Majestas* 10 (2002), 125–150; Peter Burke: *The Language of Orders in Early Modern Europe*, in: Michael L. Bush (ed.): *Social Orders and Social Classes in Europe since 1500. Studies in Social Stratification*. London 1992, 1–12; Dror Wahrmann: *The Making of the Modern Self. Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*. New Haven 2004. For the Ottoman context, see Gottfried Hagen: *Legitimacy and World Order*, in: Hakan T. Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski (eds.): *Legitimizing the Order. The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power*. Leiden 2005, 55–83; Rhoads Murphy: *Forms of Differentiation and Expression of Individuality in Ottoman Society*, in: *Turcica* 34 (2002), 135–170.

legitimation and confirmation of this social and political order, and as social relations depended to a much greater extent than today on face-to-face communication, the particular place of the individual in society had to be visually apparent to the external observer at first sight.⁷ Against this background, and with the growing wealth of early modern urban elites and the intensification of global trade, which brought new materials for making clothes and accessories, it comes as no surprise that dress and fashion became increasingly important means of social distinction and self-fashioning.⁸ For Western Europe, where this process began during the late Middle Ages and intensified during the Renaissance, a striking example is provided by the sixteenth-century Augsburg patrician Matthäus Schwarz, who had himself portrayed more than 130 times wearing different attire.⁹ In Ottoman Europe, the new significance of dress is evident, for instance, in the growing number of political treatises and social satires that discuss the clothing choices of the elite and mock the sartorial attempts of social climbers and the nouveau riche, from the second half of the sixteenth through the eighteenth century.¹⁰

In reaction to economic and socio-cultural transformations and in an effort to bring order to the increasingly complex social universe, religious and secular authorities on all levels and across Europe enacted an ever-growing number of

7 Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger: Much Ado About Nothing? Rituals of Politics in Early Modern Europe and Today, in: *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 48 (2011), 9–25; Rudolf Schlögl: Kommunikation und Vergesellschaftung unter Anwesenden. Formen des Sozialen und ihre Transformation in der Frühen Neuzeit, in: *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 34 (2008), 155–224; Wim Blockmans and Antheun Janse (eds.): *Showing Status. Representation of Social Positions in the Late Middle Ages*. Turnhout 1999; Marian Füssel and Thomas Weller (eds.): *Ordnung und Distinktion. Praktiken sozialer Repräsentation in der ständischen Gesellschaft*. Münster 2005.

8 Stephen Greenblatt: *Renaissance Self-Fashioning. From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago 1980; Ulinka Rublack: *Dressing Up. Cultural Identity in Renaissance Europe*. New York 2010; Carol Collier Frick: *Dressing Renaissance Florence. Families, Fortunes, and Fine Clothing*. Baltimore 2005; Claudia Ulbrich and Richard Wittmann (eds.): *Fashioning the Self in Transcultural Settings. The Uses and Significance of Dress in Self-Narratives*. Würzburg 2015; Daniel Roche: *The Culture of Clothing. Dress and Fashion in the “Ancien Régime”*. Cambridge 1996 [*La Culture des apparences. Une histoire du vêtement (XVIIe–XVIIIe siècle)*. Paris 1990]; Catherine Richardson (ed.): *Clothing Culture, 1350–1650*. Aldershot 2004.

9 Ulinka Rublack and Maria Hayward (eds.): *The First Book of Fashion. The Book of Clothes of Matthäus and Veit Konrad Schwarz of Augsburg*. London 2015; Valentin Groebner: Insides Out. Clothes, Dissimulation and the Arts of Accounting in the Autobiography of Mattheus Schwarz (1498–1574), in: *Representations* 66 (1999), 52–72.

10 See for instance Andreas Tietze: Mustafa ‘Âlî on Luxury and the Status Symbols of Ottoman Gentlemen, in: Alessio Bombaci, Aldo Gallotta, and Ugo Marazzi (eds.): *Studia turcologica memoriae Alexii Bombaci dicata*. Naples 1982, 577–590; [Anonymous]: *XVIII. Yüzyıl İstanbul Hayatına Dair Risâle-i Garîbe*, ed. by Hayati Develi. Istanbul 1998.

sumptuary laws. In the Holy Roman Empire alone, sumptuary legislation produced more than 1,300 regulations between 1244 and 1816.¹¹ However, the timing of authorities' heightened interference in how people dressed differed significantly from region to region. In some Italian cities, regulations on dress were already common in the thirteenth century.¹² In England, the sixteenth century was the heyday of sumptuary legislation, whereas in most other parts of Western Europe regulations peaked in the seventeenth and tailed off in the eighteenth century.¹³ In Ottoman Istanbul, clothing legislation had existed for centuries but gained momentum only in the early eighteenth century with the development of a new middle class, urban culture, and heightened consciousness of fashion.¹⁴ In certain south-eastern European regions under Ottoman rule, by contrast, clothing regulations appeared only in the late eighteenth century, as Constanța Vintilă-Ghițulescu shows in her contribution to this issue. Internal Jewish sumptuary laws, as Cornelia Aust describes, existed in Renaissance Italy and again in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century central and east-central Europe. The effectiveness of sumptuary legislation is debatable,¹⁵ and other sources, such as inventories, provide only a limited corrective.¹⁶ Yet the mere existence of these

11 Neithard Bulst: Zum Problem städtischer und territorialer Kleider-, Aufwands- und Luxusgesetzgebung in Deutschland (13. bis Mitte 16. Jahrhundert), in: André Gouron and Albert Rigaudière (eds.): *Renaissance du pouvoir législatif et genèse de l'Etat*. Montpellier 1988, 29–57; id.: Kleidung als sozialer Konfliktstoff. Probleme kleidergesetzlicher Normierung im sozialen Gefüge, in: *Saeculum* 44 (1993), 32–46; Ulinka Rublack: The Right to Dress. Sartorial Politics in Germany, c. 1300–1750, in: Giorgio Riello and ead. (eds.): *The Right to Dress. Sumptuary Laws in a Global Perspective, c. 1200–1800*. Cambridge 2019, 37–73.

12 Catherine Kovesi Killerby: *Sumptuary Law in Italy 1200–1500*. Oxford 2002.

13 Alan Hunt: *Governance of the Consuming Passions. A History of Sumptuary Law*. New York 1996, 36; Catherine Richardson: Status, in: Elizabeth Currie (ed.): *A History of Dress and Fashion in the Renaissance*. London 2017, 117–134, here 117–118.

14 Donald Quataert: Clothing Laws, State, and Society in the Ottoman Empire, 1720–1829, in: *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 29 (1997), 403–425; Shirine Hamadeh: *The City's Pleasures. Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century*. Seattle 2008.

15 Martin Dinges: Normsetzung als Praxis? Oder: Warum werden die Normen zur Sachkultur und zum Verhalten so häufig wiederholt und was bedeutet dies für den Prozess der "Sozialdisziplinierung"?, in: *Norm und Praxis im Alltag des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit. Internationales Round-Table-Gespräch, Krems an der Donau, 7. Oktober 1996*. Vienna 1997, 39–53; Achim Landwehr: "Normdurchsetzung" in der Frühen Neuzeit? Kritik eines Begriffs, in: *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 48 (2000), 146–162.

16 Giorgio Riello: Things Seen and Unseen. The Material Culture of Early Modern Inventories and Their Representation of Domestic Interiors, in: Paula Findlen (ed.): *Modern Things. Objects and Their History, 1500–1800*. Basingstoke 2013, 125–150. For the Ottoman context, see Yvonne J. Seng: *The Üsküdar Estates (tereke) as Records of Daily Life in an Ottoman Town, 1521–1524*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss. University of Chicago 1991.

numerous regulations highlights the fact that the visual representation of difference by dress was a key concern of early modern European societies.¹⁷

The primary goals of sumptuary legislation varied from period to period and from region to region, but across Europe throughout the early modern period “hierarchic dress codes” definitely constituted its “classic form”.¹⁸ This legislation aimed at marking social difference first and foremost by restricting the use of certain extravagant clothes and luxury items to members of certain social strata. In the Holy Roman Empire, for instance, an imperial ordinance of 1530 allowed only noblemen to wear golden chains of up to 200 florins, whereas wealthy burghers had to abstain from these expensive pieces of jewelry even though they could afford them.¹⁹ In the Ottoman Empire, an imperial decree of 1727 enjoined commoners from wearing ermine fur.²⁰ Some of these regulations made only very rough social distinctions, but others were extremely detailed. An ordinance issued by the city of Strasbourg in 1660, for instance, listed what members of no less than 256 professions divided into six status groups were – and were not – allowed to wear.²¹ Clothing laws of that kind were promulgated over and over again, indicating that dress codes were not necessarily closely adhered to and were, in practice, continuously renegotiated. For instance, Constanța Vintilă-Ghițulescu highlights in her article that Romanian boyars in the eighteenth century tended to maintain the public display of luxurious clothes and accessories regardless of the law, in order both to outdo their peers and to display their sense of superiority vis-à-vis their Greek overlords from Istanbul. While commonly concerned with the appearance of both men and women, some

17 Gerhard Jaritz: Kleidung und Prestige-Konkurrenz. Unterschiedliche Identitäten in der städtischen Gesellschaft unter Normierungszwängen, in: *Saeculum* 44 (1993), 8–31; Katharina Simon-Muscheid: Standesgemässe Kleidung. Repräsentation und Abgrenzung durch Kleiderordnungen (12.–16. Jahrhundert), in: Holenstein, *Zweite Haut*, 91–115; Thomas Weller: “Von ihrer schändlichen und teuflischen Hoffart sich nicht abwenden lassen wollen ...” Kleider- und Aufwandsordnungen als Spiegel “guter Ordnung”, in: Irene Dingel and Armin Kohnle (eds.): *Gute Ordnung. Ordnungsmodelle und Ordnungsvorstellungen in der Reformationszeit*. Leipzig 2014, 203–219.

18 Hunt, *Governance*, 393. For a broader perspective on this subject see Riello and Rublack, *Right to Dress*.

19 Matthias Weber: *Die Reichspolizeiordnungen von 1530, 1548 und 1577. Historische Einführung und Edition*. Frankfurt am Main 2002, 147.

20 Quataert, *Clothing Laws*, 409.

21 Lieselotte Constanze Eisenbart: *Kleiderordnungen der deutschen Städte zwischen 1350 und 1700. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Bürgertums*. Göttingen 1962, 60; Rublack, *Right to Dress*, 62.

clothing regulations pertained predominantly or even exclusively to women, who were seen as especially prone to expensive fashion and immoral behavior.²²

Across Europe, women typically faced more scrutiny than men when it came to their appearance, a fact that is closely related to religious norms and ideas of sexual morality and appropriate clothing, the most prominent example of which is the veil. Today, the veil is exclusively associated with conservative Muslim women, but in the early modern era Christian women in Europe also covered their hair and face from the male gaze in order to exhibit their chastity and virtue. Yet, at times, the veil also became a fashionable item.²³ The *almalafa*, for instance, a white veil that covered the head and upper body, was used in sixteenth-century Granada by both Muslim and Christian women, until the practice was prohibited by the Christian authorities.²⁴ In other parts of Spain, moralists at first encouraged women to go covered and then later condemned the practice, fearing that women would escape their male relatives' control.²⁵

Clothes were expected not only to cover the body, especially the female body, but also to define a person's gender more broadly.²⁶ A number of garments and accessories were clearly associated with the gendered body, such as the female veil or the male suit or turban, but there also existed items whose meaning was not fixed and which allowed at times for different interpretations. For instance, Thomas Weller in his article discusses male earrings, which became fashionable at the English court in the sixteenth century, but which were regarded as marker of heresy in contemporary Catholic Spain. Another clothing item that was originally designed to cover the female body but allowed for contrary appropriations was the farthingale. As Gabriel Guarino notes in his article, moralists in seventeenth-century Spain claimed that women often used the

²² Barbara Vinken: *Angezogen. Das Geheimnis der Mode*. Stuttgart 2013. For the Ottoman case, see Betül İ. Argıt: An Evaluation of the Tulip Period and the Period of Selim III in the Light of Clothing Regulations, in: *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 24 (2004), 11–28; Madeline C. Zilfi: Whose Laws? Gendering the Ottoman Sumptuary Regime, in: Suraiya Faroqhi and Christoph Neumann (eds.): *Ottoman Costumes. From Textile to Identity*. Istanbul 2004, 125–141.

²³ Susanna Burghartz: Covered Women? Veiling in Early Modern Europe, in: *History Workshop Journal* 80 (2015), 1–32.

²⁴ David Coleman: *Creating Christian Granada. Society and Religious Culture in an Old-World Frontier City, 1492–1600*. Ithaca, NY 2003, 63; see also the contribution by Thomas Weller to this issue.

²⁵ Laura R. Bass and Amanda Wunder: The Veiled Ladies of the Early Modern Spanish World. Seduction and Scandal in Seville, Madrid and Lima, in: *Hispanic Review* 77 (2009), 97–144; see also the contribution by Gabriel Guarino to this issue.

²⁶ Odile Blanc: Vêtements féminins, vêtements masculins à la fin du Moyen Âge. Le point de vue des moralistes, in: Pastoureau, *Le vêtement*, 243–253.

farthingale to hide illegitimate pregnancies – or even their lovers. Of course, gendered clothing was also used to play with feminine and masculine bodily features, for instance by wearing accessories specific to the opposite gender or by cross-dressing in order to disguise one's gender.²⁷

Dress also marked, and to some extent created, religious belonging. Believers across Europe were required to wear specific clothing on certain occasions, on Shabbat or to Sunday mass, for example, and there were different traditions of clothing for the members of Europe's different religious communities in their daily lives in general. This often included, in addition to specific clothing items, other features of outward appearance, such as a certain haircut, a beard, or particular accessories.²⁸ Religious and secular authorities across Europe watched over their peoples' appearance and tried to ensure that members of different religious communities were distinguishable from each other as part of their efforts to limit excessive social interaction and, most of all, sexual intercourse with the religious other. Among the best known examples of this practice are the regulations of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 regarding the visual distinction of Christians from Jews and Muslims, which paved the way for more detailed stipulations, including the compulsory wearing of yellow signs (or those of other colors) or special hats for Jews in most of Christian Europe.²⁹ Similar restrictions on specific colors and pieces of clothing, especially hats and luxury items, existed in Ottoman Europe, in this case targeting the many Christians and Jews living in the sultan's realm.³⁰

In practice, however, we can assume that neighbors, at least, were well aware of each other's religious belonging. Specific pieces of clothing and symbols, thus, were often a means of degradation and discrimination as much as a feature of distinction. It was no coincidence that similar signs were used to stigmatize other social outsiders, such as prostitutes, beggars, or lepers, and that, in many cases, the religious other also had to abstain from overly luxurious

27 Valerie R. Hotchkiss: *Clothes Make the Man. Female Cross-dressing in Medieval Europe*. New York 1996; Rudolf M. Dekker and Lotte Constance van de Pol: *The Tradition of Female Transvestism in Early Modern Europe*. New York 1997.

28 Dorothea Lüddeckens: Relevanz in der Interaktion. Kleidung und Religion, in: ead., Uehlinger, and Walthert, *Sichtbarkeit religiöser Identität*, 37–76, here 39.

29 Solomon Grayzel: *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century: 1198–1254*. 2nd ed. New York 1966, 308–309; Sarah Lipton: *Dark Mirror. The Medieval Origins of Anti-Jewish Iconography*. New York 2014.

30 Matthew Elliot: Dress Codes in the Ottoman Empire: The Case of the Franks, in: Faroqhi and Neumann, *Ottoman Costumes*, 103–123, here 104–108. On the religious underpinning of such dress codes, see İrvin Cemil Schick: Some Islamic Determinants of Dress and Personal Appearance in Southwest Asia, in: *Khil'a* 3 (2007–2009), 25–53.

dress in order to mark his or her inferiority.³¹ Flora Cassen, in her contribution, shows not only how these mechanisms of stigmatization and exclusion worked in Italian cities of the Renaissance but also the strategies Jewish men and women developed to retain power over their own identities. Moreover, certain members of religious minorities who were subjected to discriminatory dress codes ignored or intentionally disregarded these stipulations, in order to blend in with the majority or to avoid assault.

Social status, gender, and religion were, of course, not the only qualities expressed by dress. Regional and ethnic belonging was equally important. The first European costume books, which appeared in the sixteenth century, divided the social world first and foremost into regional and ethnic groups.³² It is probably no coincidence that these illustrated volumes, which represented other peoples in their traditional costumes, first appeared when many European regions experienced a first formation of “national” self-consciousness. Although most historians agree that the modern nation was a product of the eighteenth century, earlier roots of national thinking can be traced back to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The idea of competing “nations” was widespread among European humanists and also shaped, to some extent, the depiction of foreign dress styles in early modern costume books and travel accounts.³³

Supposedly clear-cut differences between national dress styles were hardly straightforward in practice. Instead, we often find the selective use and combination of different styles. Certain presumably national styles spread across Europe, assuming different meanings in different contexts and times. As Thomas Weller shows for Dutch and German immigrants in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain, and Maria Hayward for Scottish travelers from the mid-sixteenth to the mid-eighteenth century, the predilection for black clothes, often associated with the so-called Spanish dress, was by no means exclusively Spanish and had different connotations in different cultural settings. By the eighteenth century, similar attire consisting of a long black cloak and a white ruff was worn, at least occasionally, by Jews in Frankfurt and Fürth and was regarded as distinctly Jewish,

31 Robert Jütte: Stigma-Symbole. Kleidung als identitätsstiftendes Merkmal bei spätmittelalterlichen und frühneuzeitlichen Randgruppen (Juden, Dimen, Aussätzige, Bettler), in: *Saeculum* 44 (1993), 65–89.

32 Rublack, *Dressing Up*, 146–163; Ulrike Ilg: The Cultural Significance of Costume Books in Sixteenth-Century Europe, in: Richardson, *Clothing Culture*, 29–48; Leslie Schick: The Place of Dress in Pre-modern Costumes Albums, in: Faroqhi and Neumann, *Ottoman Costumes*, 93–102.

33 Rublack, *Dressing Up*, 121–175. On the idea of “nations” in early modern Europe, see Caspar Hirschi: *The Origins of Nationalism. An Alternative History from Ancient Rome to Early Modern Germany*. Cambridge 2012.

as Cornelia Aust demonstrates. Beata Biedrońska-Słota's and Maria Molenda's contribution traces how certain garments of Eastern European and Ottoman origin constituted what would later be known as Polish "national" dress.

National ascriptions of both people and their clothes became particularly important in situations of cultural contact. Europe's courts, of course, attracted many foreigners and were major places of conspicuous consumption and sartorial display; as such, they often took the lead in cross-cultural exchange and in the spread of costumes and fashion across geographic and political boundaries.³⁴ Dynastic marriages among members of the high nobility, for instance, helped introduce Spanish and French courtly fashion to the court of Naples in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as Gabriel Guarino shows in his article. Constanța Vintilă-Ghițulescu discusses how members of the Greek community of Istanbul who were appointed princes of Moldavia and Wallachia brought Ottoman imperial fashion to the Romanian provinces, and how the local elites soon appropriated and modified these new clothes for their own ends.

It was not only Europe's princely rulers and royal families who introduced people to foreign dress and style; diplomats, elite travelers, merchants, sailors, soldiers, and many others traveling or living abroad also did so. It is no coincidence that European fashion started influencing Istanbul's elite and middle class in the eighteenth century, when the first Ottoman diplomatic missions traveled to Paris and other European capitals, culminating, following a century of vivid cultural exchange, in 1829, when state officials were obliged to abandon their traditional costume and wear the *fez* and European-style clothes instead. At the same time, but in the opposite direction, upper-class women like Lady Montague and Elisabeth Craven, writing about their experiences in Istanbul, familiarized British high society with Ottoman costumes and fashion, contributing to the trend of *Turquerie* at the court of London and other European capitals.³⁵ Maria Hayward demonstrates in her contribution how young male aristocrats stimulated fashion exchange across Europe, focusing on Scottish noblemen who came to continental Europe on the Grand Tour, for trade, or as exiles, between the

34 Isabelle Paresys and Natacha Coquery (eds.): *Se vêtir à la Cour en Europe (1400–1815)*. Villeneuve d'Ascq 2011; Philip Mansel: *Dressed to Rule. Royal and Court Costume from Louis XIV to Elizabeth II*. New Haven 2005; Dinges, Unterschied; Kirsten O. Frieling: *Sehen und gesehen werden. Kleidung an Fürstenhöfen an der Schwelle vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit (ca. 1450–1530)*. Ostfildern 2013.

35 Onur İnal: Women's Fashions in Transition. Ottoman Borderlands and the Anglo-Ottoman Exchange of Costumes, in: *Journal of World History* 22 (2011), 243–272; Joachim Gierlichs: Europeans in "Turkish" Dress, in: Ulbrich and Wittmann, *Fashioning the Self*, 151–186.

sixteenth and eighteenth century. Increasing mobility and migration during the early modern period, however, also heightened authorities' concern about how to distinguish and control foreigners. Flora Cassen and Thomas Weller emphasize in their contributions that Jews and foreign merchants were especially subject to distrust and monitoring.

Due to intensified long distance trade and technological developments since the sixteenth century, new textiles, costumes, and accessories entered the European market. Giulia Calvi describes in her article how an exotic commodity such as the cashmere shawl turned into a fashionable good all across Europe. For most of history, such luxury imports from far away were the reserve of the elite, although there had always been members of lower echelons of society who were able to afford luxurious items and fabrics (or at least their imitations).³⁶ But it was only with the emergence of a consumer culture in the eighteenth century that the number of such non-elite buyers increased significantly.³⁷ New media like fashion journals took a leading role in popularizing the latest fashion and foreign dress to a wider European public, as they spoke to and could be afforded by many, unlike the costume books and early prints of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.³⁸ However, this popularization of fashion during the eighteenth century meant that it became even more difficult to distinguish people by their dress. Indeed, by the end of the century, European societies started abandoning the utopian ideal of a self-explanatory vestimentary code mirroring a strictly hierarchical social order and gave in to the increasingly complex universe of vestimentary signs characterized by the coexistence of individual styles, transcultural influences, and rapidly changing fashions.

The eight articles assembled in this issue contribute to the growing literature on early modern dress in a truly European perspective. As the foregoing

36 Rublack, *Right to Dress*, 37; Maureen Fennell Mazzaoui (ed.): *Textiles. Production, Trade and Demand*. Aldershot 1998; Giorgio Riello and Prasanna Parthasarathi (eds.): *The Spinning World. A Global History of Cotton Textiles, 1200–1850*. Oxford 2009; Sven Beckert: *Empire of Cotton. A Global History*. New York 2015.

37 Karin Wurst: *Fabricating Pleasure. Fashion, Entertainment, and Cultural Consumption in Germany, 1780–1830*. Detroit 2005; Beverly Lemire: Production and Distribution, in: Peter McNeil (ed.): *A Cultural History of Dress and Fashion in the Age of Enlightenment*. London 2017, 45–62. On consumer culture more broadly, see eadem: *Global Trade and the Transformation of Consumer Cultures. The Material World Remade, c. 1500–1820*. Cambridge 2018.

38 Angela Borchert and Ralf Dressel (eds.): *Das Journal des Luxus und der Moden. Kultur um 1800*. Heidelberg 2004; Astrid Ackermann: *Paris, London und die europäische Provinz. Die frühen Modejournale 1770–1830*. Frankfurt am Main 2005; Karin A. Wurst: Fashioning a Nation. Fashion and National Costume in Bertuch's "Journal des Luxus und der Moden" (1786–1827), in: *German Studies Review* 28 (2005), 367–386.

outline indicates, there exist a number of studies discussing a variety of areas related to dress and appearance in the context of the political, socio-economic, and cultural transformations in Europe as well as Europe's entanglement with other parts of the world during the early modern period. Yet these studies tend to focus on one specific difference, most often social status or religion, and its expression by dress, rather than examining the intersection of various differences and their visual display. The research is also fragmented, with a large number of case studies on certain cities and regions and only a few studies with a comparative or broader European geographic scope. Modern national boundaries and ideas of separate cultural spheres, in fact, still dominate much of the scholarship.

This bias in the existing research prompted us to bring together leading scholars in the field to discuss dress as a marker of cultural difference in early modern Europe from a transcultural perspective.³⁹ The authors demonstrate how early modern Europeans used dress to express their various and overlapping senses of social, political, gender, religious, ethnic, and “national” belonging. They, moreover, point to the fact that dress was not only a means to make cultural differences visible but also in many cases literally produced these differences. The contributions provide many examples of how clothes actually “made” the man or woman. Yet they emphasize that it was rarely a specific garment, accessory, material, or color alone that produced meaning. The meaning of a vestimentary sign depended not only on the material object itself but also on the person who used it, the circumstances in which it was used, and the way it was perceived by others.⁴⁰ Thus, in many cases, the identification of specific garments with the wearer's social status, gender, religion, or ethnicity lay only in the eyes of the beholder. Even though authorities felt the need to define the meaning of vestimentary signs and control sartorial practices, the studies in this issue demonstrate that dress in practice always remained ambiguous and a subject of continuous negotiation. However, the articles also indicate that the actual negotiation, appropriation, and interpretation of sartorial practices differed significantly from time to time and from place to place.

39 A two-day conference took place at the Leibniz Institute of European History in Mainz, Germany, in October 2017, and the present issue publishes some of the papers presented on that occasion. Conference Report: Clothes Make the (Wo)man: Dress and Cultural Difference in Early Modern Europe, 26.10.2017 –28.10.2017 Mainz, in: *H-Soz-Kult* (31 Jan. 2018). URL: www.hsozkult.de/conferencereport/id/tagungsberichte-7527 (6 Feb. 2019).

40 In this regard, sartorial practices seem a case in point for actor-network-theory. See Joanne Entwistle: Fashion, Latour and actor-network-theory, in: Agnes Rocamora and Anneke Smelik (eds.): *Thinking through Fashion*. London 2016, 269–284.

Indeed, looking at dress as a marker of difference in this broader European perspective – from Scotland to Italy and from the Iberian Peninsula to Eastern Europe and the Ottoman Balkans, including marginalized regions and regions commonly regarded as belonging to separate cultural spheres – reveals a number of previously unnoticed differences, similarities, and connections across early modern Europe. Dress was definitely a key concern to all early modern Europeans and played a similar role across the continent in marking the individual's place in society, irrespective of the dominant faith and culture. Authorities also handled the issue in surprisingly similar ways and, whether Christian, Muslim, or Jewish, invoked similar concepts of morality and order to legitimize their interference in people's clothing choices. In the end, the contributions to this issue suggest that there were many more similarities among the various regions of Europe than there were differences, and that the latter often concerned merely details in form, practice, and chronology.⁴¹ While at times concerned with independent developments, the articles also propose that common features of dress and cultural difference in early modern Europe were, more often than one might think, the result of interaction and appropriation. The vibrant transcultural exchange within Europe of the period was not restricted to textiles and technologies but also extended to ideas and practices related to dress and appearance.

⁴¹ As recent research has shown, similar patterns and processes can also be found in other regions of the world: Riello and Rublack, *The Right to Dress*; Lemire, *Global Trade*.