

Costume [from Fr. *costume*, an Ital. loan-word; cf. Fr. *coutume*; both from Vulg. Lat. forms of *consuetudo*, *-inis*, usage]: dress and the ornaments of the person, taken in a general sense, and especially a national or provincial or local style of dress, prevailing for a length of time and free from sudden modifications. Thus in recent times the Japanese have to some extent given up their national costume and adopted European dress, while the Chinese have retained their national costume, although the Chinamen in the U. S. wear some garments which are not a part of that costume. We do not say that the Japanese have adopted European costume, however, for there is no such thing, except in the general sense that European men wear trousers and coats of woolen fabric, shirts of cotton and linen, and boots of leather, while the women wear gowns fitted closely to the body from the waist up, and flowing loosely below the waist down to the ankles or lower. These conditions are too general to constitute a costume, and the special shapes, colors, and materials change too often and too capriciously, and too much as a matter of deliberate choice, to allow a costume to exist. But the gown and wig of an English barrister constitute a costume; so does the dress of the Bedouins of the desert, for it has not changed for ages in any important feature; so does the dress of this and that valley of Southern Bavaria or Tyrol; so does the blouse of the French mechanic, and the smock-frock of the English country laborer. These are all traditional, they survive from old times, and continue in use merely because the people who wear them do not feel inclined to change.

If the people of the U. S. were to take up the blouse for their summer wear, it would be not a costume but a fashion. If we can imagine their continuing to wear it for a century it would have something of the nature of a costume. So the suit of white linen which "Mark Twain" gives to Col. Grangerford in *Huckleberry Finn* was in one sense a costume, because all the men of his class wore it and had worn it for years without thought of change; but it was not quite a costume, because it was a part of the modern European and American dress, and was therefore not peculiar in cut or fashion.

The history of costume can not be fully written as yet, because the monuments of art upon which it must depend have not been compared and analyzed with any thoroughness. Even the costumes of the Romans and Greeks in classical times are only half understood, and very many questions regarding both still remain unsettled and disputed. Greek authors mention garments by names of which we do not know the meaning; in Greek statues and vase-paintings are shown garments of which we know neither the names, nor the real shape and make, nor the utility. We do not know for certain what garments a Roman woman wore under her large and loose *palla*, if, indeed, it is the *palla*. In the crust of ashes at Pompeii there are cavities which formerly contained the bodies of persons smothered at the time of the city's destruction. These bodies crumbling away have left hard, shell-like molds. A plaster cast of one of them has revealed to us a woman's garment whose existence

in Roman imperial times had never been suspected by modern students. And the very numerous men's garments which were introduced during the time of the empire, as we are told by contemporary writers, we are generally not able to identify. This uncertainty is yet greater in respect to less known peoples.

The earliest sculptures found in Mesopotamia, dating perhaps 3,000 years before Christ, show in common use a garment made of a large oblong piece of stuff carried over the left shoulder and under the right arm, the two edges overlapping along the left side of the body and left leg. The same garment appears in Egypt at about the same date; it is common in Assyrian sculpture and in the monuments of the great Persian empire of the sixth century B. C. to the second, and we know it as the Grecian *peplos*. Its edges are often ornamented with fringes and with borders which are sometimes of very rich embroidery. It appears often as the only garment of either sex. But the Egyptian women are shown with this single garment drawn very closely around body and limbs, so that all the form is distinctly seen, while the Greek vase-paintings of all epochs show it as much more loosely worn, the forms wholly concealed except where it flies open at the left side. Men who wear this garment are always of some rather elevated social position; the workmen in the fields, mechanics, merchants, and even superintendents and officials are commonly shown in the Egyptian and Asiatic monuments with no garment except a piece of stuff hanging from the waist-belt, and arranged so as to cover the thigh to the knee. In the hot lands of the Eastern Mediterranean this was the dress of most men in antiquity; the thick woolen cloak used by the modern inhabitant of these same regions very seldom appears in the ancient monuments, and we are left equally unable to understand how the men of old time protected themselves from the heat of the noon-day sun, and how the Greeks and others who had a winter to face kept themselves warm in cold weather. The Assyrian princes and nobles are shown as entirely covered with clothing, and they have, what is remarkable, sleeves, though short ones. But it seems generally the shirt or inner tunic which has sleeves, and the whole dress may be taken as consisting of this shirt with the above-described wrapping garment, or a larger and fuller one worn over it.



FIG. 1.—Greek vase-painting: Warrior wearing the *chlaina* or *pharos* and a crested helmet, leading a female captive wearing the *chiton* and the *kaluptra* or long veil.

During what we may call the classical age, from about 500 B. C. to 300 A. D., it is noticeable that the non-Greek peoples of Western Asia and Egypt are more inclined to

cover and conceal the person than the Greeks. Even the women are much less heavily draped among the Greeks than in Asia. The *chiton* or shift of the Greek women (see Fig. 1) was made of one piece of stuff just as it left the loom, but with the opposite edges sewn together so as to make a straight case or tube of stuff open at both ends. This could be folded over at top, forming a kind of cape. Whether so



FIG. 2.—Greek vase-painting: Bacchus, wearing the chiton and chlamys, is overthrowing a giant wearing a chiton and a crested helmet, and carrying a large round shield and a sword of unusual form.

arranged or not, the top edge passed under both arms and was then brought up to meet at the top of each shoulder, and held there by a brooch or clasp, the arms left free, and loose folds of stuff formed under each arm. Sleeves for the upper arms could then be made by pinning the top edges of the garment together at several points. When a waist-belt was worn, the long shift could be pulled up so that the feet and ankles and a part of the legs were left free; the loose fold of the stuff then fell outward over the belt, hiding it, and this feature has often been mistaken for another garment. The men's shirt was not unlike this, but generally much shorter (see Fig. 2). Either sex would wear the peplos over the chiton (see Fig. 4). But men are more often represented wearing a very loose cloak, which we know from



FIG. 3.—Greek vase-painting: King or chief with a long chiton and a chlaina over it.

of all the Italians seems to have been akin to that of more Eastern peoples, and afterward the Romans drew most of their ideas of life from Grecian sources. But one peculiar garment they had, the *toga* (see Fig. 5), a very large and

loose cloak which was worn by all citizens when out of their homes and in the city, but thrown off indoors, and little



FIG. 4.—The peplos worn over the chiton.

worn in the country. The statues indeed show it to have been extremely cumbersome. Its shape has been much disputed, but it seems to have approximated to a half circle of from 10 to 12 feet diameter. Many modern archaeologists have experimented upon this and other shapes by draping them actually upon living men. One high authority has pronounced for a sort of crescent of an elliptical rather than a circular curve, with another smaller ellipse of stuff sewed into the inner and concave curve of the large crescent. When not wearing the toga, the shirt and the cloak constitute the chief dress of the Roman man; his armor was put on over the shirt, and the cloak worn over the armor again. The shirt was called *tunica*, and the under one when two were worn was the *subucula*; the cloak was called *sagum*, *pallium*, and *paludamentum* (see Fig. 6). Besides these names, Greek, Oriental, and even Gaulish or German names were given to various modifications of the familiar gar-



FIG. 5.—Roman statue of an orator or scholar wearing a full toga.

ments, for Rome became at a relatively early time the head of a cosmopolitan community and state, and all customs and all costumes had their day and their admirers.

One marked distinction there was between the people of the Græco-Roman world and their precursors, on the one



FIG. 6.—Roman statue of a northerner wearing the *bracae*, a girdled *tunica*, and the *sagum* or *abollia* fastened with a brooch.

hand, and the nations whom they called barbarians and who half surrounded them on the E., N. E., and N., on the other hand: these latter wore trousers. It is a most curious subject for inquiry, this general use of what the Romans called *bracae*, among so many and so different peoples, inhabiting such different climates, as Gauls, Germans, Scythians, Persians, and Parthians; or the people of modern Northern France, Belgium, Holland, Northern Germany, Hungary, Russia, Tartary, Persia, Afghanistan (see Fig. 6). It may be assumed, however, that these garments originated in cold climates, and were only kept in use by those who had often to visit cold regions; thus the Parthian and Persian princes are represented wearing *bracae* in the

hot lands of Mesopotamia, but those princes had come from the high lands of the interior, where the winters were severe. Moreover, the Romans adopted the *bracae* in their cam-



FIG. 7.—Lady's dress of 1280: Loose mantle, with band to hold it across the breast, like a cope, worn over a *bliaut* or other gown; wimple and long veil.

paigns, and apparently in peaceful life as well, when to the N. of the Alps, but abandoned them at once when they re-entered Italy. The people of the peninsula of India have never adopted trousers in common life; the Chinese seem not to have used them before the establishment of the Tartar dynasty. The Japanese have never included them in their native costume; except always that, among these various peoples; as also among the Scotch Highlanders, trousers of some sort have often been worn by individuals, sometimes as a mark of social dignity and high official or hereditary position.

A kindred garment, the stocking, appears first in the early Middle Ages. Quicherat, an excellent authority, assumes that stockings or socks began to be used only when the classical traditions of personal cleanliness and constant bathing had been lost, at the beginning of that long epoch of uncleanness which has not closed yet for the people of the greater part of Europe and the European settlements. In the eighth and ninth centuries of our era in Europe there is visible a constant struggle between classical traditions and new conditions: in the miniatures some of the highest personages are represented with bare legs, some with trousers, and some with long

stockings and short skirts, like a Highlander of the sixteenth century, while the most common style of dress seems

to have included cloaks so long and full that when they were worn all other details of costume are concealed. The long cloak is indeed almost a badge of dignity, being as it is incompatible with active and toilsome occupation. As late as the fifteenth century the dress of a courtier was essentially a robe reaching to the feet. It is not until the reigns of Louis XI. in France and Edward IV. in England that the effigies and miniatures at last show noblemen and princes in short cloaks and doublets, when not engaged in the chase or in active sports; and at a much later time still the dress is not considered complete until the long robe is superadded.

What the nobles wore the citizens always adopted so far as they dared brave or disregard the laws of the time against extravagance and the confusion of classes. In proportion as a man is "in doublet and hose," as a later phrase expressed it, he is either (1) of lower condition or (2) engaged in the chase, in traveling or (3) is in undress in his own apartments, although in the last case a long furred gown is, till the seventeenth century, the winter wear of sedentary men. It is to be noticed that throughout the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries there is complete confusion between stockings and trousers. Sometimes the same garment covers the feet and reaches to the waist; sometimes the long stockings come only half-way up the thighs, and are secured in some way not made clear; sometimes they are parted at or near the knee; and these distinctions obtain among nobles, citizens, and field-laborers alike. Hence the terms *haut-de-chausses* and *bas-de-chausses* (the upper hose and lower hose), from which comes the modern French word *bas* for stockings. Corresponding English words were trunk-hose (the hose of the trunk or body) and nether-stocks.

During the Middle Ages the costume of women was more nearly constant than that of men because the principal garment was always a gown, more or less closely fitted from the hips upward, and very loose and full in the skirts. It is only in the statues earlier than the thirteenth century that any resemblance to the ancient girdled shift is to be seen, and this seems to be always a piece of ceremonial court dress, probably a survival of classical times. Otherwise the gown always has sleeves, and is close around the neck and shoulders, and fitted to the waist in such a way as to require much cutting and sewing, and the great fullness of the skirts combined with the snug fit at the waist and hips points to the free use of gores (see Fig. 8). Within this general limit of style many differences existed: in the thirteenth century an overdress without sleeves and with a skirt reaching to the knees showed the longer skirt and the sleeves of another gown beneath; in the fourteenth century the overdress swept the ground, and was constantly held up or looped up to show the underskirt—it had short sleeves, too, showing the sleeves of the undergown to the wrist; in the fifteenth century the undergown had its bodice cut low in the neck, and its skirt reaching the ground, while the



FIG. 8.—Lady's dress of about 1450: The sleeves tight, with upper hanging sleeves purely ornamental, covered with fur in small pieces; hawking glove on left hand.



FIG. 9.—Dress of young man of good family, about 1490. Fur-lined short cloak, worn over a loose *cotte* or tunic.

overdress was open in front, but came higher on the shoulders, and its skirt was carried out to a long train for ladies of wealth and their imitators, while a broad belt kept all the complicated attire in place. In the fourteenth century, too, was worn that jacket which is so commonly taken by modern artists as a general dress for their mediæval ladies, the curious garment with an edging of fur sweeping down from the shoulder to the hips on each side, a fashion which prevailed so long that a heraldic bearing was derived from it. Varied as were the styles of dress, and far removed from classic simplicity of make for both men and women, it must be said that the shape and the movements of the body were studied, and that they controlled the style of garments throughout the Middle Ages. The whims of fashion were rather shown in the hoods and hats, the caps and veils of the time, for which see HEAD-DRESS.

The end of the Middle Ages is marked at once by the change in architecture from a natural to a deliberately copied style, the almost complete abandonment of body-armor except by the richest men, who could pay for the costly bullet-proof corselets and tassets of the day, and who, moreover, were mounted in battle and on the march, and finally a general abandonment of simplicity and reasonableness in dress, and the introduction of the most fantastic tailoring and trimming for both sexes. Splendid stuffs, such as silks brocaded with flowers, satin of rich design and color, velvet both plain and figured, and cloth of gold and of silver, became common among the nobles of the courts of Europe. The display at a tournament or other court function must have been in every way more splendid than we can now imagine, for men vied with women in the splendor of their material, and the strangeness of cut and shape of their garments, when embroidery was freely lavished upon cloaks, horse-housings, banners, and hangings, and heraldic display gave an excuse for the most positive colors in bold contrast; when, too, rich men and women did not leave to their servants the use of color and gold, of badges and significant devices, but themselves wore garments of unrestrained magnificence and enormous cost.

But the general fashion of men's dress in the middle of the sixteenth century, Henry II. reigning in France and Edward VI. in England, is not so unnatural; it may be described as follows: A gentleman wore a doublet or pourpoint with long sleeves, fitting the body and arms easily, girded at the waist, having short skirts below the belt but not reaching much below the hips; trunk-hose made very large and full, stuffed out with hair or wool or held in place with some elastic material, so that the skirts of the doublet had to be cut with a decided shape to allow of them; the stockings fitting tight to the thigh and leg, a fashion helped by the introduction at this time of *tricot*, or what we call now "Jersey" or stocking-stuff, the elastic material of our modern underclothes; over the doublet would be worn a full cloak, resting on both shoulders or on one and capable of being drawn around the body, but very short, scarcely reaching the hips. All this might be plain enough, though of some delicate choice of color and of braiding or trimming, but these garments could also be made very showy with plaits which, seeming to be in one rich material, showed as they open another even more splendid within, with gold and silver lace, or rather passementerie (real lace in the modern sense did not exist), with buttons of precious material mounted in gold, with embroidery and the use of pearls and precious stones in the embroidery itself. The dress of women had changed less from the mediæval type; it was not irrational in shape and make.

The greatest extravagances of dress came in with the last years of the sixteenth century. Those were the days of excessive stuffing, or *bombasting*, as it was called afterward. The trunk-hose were stuffed out so enormously that it was with great difficulty that the sword could be worn. And this was followed by the stuffing of the doublet into that extraordinary shape which is perpetuated for us in the protruding abdomen of Punch. The Louvre portrait of Henry II. shows the funnel-shaped termination of the body of the doublet reaching far below the waist. The habit of using thick stuffing of this sort had been gained in warfare, for very much of the armor of the time was made up of garments *gambisés* or bombasted; thus the hugest trunk-hose known to us are shown in engravings of the time as a part of the war dress of 1563, and the gambeson for the body in many forms had been worn for at least three centuries. At this time, about 1580, starch was introduced, and was immediately put to use in stiffening the neck-ruff, which, be-

ginning with a diameter of perhaps a foot, soon attained a breadth equal to that of the shoulders, and was worn by both sexes for forty years together. While the men wore the bombasted doublet, the women pinched their waists as much as nature could bear; a surgical work of the time describes the effects of this with the ribs forced to overlap one another; and these slender waists were prolonged downward by the immensely long and pointed stomacher, from which the skirt puffed out behind and at the hips to a circumference of 10 feet or more, which size it retained to the floor. A court lady of the reign of Henry III. of France should be contrasted with a Greek lady of 390 B. C., as seen in the bas-reliefs of the time, for a full understanding of the natural and the sophisticated in matters of costume.

From A. D. 1600 to the time of the French Revolution whimsical extravagance of taste governed fashionable dress, a pretense at simplicity in the dress of one sex being accompanied by wild vagaries in that of the other, and followed by equally strange ones of its own. It is difficult for us to realize the fantastic unreason of the outfit of a *mousquetaire* of Louis XIII.; or to conceive how the simple head-dress with curls which we associate with Madame de Sevigné could be followed by the "tower" of lace on the head of a lady of 1690, and that by the structure of gauze, lace, flowers, and feathers which, combined with the puffed and cushioned hair, rose above the head of a lady of Marie Antoinette's court. The only parallel to these is in the gown of the same lady, 18 feet in circumference at the floor, very nearly as great at the hips, decorated with festoons and bouquets in a way which can not be described here, or else in the men's wigs of an earlier epoch.

With 1750 the waistcoat and coat had been evolved from the doublet and cloak, the waistcoat having still the long flaps which were left from the skirts of the doublet. Knee-breeches and long stockings were the nearly unchanged hose of the Middle Ages. Pantaloon followed knee-breeches, and were worn for a very short time; they fitted the leg snugly, and were buttoned or tied at the ankle. Trousers followed these; the flaps of the waistcoat disappeared, and the costumes of the past were all merged into the uniformity of the last eight decades. What costumes still remain in existence are to be found where modern progress toward uniformity and modern disregard of individuality of design and of style have not penetrated. Women indeed retain the taste for novelty and for brilliancy of attire, but have lost the power of regulating it; costume has been lost in fashion. For bibliography, see DRESS. RUSSELL STURGIS.