

The Surrey round frock

by MARY ALEXANDER

The round frock is the protective outer garment now known as the smock. It was worn largely by countrymen rather than town-dwellers from at least the 18th century until the early 20th century, though its use became unusual in the later 19th century. The Surrey round frock is of interest because it is of a different type from that found in the rest of the country and may represent the original type of round frock, which has evolved differently elsewhere (figs 1, 2). The purpose of this article is to present the historical evidence for the round frock in Surrey, leaving details of the actual garments to a later publication.¹

The important features of the round frock are that it protects the wearer's other clothes underneath from dirt, wear and the elements. As it was worn over the normal clothes – breeches (later trousers), shirt, waistcoat and coat – it had to be loose-fitting and also had to allow for the vigorous movements necessary in agricultural work. The material used was linen, which is naturally fairly waterproof because the fibres swell when wet, but can be made more waterproof by soaking in linseed oil. (This makes fibres more liable to rot so not many waterproofed round frocks survive. There is an unused one in Guildford Museum.²) As the linen used is always closely woven it keeps out the wind to an extent, and the neck opening is usually restricted to keep out the weather. Linen is strong and does not tear easily, and can withstand a lot of washing. As the other clothes were of heavy wool, and later corduroy or moleskin (heavy cotton), it was easier to wash the round frock. Clothes were a major expense in the labourer's budget so it was essential to make them last as long as possible. Round frocks cost roughly one week's wages for a farm labourer and coats, shoes, etc, cost roughly twice that.

When cheaper, mass-produced clothing became widespread in the second half of the 19th century the round frock became less necessary. This coincided with an increase in the use of machinery, making the loose round frock dangerous because it was liable to be caught up in the machinery, and with a change in fashion. The round frock was a symbol of the farm labourer, whose status declined throughout the 19th century, and so young men ceased to wear it. Gertrude Jekyll, writing in 1904, lamented the wearing of cheap, ready-made clothing which always looked unsuitable and quickly became shabby, instead of the old-fashioned garments, suitable for the wearer's occupation, which never looked out of place.³

The round frock is made entirely of squares and rectangles of material and does not fit the body closely, so there are no complicated curved seams. There is a square gusset under the arm to allow for movement. A narrow slit with curved ends is cut out for the neck, but as the straight edge of the collar is sewn along this slit there are no difficulties in fitting the curve in. Normally the round frock can be worn either way round – back and front are identical. This must be deliberate as no other garment is reversible, and it means that wear can be distributed evenly and washing can be postponed until both sides are dirty. It is not certain whether a man had two working round frocks so that one could be worn while the other was being washed; he would certainly have a best round frock. In 1825 an inventory was made of the clothing of the paupers in Blechingley workhouse and most of the men had two round frocks while some had three.⁴ However, the second might have been the best one, though being paupers perhaps they had to wear both for work.

The amount of material needed for a round frock is about three times the length of the finished garment – which usually came to the knees though some were longer or shorter. Miss Musgrave of Hascombe said 'the carter's smock was short – just below the waist'.^{4a} Normally a full width of material was used which, on those in Guildford Museum, varied from about 35 to 45 inches, though narrower widths are known. Round frocks are occasionally made wider by adding an extra strip of material at one side back and front. There is no wastage of material – the



Fig 1. William Oakford of Haslemere wearing a typical Surrey round frock. The smocking stitches are very simple and there are a few lines of stitching on the shoulders; none are visible on the collar. An extra panel has been let in on the left-hand side of the round frock



Fig 2. 'Old Tanner' the shepherd at Hackhurst Farm, shortly before 1900

side seams are of selvages sewn together, usually with a simple narrow seam of backstitch, or sometimes oversewn so that the selvages are butted together. Usually one of the sleeve edges is a selvedge, sewn with a flat, or run and fell seam.

The round frock is often likened to a shirt and they are of similar cut and construction, but the shirt has more pieces in it than the round frock and can only be worn one way round. It has a much deeper neck opening and no smocking, though the shirt, like the round frock, is gathered into the shoulder pieces and cuffs. The round frock has between one and six buttons at the neck – usually two – and one to three at the cuff, often two. Many round frocks have pockets, always set in the side seam so they can be used whichever way round it is worn. Some pockets are reached by a simple slit in the seam, some have a horizontal flap and some round frocks just have a slit to reach the breeches or trouser pocket.

The features of the round frock which cause the most interest are the smocking and embroidery. The smocking is simply a way of gathering in the fullness of the material where it is not required. The body of the round frock has to be loose to allow the man to work in it, but the fullness has to be gathered up at the top to make it wearable. The material is drawn up in small regular gathers and these are sewn together with rows of horizontal stitching. This gives it a certain elasticity which is useful in a working garment.

The main difference between Surrey round frocks and all others is that Surrey round frocks have only a small area of smocking at the neck opening and no embroidery whereas other round frocks have large panels of smocking on the chest and back flanked by equally long panels of embroidery. Both types have smocking at the top and bottom of the sleeve and both have embroidery on the shoulder, collar and cuff.⁵ The smocking stitches are arranged in several zones of two or three patterns using outline and cable stitches in straight lines, zigzags or diamond patterns. The smocking on the sleeves is usually of the same pattern as on the front and back but in different proportions. Surrey round frocks have the same sort of smocking as on other round frocks but on a smaller scale. It is not necessary to make decorative patterns with the stitches, but smocking produces a very impressive result from a simple technique and it would be natural to make the round frock attractive as well as practical.

The embroidery on non-Surrey round frocks is usually very striking, using floral motifs, circles, hearts, etc, but that on Surrey round frocks is always restrained, with small neat stitches in parallel lines, zigzags or diamonds. The embroidery is entirely decorative, though the stitches on the shoulders may protect the material from wear to an extent. Backstitch is the most common stitch on Surrey round frocks, always very small and neat and often combined with dots made up from several stitches (not French knots as one might expect, which are of one stitch). Feather stitch, chain stitch, running stitch and herringbone stitch are also used, to a lesser extent. On non-Surrey round frocks feather stitch is the most common stitch. The other difference between the two types is that the back and front of Surrey round frocks – like shirts – are of one piece of material with a narrow shoulder piece sewn on for strength, whereas the other type is made of separate pieces for back and front hanging from a yoke of double thickness on the shoulders.

There is a variant type of round frock shaped like a coat, with a curved yoke and open at the front only, but this is not common. As it happens, the earliest published round frock, one from Mayfield in Sussex dated 1779, is open down the front but has the normal square-cut yoke and is the same back and front. It is of the plain Surrey type, which is quite often found in Sussex.⁶ There are two round frocks from Horsell (near Woking) in Guildford Museum⁷ which are said to date from the 1770s and there is another in Weybridge Museum, from Send Barnes, said to be c 1780–90.⁸ They are of the usual Surrey type and there is no reason why any of them should not be that old. The evidence for their date is family tradition.

It is not known why there is a difference between Surrey and non-Surrey round frocks. (It is difficult to find a suitable name for the non-Surrey type, which is of course the majority of round frocks.) It is logical to suggest that the Surrey type is the original and that the other developed from it. The elaborate smocking and embroidery seems to have developed in the early 19th century, by the 1830s, but it is not known whether the round frock developed in Surrey and

remained there unaltered or whether it developed elsewhere but did not become elaborate in Surrey. As Surrey was a poor, rather backward county until the later 19th century the latter may be the explanation. The Surrey type is found in adjacent counties, particularly Sussex, and elsewhere but not exclusively, whereas all the round frocks known to the writer to be from Surrey (about 50) and all the photographs of Surrey men in round frocks are of the Surrey type.

The original name of the garment was the round frock. During the 19th century this changed to smock frock, though not universally, and it is really only in the 20th century, since round frocks have gone out of use, that they have been called smocks. A smock in the 17th century and earlier was a woman's loose linen undergarment. During the 18th century this changed to 'shift' and during the 19th century to 'chemise'. Presumably the round frock was called a smock frock because it had a general similarity to the woman's smock, but there are many differences between them. A frock in the early 18th century was a loose coat worn in the country, and the term 'round' in costume means a garment that goes all the way round the body. For example a 'round-gown' is one closed all the way round, rather than open at the front to show the petticoat. So a round frock would be a garment with the function of a coat, ie an outer garment, going all the way round – not open down the front.

Hitherto it was thought that the earliest published records of round frocks were in the 1740s in the Purefoy letters.⁹ In 1741 a 'strange man' from Lincolnshire is described as wearing coat and waistcoat 'and a white frock over, buttoned at the hands like a shirt'. This sounds as if the garment was unfamiliar to the writer but by 1746 he was asking his tailor in Chipping Norton to 'bring the Coachman a linen frock to put over his cloaths when hee rubs his horses down'. The 1741 reference is usually taken to mean that round frocks were new at that date.

However, in the accounts of Surrey overseers of the poor there are much earlier references. The earliest one seen so far is an entry at Compton for 1710: '(paid) For a Round Frock 0 – 2 – 0'.¹⁰ At Womersley there are several similar entries:

1720 'for meking of to shorts [shirts] and a round frock for William Long 0 – 1 – 0'.

1734 'Round Frock Tho: Davis 0 – 3 – 2'

1740 'For a Round Frock and a pair of Breeches for ye Widd: Whites boy 0 – 1 – 0'.¹¹

It is not possible to tell from the accounts what sort of garment is meant but it appears to be a normal, familiar one. There are not often any references in the overseers' accounts to the materials used for garments, but it is very likely that the round frock of 1710 is the linen garment now called a smock, or at least an early version of it. There is an entry in the Shalford overseers' accounts of 1749 in which two shirts, a round frock, a coat and a waistcoat are made for William Burl (for 6s 2½d).¹² This, with breeches, stockings, shoes, and hat, would be a complete outfit for a working man, so it is likely that in Surrey by 1749 the round frock was worn over the coat and waistcoat as in the Purefoy letters. The paupers were often given clothing by the overseers, but only the minimum. Usually it was one or two garments but occasionally they were given a set of clothes, like William Burl, or like Stephen Creese of Ockley who had a 'frock, wasket, Briches and round frock' in 1758.¹³

Sailors in the 16th and 17th centuries seem to have worn a short loose coat with a restricted neck opening, but a more likely fore-runner of the round frock is the carter's coat shown in two later 17th century illustrations.¹⁴ Both are loose, knee-length and open down to the waist but do not appear to be reversible, nor to be of the square-cut construction of the round frock, nor do they seem to be gathered at the shoulder. The one worn by Randal Holme's carter was called 'A Linnen or canvas Coat'. There are many 18th century paintings and drawings which show round frocks.¹⁵ The paintings are not always very detailed but seem to show a plain garment without embroidery and perhaps even without smocking in some cases. Such plain garments are unlikely to survive because as working clothes they would wear out and there would be nothing picturesque about them to warrant their preservation as was the case in the 19th century. Efforts have been made to trace the round frock back to Anglo-Saxon tunics, but this is pointless since a knee-length garment hanging from the shoulders has been men's wear for hundreds of years and few variations are possible. The medieval tunic was the main garment, worn over a shirt. What is

important is to find out when a tunic-like garment was first worn in addition to the main garments and when the square-cut construction and smocking developed: medieval tunics were shaped to the body, with curved seams.

The term 'smocking' for the gathering stitches seems to have been derived from the Victorian term 'smock frock'. *The Workwoman's Guide* of 1838 calls the smocking 'biassing'.¹⁶ An old man in Surrey in the late 19th century called it 'gauging'.¹⁷ George Sturt in his diary in 1902, recording a conversation with a woman who used to make round frocks, called the smocking 'the gauze':¹⁸ it is just possible that this is a mistake for 'gauging' or it may be another term that was in use. Gertrude Jekyll referred to it as 'worked gathering' and as she was an embroiderer (among other skills) she would have known the term in current use.¹⁹ However, she presents something of a problem in the study of the round frock. It is worth discussing this at some length because Gertrude Jekyll is normally regarded as a good source of information about life in west Surrey, but it seems that she did not give round frocks her usual detailed attention.

She spent most of her life in west Surrey and was thoroughly familiar with the way of life of the country people – even noticing, for example, that heath brooms had two bonds to secure them and birch had three – but she does not seem to have noticed that the Surrey type of round frock is peculiar to that county. There is so much other evidence for the Surrey type that one can only remain puzzled. In *Old West Surrey* she describes 'the old carter's smock-frock or round frock still lingering but on its way to becoming extinct' (1904). She mentions the 'ordinary local pattern . . . that has a wide turn-over collar' and refers to a photograph of a man in a Surrey round frock, probably taken by herself. There is no other evidence for a wide collar being a feature of Surrey round frocks. She also says 'The shaping is made by the close gathering, either over the whole back and front, or in two panels on the breast and back near the buttons' so she obviously realised that there were two types. There are two other photographs in the book of a man in a white round frock, in which it is difficult to see the smocking or embroidery, but in the back view a large clumsy criss-cross pattern has been drawn on to the photograph. It is more likely that the round frock is a Surrey type or something of the large panels of smocking or embroidery would be visible. She also shows a photograph of a non-Surrey round frock entitled 'an old Sunday smock'.²⁰

In 1892 Mrs Butcher of Onslow Road, Guildford, advertised in the local directory: 'smocking done', using the modern term.²¹ This was smocking for fashionable clothes for women and children, which was taken up in the 1870s, so perhaps the term 'smocking' was a fashionable one. The actual method of smocking is a fairly obvious one, being a development of gathering. The same technique is seen on baby's caps of the late 17th and the 18th centuries which are gathered into a circular crown and the gathers sewn down with one or two lines of stitches. This may be decorative or it may be to help the caps fit closely. An illustration in the Luttrell Psalter of c 1340²² shows a woman with an apron apparently gathered at the top and sewn with coloured embroidery stitches, which may be smocking, though it is doubtful whether there is any continuity between these aprons and round frocks in the way of a 'peasant' style – it is more likely that the same technique developed in different situations independently.

Round frocks were always of linen until the later 19th century when some were of cotton, though all surviving Surrey ones are of linen, of plain, or tabby, weave. In Surrey they seem usually to be of natural shades, ranging from white to dark brown. Unbleached linen is a pale brown colour. The round frocks were sewn and embroidered with linen, usually of the same colour, though some are sewn with a darker or lighter shade of the colour of the material.

The idea of regional differences in colour and style, and of the embroidery denoting the wearer's occupation, have seized the popular imagination, but there is conflicting evidence for the former and none at all for the latter. There are certainly regional differences in construction, such as the Surrey round frock, and those with cape-like pieces on the shoulders found in the Welsh marches, but differences in colour are less clear. Howitt in 1845 said that 'In the counties round London, east and westward, through Berkshire, Hampshire, Wiltshire, &c' a white round frock was worn, to the north olive-green and in the Midlands blue.²³ Surrey was probably included in the white area but there are records and surviving examples of many other colours or

shades in that county. Certainly the East Midlands were well known for blue round frocks in the 19th century, but William Cobbett wore one in Surrey in the 1760s²⁴ and the sexton at Hascombe wore one when digging graves in the 1870s.²⁵ There is a blue Surrey-type round frock dated c 1860 in Haslemere Museum, from the Haslemere area. Gertrude Jekyll said that the round frock was 'in four colourings; light and dark grey, olive green and white'.²⁶ Colonel F W Savage (born in 1847), writing his memories of Guildford, in the 1920s, said 'All market days were interesting for people came in from neighbouring villages all wearing their proper smock frocks. Each county had its distinctive colour and some of the smocks were decorated by much hand stitching. Even the squires wore their smocks over their black suits.'²⁷ This was probably in the 1850s or 1860s. The reference to squires is interesting as it is normally thought that only working men wore round frocks, but perhaps these were landowners who worked their own farms. (There is a reference to two brothers of Kingston 'of independent means, but very eccentric gentlemen who always dressed in long white smock frocks'²⁸ which suggests that it was unusual for wealthy men to wear them.) George Sturt, recording conversations with his aunt and uncle about life in the Farnborough area in about the 1830s said 'All folk had the same sort of schooling, the same sort of food and fire and pastimes, the same sort of clothes. In this last respect a curious kind of fashionableness could even be cultivated, to the extent of wearing smock frocks of the current village colour – for the colours differed in different villages, it has been hinted to me.'²⁹

There may have been general differences in colour but it was probably not as simple as the foregoing writers thought. There were perhaps different colours for different occupations and for different villages. It seems unlikely, however, from the evidence, that there were rigid rules about colour. Messrs Browne & Crosskey of Lewes made different coloured round frocks for different occupations: 'dark grey for shepherds, drab for cowmen and ploughmen and royal blue for butchers'.³⁰ Unfortunately the wearers of many round frocks are unknown so it is difficult to correlate occupation with colour of round frock from surviving examples, but blue and white round frocks worn by shepherds are known. Perhaps the dark grey ones made in Lewes were for local use only. A resident of Worplesdon, who died in 1940, remembered the parish clerk, who was also a pig-killer, going from killing pigs to church still in his blue round frock.³¹ Blue was a cheap dye and blue material was associated with poor people and servants' clothing for hundreds of years; it was also associated with butchers. Miss Mitford, writing about the area south of Reading in the early 19th century, mentions that a young carter started a fashion for smock-frocks 'of that light blue Waterloo such as butchers wear' so the influence of fashion should also be considered.³² George Sturt's gardener 'Bettesworth' said of round frocks 'they was warmer 'n anybody'd think. And if you bought brown stuff, 'tis surprisin' what a lot o' rain they'd keep out. One o' them, and a woollen jacket under it, and them yello' leather gaiters right up to your thighs – you could go out in the rain . . . But 'twas a white round frock for Sundays.'³³ This suggests that there was a choice of colour for everyday wear.

A J Munby noted in his diary on 13 April 1873 that at Ockley 'men of all ages wear [smock frocks] and lads, and little boys; brown or purple smocks, worn even on Sunday and at church, worn with corduroys and leggings'.³⁴ It is difficult to believe that they really were purple – perhaps it was a dark brown with a purplish tinge. Colours are very difficult to describe, and Gertrude Jekyll's 'light and dark grey' round frocks may have been more of a brown, judging by surviving examples. Other references mention a variety of colours. George Sturt remembered the water-carrier in Farnham in the 1860s wearing a 'dark slate-coloured smock-frock'.³⁵ A labourer accused of setting fire to a mill at Albury in 1830 was described by several witnesses as wearing a brown, or dark coloured round frock.³⁶ In the early 20th century a teenage boy was seen near Farthing Down selling cowslips and wearing 'a beautifully worked brown linen smock', the last that the writer recalled seeing as normal adult dress.³⁷ Mr Heath, a keeper at Alfold and Godalming some time in the 19th century, wore a black round frock when he was off-duty,³⁸ and William Stanton, the lock-keeper at Bramley from the late 1850s to 1872, is recorded thus: 'His venerable figure, clad in high hat and long smock (black or white as occasion demanded) was to be seen daily on his beloved wharf'.³⁹ Unfortunately the occasions demand-

ing black or white are not recorded but white may have been worn for special occasions. Black round frocks are often said to have been worn in Surrey but none appear to survive. It may be that the black dye rots the fabric. There is a very dark brown one in Guildford Museum which might possibly be termed black.⁴⁰ Browne & Crosskey of Lewes are known to have made black round frocks.⁴¹ Daniel Edwards of Palmers Cross, Bramley, a farm labourer, wore a cream coloured round frock up to c 1915, and an old man of Littleton was seen in the village shop at Farncombe c 1910 wearing an off-white round frock. A lady from Ewhurst remembered round frocks being worn just before the first World War, and in particular one old man who used to walk about the village in a beautiful dark round frock and wearing a flat top hat. In a letter to Guildford Museum in 1961 Miss Musgrave said that 'The ordinary smock was a sort of brown linen'.⁴²

A little boy in Guildford c 1895 had a red smock⁴³ but this was part of the fashionable revival of smocking rather than an ordinary country child's round frock. None of the latter seem to survive from Surrey, though there are photographs of boys wearing them, for example at Guildford c 1860⁴⁴ and at Hascombe c 1900.⁴⁵ Gertrude Jekyll mentioned them: 'Boys had short round frocks like small smock-frocks over suits of corduroy: these short frocks were sometimes called by the old name "gabardine"'.⁴⁶ When William Cobbett was little he and his brothers used to play on a steep hill-side. One boy 'used to draw his arms out of the sleeves of his smock-frock, and lay himself down with his arms by his sides; and then the others . . . sent him rolling down the hill' accompanied by 'monstrous spells of laughter'.⁴⁷

The shade of round frock about which there is no doubt is white, which was worn for Sundays and for best, as Bettesworth told George Sturt. Munby seemed to imply that at Ockley the brown and purple round frocks were also worn on Sundays but as they were clearly a surprise to him he may have misunderstood their use. However, in 1860 he had been to Guildford and watched people coming out of Holy Trinity church ' . . . but amongst the people I saw no pretty faces, no rustic peasant costumes; always excepting the old men, who came out of church in clean white smocks and gaiters'.⁴⁸ Gertrude Jekyll noted that 'A "best frock" and a tall hat with long nap, or the usual felt hat, was the Sunday dress, unless a man had a suit of cloth wedding clothes (ie wool) which would be his Sunday suit for life'.⁴⁹ William Smith (1790–1858) was a potter and farmer, and therefore of a higher social rank than labourer and 'For ordinary wear, on weekdays, he had a white "smock frock": but on Sundays, or his visits to London, he "got up" for the occasion, and was something of a dandy in his countrified way. Top boots . . . knee breeches, longish drab waistcoat . . . and frock-coat; with white kerchief round a high white collar, and black beaver hat.' However, he used to tease his daughters 'when, on a Sunday morning, he threatened to go to church in his "smocked frock", which hung on the kitchen door, ready for his return. It was painful earnest to them, and perhaps all the funnier to him therefore'.⁵⁰ This shows that the round frock was of lowly social status.

In 1851 a father and son who attended the Friends' Meeting at Capel 'came in well-oiled boots, snuff-coloured leather leggings, most beautifully white smock-frocks, soft yellow silk handkerchiefs round the neck and beaver hats'.⁵¹ Several round frocks worn at weddings survive, including a beautiful one from Ewhurst in a private collection, of linen so soft and fine that it feels almost like silk.⁵² In 1822 when William Cobbett was riding between Hambleton (Hants) and Thursley he engaged a guide at Headley to take him to Thursley. 'Off we set, the guide mounted on his own or master's horse, and with a white smock frock, which enabled us to see him clearly.' On that same journey, 'at Headley there was a room full of fellows in white smock frocks, drinking and smoking and talking' and a similar group in a public house near Hindhead.⁵³ The day seems to have been a Sunday so perhaps they were all in their best round frocks.

White round frocks were also worn for best on other days, such as the Benefit Society parades of the 1860s described by George Sturt. 'In one Club the men stumped along doggedly, wearing their best white smock frocks and chimney pot hats. This, called "The Round Frock Club", was the same, unless I mistake, as Jack Stone's Club, or "The Dumb Gluttons"'.⁵⁴ (So called after deciding to hold their annual dinner without speeches.) Similar processions of men in white

round frocks were noted in Hampshire near the Surrey border.⁵⁵ Another occasion for wearing the round frock was a visit to the Great Exhibition of 1851 by the villagers of Godstone. 'A remarkable feature of yesterday's experience in the interior of the Exhibition was the appearance there, at an early hour, of nearly 800 agricultural labourers and countryfolk from the neighbourhood of Godstone in Surrey, headed by the clergymen of the parishes to which they respectively belonged . . . the men wore their smartest frocks and the women their best Sunday dresses and more perfect specimens of rustic attire, rustic faces and rustic manners could hardly be produced from any part of England.'⁵⁶

One particular use for white round frocks was at funerals. It was the custom for bearers at funerals to wear white round frocks, presumably to give a look of neatness and uniformity. Sets of round frocks were often kept in churches for this purpose. A set of non-matching white ones was kept at Peper Harow House and they were used from before 1885 until 1942 for funerals of Lord Midleton's family and employees.⁵⁷ In 1961 there were four round frocks but there may have been more originally. Hascombe has an interesting set of eight funeral round frocks given by Mrs Algernon Stewart in 1898 in memory of her son P G Stewart who died while on active service in India. The parish magazine in 1899 said that the custom of wearing such smock frocks at funerals had only died out within the last 40 years and hoped that it was now coming back into use,⁵⁸ but by 1944 the PCC decided that the round frocks were no longer needed:⁵⁹ they were last used in 1935.⁶⁰ In 1875 the parish magazine, recording the funeral of an important parishioner, had commended the disuse of 'the usual insignia of paid mourning' (hat-bands, scarves, plumes, etc) and the fact that 'Eight of his own labouring men, in their white smock frocks, [bore] him, as they would one of their fellow workmen – to his grave. By degrees we may hope that such an example will be universally followed.'⁶¹ It does not appear that the example was followed until 1898 when Mrs Stewart gave the set of eight round frocks to the church. They are of Surrey type⁶² but have more elaborate embroidery than usual on the shoulder piece. It is in the Surrey tradition but includes crosses – the only examples known to the writer with specifically Christian symbols on them. The embroidery on all eight is similar but with variations. The collars are all different and are perhaps unique in having words embroidered on them (though a set of round frocks from Lincolnshire had a letter and number on each, denoting the name of the estate⁶³). Each collar of the Hascombe set has a different religious text, half on each side, such as 'Lord have mercy: Christ have mercy' and 'Blessed are the dead: which die in the Lord'. Each collar also has the initials 'PGS' with crossed swords.

There was another set of white funeral round frocks at Ashted, where a Burial Guild was formed in the later 19th century to provide a free burial service for poor people. A bier, round frocks and hats were provided for the bearers from donations. One of the round frocks is now in Guildford Museum. It is of the usual Surrey type but is rather crudely made and gives the impression of being a late, degenerate one made by someone unfamiliar with round frocks. It has a very deep neck opening and a breast pocket on the left front, something never found normally. A photograph taken in 1895 shows five men wearing round frocks with the bier. They also wear top hats, black armbands on the left arm and badges on a ribbon round the neck.⁶⁴

An Ashted undertaker's account book of 1872–80⁶⁵ mentions only three funerals where round frocks were worn and a similar account book for 1880–90⁶⁶ also lists three. The fact that round frocks were unusual by then is further suggested by the phrase 'collecting & paying bearers & they having to use white frocks 10s' (1879). The funeral of Mr Beale in 1890 is the only one where the cost of round frocks is noted – 'Use of white Frocks at 6d each 3s'. At the funeral of Lord Hervey in 1875 there were 12 bearers: 'The men wore white round frocks crape armlets & black berlin gloves'. The cost of the armlets and gloves was noted but not that of the round frocks. The armlets and gloves were probably given to the bearers to keep, as was the custom, but perhaps the round frocks were the men's own, or were lent out as required. Funeral round frocks were last worn in Ashted c 1924 when Mr Pantia Ralli died.⁶⁷

In 1873 Henry Currie, MP for Guildford 1847–52, was buried at St Martha's church. His later years were dedicated to agriculture and he 'directed in his will, that his body should be taken to St Martha's from West Horsley Place, in one of his own waggons, drawn by three horses, and

that sixteen of the labourers in his employ, all dressed in new white frocks and straw hats, should bear the coffin from the foot of the hill to the chapel [*sic*] on the summit. These directions were rigidly carried out.⁶⁸ (The new white frocks would have been provided for in the will.) When the rector of Caterham died in 1856 'he was carried to the church by eight of his parishioners all robed in white smock-frocks as was customary in those days'.⁶⁹ A Pirbright historian recalled that 'A native of Pirbright, George Rose, born in 1856, tells me that one of his earliest recollections is of his eldest brother being one of the bearers at the funeral of Tom Poulton, only son of Mr Poulton of Burners Farm. The bearers all wore smock frocks . . . In 1885, I remember an old man named Hall . . . came to church in one' which suggests that this was unusual by then. The men of the church band, at least from the 1850s to the early 1880s wore smock frocks. (They played clarinets, cornets, violin and 'cello.⁷⁰) The bell ringer of Hale in the 19th century wore a round frock.⁷¹ A booklet about Horley quotes (without a reference) 'a book on country church customs, written in 1903' which said "'the smock frock was a very sensible and useful garment and its disuse is a sign of the foolish craving for modernity on the part of our country folk. The choir men in their white smocks were far more in keeping with the grey old Surrey churches than are their cassocked and surpliced successors of today"'. The author of the booklet continues 'For many years, the two brothers King, from Dean Farm, Salfords, came to sing in the choir in their smock frocks, but this custom died away about 1860'.⁷²

There is no evidence in Surrey for the embroidery denoting the wearer's occupation and none from elsewhere. The idea seems to come from one modern booklet about making smocks but no evidence has ever been found to substantiate it.⁷³ It is possible that on occasions a man would request embroidery using motifs connected with his job. The motifs on elaborate round frocks are the simple ones generally found in 'folk art', and an observer could link flowers and leaves with farm work or circles with waggon wheels without that having been intended by the embroiderer. In Surrey the question hardly arises as the embroidery is never elaborate enough. It is plain and geometrical, sometimes just straight lines of backstitch or chain stitch.

Many round frocks were made at home though there were factories which made them in the 19th century, sending them to outworkers for the smocking. The best known centre was at Newark-on-Trent, though it seems unlikely that their round frocks were sold in Surrey as they are all of the elaborate type. A nearer source would have been Browne & Crosskey of Lewes, but the only evidence for the making of round frocks in Surrey concerns their being made on a small scale. Round frocks were sold at fairs and markets and could also be bought in shops. Often the wife or mother would make round frocks for the men of the family or sometimes a woman would specialise in making them for the men of her village or area. Bettesworth in the 1850s bought his clothes ready-made except for round frocks which were home-made. His sister-in-law and her mother 'used to earn half a living' making round frocks to order for neighbours, at a cost of 18d "or if you had much work on 'em, two shillings." Much fancy-work, did he mean? "The gaugin', you know, about here." Bettesworth spread his hands over his chest, and continued, "Most men got 'em made; their wives 'd make 'em. Some women, o' course, if they wasn't handy wi' the needle, 'd git somebody else to do 'em."⁷⁴ The material was provided, so the 18d or 2s was for the making up only. The *Workwoman's Guide* of 1838 said that round frocks cost between 9s and 18s depending on the work in them. George Sturt also noted in his diary in 1902 a conversation with a Mrs Stovold whose mother altered clothes. 'Yes; Mrs Stovold's mother used to do a lot of it; "and makin' smock-frocks, too, when they was so much worn; and I used to help her. I could make a smock-frock now – I don't say by candle-light, but by a good light. Sometimes mother had as many as thirty to make at a time", for a tradesman down in Farnham, "and I watched her so often that I said at last "I thinks I could do that, mother". "I wish you could", she says, "to help me. But I be afraid that you won't be able to do it well enough." So I tried, and after she gave it up I took it on myself."

'So the talk drifted easily to this lost village art: "the gauze" [the smocking, apparently, across the chest], the shoulder straps, the felling of the pockets, and the ornamentation of the shoulders with long stitches. "We used to do uprights an di'monds and some would have three rows [?] and some five. There'd be a lot o' work in some of 'em" and in others the work would be

very simple – according to the taste of the wearers. “Some liked a lot o’ work on ’em, and some didn’t care about much.” And so for a time Mrs Stovold earned a part at least of her living.⁷⁵

Although the round frocks were made for a tradesman it sounds as if they were commissioned for individuals. The ‘uprights and di’monds’ could refer to the geometrical embroidery on the shoulders or to the smocking stitches. ‘Long stitches’ may be the name of the stitch, since surviving round frocks all have very short stitches on the shoulders. Hannah Mackrell, probably of Brook, made round frocks for farm labourers at night by the light of a rush lamp. (Her sister made a sampler in 1852 so Hannah was presumably working in the second half of the 19th century.)⁷⁶ In her memories of Chaldon Miss Mabel Roffey, born in 1878, remembered that her grandmother made round frocks for a bachelor farmer in the area.⁷⁷

In 1912 an old couple from Busbridge celebrated their 60th wedding anniversary, the husband wearing ‘a smock frock beautifully worked by his wife and adorned with a rose’.⁷⁸ Mrs Hamshire of Ewhurst made round frocks for her husband Eli (1834–96), a carrier and writer of pamphlets on rural poverty.⁷⁹ His white round frock is in Guildford Museum⁸⁰ and his family have a dark brown one that belonged to him. George Rose of Pirbright, born in 1856, ‘wore a little smock when a small boy; his mother was an expert in making them’.⁸¹ Gertrude Jekyll said ‘It was an old custom for a girl engaged to be married to work a round frock for her future husband, and one can well imagine with what care and pleasure the beautiful patterns would be stitched by the loving fingers’.⁸²

Round frocks were also made by tailors in villages. The accounts of overseers of the poor often contain entries for clothes given to the paupers, in which round frocks are obtained and issued in the same way as other garments. At Ockley John Leman was frequently employed in making clothes for the paupers. In 1758 he was paid 3s 6d for making a frock, waistcoat, breeches and round frock, and in 1759 6d for making a round frock and later 8d for making a shirt and a round frock. The overseers may have had a stock of material which John Leman used, or they may have bought it from the draper and paid him directly. John Leman was being paid for the making only, not the cloth. In 1769 Henry Jupp was paid 4s 1d for a round frock, and in 1770 4s 6d for a pair of breeches: this may mean the material for the garments or the finished clothes. He was a tradesman who presented an annual bill to the overseers. In 1755 his bill for clothing was £6 11s 2d, in 1756 it was £2 4s 4d and in 1770 it was £14 6s 2d. He was also one of the overseers in that year.⁸³ In 1807 at Mickleham Mr Becket presented a bill for a round frock and waistcoat for 14s 8d.⁸⁴

Women also made round frocks and other clothing for poor people. At Ockley in 1759 Dame Birchard made a round frock and breeches for 1s and in 1776 Dame Weller made a round frock for 6d (the normal cost of making a shirt).⁸⁵ In 1769 at Great Bookham Widow Blake made a round frock for 1s⁸⁶ and in Byfleet in 1808 there was a payment for a round frock of 5s 9d and a separate payment of 1s to Mrs Cook for making it: the first payment is clearly an instance of the material for the garment being referred to as the garment itself. In 1815 at Byfleet Dame Chapman was paid 1s 4d for making a round frock.⁸⁷ In 1822 in Mickleham ‘James Poplet apply’d for Stuff to make a Round Frock for himself’ and this was granted.⁸⁸ In West Clandon in 1817 John Lemmon was given 2s 6d to buy his son a round frock and in 1822 Mrs Rickets was given 6s 6d ‘to buy John Smith a Shirt and Round Frock’.⁸⁹

There is a lot of variation in the costs of round frocks in the overseers’ accounts, not a steady increase over the years as might be expected. At Shalford in 1750 a round frock for Richard Page cost 2s 5d,⁹⁰ at Ockley in 1769 Mr Jupp charged 4s 1d⁹¹ and in 1777 a round frock for George Heather of Hambledon cost 1s 7d.⁹² In 1790 at Mickleham Mr Tickner was paid 6s for a round frock⁹³ and in 1792 in St Mary’s parish, Guildford, 1s 6d was paid ‘To a Round Frock for Thomas Pratt’.⁹⁴ At Mickleham in 1797 a round frock for Moses Haynes cost 5s 6d.⁹⁵ The entries are so brief that it is difficult to know whether it is the making up, the material or the complete garment that is being paid for. There might have been fluctuations in the price of linen, or different grades might have been bought, though one would expect that the overseers bought the cheapest. Some men would need more material than others, and boys would need less. Boys are usually specified as such in the accounts, but do not always have cheaper round frocks. At

Mickleham in 1803 a round frock for R Haynes' son (not Moses) cost 5s 6d and in 1804 a round frock for 'Martin boy' cost 5s 9d. In 1805 one for 'Martin' cost 5s 6d and one for David Wright cost 6s. In 1806 a round frock for Mrs Parrot's boy cost 5s.⁹⁶ In 1822 at Byfleet a round frock for S Hitchcock cost 4s⁹⁷ and in St Nicholas' parish, Guildford, one for Neale's son cost 2s 4½d.⁹⁸

Flax was grown widely in northern Europe and some was grown in Surrey. In 1878 an old lady born in 1788 recalled that her father grew flax at Eashing which was spun locally and made into sheets. 'Russian sheeting was softer; my father liked to have his round frock made of Russian sheeting. I remember once we gave 4s a yard for a very superior quality of Russian sheeting.'⁹⁹ At Blechingley workhouse in 1825 '6 yd Shop Cloath For 2 Round Frocks at 1s 6d pro yd' was bought and there are similar entries in 1824 and 1826.¹⁰⁰ The 'shop cloath' was presumably cloth bought from a shop as opposed to the linen which was spun by some of the old women in the workhouse (for which they received 10d per pound). At Albury in 1739 and 1740 several 'Widows' and 'Goodwives' were paid 6d per pound for spinning flax and in 1740 Joe Elstoane was paid 3d per ell for weaving 42 ells of linen.¹⁰¹ At Ockley in the 1730s the fine flax called tyre was spun, washed, wound, woven and whitened by the paupers, but there is no record of what it was used for.¹⁰² The old parish workhouses often tried to set the paupers to work, particularly with textiles, but their efforts were rarely a commercial success. However, if the old women were skilful workers they could have made a useful contribution to their fellow paupers' clothing and bedding. Flax growing and spinning in Surrey seem to have died out in the first half of the 19th century, when imported cotton was replacing linen.

As round frocks were protective working garments they were worn by all sorts of men. (The only reference the writer has seen to women wearing round frocks is in a pamphlet by Eli Hamshire in which (*inter alia*) he contrasts the present ie 1880s, generation of farmer's children with their parents. In the old days the children helped on the farm – 'your sisters used to put on ankle petticoats, which kept them dry and comfortable, and their linsey-woolsey aprons, and perhaps an old round frock . . . and milk the cows . . . feed the pigs', etc.)¹⁰³

Round frocks are particularly associated with farm labourers and waggoners, who were out in all weathers. Mr Rose, remembering Dorking in the 1820s, distinguished between 'The mechanic in flannel jacket, cloth or paper cap and white apron, and the labourer in fustian or smock frock and straw hat'.¹⁰⁴ We have already come across a butcher, a sexton, a water-carrier, a gamekeeper and a lock-keeper wearing round frocks. The Cranleigh postman at some date in the 19th century wore a smock frock (and carried the letters in his top hat).¹⁰⁵ There is a drawing of the town-sweeper of Godalming c 1835 wearing a long round frock,¹⁰⁶ and there is a photograph probably taken in 1861 of Samuel Hook, a woodman at Titsey and neighbourhood wearing one.¹⁰⁷ 'Host Potter' of the Star in Dorking wore a round frock in the 1820s.¹⁰⁸ There are two photographs of William Oakford of Haslemere (1806-1905), said to have been the last shepherd in the area to wear a round frock (fig 1). One and perhaps both photographs were taken in 1896 and show a round frock of a medium shade with very simple smocking and embroidery.¹⁰⁹ 'Old Tanner', the shepherd of Hackhurst Farm, Abinger, was photographed shortly before 1900 wearing a patched and torn round frock with a sack tied over it round his waist as an apron, perhaps for use during lambing, as he is with a sheep and a tiny lamb (fig 2).¹¹⁰ The photograph is a useful reminder that most round frocks must have become so worn with use that they were not worth preserving. Miss Musgrave 'tried to get a smock . . . from an old body and she only said, I long ago cut it up for aprons'.¹¹¹

Mr Harms, the tollgate keeper at Merrow, was photographed in a round frock in 1861,¹¹² and Mr Kilner of Alfold wore a round frock when repairing sacks, c 1900.¹¹³ Several photographs of Guildford in the 1860s show, incidentally, men in round frocks in the street, one being a carter and others, doubtless farm labourers, at the Cattle Market and the May Fair in the High Street.¹¹⁴ A photograph of Croydon Cattle Fair in 1894 shows a man in a dark round frock very clearly.¹¹⁵

In the 19th century May Day was celebrated at Carshalton (and other places, usually towns) by a chimney sweep and his assistants: he was 'clad in a smock with honeycomb work' but this was almost certainly his best smock.¹¹⁶

There is a photograph by a Guildford photographer of a man in a round frock, presumably a local gamekeeper, with a gun under his arm and a Guildford gun-maker, James Adsett, wore a round frock in the later 19th century.¹¹⁷ A photograph of a shooting party at Horley between 1901 and 1911 includes a man in a round frock,¹¹⁸ and the beaters a Pallinghurst, Cranleigh, before 1914, were issued with them.¹¹⁹ These may have been for their protection, as it made them conspicuous. The beaters at Park Hatch also wore round frocks. Mr Parsons of Ewhurst remembered going to Hascombe regularly as part of his work 'and that is where I saw the beaters with the smocks on. I have always remembered it, they looked very nice in them. I would say these beaters, and no doubt farm workers, worked for Mr Godman, Park Hatch Estate, Hascombe, and the smocks were supplied by their employer, Mr Godman, for that job only, so that would be 1909 or 1910.' The estate agents said that the beaters wore 'holland smocks with red collars and cuffs . . . up to not long before 1939'. However, the Country Gentlemen's Association Annual Price Book for 1930 advertised 'Beaters' smocks' with red collar and cuffs which were coat shaped garments with buttons down the front and a belt, so it may have been those which were worn at Park Hatch.¹²⁰ The round frock was replaced by the coat-shaped overall which is still seen on farms (and elsewhere) today. It still protects the clothes but is less likely to get caught in machinery.

Round frocks were suitable as charitable gifts in the days when clothing was a major expense for poor families. In the 1830s the daughter of Bishop Sumner who lived at Farnham Castle started a school for the small children who lived to the north of the castle park. 'In those days schools were not only free but it was the custom to give frocks to the girls, and smocks to the boys. I did not do this but I did give each child a pair of boots at Christmas.' (She could barely afford this.¹²¹) A school at Capel founded before 1819 had an endowment which paid for the teacher and provided a gown and bonnet for the girls, and a smock frock and boots for the boys annually.¹²² Incidentally a photograph of the Glanville charity at Wotton in 1872 shows several boys in round frocks around the tomb of the benefactor carrying out his directions for the charity.¹²³ In 1865 when Vernon Lushington was married 'the workmen on his father's estate [at Ockham] were treated to a most substantial dinner. Every poor person in the village was presented with a pound of tea, two pounds of sugar, and two pounds of cake. All the aged men had the gratification of receiving a new round frock, and the old ladies a new dress each.'¹²⁴ Round frocks were also given as prizes at ploughing matches or competitions at festivities, though there are no records for this in Surrey known to the writer.

The wearing of round frocks seems to have declined from about the 1860s. A J Munby made a strange remark in his diary in 1873 . . . 'One thing to be noted in the Dorking country, is the great number of smockfrocks. Sir F Palgrave, in 1837, spoke of the smockfrock as a thing all but extinct: yet in 1873, here at Ockley, men of all ages wear them, and lads, and little boys' (the brown and purple round frocks referred to earlier). When he came to Guildford in 1860 (see above), he had been expecting to see 'rustic pleasant costumes' everywhere but saw only old men in white round frocks. 'The same thing was to be noticed everywhere: it was sad to see standing at an old time-honoured cottage door, a grey old peasant in his Sunday smock, with his strong hearty wife beside him, in her high cap and old-fashioned russet gown, whilst a couple of pert flimsy girls, in worthless garments of a pseudofashionable kind, stood talking to them, gaudy with ribbons and crinoline . . .'¹²⁵ Sir F Palgrave's remark is difficult to understand, as the 1830s are generally regarded as the heyday of the round frock, when the embroidery and smocking on the elaborate ones reached their peak. It is likely that educated writers, living mainly in towns, would have a distorted impression of the clothes of country people.

According to S Mann, in Cranleigh 'The coming of the railway in 1865 altered the whole outlook of the community. The youths discarded their smock frocks and the maidens their spriggy printed Manchester gowns' (ie cotton).¹²⁶ At Dorking in the 1870s Rose said that in the 1820s 'there were more round frocks, more grey "Newmarket cut" coats and more top boots than now'.¹²⁷ The last round frock in Guildford was seen c 1895, an off-white one worn by a very old man, Mr Streeter, who had been the carrier from Cranleigh.¹²⁸ There is a photograph of him as an old man in a dark round frock, in the Cranleigh WI village scrap-book. George Sturt

described an old man in about the 1890s who 'wore an old-fashioned smock-frock, doubtless home-made'.¹²⁹ One of Sturt's memories of his childhood in the 1860s was the creaking back-door of his grandfather's farm-house. Watching this, 'a man came in, wearing an old-fashioned smock-frock and carrying a lantern'.¹³⁰ It is not clear whether the smock-frock was old-fashioned then or when Sturt was writing in 1919. J H Knight of Farnham said in 1909 'the dress of both men and women has changed greatly. Most of the farm labourers wore the smock frock, a sort of coat of some coarse white stuff which was put over the head like a bicycle cape, but it had sleeves; it reached down to the knees and was sewn up in ridges over the chest. I have been told that these smocks would keep out a good deal of rain.'¹³¹ It seems extraordinary that Knight, born in 1847, should think the round frock so unfamiliar. His allusion to the bicycle cape is perhaps a clue – he was very much involved in modern inventions. At East Horsley between 1900 and 1914 the farm labourers had abandoned round frocks, but still wore corduroy trousers, leather leggings, etc, though Farmer Carpenter still wore 'a farmer's smock'.¹³² Old men continued to wear round frocks into the 20th century, as we have seen, though the fact that they were remarked upon suggests that they were rare. There are occasional records from elsewhere in the country of round frocks being worn in the 1920s and 1930s. Most of the posed photographs of men in round frocks (as opposed to general street scenes) show old men. (Photography, of course, was not widespread until the 1860s.)

The round frock had always been humble, and to townspeople was sometimes a source of amusement. In the 1850s deserters were taken back to Aldershot past William Smith's farm. He would give them a piece of cake and say "There, be a good lad. Don't ever do it again" . . . And how the officers used to laugh! . . . Well, he was a funny-lookin' old figure, in his round frock' said Sturt's informant.¹³³ The *Pall Mall Gazette* in 1891 described a meeting between Eli Hamshire of Ewhurst and Mr Gladstone who was staying at Holmbury. It was somewhat patronising about the eccentric pamphleteer and said 'He is remarkable for his appearance – always Sundays and weekdays, is his burly form seen encased in a quaint smock frock'. Eli quoted this in one of his pamphlets¹³⁴ and was probably not at all displeased. He was proud of the fact that his round frock marked him out as a plain country fellow. He described how, at a meeting, with several gentlemen and clergymen present, after the speeches when questions were asked for 'I, with my old round frock on was first called upon to speak'.¹³⁵ On another occasion he was telling a gentleman that he must give up stag-hunting 'and because I told him in a plain sort of way the lawyer took hold of my round frock tail and pulled it for me to leave off telling him so plain'.¹³⁶

Eli was typical of the older countryman in being very attached to his round frock, and even proud of it, but as his political views, though full of good sense for the labourer, had little place in the world of politics, so his round frock no longer had a place in the modern world. Cheapness, easy availability, better water-proofing, safety and fashion all combined against the round frock and a change of attitude made embroidery unacceptable on men's wear. Despite the regrets of writers like Gertrude Jekyll, change was inevitable and nothing could bring back the days when a round frock was a normal part of daily life, admirable both for its practical qualities and its beauty.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations used in the notes (see also list at beginning of volume)

Bourne Soc	Bourne Society Local History Records
GM	Guildford Museum
Hall	Hall, M, <i>Smocks</i> , 1979
Journals	Mackerness, E D (ed), <i>The journals of George Sturt 1890–1927</i> , 1967
Marshall	Marshall, B, <i>Smocks and smocking</i> , 1980
Munby	Hudson, D, <i>Munby, man of two worlds</i> , 1972
OWS	Jekyll, G, <i>Old west Surrey</i> , 1904, reprinted 1978
Pirbright	Cawthorn, M & Curtis, H, <i>Collections for a history of Pirbright</i> , 1931; typescript book in GM
Rose	Rose, C, <i>Recollections of old Dorking</i> , 1878

RR	Cobbett, W, <i>Rural rides</i> , 1893 edn, Vol 1
SE	Information gathered by GM for Smock Exhibition, 1961
SF	Smock File at GM – usually information from letters or conversations rather than published material
Small Boy	Sturt, G, <i>A small boy in the sixties</i> , 1927
Source	Hamshire, E, <i>The source of England's greatness and the source of England's poverty . . .</i> by A Carrier's Boy, 1884
Sy Labourer	Sturt, G, <i>Memoirs of a Surrey labourer</i> , 1907, reprinted 1978
Wm Smith	Sturt, G, <i>William Smith, potter and farmer: 1790–1858</i> , 1919, reprinted 1978

Notes

- 1 A booklet on the smock collection at Guildford Museum. Two good publications on smocks generally are Hall and Marshall
- 2 Catalogue no NG 1214
- 3 OWS, 262
- 4 SyRO 2727/1/48/96, on loan from SyAS
- 4a SE
- 5 The difference between the two types was realised in 1961 when Dr E M Dance organised an exhibition of smocks at Guildford Museum. This was reinforced by a seminar held by the Museum Assistants Group at Platt Hall, Manchester, in 1962 (see Buck, A, The countryman's smock, in *Folk Life*, 1, 1963, 16–34). It is curious that there are apparently no contemporary records of Surrey round frocks being a distinct type
- 6 In the Victoria & Albert Museum. See Marshall, 42
- 7 Catalogue nos NG 880, NG 881
- 8 Catalogue no 105.1973
- 9 Eland, G (ed) *Purefoy letters*, 1931. See Hall, 5
- 10 GMR PSH/COM/6/3
- 11 GMR PSH/WON/18/1 and 2
- 12 GMR PSH/SHD/7
- 13 GMR PSH/OCY/8/2
- 14 A carter in *Academy of armory* by R Holme, 1688, reproduced in *Occupational costume in England* by P Cunnington & C Lucas, 1967, pl 6; and a playing card showing a waggoner from a set called *The knavery of the rump*, c 1679, reproduced in *Rural costume: its origin and development in western Europe and the British Isles*, by A Oakes & M Hamilton Hill, 1970, fig 270
- 15 For references to some of these see Buck, op cit in note 5, 19
- 16 *The workwoman's guide* by A Lady, 1838
- 17 Sy Labourer, 174
- 18 Journals, 399–400
- 19 OWS, 259
- 20 OWS, chapter 13
- 21 Watford Hooke's Almanack of Guildford, 1892
- 22 B L Add MS 42130 f. 172 b
- 23 Howitt, W, *The hall and the hamlet*, 1845
- 24 RR, 216. Cobbett actually said, of a landlady's son at Billingshurst, Sussex, 'he was just such a chap as I was at his age, and dressed in the same sort of way, his main garment being a blue smock-frock . . .' Even if Cobbett's smock-frock was not blue, blue ones were clearly worn in the south at this date (1823)
- 25 SF. Noted by Miss Musgrave of Hascombe
- 26 OWS, 260
- 27 Typescript given to Royal Grammar School, Guildford by Savage's family: copy in GM
- 28 Ayliffe, G W, *Old Kingston*, 1914, 45
- 29 Wm Smith, 213–14
- 30 Hall, 11
- 31 Dingle, J & Tovey, J, *Worplesdon old and new*, 1974, 14
- 32 Mitford, M R, *Our village*, 1894 edn, 46, 'A village beau'
- 33 Sy Labourer, 174
- 34 Munby, 326. John Nevinson drew attention to this in SyAS *Bulletin*, 110, September 1974
- 35 Small Boy, 127–8
- 36 *The Morning Herald*, 3 January 1831, back page 'Winter Home Circuit, Kingston, January 1st'
- 37 Bourne Soc, 3, 1964, 22
- 38 SE
- 39 Goodchild, R, Bramley Wharf, in *Guildford City Outlook*, June 1939, 29–32
- 40 Catalogue no NG 1214
- 41 Hall, 11–12
- 42 SE
- 43 Exhibited at the Smock Exhibition, GM, 1961

- 44 Catalogue no TG 149
- 45 Catalogue nos LG 391, LG 392
- 46 OWS, 257
- 47 RR, 125
- 48 Munby, 66-7
- 49 OWS, 260
- 50 Wm Smith, 98, 197
- 51 Nash, W, *A Surrey memory of 1851*, 1979 (no page nos)
- 52 SF. Worn by Mr Tickner at his wedding in 1866
- 53 RR, 183, 185
- 54 Small Boy, 113
- 55 Eggar, J A, *Remembrances of life and customs in Gilbert White's, Cobbett's and Charles Kingsley's country*, 1923, 155
- 56 *The Times*, 13 June 1851
- 57 SE
- 58 *The Hascombe Almanac*, 1899
- 59 Parish papers at Hascombe Rectory. I am grateful to the Rector, the Rev C MacKenna, for letting me see them
- 60 SE. They were last used for the funeral of Joseph Godman of Park Hatch – information in a letter from Miss Musgrave of Hascombe
- 61 *Hascombe Almanac* 1875
- 62 Miss Musgrave wrote in 1961 'The smocking is nothing particular and not much of it. I ought to know because I believe I did them. I was taught to do smocking by an old woman in the Village who made her husband's.' SE
- 63 SF. A private collector in Guildford bought one of the set
- 64 SF
- 65 GMR PSH/ATD/GIL/9/4
- 66 GMR PSH/ATD/GIL/9/5
- 67 SF. Information from A W G Lowther
- 68 Hooke, J, *Guide to Guildford*, c 1877, 53-4
- 69 Bourne Soc, 3, 1969, 22-9: Victorian Caterham, by James Balch
- 70 Pirbright, 22, 7
- 71 Knight, J H, *Reminiscences of a country town* (Farnham), 1909, 25
- 72 Chouler, W H, *Horley: pageant of a Wealden parish*, 1976, 29
- 73 Armes, A, *English smocks*, 1950
- 74 Sy Labourer, 174
- 75 Journals, 399-400
- 76 SF. Information from her great grand-daughter. The sampler is in GM, catalogue no NG 1176
- 77 Bourne Soc, 2, 1963, 23
- 78 Lerner, Rev H M, *Busbridge . . . A history: ancient and modern*, 1947, 8
- 79 SF. Information from the family
- 80 Catalogue no NG 1166
- 81 Pirbright, 22
- 82 OWS, 260
- 83 GMR PSH/OCY/8/2, 3
- 84 GMR PSH/MIC/10/1
- 85 GMR PSH/OCY/8/2, 3
- 86 GMR PSH/BK.G/8/4
- 87 GMR PSH/BY/10/1, 2
- 88 GMR PSH/MIC/9/6
- 89 GMR PSH/CL.W/16/1
- 90 GMR PSH/SHD/7
- 91 GMR PSH/OCY/8/3
- 92 GMR PSH/HAM/7/1
- 93 GMR PSH/MIC/10/1
- 94 GMR BR/MA/5/1
- 95 GMR PSH/MIC/10/1
- 96 GMR PSH/MIC/10/1
- 97 GMR PSH/BY/10/2
- 98 GMR BR/N/2/2
- 99 GMR RB 01573, Transcription of Frank Evershed's notebooks, 27
- 100 SyRO 2727/1/48/96
- 101 GMR 1439 Overseers etc accounts
- 102 GMR PSH/OCY/8/1
- 103 Source, 25
- 104 Rose, 1
- 105 Cranleigh WI Scrapbook, 1944

- 106 Reproduced inside front cover of *Godalming 400*, ed D Coombs, 1974
- 107 SF
- 108 Rose, 15
- 109 Haslemere Museum; Swanton, E W (ed), *Bygone Haslemere*, 1914, pl 22
- 110 GM catalogue no LG 2172
- 111 SE
- 112 SF
- 113 SF
- 114 GM catalogue nos G 7963, TG 955, LG 3482
- 115 Croydon Public Libraries, reproduced in Gent, J B (ed), *Victorian Croydon illustrated*, 1979, no 49
- 116 Jones, A E, *From medieval manor to London suburb*, 1970, 92
- 117 SF
- 118 Chouler, W H, *1 to 8 the story of Horley and its schools*, 1973, 76
- 119 SF
- 120 SF
- 121 Farnham & District Mus Soc Newsletter, 4, no 7, 1976, 113
- 122 VCH, 3, 136
- 123 Original in Dorking Museum, copy in SF
- 124 *Surrey Advertiser*, 4 March 1865, 3
- 125 Munby, 66-7
- 126 Mann, S, *Cranley in ye olden days and – Cranleigh today*, 1930, 27
- 127 Rose, 69
- 128 SF
- 129 Sturt, G, *Change in the village*, 1912, 125
- 130 Wm Smith, 9-10
- 131 Knight, loc cit in note 71
- 132 Salter, C, *East Horsley within living memory*, 1982, 13, 19
- 133 Wm Smith, 225-6
- 134 Source, 4 edn, 1892
- 135 Source, 24
- 136 Hamshire, E, *The three great locusts*, 1889, 64