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Abstract

The eighteenth century saw the slow but steady rise of the middling classes to their nineteenth century social and cultural prominence, reinforced by a changing political landscape and the steadily increasing importance of the market. As the social and cultural power of the city burghers making up the majority of the middling classes grew, so did they start to consume in a manner to reflect to their new status in society. The question that arises then is more exactly how this group consumed, what types of objects that became important and what type of status that became the most paramount. Since status and social groups can differ greatly between both times and places, focus of this investigation is the burgher elite of Stockholm, the social, economical, and cultural centre of Sweden during the whole of the early modern era.

By using a combination of Bourdieu's capital theories and Erving Goffman's theories on the presentation of self the inventories of fourteen elite burgher households has been analysed in order to investigate how these individuals constructed their home to present their own perceived social and cultural status. Through a thorough and theoretical investigation of these early modern front regions it can be revealed that the traditional representations of cultural capital, the main form of symbolic status capital, such as paintings and books, albeit important, constituted but a minor part of the capital presentation in the home. Instead it appears as if the most important status capital is presented through sociability, the ability to host social events or, if that option is unavailable, attend social events.

Objects with the express function of sociability, such as tea- and dinner-ware, together with chairs, tables, and fashionable interior decoration suggests that sociability indeed stood at the forefront for the presentation of status for the late eighteenth century Stockholm burgher. At the same time, fashionability appears to have been extremely important, with almost all of the investigated households going to great lengths to stay up to date with the most recent trends in both furniture, colours, literature, and china. Much more research is however needed in order to really understand the structures of status and how it was expressed during the early modern times, and especially comparative studies between estate borders is needed in order to understand the status relations between social groups and how this affected status presentations.
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Introduction

Early morning the fifth of June, year 1799, the Stockholm mayor of justice and knight of the order of Wasa, Carl Ulner, the councilman Pehr Stenhammar, the assistant Carl Lidmark, and the notary at the magistrate's court Nils Ludvig Thåström met with the widow Kristina Elisabeth Grill at her large four storey town house by the main square in central Stockholm. Kristina's husband, the former director of the Swedish East India trading company, knight of the order of Wasa, and member of both the academy of science and the academy of music Johan Abraham Grill had died only three months earlier, on the sixteenth of March, and it had become time to inventory the late director's earthly possessions for the records.1

They started by valuing the house, his ships, his money and his stocks, followed by his gold and silver, clothes, and linen. It was not before long, however, that it became time for the furnitures, and as they always did on such occasions they started in the great hall, the saloon. Located on the first floor, above the late director's offices on ground level, the saloon was an impressive social space with several mirrors in gilded frames to enhance the light coming in through windows. A large mahogany dinner table dominated the centre of the room, surrounded by a dozen cushioned chairs, with three more tables along a wall. Along another wall stood a sideboard with a marble disc, a walnut tree harpsichord was majestically placed in a corner, and two tea-tables in mahogany and an old gaming table in walnut stood strategically placed around the room, as if awaiting guests at any moment.2

Through one of the doors the splendour continued as the company moved first into the late director's bedroom and then into the blue-striped parlour where they found even more tea-tables, an older couch of French origin, and eight draped chairs. Moving up the stairs led them to the widow's social floor, coloured mainly in greens and yellows. There they found a smaller saloon with more gilded mirrors, mahogany furniture, and cushioned chairs, and another parlour filled with mahogany, marble, and the widow's collection of Saxon porcelain dolls. As the company moved through the house they noted down everything they found, and the probate record they created can be read as a parade of luxury. Expensive mahogany furniture can be found in almost every room, all the mirrors have gilded frames, marble features are common, and enough china for dozens of modern houses are counted among the thirty pages of the finished record.3

The Grill home in central Stockholm was a house of splendour and material prestige, with both the spatial and material possibility to entertain a large number of guests for both lavish dinners and

1 See Appendix C
2 Johan Abraham Grill 1799: SE/SSA/0145a/F1A:337, 1799. Probate record, pp. 795-824
3 Johan Abraham Grill, 1799
more restrained tea-parties which can be recreated through the detailed inventory made after the
death of Johan Abraham. But the probate record not only allows for a recreation of the physical
splendour of the early modern house, it also allows a window frozen in time into the minds and
tactics of the early modern individual, who through their homes sought to create themselves.

Aim and purpose
The aim of the paper will be to analyse how the early modern elites expressed and reproduced their
social status in society through the use of cultural capital, and a lesser extent social capital, with a
focus on how, as well as why, this was achieved through the use of material objects in the house. As
will be made clear in the later section on the earlier research that has been done in the field of
material culture, the overt expression of material wealth was key in the reproduction of the social
status of the early modern household. The main focus of this very extensive collection of literature,
however, has been on material wealth and expression of this as mainly an indicator of economic
capital: the reproduction of status through economic means, such as the overt expression of wealth.
The analysis of material wealth as an expression, and reproduction of symbolic capital is in this
field of research somewhat lacking.

Even less investigated than cultural capital, especially from an analysis on material culture, is
social capital. As will be seen in the following section on the theoretical framework for the thesis,
social capital has, even by Bourdieu himself, been largely disregarded as a manifested capital asset.
Newer research in the field, however, suggests that this capital type might have been more
important during the early modern era than previously understood. To this end, this paper will also
aim to investigate the role of social capital in the material manifestation of status and capital in the
household.

The research questions are aimed at the expressions of cultural and social capital, both how they
are expressed and the materials used to express this (such as paintings, furniture, porcelain); the
acquisition of the objects used for the expression of cultural capital, mainly the reasons to why just
these objects; and the value assigned to these objects, where this information is available. It should
be remembered that the forms of cultural capital, the values ascribed to different capital assets, as
well as which groups of society are entailed to what type of capital differs greatly between both
time and place. Because of this the field of study has been confined to the burgher elite in late
eighteenth century Stockholm, and how cultural capital functioned and was expressed in this
specific setting. Despite the specificity of cultural capital, however, it should be possible to draw
somewhat general conclusions about the time in question, if the research questions and investigative
angle only is wide and open enough. To this end, the research questions are as following:

- How is cultural capital expressed through the material culture of the house, what materials and objects appear to be most invested with cultural wealth and status, and how does these differ in their expression of status from those objects and materials mainly expressing economic wealth and status?
- How is the correlation between the capital assets expressed and valued in the material assets of the household, and how, if at all, does this differ between the different social groups among the burgher elites.
- How do the different social groups of the Stockholm burgher elite differ in their expression of cultural capital.
- What connection between cultural capital and social capital is expressed within the burgher households?

In order to answer these questions a fairly specific theoretical framework has been used which focuses on the physical expression of capital in the home. This theoretical framework, a combination of Bourdieu's capital structure and Goffman's theory on the creation of self, is explained in greater depth in the next section.

**Theoretical framework**

*Cultural Capital*

According to Pierre Bourdieu individuals are in the possession of different kinds of capital, which they interchange and use in the common market of inter-human interactions. Especially two types of capital is acknowledged by Bourdieu as inhabiting favoured positions on this shared market, namely those of symbolic capital and economic capital. A concise description of symbolic capital according to Donald Broady, one of Sweden's premier experts on the theories of Bourdieu, is “everything that by social groups are acknowledged as valuable and is ascribed value”⁴, which although enlightening is too wide an explanation to on its own be analytically valuable. In order to acquire analytical value symbolic capital should be seen as a tool to describe the relations between individuals and institutions: why some forms of expressions are ascribed a higher value, esteem,

---

Cultural capital is the form of symbolic capital that dominates in civilised regions, where education, art, and traditions are valued highly. It is the form of symbolic capital which enjoys both a large and influential market for exchange, constitutes the predominant type of symbolic capital on this market, and is acknowledged higher value than other types of symbolic capital by the dominant groups of society. According to Broady, “[t]he cultural capital can, moreover, be defined with respect to its historical genes. Cultural capital emerges as the symbolic assets in a more permanent manner are solidified in the form of titles, degrees, institutions, laws and regulations, written documents etc.” In this manner cultural capital can be inherited and increased over generations, as well as accumulated in objectivised form accessible through education and cultivation.

Bourdieu himself recognises three distinct forms of cultural capital: The embodied state, which are the “long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body” such as knowledge and experience; the objectified state, in which cultural capital takes the form of cultural goods such as books, pictures, dictionaries, instruments, machines, etc., described by Bourdieu as the “realization of theories or critiques of these theories”; and the institutionalized state, such as academic or noble titles which functions as a certificate of cultural competence, “which confers on its holder a conventional, constant legally guaranteed value with respect to culture” Objectified cultural capital such as paintings and books can moreover be transferred as economic capital, through direct ownership, and only acquires a cultural value through their correct usage and understanding.

In the writings of Bourdieu and those following in his theoretical steps, cultural capital is seen as the antithesis to economic capital, the tangible wealth of individuals as expressed through, for example, expensive clothes, large and lavish houses, and a large bank account. Unlike the very concrete and tangible economic capital, cultural capital is most often ephemeral and both difficult to acquire and appreciate, such as an education, refined taste, or good manners. Capital, however, is useless on its own, and only acquire meaning through the interactions of groups and institutions in

---

5 Broady, 1991, p. 169
6 Broady, 1991. p. 169ff
10 Bourdieu, 1986. p. 47
society. The capital assets are neither fixed resources, nor possess a steady exchange rate to other types of capital, instead the different social groups of society are permanently developing different strategies in order to both increase and maintain their own capital assets, as well as to keep other social groups with different capital compositions from doing the same. Cultural capital becomes in this manner a distinguishing asset, since a form of specialist knowledge is required to successfully acquire it. Because of this the value of capital, as well as what type of symbolic capital which at the moment is dominating the shared market of human interaction, is under constant negotiation.

There has been critique aimed towards the use of capital in an historical context, based on how its often viewed as an isolated system of values, separated from the larger structures of society. This isolation can however effectively be countered through the incorporation of specific group-contexts with the study of fields, such as the French literary field of the 20th century or, more related to the present study, the social elites of late 18th century Stockholm. In this manner, the study of capital becomes not so much the study of the specific forms of, for example, cultural capital, but rather how different forms of capital correlate to each other, and the relative dominance between them; how the relations of value is structured between the different forms of capital within the social group, and how this mirrors the internal dynamics of the groups themselves. According to Bourdieu, the value and efficiency of capital is in direct relation to the different social groups competing about the goods associated with the capital, and hence the social value generated by the acquisition of the capital. In his own words, “[t]he structure of the field, i.e., the unequal distribution of capital, is the source of the specific effects of capital, i.e., the appropriation of profits and the power to impose the laws of functioning of the field most favourable to capital and its reproduction” In practice this would entail that the higher the status of the groups competing for the capital goods, the higher their relative value would be in relation to goods acquired by lower status groups.

Broady himself formulates the focus on the study of fields as following:

The investigation of a field […] aims to construct the system that interconnects the positions, to distinguish the dominating and the dominated positions, to distinguish the assets tied to the different positions, to map the types of investments and efforts demanded by the agents and the different strategies and routes available to them, to investigate the agents' systems of dispositions, to assert the field in question's relations to other fields, and so on.  

14 Bourdieu, 1984. p. 11f  
15 Larsson, 2005. p. 49f  
16 Bourdieu, 1986. p. 49  
17 Broady, 1991. p. 267. Author's translation."En undersökning av ett fält […] innebär att konstruera det system som förbinder positionerna, att särskilja de dominerande och dominerade positionerna, att urskilja de tillgångar som är knutna till olika positioner, att kartlägga de typer av investeringar och insatser som avkrävs agenterna och de typer
As can be easily distinguished from this general description of the investigation of fields, the study of capital can only effectively be done when analysed in a social context. The study of capital is also the study of the structures of power and influence in society; of how the dominant and the dominated social groups negotiate the value of capital on the shared market of social interaction, and also how this value is negotiated among the fractions of the different social groups. It is more often than not the dominating social groups in society who dictates the values of the different forms of symbolic capital: those groups who monopolises the social and cultural institutions constructed to maintain and exchange symbolic capital, as well as to include and exclude certain individuals and groups in relation to these capital assets. From this follows that cultural capital most often is tailored to suit the needs of the dominant social and cultural group of society in their negotiations with other groups.18

The creation of self

During the preceding description the term “market of social interaction” has been used extensively. The reason behind this is that human identity, image of self and social position can only be created and upheld through the interaction with others.19 This was especially the case of the early modern society, where for example a duke would only be able to actually count himself as such if he could successfully present himself as a duke to others, through for example dress, manner, living, and expenses.20 From this it follows that it would not be enough for early modern individuals to simply invest in cultural capital; in order to benefit from these investments the acquired assets would have had to be properly expressed and acknowledged by society.

Erving Goffman, in his groundbreaking work on the mechanisms of social interaction writes that it should be assumed that individuals in any given situation of interaction will strive to influence the definition of the situation in their own favour, expressing themselves in a given way solely to evoke from the audience a specific response.21 This response, according to Goffman, is mainly an acceptance of the definitional claim made by the individual, that is the individuals claim to define the situation and their own place within this situation.22

Goffman states in his writing that “[s]ociety is organised on the principle that any individual who possesses certain social characteristics has a moral right to expect that others will value and treat

---

22 Goffman, 1959. p. 21f
him in an appropriate way”, and that “[c]onnected with this principle is a second; namely that an individual who implicitly or explicitly signifies that he has certain social characteristics ought in fact to be what he claims to be”23 What this entails is that individuals, in their claims to social positions in society, is seen by society to be under both a moral obligation to not claim a position they are not entitled to, and to acknowledge and accept the claims made by other individuals.

Using the terminology of the theatre, Goffman analyses social interaction as a stage play with the individuals as actors in a well-articulated and set scene. As such, individuals in social interactions make use of a constructed front, which is explained as “that part of the individual's performance which regularly functions in a general and fixed fashion to define the situation for those who observe the performance”24 This front might either be personal, such as appearance and manner, or as the setting, i.e. the actual space where the interaction takes place. In either way the front is used by the actor in order to define the situation, and their construction of self within the interaction. Goffman also uses the term back, denoting a region where the actors makes themselves ready for the performance, and which generally is hidden from others, such as the kitchen or the bedroom.25

In order for a construction of self to be successful, in order for the duke to effectively portray himself, and be accepted, as a duke, the performer must offer the type of scene that realizes the observers expectations.26 In order to effectively achieve this there exists a finite number of standard fronts for actors to present and work within, and likewise social groups tend to be attributed standard fronts and thus expected to perform and maintain themselves in already established manners.27 From this follows, for example, that members of a specific social group are expected to maintain and express a certain, often pre-determined set of symbolic capital in order to successfully construct themselves as members of this social group.

The physical space were the performance is given, the so called front region, is often accentuated and constructed with care in order for the actor to achieve the best possible result. The term front region refers to the physical place were the performance is given,28 which in an early modern context, just as today, would include the home. Actors will often invest the most in accentuating and dramatizing their position in those contexts that most effectively can affect their occupational or social position, such as social events29 For this reason the actor might be compelled to furnish their front regions as to effectively express their social standing through the overt display of capital.
assets. During social encounters in these carefully orchestrated front regions, the actors will construct, as well as conduct, themselves as to enhance their social and cultural value, or face. As Goffman writes: “The term face may be defined as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes – albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself”\textsuperscript{30} Face in this sense is the actor's image of self and position within society, and to successfully construct and maintain this is not only a matter of manner and decorum, but more a matter of image. In order to be able to construct an image of self, an individual must be presented with a context where it is possible to maintain this image, and where it is possible to gather and harness those resources, such as clothing or furniture, that complements and makes possible this image.\textsuperscript{31} Thus the front regions of the home becomes the main arena for the construction and expression of self, since this is the most easily available context which the actors can manipulate to their own needs. The home becomes the main arena for the display of cultural capital, and where the social position of the actor is most successfully expressed and maintained.

**Social capital as early modern symbolic capital**

Social capital is the third, and last, of the major types of capital acknowledged by Bourdieu, although it holds a far less favoured position in his theoretical framework. According to his own definition:

Social capital is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition - or in other words, to membership in a group - which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectivity-owned capital, a 'credential' which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word.\textsuperscript{32}

A similar definition of social capital, employed by social scientists such as Robert Putnam, is that of “organizations and connections that foster cooperation, trust, participation, the exchange of information, civil interaction, and coordinated activity in pursuit of social goals”\textsuperscript{33}

Despite this expensive definition, Bourdieu himself denied that social capital could be used to generate other types of resources, but only could facilitate the transaction between capitals, such as transferring ones educational (cultural) capital into economic capital through, for example, being

\textsuperscript{30} Goffman, 1967. p. 5
\textsuperscript{31} Goffman, 1967. p. 92
\textsuperscript{32} Bourdieu, 1986. p. 51
\textsuperscript{33} Greene, Jack P. *Social and Cultural Capital in Colonial British America: A Case Study*, in Journal of Interdisciplinary History 01/1999, Volume 29, no. 3.. p. 491
offered an employment by an old university friend. Many historians indeed refer to social capital as to inconcise and insubstantial, or as American historian Jack P. Greene puts it, “too narrow, too instrumental, too whiggish, and too Western” to be of any analytical use. Historian Esbjörn Larson, however, proposes that social capital, during the early modern period could be used to directly generate symbolic capital, and Greene himself suggest that the definition of social capital, when used in a historical context, should be expanded to include “not just traditions of civil interaction but the entire range of institutions, practices, devices, and learned behaviours that enable collectivities and individuals to render physical spaces productive and social and cultural spaces agreeable”.

With this much broader definition social capital becomes an integral part of civic cooperation and institutions, such as the council of aldermen or secret societies such as the Freemasons. Through membership of such groups the individual could exercise both social influence, and easily acquire symbolic capital. The early modern era was also a highly unequal society, and elite power was more often than not founded on social connections, and especially closeness to the monarchy. As such, membership of the correct groups and institutions constituted a safe foundation for influence and honour, and thus constitutes another form of symbolic capital for the early modern individual.

**The social field**

Anyone familiar with the works of Bourdieu will instantly recognise the absence of the term *Habitus* from this description of the theoretical framework. In short, *Habitus* is used to describe the tastes, goals, and manners, or *dispositions*, acquired by individuals from their upbringing and social position, but is in reality a great deal more complicated, especially when used as an analytical tool. The main problem with habitus, is that it is highly personal, and best analysed through anthropological or sociological studies, the fields that Bourdieu himself belonged to. Because of this, it becomes both difficult, and possibly futile, to incorporate this into a historical study. Instead of habitus, another of Bourdieu's terms, that of *Social field*, will be used.

When describing the differences between different groups of society, what types of capital is important and what type of capital goals they strive after, Bourdieu used the term social field. At it's most basic, the social field is little more than an analytical tool, a diagram mainly, onto which...
different groups of society are placed according to their general capital structure, i.e. if they have more or less of cultural or economic capital.\textsuperscript{40} At the heart of this analytical framework, however, is the notion of a relative and, to some extend, universal difference between the members of different groups. Bourdieu writes, in his usual complicated manner, that:

To each class of positions there corresponds a class of habitus (or \textit{tastes}) produced by the social conditioning associated with the corresponding condition and, through the mediation of the habitus and its generative capability, a systematic set of goods and properties, which are united by an affinity of style.\textsuperscript{41}

In short this means that the members of different groups of society are united by similar sets of tastes and goals. They will often consume in the same manners, find entertainment from the same sources, and seek to achieve the same goals. Bourdieu continues by writing that “[o]ne of the functions of the notion of habitus is to account for the unity of style, which unites the practices and goods of a single agent or a class of agents”\textsuperscript{42}. This particular study will not use the \textit{habitus} term of Bourdieu, since it recognises the great difficulty associated with trying to analyse the habitus of individuals more than 200 years dead. But by analysing the early modern individuals as part of different and specific social fields, who then will share tastes and goals, this shortcoming can be somewhat circumvented.

\textbf{Earlier research and theory as practice}

Despite the independence of the cultural and social capital as symbolic assets, they are closely bound to the possession of economic capital. According to Bourdieu the link between economic and cultural capital is established through the time needed to acquire cultural capital; the stronger the economic capital, the quicker one can acquire cultural capital.\textsuperscript{43} Bourdieu stresses, however, the difference between economic and symbolic capital assets, not the least the difference in their reception and usages:

So it has to be posited simultaneously that economic capital is at the root of all the other types of capital and that these transformed, disguised forms of economic capital, never entirely reducible to that definition, produce their most specific effects only to the extent that they conceal (not least from their possessors) the fact that economic capital is at their root.\textsuperscript{44}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{41} Bourdieu, 1998. p. 7
\item \textsuperscript{42} Bourdieu, 1998. p. 8
\item \textsuperscript{43} Bourdieu, 1986. p. 49
\item \textsuperscript{44} Bourdieu, 1986. p. 54
\end{itemize}
The symbolic capital forms then, despite the fact that they to the most part can be reduced to simple economic capital, derives their symbolic value from their inherent difference to economic capital, that they manage to conceal the economic capital at their root. These capital values are instead valued by contemporaries depending on how well they conform to the styles and fashions, to the socially accepted norms of conduct and respectability, and how well they represent the expected socio-economical status and position of their owner. Thus, for the analysis of symbolic capital within a historical context, it becomes important to develop a deeper understanding of the structures of status, styles, and norms of conduct that was prevailing during the era under analysis.

**Gentility and respectability**

The most defining aspects of early modern middling class status were those of the notions of gentility and respectability. The exact contemporary connotations of gentility and respectability are today very hard to discern, especially since these appeared rather fluent even during contemporary times. Gentility, during the late seventeenth early eighteenth centuries was a social status somewhere between the old aristocracy and the regular town people, and manifested itself mainly in a conspicuous consumption of the correct fashions as well as expressions of the correct manners. It was most often believed that a gentleman behaved like one because they were a gentleman, rather than wanting to become one. Gentility was a broad and rather undefined set of assumption of character that people of the correct lineage and upbringing were expected to adhere to, and were believed to be more or less guaranteed through class belonging. Unlike the more class bound notion of gentility, respectability were tied more or less completely to manner and actions, and could be expressed by people from all classes: “A person was respectable if he or she *acted* respectably”, rather than being respectable because he or she came from a respectable family. This notion of respectability appears much later than that of gentility, but appears to have merged with it to create what Woodruff Smith calls the “behavioural characteristics of the ‘bourgeoisie’ or ‘middle class’”.

Despite the fluency of the meanings of both gentility and respectability, it is possible to recognise a fairly specific set of values connected to these notions that developed throughout Europe during the early modern era. Central among these values were the notions of thrift and taste. Thrift, especially, developed during the era as a sort of middle class ideal, fundamentally separating even

---


47 Smith, 2002. p. 205

48 Smith, 2002. p. 26; pp. 204ff
the highest echelons of the middling classes from the landed aristocratic, leisured gentry. Even if these extremely rich craftsmen and merchants could afford for themselves an aristocratic lifestyle in old, pedigreed houses, many of them still chose a life of work and thrift, built modern mansions and immersed themselves in the local political and cultural fields.⁴⁹

Through thrift and taste these middling class men and women created, during mainly the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, a middle class identity opposed to the lower classes and different from the higher classes,⁵⁰ and expressed socially through both manners and the physical manifestation of middle class status. This identity was grounded in the domestic material culture and structure through both a conspicuous consumption and the careful management of the household resources.⁵¹

Whereas thrift is a mainly personal trait expressed through the careful management of the household resources, the active participation in cultural and political life, and the engaging in creative and inventive hobbies as opposed to the leisured life of the landed nobleman,⁵² taste was mainly manifested through consumption and the expression of material wealth. During the eighteenth century taste became central for the creation of a cultural interior, according to British historian Amanda Vickery roughly meaning “the faculty of discerning and enjoying beauty and perfection”⁵³. Taste in this manner was deeply grounded in a middling class critique of ostentatious luxury, and as such it was deeply connected to rank and good breeding. Vickery continues her description of taste by writing that “[k]nowledge of the rules of design and thorough practice of their application were the essence of taste, an ineffable gift and a lofty vantage from which to disparage the vulgar ostentation and ignorant choices of upstart nabobs, merchants and shopkeepers”⁵⁴.

Taste, in this sense, became a differentiating quality within the elite echelons. As Vickery puts it: “The mysteries of taste also offered one answer to new wealth; after all, if magnificence alone supported status then what was to prevent nabobs and bankers from simply spending their way to the top? Subtleties of choice demonstrated true taste, not just plunder and cash”.⁵⁵ Taste was the manner in which the truly cultured and educated of the elites could differentiate themselves from

⁵² Macleod, 1996. p. 95
⁵³ Vickery, 2009. p. 18
⁵⁴ Vickery, 2009. p. 18
⁵⁵ Vickert, 2009. p. 165
the newly rich. Through the conspicuous consumption and manifestation of the correct, fashionable items contemporary individuals and households created an outward facade of respectability, gentility, and status that functioned to both define and place themselves within the higher stratas of society.\textsuperscript{56}

In this manner the concept of taste became the bridge between gentility and the constantly, and rapidly, changing context of luxury. During the early modern era, and especially during the eighteenth century with its rapidly expanding marketisation of everyday life, luxury and what it entailed were much more readily affected by changes in the market than were the image of gentility. Luxury in itself thus became an unstable basis for social status and instead the ability to follow the constantly changing shifts in fashion became the sign of both gentility and status.\textsuperscript{57}

Taste and fashionability defined the border between the gentle and respectable, and the uncultured and vulgar. Magnificence, formerly a “parade of wealth in support for the hierarchical order” and understood as a “visible demonstration of morality and nobility of mind”\textsuperscript{58}, were during the eighteenth century undermined by the increased wealth of the middling classes. The manifestation of status thus changed from a display of wealth to the manifestation of a cultured self, which apart from money also required an investment of time, interested, and education to be effective.\textsuperscript{59}

\textit{The early modern evolution of the town house}

The culture of external signs of status and rank, the outward manifestation of taste and fashionability as the foundation for gentility and respectability, culminated in the social visit which during the era became the main arena for the expression of status.\textsuperscript{60} Central to this manifestation was the house itself; the physical space where taste and fashion allowed themselves to be effectively manifested and expressed to a visiting social audience. It was in the home that the early modern individual created a cultured and fashionable persona, and where they most efficiently could manifest identity in relation to others. Thus, the house often became the prime target for investments and change, and the most important arena for the manifestation of status.

The eighteenth century saw the gradual architectural change from a few large, multi-purpose rooms to many smaller, specialised rooms.\textsuperscript{61} Towards the end of the century this type of multi-room,
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single-purpose room house had become the fashionable standard among the middling sort, but due to practical problems such as the limited physical capacity of either the house itself or its old-fashioned room-plan this fashion often had to be compromised. This new type of house with specialised rooms had during the century become necessary due to the changing nature of socialising and the ascent of the social visit as the premier form of socialising. The new forms of large social invites and the saloon culture, imported from France, necessitated the building of large saloons and the construction of the “social house”, a home that effectively could entertain a large number of guests and present them with a diversified variety of entertainments at the same time.

Not only the imported saloon culture style of socialising made the home the most important arena for status. Despite the growing number of different social arenas during the eighteenth century, such as coffee houses, clubs, and theatres, the home remained the premier space for social advancement. According to Swedish historian My Hellsing:

> Hospitality was the foundation for political propagation during this period [the eighteenth century, authors note]. The homes of the elite were palaces of representation with their doors constantly ajar. A generous host manifested the raised position, reinforced the ties to supporters, and made possible the preparation for political action.

The home, despite the ever growing selection of social arenas, remained important, not only for the nobility but for every part of the upcoming middling burgher class. Investing in the home, both its exterior and the interior, thus became one of the most important requirements for social and political advancements.

All rooms in the house were not invested with equal significance, however. Putting up a polished facade was the most important aspect of the house, and only those rooms that would be seen by guests were viewed as worthy of any real investments by the influential classes. The representative rooms, the front regions and main rooms for socialising such as the saloon, the drawing rooms, and the library, where thus the most lavishly furnished with expensive, and fashionable, furniture and stylish paintings. The classical back region rooms, such as the servants quarters and the kitchen, were all expected to be sparsely furnished.

The house was a clear symbol of rank and prestige, and according to Swedish historian Gudrun
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Andersson the manifestation of power and status was probably its main function.\textsuperscript{68} When furnishing the home, contemporary households would have had to make it appropriate for their position within society, so that it would project the image of self and status expected by others and coinciding with their perceived place in society.\textsuperscript{69} Every part of the interior carried meaning and symbolism, and the contemporary visitor were expected to recognise, and possess the necessary knowledge to successfully read, the status conferred by the home.\textsuperscript{70}

\textbf{Consumption and the project of self-fulfilment}

Status and position within society were expressed and upheld through the household, both through the exterior in the form of a large and lavish house and through the interior and the objects displayed to the visitor. Thus, status and identity, the household position within the social strata, were upheld through consumption. Consumption was by no means new to the eighteenth century, but the ascent of a consumer culture during the early modern period had changed the aspect and repercussions of consumption dramatically. As Joyce Appleby puts it:

\begin{quote}
The novelty in consumption in the early modern period came from the inclusion of more and more people in the spending spree. Elite groups had always consumed and used consumption for self-gratification, establishing identity and creating privacy. Mass consumption was the driving force behind the new productive systems. Coming to terms with this reality impinged upon every social and political relation. Ordinary people had to brave the ridicule of others and buy beyond their station. Members of the elite had to give up many of the visual cues of their superiority. More important, they had to accept – however grudgingly – that ordinary people were self-activating agents, masters of their own dollars and shillings, if not their destiny. […] It's not that our humanity requires commerce for its fulfilment, but rather that in a commercial society, a whole battery of new cultural means has been created to articulate a broader range of human intentions.\textsuperscript{71}
\end{quote}

Through the advent of a culture of mass consumption during the early modern period, and more so than ever before during the eighteenth century, the conspicuous consumption of material goods allowed the common, non noble population to create personal identities.\textsuperscript{72} The new consumer culture that developed opened up a new world of expression and manifestation of self to the common population, and fundamentally reshaped the interior of the home.

The study of consumption goods within the home invariably becomes a study of objects, it is through the conspicuous consumption and displaying of objects that individuals create a social identity for themselves. Therefore it is important to recognise that consumer goods in themselves
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hold no intrinsic meaning, but rather is invested with meaning and significance through interpersonal interaction with others and in conversation with society.\textsuperscript{73} Because of this, objects are often invested with multiple meanings and values, and the study of material culture becomes just not the objects and their meanings, but also the context through which the objects derive value and meaning.\textsuperscript{74}

Objects were used to construct power, identity, and social practice, and through their display in the home they functioned to construct the identity of the household. Even if a status-object did not possess as its sole, or even main, purpose to convey household status, both the owner's status and images of self would have been easily interpreted by an audience.\textsuperscript{75} Through conspicuous consumption the social elites created for themselves an identity as elites, and at the same time differentiated themselves from both other elites, those of higher and lower status than themselves, and other groups of society.\textsuperscript{76}

Early modern consumers were by no means passive on the consumer market, mindlessly following new trends and fashions of consumption. Instead they should be viewed as very active participants on this market, actively constructing and defending themselves and their constructed identities. It is through conspicuous consumption, or even the conspicuous refraining from consumption that, in the words of anthropologist Daniel Miller, “the strategies of recontextualisation are at their most advanced”\textsuperscript{77}. It is through consumption that individuals contextualize and place themselves in the world, making the world of goods into a cultural capital and a foundation for a social identity.\textsuperscript{78}

It was through the consumption and display of objects that the early modern individual constructed for themselves an identity of gentility and respectability. As Vickery writes, “[g]entility found its richest expression in objects. Indubitably mahogany, silver, porcelain and silk all announced the wealth and taste of the privileged”.\textsuperscript{79} High status, wealth, and political power all functioned as ways of confirming one's status of gentility, and this status was in turn confirmed through the public display of wealth and style.\textsuperscript{80} In this almost circle reasoning the ownership of the correct objects became secondary to the proper display of the correct objects: the proper spatial
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context in which the objects were displayed reinforced the perceived status and confirmed the taste and gentility of the owner. Indeed, contemporary guests would easily have been able to enter a room and successfully read the status conferred to them by the objects within.81

Sweden, as the subject country for this investigation, saw the same general trends as the rest of Europe regarding the changing patterns of consumption. Despite keeping to a generally mercantilist economic system during much of the eighteenth century, lifted for some luxury goods during the 1760's, the Swedish elites saw the same consumption patterns of increased diversity of status objects as the rest of Europe, albeit slightly later in time.82

Materials, selection, and method
Probate records belonging to elite burghers living in Stockholm, who died between the years 1780 and 1820 has been used for this study. These records, which are held at the Stockholm city archives, are both extremely well preserved and remarkably complete after so long a time, and has all, at least for people who died within the jurisdiction of Stockholm city, been digitalised. This digital archive has been the premise for the present study.

Probate records as historical sources
In order to analyse the manifestation of cultural capital within the homes of the burgher elite, precise information on not only the nature of their material possessions, but also information about the homes themselves as well as how these individuals and households furnished their homes, is important. To this end, few sources should be seen as more reliable and useful than probate records: These detailed lists of belongings, as well as the estimated worth of these items, were compiled shortly after death in order to facilitate a smooth inheritance between the heirs; necessary since it was customary that all the heirs, unless otherwise specified, should acquire some part of the deceased one's belongings.83 The compiling of these records were enforced by law, and were undertaken by the college of justice together with at least one living relative of the deceased.

The study of probate records, although old and well-established as a scientific tool for the study of history,84 is no less fraught with difficulties and problems. As historian Sara Pennel writes: “inventories are texts that, for all their seemingly straightforward listing and enumeration, have the
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potential to create 'fictitious' accounts of the living standards and spatial arrangements in the households they are taken to represent". 85 Many objects that would be usually present within the household might be missing from the probate records for any number of reasons, be they either deemed of too little value to bother listing them or gifted to someone else shortly before the time of death. 86 In both these instances the general image of the household presented by the probate records are flawed with missing pieces, making it difficult for the modern historian to fully reconstruct.

When analysing inventory lists such as probate records, it is also important to consider when within the life cycle of the homeowner that the household inventory is compiled. Research has shown that, during the era in question, personal wealth generally increased with age up until roughly the age of 60 when it instead started to decline. 87 As can be seen in Appendix B, most of the investigated individuals were closer to 70 at the point of death, which would suggest that their best years were behind them. Thus, for the highest degree of accuracy when analysing these inventory lists, they should be seen as a momentary window into a moment of life, the years prior to their death, rather than a general description of a whole lifetime. 88

For all their flaws and limitations, however, probate records and similar inventory lists possess the ability to convey a great amount of information regarding the material culture of the household, especially for an analysis focusing on the analysis of status objects, such as the present one. Being of high monetary value, status objects are highly unlikely to be left out of the inventory lists, unless already gifted away. 89 Similarly, status objects, such as furniture and paintings, are actively collected over a lifetime and most often retains status over an extended period of time, with changes in fashion being the single exception. Because of this, their value is more closely tied to how they mirror the owners social, economical and cultural status, as well as their active construction of self, than to their immediate monetary value. 90

By analysing the inventories as expressions and manifestations of status, the problem of temporality can be overcome. Instead of simply becoming a momentary window into a moment, they become a mirror of a self. According to historian Gudrun Andersson, when investigating material culture one should see beyond the individual object to instead find the intentions behind them: the attitudes and symbolic values that they represents. 91
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As can be seen in Appendix C, it generally took about three months from the time of death until the probate record was compiled for the investigated individuals, with some taking only a month and two of them having a full six months between the instances. Since most of these individuals had living spouses at time of death, which can be seen in Appendix B, this should be a lesser problem though, since their spouse would inherit almost all of their belongings. Indeed, in those few records that also contains a written will, both the house and all the objects are consistently testamented to the spouse, with only a monetary inheritance going to other heirs. In Appendix C can also be found a list of the officials present at the different recordings. This list shows a large overlap with the same people attending several recordings which grants a consistency to the way the probate records are written.

Choosing the time, place, and social group
Stockholm was during the end of the eighteenth century, very much as it is in the present day, the political, economical, and cultural centre of Sweden. It was the residence of the royal family, the seat of the Swedish parliament, and up until mid eighteenth century the northernmost city in the Swedish empire allowed to carter foreign ships. Thus Stockholm became the natural seat for the richest and most powerful families in Swedish society throughout the early modern era; even if they were not from the city they most certainly acquired a house there at least for parliament season, which often would last for several months at a time. All of this combined helps make Stockholm the prime area for an investigation into the burgher elite as the city had the largest arena in the country for them to compete for status on.

Just as Stockholm was the largest arena for the acquisition of status, so was the end of the eighteenth century, in Sweden, a time for the redefinition and reinforcing of status. The age of freedom during eighteenth century, between the years 1718 and 1778, had dramatically changed the political, cultural and social scene of Sweden by placing more or less all constitutive and legislative power within the hands of the parliament. During this time the burgher estate saw an unprecedented increase in political influence and cultural status, especially in Stockholm as the city, as the seat of the parliament, even more than before become the political and social centre of the country. This changed dramatically once again with the royalist revolution of Gustav III in 1778 and the return to royal absolutism. Gustav III ruled, simply put, by playing the different estates against each other, especially the burghers against the nobility by to a larger degree than ever before including the
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former in the social and cultural life of the country.⁹⁵

The combination of these spatial and temporal contexts makes Stockholm at the end of the eighteenth century a rewarding example for the investigation into the manifestation and expression of symbolic status of the burgher elite. Due to their recent ascension to the social and cultural top with both the age of freedom and the Gustavian era (so called because it occurs during the reigns of Gustav III and his son Gustav IV) it is an era of dramatic change that should be visible in the possessions of especially the burgher elites, the group in society posed to gain the most through ascertaining their newfound status.

Finding the burgher elite

The probate records were recorded chronologically an the individual records were inserted into the massive binders they are found in today as they were recorded during the year. For a city the size of Stockholm, the largest city in Sweden at the time, this amounts of to several binders of probate records per year, with hundreds of records per binder in no other order than when they were compiled. There exists, however, an extensive name register for the entire collection which is ordered alphabetically per fifty years.

The main problem with this rather arbitrary order is that without knowing exactly which individuals probate record you are looking for, together with a rough estimation of which year the person died, it is very difficult to successfully navigate the records for relevant inventories. This made it necessary early on in the investigation to identify the individuals whose inventories could be deemed to provide the most insight into the research question, effectively eliminating any form of randomising approach to the investigation.

Earlier research and historical works dealing with the late eighteenth century, and then mainly the gustavian era, were used to identify these individuals. Since research about this era of Swedish history is both bountiful and extensive it proved very easy to identify the richer and more influential of the city burghers, especially since a large part of the research very specifically treats this social group. Especially the generally biographical works of Carl Forsstrand published in the early twentieth century, chronicling the lives of “interesting individuals” in Gustav III's Stockholm, has been used to identify the most influential burghers of the city.⁹⁶ Forsstrand based his historical


research on a combination of even later historical writings, probate records, taxation records, and personal letters borrowed from the descendants of those he wrote about, and his conclusions, apart from maybe the gossipy nature of his writing, has all been verified by newer research. Another useful source for finding these influential and “interesting” individual has been the official chronicle of the burghers of Stockholm, published in 1929 by, frankly speaking, what was left of the burgher guild estate in Stockholm seventy years after the estate system had been abolished politically.

In Appendix B can be found a table with general information on the investigated burghers, including age and year of death, whether their partner was alive at the time of their death, which social group they are placed within in the study, as well as a very short description of who they were in society during their life. This information is mainly basic, and provided mostly to give a sense of who the different individuals were, and the general difference between them.

Method
A very simple methodology was used when analysing the probate records for information relevant to the investigation. Since, as have been shown in the Theory as practice-section above, manifestations of status has to be understood within its own temporal and spatial context the inventories presented within the records were analysed from the theoretical premise of manifestation and expression. For every different item presented within the records were asked the question of the type of manifestation of status that it presented, both in relation to the object itself as placed within a contemporary context of style and fashion, in relation to its function within the household, and in relation to its spatial placement within the home, when presented. To give an example a cushioned chair in the great hall is invested with status and meaning since it is placed in a front region room whereas the same chair placed in the attic storage would have been derived of this status and meaning as it would have been in a back region exempt from any social interaction.

The objects of interest found within the probate records, which in the end included most of the objects found within the front regions of the home, were then listed by type under their owner for both a clearer overview of the full collections and ease of comparisons between households. These types, or headings, roughly consists of the same headings as those used by the contemporary notaries as they recorded the inventories, and includes, to mention a few, “Gold & Jewels”, “Tin”, “Copper” “Real” as well as “Other” Porcelain, “Furniture” listed by room when this distinction is


provided, “Clothes”, “Books”, “Paintings”, and “Other”, for those items not fitting any special
description. Whenever the probate records included a reference to any specific room where an item
was placed this has been included. These objects were lifted from the probate records on the ground
that they in some manner expressed a capital asset other than merely economical, and includes
almost everything from chairs and tables to china, table cloth, sauce-pan, hats, and silver snuff
boxes.

For the analysis both the theory and the field of research have then been applied to these
compiled lists of the household inventories in order to analyse the outward, social manifestation of
status. Through analysing the household inventories as conscious expressions of status, consulting
research in the field as to what constituted status during the era, and comparing the different
inventories, the hope is to acquire a deeper understanding about the mechanisms of symbolic status,
its expressions and manifestations within the daily lives of the contemporary household.

For another example of the process of this analysis we will return to the cushioned chair. It has
already been stated that this chair is void of meaning when withheld from social interaction, that is
when placed in a back region. But meaning is also derived from a context of other objects, and not
only from spatial placement. If for example the home contains only a small number of chairs, and
no discernible large table of any sort, it can be derived that the household is ill equipped for any
larger social gatherings. If, on the other hand, there are a number of smaller tea or gaming tables,
and the home is equipped with a full set of tea ware the owners are adequately equipped to
entertained guests, albeit at only a smaller scale. From this arrangement would follow that this is a
household that cannot present itself as the centre of a social gathering and thus cannot participate in
the growing saloon culture of the time, but since it retains the ability to entertain at least some
guests it would still prove that the social visit is a integral part of the creation of status.

In this manner the objects are placed in a context of not just their immediate spatial arrangement
but also the other objects, and even rooms, present in the house. If for example the earlier described
chairs and tables were present not as the full extent of chairs and tables in the household, but merely
as the contents of a single room, and in another room can be found a large table and sixteen other
chairs, this would mean that the household not only can entertain a much larger group of guests, but
that they can present a variable entertainment for their guests, and has a house of different,
specialised rooms that, as we have seen, became fashionable during the century.

**Stockholm at the end of the 18th century**
The end of the eighteenth century saw great social and political reformation in Sweden, especially
recognisable in the capital which remained the uncontested heart of the country. The 1772 royal coup by king Gustaf III, which saw the end of the so called age of freedom and the parliamentary rule and a return to royal autocracy was paradoxically followed by increased status and influence for the burgher estate since he depended on their support to efficiently rule against the oppositional nobility. Even though this surge in status proved rather short lived with the king's murder in 1792, many of the elite burghers that had managed to take advantage of the king's favour did manage to retain their newfound position even through the following years.99

The main focus of this study will be on three different social groups within the Stockholm burgher elite, with the intention to encompass the potential variety for manifestation within the larger elite group so that more generalised conclusions can be drawn. These three groups consists of first the so called Skeppsbro-nobility, a group of extremely rich wholesale merchants defined socially already by contemporaries. The second group consists of the often very rich and influential craftsmen, guild aldermen, entrepreneurs, and administrators making up the top elite of the burgher estate of the city, who often held political position and even entertained social connections with the king himself. Lastly are the artistic elite of the city, mostly painters, who often could be found within several important social circles and as such could be said to represent the social bridge between the different groups of the capital.

**The Skeppsbro-nobility, the highest class of burghers**

The *Skeppsbro-nobility*, as a term denoting a fairly specific group within the burgher elite, were in use already during contemporary times. This rather diminutive term were reserved for a group of wholesale dealers and stock-brokers, most of them geographically located along the same road from which the name is derived, who, on the basis of their impressive wealth and considerable education considered themselves socially equal the nobility.100 In the words of early nineteenth-century historian Carl Forsstrand, what differentiated the burghers of the *Skeppsbro-nobility* from other often more or less as rich burghers of their time, was “not only through bigger, more far-reaching and broad-minded operation but also through higher education and more respected social position, more distinguished family relations, etc. and thus a greater claim”101

The history of the *Skeppsbro-nobility* is generally divided into two parts, with the first part mainly confined to the age of freedom between 1719 and 1772. During this time, these resource strong merchant houses wielded a great deal of political influence through their involvement in the
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so called Hatparty, which allowed them a high degree of control over the economical policy of Sweden for their own advantage. After a set of financial crashes and scandals during the 1760's, however, the groups influence over politics faltered, to diminish greatly in favour for a new rising group of less conspicuous merchants and craftsmen. Despite this fall from political grace during the Gustavian era they remained important in the Stockholm economical life well into the nineteenth century.102

The traditional Skeppsbro-nobility, as a group, were preoccupied by social advancement and over time many of them found themselves or their children ennobled. To this end they often engaged in conspicuous consumption and invested greatly in social contacts, such as godfatherhood or marrying daughters into noble families. In this sense, they differed greatly from the new group of burghers who, during the last decades of the eighteenth century rose to prominence.103 For the present study three individuals from this social group has been identified and analysed: The co-director of the East India Trading Company, Johan Abraham Grill (1799); hist partner and also co-director of the East India Trading Company, Carl Gottfried Küsel (1795); and the councellor of commerce in Stockholm, Simon Bernard Hebbe (1803).104 All three rich and successful whole-sale dealers with wide social connections.

**The burghers, the capital, and the king**

To simply divide the large social group of burghers in Stockholm at the end of the eighteenth century into the stock-market elite of the Skeppsbro-nobility on the one hand, and a broad middling class of regular burghers on the other hand would, of course, be a severe simplification of reality. There were many smaller groups within the broader group of burghers, the brewer elite being a noteworthy example who due to their extreme wealth derived from a royal monopoly on brewery would have had much more in common with the Skeppsbro-nobility that other burghers of their time. Indeed through both their much larger wealth and greater social influence these elite families differentiated themselves from the broader mass of burghers within the city, and through the careful negotiation of political and administrative positions within the city, and indeed state, governance they managed to rather successfully advance their own positions and interests in opposition to other social groups in the country.105

Where the members of the Skeppsbro-nobility very seldom acquired titles within the burgher militia or within the city administration, others than as directors and council of commerce, this new
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group of burghers were often highly invested in the different organisation and associations available to them.\textsuperscript{106} It is for example among this group of influential guild aldermen and successful merchants and entrepreneurs that the members of the burghers 50 elders (borgerskapets 50 äldste) can be found, an elected committee of 50 notable burghers that represented the burgher estate within the city, as well as the city burgmeisters, as well as several different parliament representatives.\textsuperscript{107} Indeed, the burgher estate parliament representatives from Stockholm appears to have taken prominent positions among their estate colleagues during almost all of the parliamentary sessions during the century, and burghers from the city were consistently chosen as speakers for the estate even though the estate were free to choose anyone among themselves for the position.\textsuperscript{108}

Several of these influential and successful burghers upheld close personal connections with the royal family, and through these acquired substantial social influence during their own time.\textsuperscript{109} They also actively sought out and created social connection within the burgher elite group through both an active socialisation, especially through the culture of the social visit, but also through the foundation of “secret” orders, such as the Freemasons, the order of timbermen, or, especially influential among the burghers of Stockholm, Par Bricole, the order of Bacchus founded by the influential culture personality and musician Carl Michael Bellman during the second half of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{110}

Since this social group of more general, if still extremely rich, burghers made up the largest and most diverse of the three social groups, the most individuals has been identified and analysed from this group, spread out over the full extent of the investigated period. Seven households of burghers has been analysed: Those of baker alderman Jacob Röhl (1783), and royal baker, as well as Röhl's relative by marriage Nils Lychou (1800); mayor of Justice and member of parliament Carl Ernst Oldenburg (1812), and mayor of building and offices, as well as parliament spokesman for the burgher estate Anders Bengtsson Lüdberg (1799); brewer alderman, member of parliament, and good friend of the artist Bellman, Abraham Lorentzon Westman (1802); cellarmaster and also good friend of both Bellman and the sculpot Sergel, Erik Noer (1794); and the wife of the secretary of the queen dowager's court office, Johanna Gustava Rehn (1795), the single investigated woman.\textsuperscript{111}

\textbf{The artistic elite}

Many of the elite burghers held top position within Par Bricole, and many of the cultural
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personalities of the time, especially Bellman himself but also painters and sculptors, were staple guests at the houses and dinners of the burgher elite. During the eighteenth century, first with the initiation of the royal drawing academy early in the century and then later with the founding of the Royal Academy of the Fine Arts under Gustav III, the artistic profession acquired both a whole new legitimacy and an increased social status.\textsuperscript{112}

Decorative painting in the home spread during the eighteenth century and the age of freedom to encompass even more social groups than ever before, and not only the nobility as in previous centuries. During the age of freedom the largest group of buyers could be found among the group of burghers who made up the ranks of the \textit{Skeppsbro-nobility}, the richest of the merchants and wholesale dealers in Stockholm who decorated their large town-houses with paintings and murals to impress guests and increase their own living standard.\textsuperscript{113} During the gustavian era, with the further decrease of the noble privileges, the luxury consumption of paintings and other artistic objects, such as busts, spread even further among the burghers.\textsuperscript{114}

With the increased popularity in artistic consumption came an increased social status for the artists themselves. Artists, both painters, sculptors, and musicians, became staple guests at the homes of the elites and often important focal points for social groups to centre around, with musician Carl Michael Bellman being the most noteworthy, but not only, example, who not only founded the Par Bricole but also effectively brought both artists and patrons together, as well as facilitated business contracts between different burghers through his extended social circle.\textsuperscript{115} Four artists has been investigated for the present study, in order to accommodate for the differences within the social group: The among mainly the nobility popular painter, \textit{Per Krafft} (1793); painter and member of the art academy, \textit{Johan Pasch} (1811); painter, member of the art academy, and good friend of Bellman, \textit{Pehr Hilleström} (1816); and famous sculptor and artist, \textit{Johan Tobias Sergel} (1814), who enjoyed royal patronage and was ennobled late in his life for his works.\textsuperscript{116}

\textbf{Disposition}

The analysis is divided into four distinct, thematic sections based both on the different manifestations of status, gentility, and style present in the homes, and on the functions of the objects within the broader context of the household. In the first part of the analysis the architectural structure of the different homes are analysed, as well as the houses themselves as to location and
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size. In the succeeding section the focus is narrowed to the individual rooms, and the furniture as well as smaller objects are analysed. This section concerns both the types of objects found within the homes and where these are found, what type of status these would derive for their owner and what type of manifestation of self that they represent within the larger stage of the house.

The third and fourth parts of the analysis is more directly concerned with the capital structure as presented by Bourdieu: In the third part the traditional trappings of cultural capital, education and cultural refinement, is analysed in the form of mainly the many books and paintings found throughout the homes. These are the objects that most generally has been the concern of historians interested in the manifestation and expression of cultural capital in the past, and the discussion of these will be supplemented with a broader discussion of the physical manifestations of education as can be found within the homes.

The fourth part of the analysis focuses on the object manifestation of sociability, mainly as represented through those items necessary to facilitate the creation and reinforcement of social status. In this part all those items necessary to hold a dinner party and host a social visit is in focus, and how these would function in the manifestation of symbolic capital.

The analysis

The home during the early modern period were among the middling sort, which to extent includes the elite burgher class herein analysed, according to Ponsonby highly individual and far too different from one other to be described in generic terms.\textsuperscript{117} They were placed differently throughout the city, they had different floor plans, and each family would decorate and furnish according to personal taste and preference. Despite the individual nature of the household, however, several general patterns can be distinguished. According to Ponsonby,

\begin{quote}
At its most fundamental level the home provided a place to live, work and bring up a family. But beyond such basic requirements the home also needed to project the right image, which was closely connected with a person's position in society, their family background, their occupation and their aspirations.\textsuperscript{118}
\end{quote}

The home was seen to be a reflection of the family status and background, and to that end it would had to be constructed in the appropriate manner. The placement of the home would have to mimic the relative social placement of the family, the floor plan would have had to correspond to an
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expected standard for the function of the house apart from living, and the furnishing and decoration would have had to properly convey the status of their owners. Thus the similarities between the households will undoubtedly amount to the obvious expressions of status and capital, all those things expected and demanded of the household in order for it to both manifest and reinforce their social status within society. This does not mean, however, that the differences between the households become irrelevant. These differences can serve to effectively highlight the similarities, and often constitutes merely other expressions of status and capital than was the general norm, either through new and rare fashions, old and discarded fashions, or just by being different, exotic, or strange.

The architecture of the house

The physical location of the home within the city were of great importance for the manifestation of status during the early modern era, and some areas of the city were always more attractive to the local elites than others. Throughout Europe these urban elites tended to congregate to the city centre, creating clear spatial hierarchies within the urban landscape.\textsuperscript{119} Stockholm were of course no different with the central islands of Stadsholmen and Riddarholmen, being the seat of both the royal castle, the house of nobles, and the traditional city centre, being the most attractive areas for elite settlement. This hierarchy is somewhat mirrored in the spatial placements of the homes, as can be read by the map found in Appendix D. As should be expected, the three members of the Skeppsbro-nobility have all their houses situated in this hierarchical centre of the city. The Küsel home was, as probably should be expected by a member of the Skeppsbro-nobility, situated by the road that gave the group its name along the shore of Stadsholmen,\textsuperscript{120} while the Grill home instead lay by the old square at the islands centre.\textsuperscript{121} The home of Simon Bernard Hebbe lay on Riddarholmen, the to the old city adjoined island filled mainly with the palaces of the nobility.\textsuperscript{122} This spatial placement near the centre of power in Stockholm would have been a clear statement by the Hebbe household that they belonged among the social and cultural elite of the time, and it would have placed them socially close to influential individuals as neighbours and members of the same parishes.

Only two of the more general burgher elites appears to have had their home located in the city centre. Instead these households appear to have been mainly situated on the adjacent Norrland, just north of Stadsholmen, spread out between mainly the Klara and Gustav Adolph parishes in this part
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of the city. As can be seen on the map in Appendix D this region contains about a third of the investigated households, and most of these roughly follow the path of the Queen street suggesting this street as somewhat of an axis for the Stockholm burghers to congregate around. This matches well what Mats Haye's writes when he states that the street during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries became a favoured place for both officials and traders. The congregation of elite households on either the central islands or on Norrmalm is, when looking at the map, rather obvious, with only the Röhl and Hilleström homes being placed clearly outside this general area. The Röhl home just slightly to the east, and Hilleström the only household having its seat on the southern island, which otherwise appears generally shunned by the burgher elite. Another reason for the distance to the city centre might have been that the house itself was more important than its actual location, given that this location was not directly detrimental, which might have been the case of large parts of the southern island.

According to Andersson large impressive stone houses enabled the type of social representation that became paramount for the manifestation of social status during the eighteenth century, and the size of these houses often necessitated the aggregation of several adjacent plots of land. The spread out placements of the elite homes thus suggests that for this group the actual house were more important than its location. It might be that due to economical shortcomings they had to compromise, or it might be that the location outside the city centre were an active choice to differentiate themselves from the nobility and the Skepsbro-nobility who both had their homes mostly within this city centre. Whatever the reason, this large, and rather diversified elite were spread out among what would have been the relative outskirts of the central city, outside of the absolute centre located around the royal castle. Noteworthy is that

The eighteenth century, as has been seen, saw the transition from houses with a few large multi-purpose rooms to several smaller, specialised single-purpose rooms. Together with this change came a new distinction between public and private spaces within the home that became fashionable especially among the middling sort. This transition was very clear in especially England and France, but also in Sweden can this be traced in the changing structure of the home. During the time investigated this transition appears to have been more or less completed, at least among the more well-to-do of the burgher middling class. Apart from the two painters Pehr Hilleström and Johan
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Pasch, all of the homes contained several rooms, most often specialised for social interactions such as parlours or drawing rooms. The homes of Hilleström and Pasch instead appears to have both been much smaller and much less specialised than the others, containing only a few rooms, possibly not many more than two. A similar case can be seen with the painter Per Krafft, who too only appeared to have had a few rooms within the house, even if his home does appear to have contained something alike to a saloon, or large hall.\textsuperscript{128}

According to art historian Ing-Mari Danielsson a fashionable, French-inspired home during the latter half of the eighteenth century was to consist of two distinct units: a suite for socialising and a private suite. The social suite was centred around the saloon which was to be decoratively different from the rest of the rooms, while the private suite was to be out of sight from guests.\textsuperscript{129} Even though Danielsson is mainly concerned with the nobility and higher strata of the middling classes, her findings appear partially applicable on many of the households analysed for this investigation. For example is the partition between public and private spaces within the houses often very clear, with the obviously public spaces being represented by the great hall and the many parlours, while the servant quarters, and to some extent the bedrooms, not counting the guest bedrooms, appears to have been private spaces, as based on the furnishing of these rooms as will be discussed in the next section. Those probate records that lists the inventory of furniture by room reinforces the image presented by Danielsson of private and public floors within the houses. For example in the record of baker alderman Jacob Röhl, the saloon and the more general rooms are all specified as being on the “lower floors”, while the pair's individual bedrooms are placed upstairs.\textsuperscript{130} A partition like this would suggest a very clear difference between the public and private spaces, or the front and back regions, separated not just by function and decoration but by tangible, physical space, in this case by altitude. It would also be an adherence to fashion, since the fashion of the time clearly stated such a partition of space within the home

Not every home followed this style of lower floor front regions and top floor private regions, however. The home of the East India Trading Company director and prominent member of the Skeppsholm nobility, Johan Abraham Grill were for example an impressive four storey building in central Stadsholmen, out of which the middle two floors appears to have been dedicated to socialising while the ground floor consisted of the directors and his assistants' offices. These two middle floors appears to have not been entirely public, though, since they contain both the usual front region rooms such as parlours and drawing rooms and more private back region rooms such as
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the couple's bedrooms as well as the kitchen-chamber on the second floor. The top third floor, however, appears to have been a private, back region floor, mainly devoted to servants quarters.\footnote{Johan Abraham Grill, 1799}

With its two distinct public front region floors, the \textit{Grill} home is unique among those investigated for this study. Both of these floors had their own individual saloons with adjoining parlours, the second floor two of them in different sizes. The first floor saloon appears to have been the main public space, however, based on its contents. The contents of these two rooms suggests moreover that these floors might have been gender coded, with the first floor being a mainly male, or even neutral floor and the second one female.\footnote{Johan Abraham Grill, 1799} According to Vickery it must be seen a very strong possibility that a familiar taxonomy of objects and décor existed during the early modern era that characterised rooms by gender and organised the objects therein according to the sex of the user.\footnote{Vickery, 2009. p. 303} Apart from the clear presence gendered, individual bedrooms in many of the investigated houses, this rather clearly gendered distinction between the two different social floors of the home is unique to the \textit{Grill} household. There is of course the possibility that this distinction existed in more homes, but the \textit{Grill} home is the only one in which this distinction is clearly showed through the gendered furniture placed on the two floors.

This type of gender distinction between rooms, and in the case of the \textit{Grill} household floors, would have had two main status functions during the early modern time. Firstly it would most likely have been very fashionable at the time, as through contemporary literature from mainly England it can be concluded that dedicated female rooms were a standard feature among the gentility during the mid nineteenth century, meaning that the fashion would have started considerably earlier during the eighteenth century for it to be standardised during the proceeding century.\footnote{Vickery, 2009. p. 85} The presence of such a distinction in Stockholm during the late eighteenth, early nineteenth century would have been a clear sign of the households sense of fashion. Secondly it would enable for a sort of gendered privacy within the home, giving the females and female guests of the house a private space apart from the men. Privacy was during the early modern era a sign of power, wealth, and prestige, since it took a great deal of wealth to enable properly private houses with both locks and private rooms.\footnote{Vickery, 2009. p. 41} This combination of fashion and privacy that these gendered floors entails would have created an image of respectability around the \textit{Grill} home, as a place for both fashionable and respectable socialising, which would have conferred a significant social and cultural status to the household.

A noteworthy pattern of the investigated homes is the clear lack of dedicated libraries in the
houses. According to historian Jessica Kross the library became during the course of the eighteenth century the “quintessentially private male space, ‘the innermost, personal sanctum of the great man.’”\textsuperscript{136} Libraries, according to Kross, were private spaces often entered by invitation only, and the often dedicated site for personal corresponding between men.\textsuperscript{137} Thus the library becomes a semi-public front and back region at the same time; a place for intimate conversation between the male houseowner and his close friends and distinguished, often intellectual guests. It is for this reason that the conspicuous lack of libraries among the Stockholm burghers are so striking, since it suggests that this trend so prevailing in both north America and on the continent appears absent in Sweden, at least among the middling class. Only two households had a dedicated library: that of the sculptor \textit{Johan Tobias Sergel}, who it should be mentioned had been ennobled for his work circa a decade before his death, and the \textit{Grill} home.

Noteworthy about both these libraries, or “book-room” as it is called in the \textit{Grill} probate record, is that they show no signs of having been public rooms, or even social rooms, at all. In the \textit{Grill} home the library is situated on the third floor, above the two aforementioned social floors among the servants' quarters,\textsuperscript{138} and in none of the two cases does the furnishing of the rooms suggests them being used in any form of social interaction.\textsuperscript{139} What function the library had in the Stockholm household during the end of the eighteenth beginning of the nineteenth century, apart from being an efficient storage solution for books and papers as appears to have been the case in the \textit{Grill} home,\textsuperscript{140} is unclear, but its presence within the house does not appear to have carried any substantial symbolic status, as otherwise could have been expected.

\textbf{Furnishing the cultured home}

The house itself, even though the absolute first impression and constituting the general limitations for status manifestations and social interaction through delineating the physical space available, would only hold a minor role in the expression of status as soon as guests passed the front door. Instead the interior of the household would be the most defining aspect for the manifestation of self and status, those objects that the owner would use to impress and define the scene presented. Indeed the contemporary guest and consumer would easily have been able to enter a room and successfully read the status conferred to them by the interior of the room, the objects, contexts, and furnishing
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found therein. Simply owning a status object would have been insufficient to confer status to its owner, instead the objects needed to be displayed; to be viewed and evaluated in a context that defined the status of the object almost as much as the object itself.\footnote{Ponsonby, 2007. p. 133}

The right furniture, just as the right house, was an important aspect in the construction of an image of self, and reflected both ones social status and ones social credit.\footnote{Ponsonby, 2007. p. 60} ‘The right furniture’ during the early modern era, just as today, conferred status through their combination of the correct materials and fashion, the type of furniture as well as their placement within the room. Especially the materiality of the object conferred status since this was easily obvious to anyone evaluating them. The contemporary elites furnished their homes with expensive objects, whose cost would have to be expressed through concrete expressions to effectively confer status to their owners, such as through material, colour, or model.\footnote{Andersson, 2009. p. 154} As Vickery writes, ”Gentility found its richest expression in objects. Indubitably mahogany, silver, porcelain and silk all announced the wealth and taste of the privileged”\footnote{Amanda Vickery, quoted in Andersson, 2009. p. 107} This is indeed true for almost all the investigated burgher households, which often contains an abundance of status objects in their front region rooms. The notable exception to this is the group of artists investigated, whose homes instead are fairly low on these kinds of conspicuous status objects, owning far less than the rest of the burghers. This is likely due to their lower access to economic capital compared to the other investigated groups, but it is also possible that this group valued conspicuous consumption and overt status objects lower than their more economically powerful burgher contemporaries.\footnote{Appendix E, see also for further comparisons in this section}

Within the confine of the individual room, mahogany appears to have been an important material for the manifestation of status. Every single household investigated, even those of the artists which otherwise are fairly low on conspicuous status objects, contains at least one piece of furniture in mahogany, most often several. Most common are the mahogany small tables, such as tea-, gaming-, folding-, and sewing-tables, which can be found in most of the social rooms in the different houses suggesting mahogany to be a fashionable material whose high cost would restrict most households to only invest in smaller objects of this material, or one big such as the mahogany bureau found in the home of artist Pehr Hilleström.\footnote{Pehr Hilleström, 1816} The notable exceptions are the two Skeppsho-nobility members Johan Abraham Grill and Simon Bernard Hebbe, as well as the extremely rich brewer alderman Abraham Lorentzon Westman, who apart from a plethora of smaller mahogany tables also
owned large dinner tables in the material. Apart from its status as a fashion material, however, mahogany probably mainly held value as economic capital through the manifestation of economical wealth. By furnishing all the public front rooms with objects of expensive materials, especially tables which would be brought forward and used frequently, these households would express their economical ability to acquire such objects, as well as to lesser extent their taste in knowing this material is fashionable. This would be equally true in the cases of even rarer materials, such as alder tree used mainly for sewing- and tea-tables, and ebony used for mainly smaller objects such as lamps or decorations.

The materials used in the furnishing of the home did not only manifest economic capital, though. Vickery suggests that English middling class during the eighteenth century used wallpaper and textiles to colour code their rooms, during the Victorian era possibly even after usage and gender. Through the use of colours and its combination with certain materials it is possible that the household could express taste and respectability, and thus manifest cultural capital. From the descriptions provided about some of the objects within the probate records, mainly the different chairs and sofas that were clad or draped with textiles, the general colour that the rooms were decorated in can often be discerned. From the way that the records are ordered the different rooms and their general colour can often be discerned even when the actual room partition is missing, and by analysing the colours of the textiles of the chair cushions and sofas it becomes clear that the early modern household actively colour coded their different rooms, or at least decorated their rooms to have matching colours. The bedroom of Johanna Gustava Rehn, wife of the secretary of queen dowager's court office, were decorated in blue and white, with blue and white textiles for both the bed, the sofa, and the stools as well as white marble discs on both the bureau and the two pillar-tables to match. In the same manner were all the chairs in what appears to have been her saloon clad with yellow silk, possibly to match the many small mahogany tables also present therein.

Similar patterns of colour coded rooms can be found among most of the homes analysed. Prominent jeweller, burgher estate spokesman, as well as mayor of building and offices Anders Bengtsson Lüdberg had what appears to have been one of his parlours clad completely in red, with a
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red sofa, two red stools and a whole six red armchairs, while his saloon and one other parlour appears to have had been furnished yellow.\textsuperscript{153} Similarly did the goldsmith and member of the burgher's 50 eldest, \textit{Carl Ernst Oldenburg}, own several different sets of colour matched sofas and armchairs in blue, green, and yellow, that probably were located in different parlours and drawing rooms throughout his home.\textsuperscript{154} Not only the more regular burgher elite colour matched their furniture which suggests it being a more general sign of taste among the elite group. In the home of east India trading company director and prominent member of the \textit{Skeppsbro-nobility}, \textit{Carl Gottfried Küsel} can be found three large, green-painted dinner tables with two different large sets of matching green painted chairs, on of the sets with blue cushions suggesting a green and blue theme for at least one of the larger rooms.\textsuperscript{155}

Unfortunately the probate does not include whether there were any type of wallpapers hanging in the different rooms, which makes it impossible to conclude whether the colour of the walls would have matched the colour of the furniture found within. Neither does it state whether the wall was painted, if wallpapers were absent. According to Vickery wallpaper became a way to express taste on a budget, which became very popular among the middle classes and town gentry of England towards the end of the eighteenth century. In this setting, the choice of the correct wallpaper became an extension of the correct choice of decorum, and an important manifestation of ones correct rank and status. In an ever-changing fashion scene cheap wallpaper was also an efficient way to always decorate rooms in the fashionable colours, and thus an efficient way to manifest taste.\textsuperscript{156} Whether the lack of wallpapers in the probate records is the because these were absent or because they were not viewed as worthy of noting down is of course impossible to know, but its consistent absence from all the records suggests the former.

The absence of wallpapers instead suggests painted walls, which would mean that the fashion probably did not change quick enough to necessitate constant colour changes for the different rooms of the house. That these rooms had specific colours, however, seems clear from the probate records, and is reinforced by room names such as the Grey chamber found in the house of baker alderman \textit{Jacob Röhl}.\textsuperscript{157} Thus it appears that the presence of colour-coded, or -specific, rooms appears to have been more important than what colour they were in, even if it should be expected that some colours held more status than other due to their rarity and cost.\textsuperscript{158} There are of course some colours more common than other throughout the records, with yellow being the absolutely most common colour.
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for both tables, chairs, and lining throughout the investigated period, closely followed by green. No clear fashion change between colours during the period can be discerned in the material, which suggests that the sign of refined taste was to have colour-specific room, rather than having these rooms in any special colour.

As mentioned it was not only the material of the object that carried status, but also the type of object was important. Just as the eighteenth century saw the transition to smaller more specialised rooms did it also see the introduction of smaller more specialised furniture, especially tables, which apart from representing changing fashions of interior decoration also represented broader changes in habit. The most common of these tables were the tea-table, which appears to have been a veritable staple within most rooms of the elite during the time and can be found in several different sizes, shapes, and materials in all of the probate records save one.

The one home among the probate records analysed not owning a tea-table were the home of painter Johan Pasch. According to Vickey tea-ware and its appropriate furniture were among the most necessary inventory for the cultured individual, which means that the lack of the proper furniture associated with the drinking of tea would have been detrimental to an image of cultural refinement. Indeed, Pasch did not even own the china necessary for the drinking of tea, such as a tea-pot or tea-cups, which would have made it impossible for him to invite others for tea. According to Woodruff Smith, however, tea was seen as a domestic event, closely tied to respectability and the family. It was through the drinking of tea that the family reinforced their ties and signified what it meant to be a family, and eventual guests would acquire temporary status as family members during this event. Since Pasch according to his probate record was a bachelor at his death, it probably should be expected that he did not own a tea-table since he could not be expected to attain the level of domesticity expected of the drinking of tea as a social event, especially since his home is poor also in other items necessary for hosting guests.

The absence of a tea-table in Pasch's probate record might not only stem from his status as unwed however, but from the fact that he was an unwed male. According to both Vickery and Ponsonby socialising around tea-drinking were a female habit during the early modern time, and mainly the household area of the wife. Thus it should be more or less expected to not find a tea-table in Pasch's home. This entails, however, that elite households containing women are to be
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expected to have at least one tea-table. Within the probate record of Oldenburg can be found added towards the end the complete inventory of the household of his unwed daughter, since he as her economic guardian officially owned those items as well. Remarkable for this list of objects is the absence of specifically a tea-table, despite it listing both several other expensive smaller tables, enough chairs to suggest frequent guests, and a full set of tea-ware. Whether this absence is coincidental is hard to tell, but it does suggest that the tea-table were a domestic item, and its ownership were reserved for a respectable family setting.

Pasch were not entirely without tables, however, since he owned a gaming table in mahogany, with five cushioned chairs to place around it. The gaming table are in the record almost as, if not in some households even equally, common as the tea-table, as representing another small, specialised table that becomes popular during the century. What games they were used for are consistently unspecified, but the table probably allowed for common contemporary games such as chess, bridge, backgammon, and cards. The tea- and the gaming-table were together so common and numerous throughout the records that hardly a single front region room lacked at least one of them, and often contained one or more of each. These tables are indeed so common in the analysed households that they cannot be deemed only as fashionable items that one should own, but rather as necessary items that one must own. No respectable household should be without at least one tea-table and one gaming-table, if possible one of each per parlour almost, as must have been the cases of brewer alderman Westman who owned three different gaming-tables and six tea-tables, as well as Küsel who owned five gaming-tables and four tea-tables spread out throughout his home. In this manner tea- and gaming-tables falls neatly into the category of ‘decencies’, identified by historian Lorna Weatherill. These include objects that were neither viewed as necessities nor luxuries, but were nevertheless important for the middling class idea of sensibility and taste. As such the ownership of these kinds of tables becomes physical signs of proper taste, and manifestations of cultural capital.

The many tea- and gaming-tables were extremely common, but still only a few examples of the many types of tables found within the homes of the late eighteenth century elite, who also owned a plethora of pillar tables, folding tables, sewing tables, and of course dinner tables. Apart from the sewing table, which also held a practical value as a storage for sewing tools for the women of the
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household, the true value inherent in the differences between the tables would only have been revealed in a social context. Indeed, many of these tables would only have been able to be used properly within a social context.\textsuperscript{172} For example even if one certainly can drink tea at a tea-table alone, its special distinction as a tea-table and its owners special knowledge of how to use it properly as such would be unable to confer any form of status without an audience to evaluate and appreciate this knowledge. Without this social interaction, the table would lose many of the values associated with it and be reduced to just another small table. In order for his single game table to confer any value to him apart from its practical value as a raised surface, Pasch would need to have had guests to use this table with, both to evaluate his proper knowledge of its use and to connect the values manifested to him as its owner.

It was especially the special knowledge of how to use these different tables properly that would have conferred value to their owner, since furniture during the era had prescribed usages.\textsuperscript{173} The same values and conditions for its manifestation were present in other types of furniture than tables, though, especially the many different types of chairs present in the houses. Unlike the tables, however, it appears as if the different chairs could confer status value through style as well as proper usage. This is suggested not only by the relatively higher amount of different types of chairs present in the households and the fact that these often were clad in coloured textiles, as stated above, but also by the fact that many of these carry French names in the records. These includes the Chaise Longues owned by both Westman and Noer,\textsuperscript{174} the fauteuiller in the houses of Noer, Sergel, and Oldenburg,\textsuperscript{175} as well as the many canapés spread out throughout many of the houses.\textsuperscript{176} It should be noted that Sergel is the only one among investigated the artistic elite that appears to have owned any of these specialised, and mostly French, chairs, suggesting this ownership to be more exclusive than that of specialised tables. The much lower numbers of specialised chairs compared to tables reinforces this suggestion, adding to the apparent exclusivity of this type of furniture.

This exclusivity, and the status capital that invariably would derive its ownership, was probably derived from one, or both, of two different aspects of these chairs. The first of these aspects would be the special knowledge required to both acquire and correctly use these chairs, e.g. where one can find an artisan skilled enough to construct a chaise longue and how to properly sit in one without making a fool of oneself in front of someone who do possess this knowledge. The second aspect would be the exoticity of the object, that the object would be able to confer status to its owner.

\textsuperscript{172} Ponsonby, 2007. p. 41
\textsuperscript{173} Ponsonby, 2007. p. 41
\textsuperscript{174} Erik Noer, 1797 & Abraham Lorentzon Westman, 1802
\textsuperscript{175} Erik Noer, 1797; Carl Ernst Oldenburg, 1812; & Johan Tobias Sergel, 1814
\textsuperscript{176} For just a few examples, see Carl Ernst Oldenburg, 1812; Johan Abraham Grill, 1799; & Simon Bernard Hebbe, 1803
simply by being novel and strange, and thus exhibiting the specialised knowledge and interest of the owner.

Many of the objects found throughout the houses investigated can not simply be attributed or treated as furniture, which are the more practical, usable objects of the interior decoration. These are instead objects whose main function was to be aesthetically pleasing, or to be interesting focal points for either leisured conversation while in company or respectable past-time interests, such as collecting. Some of these objects, like instruments, paintings, and scientific equipment, represents cultural interests in the traditional, cultural-capital sense of the word, and will be explored in the next section. The focus here will instead lay on those objects that easily can be deemed purely aesthetic, or even simply, and only, representing the economic capital of their owner. Collection items are common throughout the investigated inventories, and indeed throughout the houses of the well-to-do throughout Europe, and constituted their own form of cultural capital by requiring both a dedication of time, interest, and resourced to acquire. It should, however, be investigated what types of objects were the most common among the burghers of Stockholm.

The most common such collectors item was the snuff-box, which can be found among all of the investigated records, with the notable exception of Johanna Gustava Rehn. Not all of these boxes were part of grand collections though, even if it appears to have been common to own more than one, most often in different materials, ranging from gold and gilded silver to turtle shell and even papier maché. Oldenburg, however, owned a grand collection of more than 20 snuff-boxes of different materials, an impressive collection that surely would have been proudly presented to guests and friends. Snuff boxes were during the era one of many symbols of an aristocratic lifestyle, and in a Swedish context Gudrun Andersson has been able to tie the ownership of such items to an elite identity especially connected to individuals with ties to the capital city. This special connection to both aristocratic habits and a capital culture suggests that an extended collection of snuff-boxes might have held more than just economic value, but also a cultural value as a valuable interest and past-time. Such an extensive collection would have needed time invested in both curating and expanding over the years, as well as the economic means necessary for the later. Oldenburg also had several cupboards with glass doors and, even though it is never explicitly stated in the probate records, it is easy to imagine that at least some of these might have held his snuff-box collection for visitors to view.

Snuff boxes are not the only collectors item to be found in the probate records. Not uncommon

177 Carl Ernst Oldenburg, 1812
179 Carl Ernst Oldenburg, 1812
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among the households are dolls of different kinds, most often porcelain but sometimes, as in the case of *Oldenburg*, painted wooden dolls. Those dolls not explicitly made out of wood are in the probate records described as Chinese, Saxon, or Swedish, which all suggests them being made out of porcelain and thus small ornamental figurines, rather than the children's toys that the modern reader most likely would associate the word with.\(^\text{180}\) The most notable aspect of the collection of dolls, however, is its spread among the investigated groups. All three of the investigated *Skeppsbro-nobility* households has porcelain dolls while only *Johanna Gustava Rehn* among the more regular burghers, apart from the aforementioned *Oldenburg*, owned dolls. Unlike *Oldenburg*, however, she owned Chinese porcelain dolls, five of them that were apparently placed upon their own small pedestals.\(^\text{181}\) This exclusivity of porcelain doll collection suggests this interest to an inherently noble interest during the time, and not necessary a culturally defining interest for the larger burgher group. The *Skeppsbro-nobility* is notorious in Swedish historiography for their collective strive to emulate the nobility,\(^\text{182}\) and *Gustava Rehn* had through her husband close ties to the royal court, which would have allowed for a quicker adoption of new trends.\(^\text{183}\)

The collections of dolls among the different *Skeppsbro-nobility* households differed greatly, however. Whereas the *Küsel* household only had nine so called tableau dolls in Chinese porcelain, fanciful table decorations, the *Grill* household contained a room on the second floor, within the wife's social space, that were furnished with a whole 26 different dolls, 14 made of Saxon, probably Meissen, porcelain and 12 made in Sweden, probably by Rörstrand.\(^\text{184}\) These dolls were probably very different from those found in the probate inventory of *Oldenburg* roughly a decade later, which probably would have been more in line with the children's toy dolls that would become popular among burgher and bourgeoisie families during the nineteenth century. Especially since these kinds of dolls could be dressed and this introduced doll dress-making as a valuable past-time and hobby for the respectable burgher female.\(^\text{185}\) As such these porcelain dolls, or figurines, would probably represent not so much a defined burgher cultural capital, but rather a noble style of cultural capital, a fashion more popular among a nobility that these individuals were either influenced by or tried to emulate. By adopting this fashion they differentiated themselves from the other groups of elite burghers, most likely a conscious choice in the case of the *Skeppsbro-nobility*.
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180 For a few examples of such dolls, see the images of Meissen porcelain figurines in Diviš, Jan. 1983. *European Porcelain, an illustrated history.* Peerage Books: London. pp. 41, 43ff, 52, & 58ff
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183 North & Selwyn, 2008. p. 68
**The objectified signs of education**

Traditionally in both historical and anthropological studies on capital ownership and structures cultural capital has been closely connected to education and the, so to speak, signs and institutions of education. These are most often represented by the classical works of poetry, art, and literature, and well as degrees and titles associated with higher education.\(^{186}\) In western early modern societies cultural capital is also closely linked to social status positions, such as nobility, which were seen as carrying and bestowing inherent cultural capital.\(^{187}\) In most historical research on the capital structure this capital is most often represented through ownership of books and paintings, and to a lesser degree scientific equipment. These were the objects that would have necessitated special knowledge to both appreciate for themselves and evaluate for others, and thus represent an educated capital form in the traditional sense of the term.\(^{188}\)

During the seventeenth century the ownership of paintings exploded among the European nobility as a way of expressing cultured and refined taste, as well as social relations in the form of portraits.\(^{189}\) This spread during the following century to also encompass the upper stratas of the middling sort, where it too became a clear sign of cultural capital. Gudrun Andersson have for example been able to trace a clear connection between the ownership of large collections of paintings and cultural capital among the burgher elite in the Swedish town of Arboga during the eighteenth century.\(^{190}\) Among the investigated Stockholm burgher elite, however, almost no such large collections of paintings can be found.\(^{191}\)

This very clear absence of larger collections of paintings is rather remarkable and appears to be fairly unique to Stockholm during the era, since more or less any other similar investigation into other contemporary regions suggests painting ownership to be an important expression of cultural capital among every elite group of society.\(^{192}\) The painters are exempt from this general lack of art collections, as should be expected considering their livelihood and considerable social connections with other artists both throughout Sweden and the rest of Europe. Many of the paintings owned by the four artists appears to either be gifts by other painters, be portraits depicting other artists, or simply personal paintings in styles different from the ones they sold on the general market, as

\(^{187}\) Larsson, 2005. p. 48  
\(^{189}\) Vickery, 2009. p. 143  
\(^{190}\) Andersson, 2009. p. 178f  
\(^{191}\) Appendix F, see also for further comparisons in this section.  
\(^{192}\) For examples, see Andersson, 2009; Vickery, 2009; Ponsonby, 2007; & Macleod, 1996.
presented by the many paintings still found within their studios.\textsuperscript{193}

Other than the painters, the only individuals that appears to have at least an inkling of an art collection are the three investigated members of the Skeppsbro-nobility, as well as \textit{Oldenburg} who owned an impressive 73 paintings throughout his home.\textsuperscript{194} Among the three members of the Skeppsbro-nobility, both \textit{Küsel} and \textit{Hebbe} owned twelve and fourteen paintings respectively, all in gilded frames, while \textit{Grill}, who from a note in his probate record appears to have owned a substantial collection of paintings, which unfortunately was recorded elsewhere and removed three days prior to the recording of his inventory.\textsuperscript{195} Even if several of the other burghers did own paintings, \textit{Röhl} had three of them in what appears to have been an ante-room of sorts,\textsuperscript{196} none of them are even close to the amount owned by the members of the Skeppsbro-nobility. This rather clear difference is, once again, most certainly due to the different goals of these different groups sought to attain, which also functions to differentiate and delineate the two burgher groups. The Skeppsbro-nobility, with their aspirations for true nobility, would have tried to adopt a more noble cultural capital, which during this time included collections of paintings,\textsuperscript{197} whereas the more regular burgher elite instead were contempt with creating for themselves a new burgher ideal, which included their own specific cultural capital differentiating themselves from the nobility. Instead of paintings, both \textit{Noer} and \textit{Gustava Rehn} owned large collections of paper prints, woodblock prints on paper, sometimes explicitly framed and sometimes apparently just put up on the wall as modern era posters.\textsuperscript{198} These paper prints were a great deal cheaper than proper paintings, and was probably more for decoration than an expression of education and high culture. \textit{Küsel}, too, owned fourteen paper prints which he had behind glass in gilded frames,\textsuperscript{199} and both \textit{Pasch} and \textit{Krafft} appears to have had these in their homes, even though it is unclear whether these were actually hanging on their walls or were just stored there for future sales.\textsuperscript{200} Neither \textit{Oldenburg} nor \textit{Hilleström}, the two latest of all the investigated probate records, show any signs of these paper prints however, suggesting that they might have gone out of fashion during the beginning of the nineteenth century and in favour for proper paintings among the regular burghers as well.\textsuperscript{201} This, of course, needs a much larger investigation to state with any certainty, but appears to neatly coincide with the middle

\textsuperscript{193} Per Krafft, 1793; Pehr Hilleström, 1816
\textsuperscript{194} Carl Gottfried Küsel, 1795; Johan Abraham Grill, 1799; Simon Bernard Hebbe, 1803; Carl Ernst Oldenburg, 1812
\textsuperscript{195} Where this was recorded is, unfortunately, unknown. But the inventory of the household paintings, all but 6 of them, was apparently undertaken by one Professor Eric Hallberg, who also appears to have been the one who removed them from the house. Johan Abraham Grill, 1799
\textsuperscript{196} Jacob Röhl, 1783
\textsuperscript{197} Vickery, 2009. p. 143
\textsuperscript{198} Erik Noer, 1797; Johann Gustava Rehn, 1795
\textsuperscript{199} Carl Gottfried Küsel, 1795
\textsuperscript{200} Pasch had, according to his record, two portfolios of these paper prints, which suggests that they might have been for sale rather than as a part of his own collection. Johan Pasch, 1811; Per Krafft, 1793.
\textsuperscript{201} Carl Ernst Oldenburg; 1812; Pehr Hilleström, 1816
class ascent in the art market observed in England during the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{202}

Differing goals and capital agendas might not be the only reason to the general lack of paintings among the Stockholm burgher elites, however, even if the generals trends does express that these reasons might have played an important part in household's interior decoration choices. According to Ing-Mari Danielsson, who studied wall-paintings in the houses of the nobility andburghers of Stockholm during the so called Age of Freedom, most of the eighteenth century up to 1772, came to the conclusion that most of these hired painters, such as the in this paper investigated \textit{Pasch}, to decorate their interior walls with artistic motifs, such as pastorals. Danielsson dates many of these paintings found among elite burgher homes to the 1750's and -60's, fairly shortly before this investigation starts, and there is nothing in her own research that tells that this trend necessarily ended with the Age of Freedom.\textsuperscript{203} Thus it must be taken into consideration that in many of the elite burgher homes during the time the walls themselves would be paintings, which could explain the complete lack of paintings in the homes of \textit{Lüdberg, Lychou, and Westman}.\textsuperscript{204} This does not explain, however, why these would completely lack paintings while the members of the \textit{Skeppsbro-nobility}, who according to Danielsson were frequent purchasers of these kinds of wall-paintings, did own collections of wall-mounted paintings.\textsuperscript{205} Especially since all these left living spouses upon their death that inherited their possessions, and thus would have less incentive to gift away their paintings before death.\textsuperscript{206}

According to Ponsonby portraits, and then especially family portraits, were extremely common among middling class homes in England during the era, as tangible symbols of lineage and the history of the family. They carried high symbolic value and would often be included in wills to be gifted to other family members and friends as mementos and symbols of friendship.\textsuperscript{207} In Sweden, too, were family portraits an important part of the manifestation of status and contacts, and according to Andersson they were invested with strong emotional value and would often be divided outside of the official heritage, and thus not to be found among the probate records.\textsuperscript{208} If this were indeed the case it would explain the complete lack of family portraits within the probate records, since not a single of the very few paintings found within them are actually notes as such, apart from the two paintings of himself that \textit{Sergel} had hanging in his library.\textsuperscript{209} Since not even the few actual

\textsuperscript{202} Macleod, 1996. pp. 3ff & 212f
\textsuperscript{203} Danielsson, 1998. pp.117ff & 159ff
\textsuperscript{204} Anders Bengtsson Lüdberg, 1799; Nils Lychou 1800: SE/SSA/3699/F6:18, 1800. Probate record, pp. 123-134; Abraham Lorentzon Westman, 1802
\textsuperscript{205} Danielsson, 1998. pp. 117ff & 131f
\textsuperscript{206} See Appendix B.
\textsuperscript{207} Ponsonby, 2006. pp. 68f
\textsuperscript{208} Andersson, 2009. pp. 181f
\textsuperscript{209} Johan Tobias Sergel, 1814
wills presented in the probate records give any mention of any family portraits, it has to be assumed that if they did exist in the homes they were gifted away through unofficial channels before death. Either that, or the social ties that these portraits represented, both family continuity and social connections, were expressed in other, less tangible ways.

The lack of family portraits does not necessitate a complete lack of portraits per sé, though, and a few portraits of royalties can be found among the homes. According to Andersson investments in royal portraits were an expression of high cultural interests, all well as a way of situating oneself within a larger, national context with the royal family at the natural centre and themselves as loyal subjects. As such the royal portraits became a symbol of the reigning social order, and the owners distinguished position within this order, even more so reinforced if the owner could boast with any form of personal connection to the royal subject in question. Apart from the painters, who all were members of the royal academy of arts and frequently were patroned by the royal family, the only two households who owned royal portraits were Küsel and Oldenburg. The former of these owned a portrait of the reigning king Gustav IV, while the latter owned a depiction of the former heir apparent Karl August, who died in an accident only two years prior to Oldenburg himself. Oldenburg were by all accounts a staunch royalist, whereby this portrait very likely would have been a way to express his own personal connection, as well as dedication, to the royal family, but if Küsel would have wanted to express a similar sentiment with the portrait of the young king is unclear.

It is not only the Swedish royalty that is represented among the few portraits hanging on the walls of the investigated homes, however, but both Küsel and Oldenburg had the portraits of foreign royalty hanging in their homes as well. In these case, however, it must be deemed as highly unlikely that that either of them had any personal connections to either the Prussian king, whose portrait hung in Küsel's home, nor Austrian Empress Maria Theresa, whose portrait was owned by Oldenburg. These paintings should rather be seen as signs of education and travel, and manifest signs of cultural capital necessary to both understand the depiction and the value of them, much in the same manner as paintings by well known masters and painters, such as the painting by van Dyck hanging in one of the rooms belonging to Eric Noer. Similarly the paintings attributed to Hileström and Pasch hanging in the house of Gustava Rehn would have been clear expressions of
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215 Most probable the Dutch seventeenth century master portrait painter best known for his work at the English court.
216 Erik Noer, 1797
the taste of their owner, since these painters were popular among burghers and nobility alike during the time.\textsuperscript{217} Rhen's record is also the only one, apart from the painter's owns, that actually list works of these painters, which of course most likely can be attributed to the fact that they would often paint straight on to the walls or tapestry whereby the painting would not be counted as part of the inventory.

Paintings are not the only artistic expression found within the houses, though, but some of the burgher also owned busts or urns in stone or, often in the case of the former, plaster that they appears to have decorated the rooms with. It appears as if these objects often were placed on their own pedestals or on small pillar tables, as in the households of both \textit{Gustava Rehn} and Grill, where they probably held a place of privilege within the room. On the second floor of the \textit{Grill} home they even had a bust placed under a small glass dome, possibly to both protect it and better reinforce its position and significance in the room.\textsuperscript{218} Among the busts are also one of Gustav III, in the ownership of \textit{Westman}, who apart from this bust and a few urns otherwise appears to own no significant works of art what so ever.\textsuperscript{219} In the case of this, as well as the other busts without any noted motif, the expressed cultural capital should be the same as with the paintings. Further knowledge would have been needed to understand and value these busts, and the proper knowledge needed to properly understand and discuss them would have been manifest signs of education, and thus a cultural capital. This can be further expressed by the many busts owned by \textit{Hilleström}, which are noted as depicting famous English writers such as Shakespeare and Milton.\textsuperscript{220}

As already mentioned, very few of the investigated household had any proper library, and even in those two houses that had one the library did not appear to be have been a front region room, given their general state of furnishing. Bookshelves and book-cabins, too, appears to have been somewhat rare among the burgher elites, with only five households having bookshelves and three owning book-cabins, with only a single household, \textit{Hebbe's}, owning both types. Furthermore only three households, \textit{Noer}, \textit{Gustava Rehn}, and \textit{Sergel}, owned more than one bookshelf, and not a single household owned two or more book-cabins. \textit{Sergel} had all three of his placed in his library,\textsuperscript{221} which have already been concluded were most likely not a front region room, and in both the cases of \textit{Noer} and \textit{Gustava Rehn}, it appears as if they were placed in the office,\textsuperscript{222} which can be described as a semi-public room and thus somewhere between front and back region. Bookshelves thus appears

\textsuperscript{217} Johanna Gustava Rehn, 1795
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\textsuperscript{220} Pehr Hilleström, 1816
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\textsuperscript{222} Johanna Gustava Rehn, 1795; Erik Noer, 1797. In \textit{Noer}'s record his four bookshelves are all listed in his office. \textit{Gustava Rehn}'s two bookshelves are either placed in an office or a drawin room, since her record does not list rooms by name. The apparent presence of a desk in the room, however, suggests office, most probably her husband's.
to have not been front region furniture, and book-cabins with glass doors appears to have held a somewhat similar position within the house. Only Hebbe appears to have had his book-cabin, described as a small one, in a front region room.\textsuperscript{223} With the two main types of furniture used to store books visibly not having any prominent positions in front region rooms, it should be safe to assume that books in themselves as objects did not display status, neither cultural nor economical.

That is not to say, however, that books were completely devoid of status. Most of the household had extensive book collections, but without any obvious way of storing these visibly it appears as if owning a large library would have entailed or manifested cultural capital by itself. Instead it appears as if the status inherent in books came from reading them, the ability to quote them, discuss them, and properly use the knowledge contained within them. There appears to have been exceptions to this general pattern that books in themselves did not contain status, or course, but these would mainly have been books with gilded and expertly crafted book covers that mostly would manifest an economic capital.\textsuperscript{224}

Since the capital status appears to have been found in the contents on the book, rather than in the book itself, it becomes interesting to know what kind of books the households invested in to see if there exists any general patterns in the kind of genres that were the most popular, and thus probably would confer the most cultural capital. The absolutely most common type of book found among the different collections was, unsurprising enough, religious books, with the bible and the psalm book found in more or less every single household.\textsuperscript{225} In the case of the baker alderman Jakob Röhl religion in one way or the other was the subject of a whole eleven out of his twenty-one books, including, apart from the bible and psalm book, a catechism, a communion book, and several theological texts.\textsuperscript{226} With religion being such an important part of everyday life, however, the ownership of such books should not be counted as expression of capital, but rather as expression of the religiosity that prevailed in the early modern society.\textsuperscript{227}

After the religious books, the second most common type of book appears to be ones that in one way or another is connected to the professional life of the owner. These include books such as law-books and current political commentary for the burghers with elected positions, such as Lüberg and Oldenburg who both were mayors in Stockholm as well as burgher representatives in the

\textsuperscript{223} Simon Bernard Hebbe, 1803. \textit{Hebbe's} probate record does not include a clear room division, and the assumption that his book-cabin were placed in a front region room is based on its general position within the list, since the notary appears to have started with the main, front region rooms to then proceed to the back region.
\textsuperscript{224} Andersson, 2009. p. 174
\textsuperscript{225} A few household records, such as Johanna Gustava Rehn, 1795, and Simon Bernard Hebbe, 1803, fail to list any books at all, instead merely presenting these books as a clump sum of money. But it can probably be safely assumed that these contained an exemplar of each.
\textsuperscript{226} Jacob Röhl, 1783
\textsuperscript{227} Andersson, 2009. p. 174
parliament,\textsuperscript{228} as well as art books owned by all the artists.\textsuperscript{229} According to his record, Grill at first glance appears to have owned an extensive collection of books and texts fitting for his library on the third floor of the house, but under closer scrutiny it is revealed that more or less this whole collection is only different journals, receipts, and reports connected to his many different businesses.\textsuperscript{230} These neither should be regarded as carrying any cultural, or probably even economical, capital, but rather would have been needed for these individuals to properly fulfil their professional duties.

The remaining books, still constituting a substantial part of the different collections of books, however, can neither be attributed to religious nor professional life. These would instead be books that, when read, would give the reader the knowledge necessary to present themselves as well educated and cultured. The most common genre of books left, after the religious as professional ones, are books concerning geography and places, such as atlases and travel literature, followed by historical and scientific, including philosophical, works. The travel literature and atlases include books such as “Beers Geographica Universalis” in the collection of Lüdberg,\textsuperscript{231} while the historical literature includes works on both Erik XIV and Karl XII of Sweden, in the possession of Röhl,\textsuperscript{232} as well as a “Historie Universelle”, owned by Hilleström.\textsuperscript{233} These books would have helped reinforce the image of the well-travelled, well-read, and well-educated gentleman central to the image of middling class gentility during the time.\textsuperscript{234} These topics also fits neatly into the more traditional definitions of cultural capital, which stresses education and manner, the embodied state of capital.\textsuperscript{235} These are however not the only books in the collections that are worth extra notice for conferring cultural capital. Among the lists of the many books presented among the households are a great deal of texts in other languages than Swedish, mainly French but also, to a lesser extent, German. That French is more common than German is interesting, since this suggests that the large German influence of the preceding eras by the end of the eighteenth century definitely has been replaced by the more aristocratic French, which of course was in high fashion among the court at the time. Also the sheer size of the book collections are telling, since large collections would have needed a high investment of both money and time, both acquiring and reading them, and several of the different households had extensive collection of about 70 books or more. Lüdberg, for example, owned a whole 108 different books, among them works such as Newton's philosophical system and “Bon
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mots d'histories d'arlequin”, a book of French fairytales. Large book collections appears to have been well spread among the burghers, and no special discernible difference is clear between the different groups. Küsel, of the Skeppsbro-nobility for example owned a collection of 70 books on different subjects, and both Sergel and Hilleström had extensive personal collections.

A special mention should be made of the book collection owned by Erik Noer, and a few of the more interesting titles found in his personal library. Among these can be found such titles as “Émile”, written by French philosopher Rousseau, a book titles “Tablesse de Paris”, which apparently was banned in France at its release due to its critical depiction of the city under the monarchy, and a book about a steamship called the “Prosvenon”. With his probate record being from 1797, all of these books must have been very new when acquired by Noer, thus representing the newest in modern thought and science. This suggests that not only were novel styles and fashions important for the manifestation of status, as presented in the former chapter on the furnishing of the home, but also novel ideas. Being up to date on the newest philosophical and scientific breakthroughs would have been a clear sign of cultural capital; time and interest would have been needed to be invested to both acquire and read these books, and a higher degree of education would have been needed to understand them, making these kinds of books and their contents efficient markers for cultural capital.

Important to remember, however, is that since none, or at least very few of these books, would actually be visible to any visitor to the house, their presence, in the form of acquired knowledge, would have had to be presented otherwise, most likely through discussion with other like-minded and well-read individuals. Thus it is not the ownership of books that appears important, but rather the active reading and understanding of these books. The personalised, embodied, capital that can only be expressed socially, and not really presented physically. Also, despite the somewhat clear patterns in book ownership, what type of books that were important to own, there is still a presence of individuality to the collections, dependant on taste, interest, and most possibly what type of persona the owner tried to create for themselves. This individuality in itself is no new discovery, and has already been clearly stated by Stobart & Rothery in their study on images of gentility and respectability in the English society of the time. It is, however, interesting to see the same patterns also in Stockholm.

Books and paintings are not the only objects traditionally associated with cultural capital that can be found among the possessions of the Stockholm burghers. In about half of the investigated
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households could be found a musical instrument, most often a piano of some sorts. It should be noted that none of the artists appears to have owned an instrument, suggesting that being a professional painter or sculptor either gave no time to learn how to play an instrument as well, or was regarded as cultural enough to not need another artistic expression to complement it. The playing of an instrument is traditionally, even during modern times, a tell-tale sign of cultural refinement, and at least during the nineteenth century musical pieces, often performed by family members, became a staple of Swedish middle class saloon culture. 241

Apart from the artists, the ownership of musical instruments appears somewhat evenly spread among the burgher elite, possibly being slightly more common among the members of the Skeppsbro-nobility than among the more regular burghers: Only Hebbe from the Skeppsbro-nobility did not own an instrument, while only three out of seven of the more regular burghers, Noer, Oldenburg, and Westman, owned instruments of their own. It is, of course, possible that Hebbe, aged 77 at his death, already have gifted any possible instrument to someone, but no proof of this can be found in the record and the assumption should thus rather be that he did not own one. 242 It is noteworthy that Oldenburg and Westman are among those three out of the regular burghers who owns instruments, since their probate records are, apart from that of Lychou, the only from among the regular burghers that are written during the nineteenth century. Since Westman, unlike Lychou, died relatively young at the age of 49, and Oldenbrug, as already has been seen, often were at the forefront in burgher trends, it is very possible that they represented the coming saloon culture trend with musical pieces that would become very popular during the century.

The most common type of musical instrument owned by the burghers appears to have been some type of piano. It is unclear whether they owned an actual piano, a clavichord, or a harpsichord, however, since the records consistently use the Swedish catch-all term claver, which encompasses all these similar instruments. The noted exception is the Grill household, who according to the record owned a clavecin, the French word for harpsichord. 243 Another exception is Erik Noer, who instead of owning a piano-like instrument like many of his peers owned two violas, and base and one alto. 244 In comparison to the much more common clavichord, the most probable type of piano owned by the burghers of the time, the harpsichord in the Grill household would have been almost prohibitively expensive and, at the end of the eighteenth century, seen as very old fashioned, on the
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grounds of it being a typical baroque instrument. As such it would probably be more related to the image of nobility and court culture than any burgher identity of the time, and would have presented a clear indication of the type of social status that the Grill household strived after. In the case of Noer and his two violas, these instruments, rather uncommon if the other probate records are any indication, would indicate their owner as one of cultural refinement and education, who invested both time and interest in learning not only an instrument, but a more specialised instrument than the much more common piano.

In order to properly convey cultural capital, the knowledge of how to play these instruments would of course have been almost equally as important as their actual presence in the home. It is impossible to know whether anyone in the households possessed the knowledge of how to use these instruments, but since every record that both contains musical instruments and a clear partition of rooms they are consistently placed in the great hall, the most public of all the front region room, it should probably be assumed that they were used. Whether they were used by family members or musicians hired to entertain during social events is unclear, but both would become fairly standard during the nineteenth century.

Scientific endeavours and knowledge of the new findings within the broad fields of scientific research became a hallmark of the burgeoning middle class identity during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, at least in England. Because of this it should come as no surprise that these trends can be found in Sweden at roughly the same time as well among the well to do middling classes. Needing both dedication, education, interest, and resources, scientific endeavours are one of the trademark cultural capitals, and during the early modern era this was represented by both knowledge of the universe and man's power over nature. The former of these are best represented by the large number of books on scientific matters that can be found among the collections of the identified individuals. Several of the collections contain at least one encyclopedia, often in several volumes and often in French, but other types of scientific books can be found. Some of the most noteworthy are “Wolsens mathematique” and Newton's philosophical system belonging to Anders Bengtsson Lüdberg, the already mentioned book book about the steamship “Prosvenon” in Erik Noer's collection, and the “Noveau Dictionaire Historique pour une Societe de Geno lethres” in 6 volumes belonging to Sergel. Books like these represents man's knowledge of the world, and
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having read these would be a clear sign of education and cultural refinement. Displaying such books would be an even clearer sign, and transforming this capital from purely internal to external and manifest capital. As earlier mentioned, however, is there no indication that these books would have been openly displayed within the home for guests to see them, which reduces them to integrated capital.

Man's power over nature is in its own part represented by instruments, objects that can measure and order nature. At its most basic, this is represented by clocks, common throughout the different households in many different forms. The clock as a scientific instrument, to measure time and order the day, is well-established among the research on the early modern era, and indeed everyone appears to have owned at least one clock, be it a pocket watch or a table-clock, or even just a pendulum clock. This can of course have more practical than cultural connotations, since it is useful for people to know the time. According to research, however, clocks were a male investment, and in the home it was most likely to be found in the kitchen if a woman owned it. Unfortunately, there is little information on where the different clocks were placed, but very little indicate that the kitchen would have been a common place for one. Instead the large hall, drawing rooms, and anterooms appears to have been furnished with clocks of all different kinds, be they mantelpiece clocks or large grandfather clocks.

More specifically scientific is the barometers, by far the most common scientific items found in the homes of the burgher elite. Living in a city located fairly far from the coast, without extreme weather, it is unlikely that any of these individuals had any pressing use for a barometer, instead it should be seen as a scientific endeavour, as man's control over the weather. The ownership of, and knowledge of how to interpret, a barometer would entail cultural capital. It should be a fairly good guess that these were located somewhere visible, probably fairly close to the main entrance or even in the large hall, since these are usually found early in the probate records, even when a room distinction is lacking. Indeed, Amanda Vickery points out the barometer as a “conversation piece in an era that prized enlightened conversation”, while at the same time being a luxury item. As can be seen in Appendix F, however, the ownership of this kind of scientific object were not evenly spread among the burgher groups, with every investigated member of the Skeppsbro-nobility owning one while not a single of the artists appears to have had one. This suggests that this kind of scientific endeavour was not of interest to the artists, who probably not needed that type of cultural expression due to their professions.
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Apart from these, the purely scientific objects are scarce in the investigated records: a thermometer and some tubes in brass can be found in the home of Hebbe, and a sunglass can be found in the home of Grill. The noteworthy exception is Oldenburg, who appears to have been very scientifically inclined and interested. Being from 1812, Oldenburg's probate record is one of the younger, but even its slightly lower age does not change the fact that he must have been ahead of his time with his scientific interest. In his home can be found a camera optica, a special type of camera obscura, along with 162 associated plates. Even if the camera obscura had been around since long before the eighteenth century, it was by no means a common item, and simply owning one must have made Oldenburg fairly unique outside of purely scientific circles. Even knowing how to use one must have been regarding as a good foundation for cultural status, since it would have needed fairly specialised and uncommon knowledge and skills to properly use. Apart from this he also owned a galanty show, a play of shadows, which probably were used as entertainment at social parties. He also, even more remarkably, owned a set of 4 magnets, and something in the record called an “electricity machine”. Being a fairly new and un-researched phenomenon during the early nineteenth century, electricity must have been seen as special and strange, and the ownership of a machine capable of producing electricity, which this should have been, must have been very uncommon. Especially considering that this is decades before Faraday started his experiments, and electricity functioned as the basis for entertainment shows by simply being new and fascinating. The knowledge of how to use such a machine, granted that he actually knew this, must have given Oldenburg quite some status as a man of science, and thus cultural capital as an educated man. It is of course unclear whether he presented this machine to guests or simply tinkered with it when alone, but the former is much more plausible than the latter, especially considering his public role in city a mayor and the large amount of money he must have invested in creating a home that could entertain large social visits. Thus because of Oldenburg's great collection of scientific instruments it appears as if science was an option when creating a cultured persona, one way to show of ones cultural capital and manifest status within the home.

Hosting a dinner party

According to Amanda Vickery, in her study of the English early modern elite, the most necessary inventory for the cultured individual appears to have been the goods and furniture necessary to entertain social visits. A few examples of such necessary inventory is tea-ware and tea-tables,
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mostly for women, as well as the well-furnished dining room and parlour, for men. Not all middling class households could afford, or had the possibility to acquire, the inventory needed to entertain social visits at home, however, and in these instances it appears as if these middling class individuals instead invested heavily in attending social visits. It is especially when looking through the wardrobes left by the deceased that a pattern is revealed where especially the artists, whose homes in general were a great deal poorer than the others, appears to have invested more heavily in clothes and personal adornments.

Among the four artists are found most of the recorded dinner jackets, all of them owned gold or silver pocket watches, adorned walking sticks, and hats of many different kinds. It is also in the inventory of Pehr Hilleström that one of the only three recorded instances of the national costume, introduced during the reign of Gustav III, is found, the other two being in the households of Noer and Lüdberg. The one costumed owned by Hilleström, however, is the only one of these three not noted as either old or damaged, despite his probate record being the youngest of the three, by thirteen years compared to that of Lüdberg. Only two of the four artists, Per Krafft and the nobleman Sergel, owned enough plates, knives and forks, or even tables and chairs to host any larger social events, or as in the case of Pasch even entertain guests at all. Despite owning four different dinner jackets in different colours, as well as several coats and a whole five different hats, owned according to his record a mere two tea-spoons, in silver, and not a single instance of any porcelain at all.

Pasch did by no means die a poor man, which makes the conspicuous lack of objects in his home, especially those necessary for entertaining guests, all the more remarkable. He did, however, die a bachelor with no children, and it might have been that as he never married he could never found a proper household according to contemporary values. It might have been that as a bachelor he simply could not invite any larger gatherings to his home, the presence of a game-table and chess pieces suggests that he at least used to entertain single guests, and thus was confined to only attend social visits in other homes. Painter Per Krafft on the other hand were both married and had a household with exactly enough knives, forks, and chairs in his great hall to entertain a maximum of twelve guests. He is, however, together with Sergel who also owned enough utensils and chairs to actually entertain guests, the artist with the least impressive wardrobe, once more suggesting the
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importance of sociability for status.\textsuperscript{266}

Important to remember, however, is that the most important region for socialising for most of these middling class individuals were their own home, rather than the homes of others. They invested heavily, both money and interest, in furnishing their homes and creating respectable front regions for their guests to both evaluate and appreciate. According to Karen Harvey in her study of masculinity and the gender roles in the early modern English households, tables functioned as focal points for socialisation,\textsuperscript{267} and thus it is no surprise that even among the Stockholm burghers investigated, tables, chairs, glasses, kitchen-ware, and china are both bountiful and rather central in the probate records.

Especially porcelain, or china, appears to have been extremely important for the middling class burghers, and almost all of them, Pasch being the most notable exception, owned large quantities of porcelain.\textsuperscript{268} Porcelain table- and tea-ware are almost universal among the probate records, and most of the burghers owned several different sets of them. Especially East Indian, i.e. Chinese, porcelain appears to have been important and held high status. This type of china, often called “Real” or “True” porcelain in the probate records, as opposed to the then false “English” or “Swedish” porcelain that appears to have been the option are very common and some of the burghers owned several different sets of Chinese table-ware. Küsel, of the Skeppsbro-nobility for example owned four different sets of Chinese porcelain table-ware, including all from serving-plates in different sizes, sauce-boats, butter-boxes, and a grand total of 258 flat plates, as well as 117 deep ones. He did only own 18 silver knives and forks, however, which probably would have set the top limit for the number of guests he could have invited at a time.\textsuperscript{269}

Chinese porcelain were of course a great deal more expensive than both the Swedish and English porcelain, and it appears that most households complemented tea-ware collections of Chinese porcelain with dinner sets of mainly English, and in much more uncommon cases Swedish, porcelain. Saxony porcelain can also be found, probably from the Meissen factory, but these are invariably tea-related. It appears as is the English porcelain was the option chosen for those households who could not afford full dinner sets of Chinese porcelain, such as Gustava Rehn and Sergel who both owned tea-ware in Chinese porcelain but table-ware in English and Swedish porcelain.\textsuperscript{270}

Another possible interpretation of the place of the Chinese porcelain in the household inventories is that they did not only hold higher status than the English porcelain, being more expensive and
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thus more exclusive, but it also held noble connotations, maybe because of its exclusivity. Among the inventories of the investigated members of the Skeppsbro-nobility the collections of Chinese porcelain table-ware were by far larger than the collections of either English or Swedish table-ware, while among the more regular burgher elite the ratio is reversed. Among these households it is only the mayor of justice Oldenburg that owned any substantial collection of Chinese plates, but even he owns more plates of Swedish porcelain than Chinese, if only a slight 167 plates of Swedish porcelain against 158 plates of Chinese origin.\(^{271}\) Even brewer alderman Westman, who due to his massive wealth certainly could afford it, owned but a humble collection of three dozen Chinese plates in comparison to his 24 dozen English plates.\(^{272}\) A similar, if not so extreme, difference between Chinese and English/Swedish porcelain can be found in most of the regular burgher inventories, such as both Lychou and Lüdberg who both owned tea-ware as the only Chinese porcelain, while they both had large sets of English porcelain dinner-ware.\(^{273}\) Because of this very clear difference in the owning of Chinese porcelain between the Skeppsbro-nobility and the regular burgher elite it can be suggested that the burgher elites already during the end of the eighteenth century created a kind of burgher identity of moderation and fiscality, and that the “real” porcelain from China in this identity were deemed to conspicuous, too luxurious, and possibly too noble, to have a proper place. Instead the economically more feasible English porcelain, as well as to a lesser extent Swedish porcelain, appears to have been the porcelain of choice for this group of burghers, who sought the respectability of having a “proper breakfast on proper china”, as proposed as a clear sign of early modern respectability and gentility by Woodruff Smith,\(^{274}\) but without the noble connotations of excessive conspicuous consumption.

Even the regular burghers, however, had most of their tea-ware in Chinese porcelain. Across all the probate records the number of tea-cups and -pots in either English or Swedish porcelain are consistently lower than the those in Chinese porcelain, suggesting that even though most burghers appears to have disregarded serving food on Chinese porcelain, tea was only properly drunk in real porcelain. The aforementioned Westman is a good example, since the only “non-true” porcelain tea-cups he owned was six cups of Saxony origin, while he owned four dozen tea-cups of Chinese porcelain. The only tea-pots he owned was two of English origin, suggesting either that only the actual cups mattered, or that he had of some reason not been able to acquire proper tea-pots of Chinese porcelain yet.\(^{275}\) A similar pattern can be seen with all the regular burghers. For example Lüdberg owned not a single dinner plater in Chinese Porcelain, but at the same time all his tea-ware
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was of this origin, while Lychou owned about four dozen cups of two different sets in Chinese porcelain, but only two pots as the only tea-related porcelain of any other origin. Thus, even if oriental porcelain might not have carried the same importance for the regular burghers as it did for the more socially progressive members of the Skeppsholmen nobility, it is clear that they still carried great value as status objects.

Consistently among those households that owned larger collections of plates, i.e. most of the investigated households with the main exceptions of Pasch and Hilleström, is that they also would own large dinner tables and large number of chairs. This might appear basic, since every house needs both chairs and tables, but present in the inventories are invariably at least one larger table, always placed in the great hall or saloon and often accompanied by a pair of folding tables often in the same colours, as well as large numbers of matching chairs, often in sets of between 12 and 18. In similar manner all these households also had several different sets of damask and linen tablecloth, with large sets of matching serviettes, most often in sets of between 18 and 24. Together with their knives and forks, always in silver, these factors would most likely have set the upper limit for the number of guests that could be invited at a time. Apart from Pasch and Hilleström, who did not have any of the necessities associated with hosting a social, visit all the investigated households contained enough tables, chairs, table-ware, table-linen, and utensils for 12 guests at a minimum. This is perfectly exemplified by the artist Per Krafft who according to his probate record owned a dozen silver knives and forks, exactly a dozen dessert-plates, he owned six dozen regular plates in English porcelain), three different tablecloths with matching sets of a dozen serviettes for each, together with exactly a dozen chairs in the saloon.

The other more well to do burghers of the study of course owned considerably more than just a dozen of each for furnishing their dinner parties. Alderman Westman owned, apart from his impressive 24 dozen plates of English porcelain, also 30 knives with silver handles, a whole 6 dozen silver forks, as well as 28 dessert-knives and -forks. The wholesaler Abraham Grill owned on his part 36 knives and forks in silver, even if only a set of twelve chairs can be found in his saloon, suggesting that despite the large number of utensils and plates, he owned over 400 plates of Chinese porcelain divided on two sets, the number of guests he could entertain at the same time for dinner was effectively capped at a dozen. Considering that the Grill household had three dinner tables standing in their first floor saloon, however, it is fully plausible that they had access to more chairs if they needed it. Since their chairs in the record are noted down as “old”, it can be surmised that the days of large dinner parties might have been long behind the household as well, at the time
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of Abraham Grill’s death at the very advanced age of 80.\textsuperscript{279} Indeed for most of these well-to-do burghers the limiting factor to how many guests they could invite to a dinner party would probably have been the physical space limiting the number of people they could fit into their saloon at the same time, rather than lack of plates or utensils, or the like, giving the impression that these were important areas of investments for the middling class off the time.

One rather remarkable area where more or less all of these individuals are very well-invested in are dessert-ware, i.e. utensils and plates needed to eat and serve desserts. According to Margaret Ponsonby the serving of dessert at dinner parties was seen as a luxury in England during the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century, and thus even the owning of dessert-ware was seen as prestigious in itself.\textsuperscript{280} Despite the exclusivity that such a prestige would entail, dessert-ware are extremely common among the Stockholm burgher elite. Almost all of the investigated burghers, Hilleström and Pasch of course exempt, owned either dessert-spoons, dessert-forks, or dessert-knives, often all three types and often over twenty copies of each in silver. Many of them also had specialised dessert-plates in porcelain, always in considerably smaller numbers than the number of regular dinner plates, such as the 48 dessert-plates in English porcelain owned by Gril,\textsuperscript{281} or the 60 plates, of also English porcelain, owned by Küsel.\textsuperscript{282} The owning of dessert-ware appears equally common among the different groups of burghers, and even artist Per Krafft owned a dozen dessert-plates in English porcelain, even if he appears to not have owned any specialised utensils.\textsuperscript{283}

Not only regarding plates and utensils were the investigated individuals well-stocked, but also in regards to glasses of different kinds. Only Pasch does not possess a wide array of different glasses, and all from regular drinking glasses to wine glasses, beer glasses, and even specialised grog-glasses can be found in the inventories, such as the punch- and schnapps-glasses that can be found in Noer’s, Küsel’s, and Sergel’s inventories.\textsuperscript{284} Not only does every household have enough glasses for often dozen of guests, they more often then not have enough glasses for dozens of guests in several different sets. This is especially true about the many different types of wine glasses that can be found in the records, which often are described as being of different types, styles, colours, and patterns. Two households, those of Küsel and Sergel even has specialised champagne-glasses listed in their inventories.\textsuperscript{285} The high number of different kinds of beer-glasses, wine-glasses, port-glasses, and even liqueur-glasses suggests that having the correct glass for the correct type of drink
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was extremely important. Considering what has already been stated regarding both chairs and tables earlier, this should be of little surprise as such specialised knowledge is a clear requisite for cultural capital. Not only would the elite burghers know the difference between a wine-glass and a dessert-wine glass, both recognising their differences and the proper time and wine to use to them with, but they would also have needed the economical capital to invest in both the many glasses needed and the proper storage space for them. The many different styles of wine-glasses, *Lychou* for example owned 7 different types of wine-glasses in different sizes and styles, also suggests a changing fashion in wine-glasses that these individuals would have needed to be mindful off.\(^{286}\)

The Stockholm burgher elite did not only possess the means to properly array a dinner table with plates, utensils, and glasses, however, but also the means to properly serve a wide array of different dishes. A large number of different pans, pots, and serving dishes can be found among pretty much all the burgher elite inventories, or at least those with the ability to host dinner parties in their own homes. These include not only the regular cooking pots and kettles of different sizes and shapes, but also much more specialised ones such as the fish-kettle and cake-forms that can be found in the inventory of *Hebbe*,\(^ {287}\) and the donout-pans that can be found in the inventories of not only bakers Röhl and *Lychou*, which maybe should come as no surprise,\(^ {288}\) but also the painter *Hilleström*, who otherwise did not possess the furnishing necessary to invite guests,\(^ {289}\) as well as among of the investigated members of the *Skeppsbro-nobility*.\(^ {290}\) The presence of the donout-pans specifically in only these inventories suggests that especially this type of pastry was not in common spread among the burghers, but mainly centred to the professional bakers as well as individuals aiming to higher social echelons of status.

These many diverse and often very specialised pans, pots, and kettles, such as the fish-kettle, the pancake-pan, and the pate-forms, together with equally specialised utensils, such as the pancake-ladle, meat-forks, and sauce-bowls, not only tells us a great deal about the culinary fashions of the time, but more importantly means that these households had the means of serving multi-course dinners to their guests. The presence of both porcelain tureens and porcelain lettuce-boels in many of the household inventories, such as those of *Noer, Lüdberg, Hebbe, Krafft*, and *Gustava Rehn*, reinforces this interpretation as both these types of serving-porcelain would have helped keeping the food accessible either on the dinner-table or on an adjacent side-table.\(^ {291}\) Whether the different
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curses would have been brought to the table one at a time, which at the time slowly were becoming the fashionable custom, or all at the same time at the beginning of the dinner which was the older custom, is unclear and the objects found in the inventories could easily point both ways.\textsuperscript{292} The often ridiculous amount of plates owned by the people in question, together with the special dessert-plates and -utensils, does however suggest that the different courses would be brought out one at a time to be eaten on fresh plates, and perhaps but not necessarily with fresh utensils.

Large, and most probable lavish, dinner parties was not the only form available for the social visit, which instead like today could take many different forms of socialising. The probably most common type of socialising was with one or more friends over a cup of tea, something well exemplified by the large number of tea-pots and -cups found in the inventories. Vickery words it very well when she writes that “visiting pre-dated the arrival of exotic hot drinks, but tea super-fuelled the activity and became synonymous with it”.\textsuperscript{293} Tea was of course far from a new phenomenon at the end of the eighteenth century, but it was so important for the social life of the early modern individual that Vickery terms it one of the most necessary inventories for the cultured individual in England.\textsuperscript{294} The tea-ware found in the inventories of the Stockholm burgher elite suggests that the same relation to tea was present also in Sweden at the time.

Tea-ware is universally common among the investigated households, \textit{Pasch} of course exempt, and every households owned at least one set of porcelain tea-ware: tea-pot, tea-cup, tea-spoons, and small sugar-bowls. Almost all households also owned at least one, often more, samovars, or tea-kitchens as they were called in the records, either of silver or copper, usually. \textit{Oldenburg}, for example, owned three of them, one in silver, one termed “simple”, and one bronzed.\textsuperscript{295} Almost fully as common as tea, and well-spread among the burgher elites, appears coffee to have been. Almost all households owned coffee-roasters, -grinder, -pans, and -cans, only \textit{Pasch} and \textit{Westman} being exempt. But even if almost every household possessed the means to make coffee, no household owned any specialised coffee cups, as opposed to the many tea-cups counted among the records.

Compared to both tea and coffee, chocolate appears to have been extremely uncommon among the Stockholm burghers. Only three households owned the necessity cook- and serving-ware to properly serve chocolate, those of \textit{Noer}, \textit{Grill}, and \textit{Sergel}, which is one household from every investigated group.\textsuperscript{296} These households three households all owned chocolate-pans to cook chocolate in, even if \textit{Noer} was the only one who also owned a special chocolate-can and chocolate-
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cups, 16 of them, to serve the chocolate in.\textsuperscript{297} Sergel, however, did own a chocolate-bake plate, meaning that he most likely could serve chocolate as dessert to eventual guests.\textsuperscript{298} Whether this general lack of chocolate-related objects is due to chocolate still being rather uncommon in Sweden at the time, having gone out of fashion during the eighteenth century for some reason, or any other possible reason is unknown, but the ability to serve chocolate to guests must surely has been seen as both unique and exotic, and possibly reserved for only a cultured few among the burgher elite. If the serving of chocolate was more common among the nobility is unknown.

The actual dinner, even though it appears to have been central to the idea of the social visit, was by no means the sole focus. The large and lavish dinner party is suggested by Ponsonby to have been mainly the concern of families, as she writes that groups of independent women rather would socialise around tea and supper parties.\textsuperscript{299} The saloon or grand hall, the public centre of the home, was the natural place in the house to have the dinner table, but the social visit was by no means restricted to this particular room. As already discussed in the section on the furnishing of the home, every parlour and drawing room, and there were usually several of them, were furnished with their own sets of matching arm-chairs and sofas, often with different colour schemes between the different rooms. All of the rooms also had their own tea- or gaming-tables, natural focal points for socialisation, together with a broad arrange of other types of small tables as well as other objects of interest. Indeed almost every non-bedroom room of the house, and sometimes even the bedrooms themselves it appears, excluding the servants quarters and kitchens, appears to have been possible spaces for socialising.

And it would not only be over dinner or drinks, whether tea, coffee, or port, that these individuals and their guests would be socialising during the social visit. Already mentioned are the many musical instruments found among the households, almost always in the saloon, which would have been a natural focal point for entertainment, but present are also games of different kinds. In the households of \textit{Noer}, \textit{Gustava Rehn}, and \textit{Oldenburg} can be found what in the probate records are described as lotto-games,\textsuperscript{300} and in the home of \textit{Westman} was a pool table.\textsuperscript{301} These types of games can only be found in the probate records belonging to the more regular burghers, with both the artistic elite and the \textit{Skeppsbro-nobility} apparently settling for regular game tables over these larger, and possibly more social types of games. These types of games can be seen as a more leisured form of of popular entertainment than both the games presented by the game tables, most likely chess, backgammon, checkers, and cards, and the musical instruments also found among many of the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{297} Erik Noer, 1797
\textsuperscript{298} Johan Tobias Sergel, 1814
\textsuperscript{299} Ponsonby, 2007. p. 148
\textsuperscript{300} Erik Noer, 1797; Johanna Gustava Rehn, 1795; Carl Ernst Oldenburg, 1812
\textsuperscript{301} Abraham Lorentzon Westman, 1802
\end{flushleft}
inventories. Thus, their presence in the households of the regular burghers and their absence from the households of the Skeppsbro-nobility, suggests that these forms of entertainment held different values, of which the possibly more social and inclusive lotto-games and pool-tables were valued higher by the regular burghers than by the more socially ambitious Skeppsbro-nobility.

The early modern elite household not only sought to showcase their cultural capital, their sense for the fashionable and refined, through their furnishing of the house. By creating an efficient arena for social interaction, a place where not only people could meet and reinforce social connection but, more importantly, would want to meet to reinforce social connection, the early modern household in practice furnished for social capital to the same extent that it furnished for cultural capital. In its traditional definition, social capital lies in the possibility to use social relationships and networks to exchange capital assets into other capital, and with the early modern home in mind it almost appears as if social capital during this era might have been the main way of exchanging capital, and thus even more important than during later periods. According to sociologist Alejandro Portes, “the consensus is growing in the literature that social capital stands for the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures” and during early modern times the home stood at the centre of creating and upholding these social networks and structures. Social communities form the foundations for social capital, and capital exchange through social capital is constantly enforced through social control both including and excluding people from its advantages. The home and the social visit might have been one of the main arenas for upholding social control, through the including and excluding of people from the social visit. What is clear, is that the home clearly functioned as a major arena for sociability and the creation and upholding of social capital.

**Conclusion**

In traditional investigations into the cultural capital of the early modern individual the investigator would stress the presence of books and paintings in the home, the possibility of scientific instruments in the home such as the barometer, perhaps give some room for the musical instruments, and then make a great deal about education of the investigated individual. Even though all those considerations absolutely would be correct in assessing the cultural capital of an individual, it misses the question of representability and visibility, that is what type of cultural capital the individual claimed to have.

---

303 Portes, 1998. p. 6
304 Portes, 1998. p. 9 & pp. 15f
capital that would have been visible to others, and what type of capital the individual would have used to represent themselves to others. A traditional investigation would have missed that none to only a few of the books would have been stored visibly, for others to see and assess them, that the paintings very likely would have been restricted to a single room in the house, and that the musical instrument consistently were placed in the most public room of the house for maximum representation.

Most of all, however, a traditional investigation of early modern cultural capital would most likely have missed all the other ways available to the early modern individual and household to express, and thus acquire, cultural capital. Cultural capital has never been a static resource, restricted to but a few institutionalised manifestations, but rather constantly negotiated between the different groups of society all vying for capital advantage. As such the definitions and forms of cultural capital has always been under constant change, and every time needs to be analysed after its special and unique circumstances. Even more importantly, being under constant negotiation and competition cultural capital would have been needed to be constantly expressed and reinforced, the early modern individual would have needed a way to present their own capital assets for others to recognise and evaluate. By using the theoretical framework of Erving Goffman it can be recognised that individuals in interactions with others will strive to influence the definition of the situation and themselves in their own favour, and express themselves through well prepared scenes and actions that best will confer the sought after image of self, and embedded in this their intended capital assets. No space is better prepared for the setting and preparation of these scenes and acts than the home.

The early modern elite burgher spent a great deal of money and effort on their home, as is clearly evident by their probate records. Even if the specific location of the home does not appear to have been the most important aspect, even if the southern island appears to have been shunned if possible, the interior instead is furnished with both care and method. The owners clearly sought to create not only comfortable and aesthetically pleasing interiors, but more importantly fashionable interiors, seeking out both the newest fashions in furniture as well as keeping up-to-date with colours and fabrics to decorate with. They invested heavily in tables of different types and materials, chairs of different forms and functions, and objects needed to entertain guests, such as tea-pots and -cups, and plates and cook-ware.

In short, the early modern elite individual appears to have invested the most in sociability, the ability to invite and entertain guests in the home. Almost all the homes contain far more chairs and

305 Broady, 1991. p. 179
306 Goffman, 1959. p. 17 & p. 32
tables than would have been strictly necessary to just guarantee the comfort of the immediate family and friends, and especially when it comes to the serving of food and drinks does the importance of the social visit become important. Tea-ware was a must among the early modern elite, more a necessity than a proper option almost if one wanted to be able to express any cultural refinement in the home, and almost every household, with a single exception, owned all the necessities required for the serving of tea, from tea-pots and -cups to tea-pans, tea-kitchens (samovars), tea-spoons, as well as as sugar-bowls and -spoons.

The serving of food and drink did by no means end with tea- however. The most important aspect of the social visit appears to have been the dinner party, and it is in this field that some the greatest investments of the household can be found, short of the family wagon and the actual house itself. Almost all the households had enough knives, forks, glasses, plates, table-cloth, chairs, tables, and serving-ware to hold large and lavish dinner parties for at least a dozen guests, often more. Especially porcelain were highly invested in, and many households boasted several hundred dinner-plates of different sets as well as a high number of serving-plates and bowls of different kinds.

There appears to have been a difference between the different burgher groups in the collection of just porcelain, with the socially progressive Skeppsbro-nobility, who according to historical sources often would strive for nobility, collecting mainly “true”, Chinese porcelain while the more regular group of burghers appears to have preferred English porcelain. This difference is probably due to the symbolic status invested in the different types of porcelain, with the Chinese most likely having a lot more noble connotation and regarding as more conspicuous than the English porcelain, which probably were seen as a more frugal option, which would have better suited the image of thrift and responsibility associated with the coming nineteenth century bourgeoisie ideal.

Indeed, the ability to host a proper social visit, either just for tea or for lavish dinner parties, appears much more important than the ownership of either paintings or books. Instead these signs of educations, the classical marks of cultural capital, appear to be highly individual and subjected much more to personal taste and preference than the chairs tables, and porcelain. The front stage regions of the home are consistently furnished to both accommodate large number of guests and to show off the fashionability and culturability of the host, reinforcing and asserting the household capital assets. But not only for the host does the social visit appears to have been an integral part of the cultured self. For those individuals that for any reason lacked the means to host their own social visits, attending social visits instead appears to have been the obvious substitute, as perfectly exemplified by both the artists Per Hilleström and Per Krafft. These both lacked the means to host proper social visits at their home, Krafft not even owning a tea-pot, but instead appears to have invested all the more in the means to make a good impression at others social events. These
individuals owned the most impressive wardrobes of all the investigated households, with Pasch owning an impressive array of dinner jackets and hats, which would have allowed them to properly influence their own scenes despite having to influence over the general setting around them.

There is a clear connection in the probate record between the front region objects and all the different types of capital as presented by Bourdieu. A high economic capital was of course necessary for these elite individuals to create these scenes and furnish their homes in the way they did, but economic capital is by no means in the centre for most of these representations. Instead it is a symbolic capital that is expressed, cultural capital through the intimate knowledge of the fashions of the time and the proper uses of the many objects within the home, as well as through the time, effort, and interest invested into the purchase of all these objects, and their arrangements into proper and fashionable rooms. At the centre, however, was sociability.

There is an especially clear connection between the investments undertaken to furnish the house in a proper and fashionable way and the social visit. It was with the social visit in mind, the drinking of tea and the grand dinner party, that the home was constructed, furnished, and decorated. The symbolic capital as manifested in the home appears to have been especially geared towards facilitating a social capital; to impress guests and to transform the home from a place to live to somewhat of a hub of social interaction. To paraphrase historian Gudrun Andersson somewhat, the home not only becomes the main arena for social life, but social life appears to have become the main purpose for the home.307 The home of the early modern elite individual appears to have been a place to mainly foster and create social connections, a physical space for the creation of a cultured image of self for others to recognise, evaluate, and be impressed by. And when lacking the means to turn ones own home into this arena for social life, it appears as if the early modern individual substituted their own home with the homes of other, and instead invested in a portable front stage in the form of clothes, jewellery, and regalia.

This research field has with this study by no means been exhausted, not even closely so, and a great deal more research needs to be done to fully understand the mechanisms of cultural and social capital among not only the burgher elite of Stockholm, but ultimately the Swedish society as a whole. A possible next step could be to broaden the field of study to include not only many more individuals, but also individuals from the noble estate who can provide a good point of reference for a further study, especially considering the noble estate constituted the main proprietors of cultural capital during early modern times, having more or less monopoly on the institutions that decided on what constituted cultural capital. Not only the elite, the richest and most influential of the early modern populace, should be investigated, however, and normal people, everyday people, should

also be considered for such an extended investigation. Even if the institutionalised cultural assets might have been unavailable to these people, mainly due to their lack of economic capital, they would have had their own cultural capital, expressed differently from that of the elite groups.

Sociability and the importance of social connections, too, should be included more in further research, either as the main focus of its own investigation or as a part in a broader investigation on the symbolic capital structure of the early modern society. By investigating social structures, social connections, and the social visit in greater depth it should be possible to dis-assemble the social capital of the time and conclude what role it played in capital acquisitions. To this end social networks studies should be especially efficient, since those better than any other study can reconstruct social spheres, that is who socialised with whom. Especially a social network study on the famous Stockholm-based musician Carl Michael Bellman, who were well known for being part of many rich and influential individuals social spheres at the time, should be able to give great insight into the social structure of late eighteenth century Stockholm.
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### Appendix B, The investigated burgher elite.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Ordered alphabetically)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Life information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Abraham Lorentzon Westman     | 49  | 1802 | Alive   | Burgher | Brewer alderman and member of parliament. Good friend of Bellman and close acquaintance with Gustav III. Known during his own time as the “Brewer-king”.  
308 Forsstrund, 1916; Abraham Lorentzon Westman, 1802, p. 631 |
| Anders Bengtsson Lüdberg      | 73* | 1799 | Alive   | Burgher | Jeweler. Spokesman for the burgher estate at parliament 1789, appointed mayor of building and offices the same year.  
309 Flood & Palmgren, 1929; Anders Bengtsson Lüdberg, 1799, p. 330 |
| Carl Ernst Oldenburg          | 68  | 1812 (1813) | Dead** | Burgher | Goldsmith, member of parliament, member of the burgher’s 50 eldest during two terms. Mayor of justice, knight of the order of Wasa, and knight of the order of Par Bricole.  
310 Forsstrund, 1916; Carl Ernst Oldenburg, 1812, p. 277c |
| Carl Gottfried Küsel           | 67  | 1795 | Alive   | Skeppsbro-nobility | Wholesale-dealer and direr of the East India trading company.  
311 https://sok.riksarkivet.se/Sbl/Presentation.aspx?id=11911 (23-08-18, 17:31) |
| Erik Noer                     | 63* | 1797 | Dead    | Burgher | Wholesale dealer and cellarmaster with a pub at Tyska Brunn. Close friend to Sergel and entertained a wide and influential social circle.  
312 Forsstrund, 1916; Carl Gottfried Küsel, 1795, p. 635 |
| Jacob Röhl                    | 57  | 1783 | Alive   | Burgher | Baker alderman.  
313 Flood & Palmgren, 1929; Jacob Röhl, 1783, p. 496 |
| Johan Abraham Grill           | 80  | 1799 | Alive   | Skeppsbro-nobility | Wholesale-dealer and director of the East India trading company. Held several offices of administration within Stockholm. Knight of the order of Wasa, member of both the academy of science and the academy of music.  
314 http://www.mattiasloman.se/forskning/index.php?title=R%C3%B6hl (04-07-18, 13:06) |
| Johan Tobias Sergel           | 74  | 1814 | Dead    | Artist | Famous sculptor and artist, enjoyed royal patronage by both Gustav III & IV. Ennobled 1808 for his work.  
315 Flood & Palmgren, 1929; Jacob Röhl, 1783, p. 496 |
| Johan Pasch                   | 59  | 1811 | Never married | Artist | Member of the art academy, wholesale-dealer background.  
316 http://runeberg.org/nfbj/0178.html (23-08-18, 17:35) |
| Johanna Gustava               | 42  | 1795 | Alive   | Burgher | Wife of Rutger Fredrich Hochschild, secretary  

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nils Lychou</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1800 (1801)</td>
<td>Alive</td>
<td>Royal court-baker under both Gustav III and Gustav IV. Good friend of Bellman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pehr Hilleström</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>Painter and member of the art academy. Good friend with famous musician Bellman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Krafft</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1793 (1794)</td>
<td>Alive</td>
<td>Painter of portraits, originally from Arboga. Painted future king Gustav IV as child and youth, popular among the nobility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*According to the archive register
** Carl Ernst Oldenburg's wife died a month before him, according to the record, and the inventory is noted as being for them both.

---
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### Appendix C, The probate records: Executors and dates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probate Record (Ordered by date)</th>
<th>Present officials</th>
<th>Death / Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Röhl</td>
<td>Mayor of justice Carl Fredric Sebacer(?), Councilman Eric Ström, Assistant Johan Landberg, Notary Johan Norlin</td>
<td>11 July / 9 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pehr Krafft</td>
<td>Court Auditer &amp; Court Notary. Illegible signatures.</td>
<td>7 November / 31 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Gustava Rehn</td>
<td>Mayor of justice Carl Ulner, Councilman Carl Ernst Oldenburg, Assistant Carl Jacob Sandsvall, Notary Johan Norlin</td>
<td>1 June / 2 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Gottfried Küsel</td>
<td>Mayor of justice Carl Ulner, Councilman Eric Ström, Assistant Claes Gustaf Sandal, Notary Nils Ludvig Thåström</td>
<td>19 February / 16 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Noer</td>
<td>Mayor of justice Carl Ulner, Councilman Carl Ernst Oldenburg, Assistant Carl Lidmark, Notary Nils Ludvig Thåström</td>
<td>12 June / 13 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders Bengtsson Lüdberg</td>
<td>Mayor of justice (and knight of the order of the north star) Carl Ulner, Councilman Pehr Stenhammar, Assistant Johan Gustaf Bergman, Auditeur and Notary Adolph Fredrick Beckmarck, Officewriter Carl Ström.</td>
<td>21 January / 11 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Abraham Grill</td>
<td>Mayor of justice (and knight of the order of the north star) Carl Ulner, Councilman Fredric Schultz, Assistant Carl Lidmark, Notary Nils Ludvig Thåström</td>
<td>16 March / 5 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nils Lychou</td>
<td>Court Auditer (Same signature as Pehr Krafft), Court Notary (J. Hlätin(?))</td>
<td>28 December / 3 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lorentzon Westman</td>
<td>Mayor of Justice Anders Wallin, Councilman Johan Michelsson, Assistant Carl Lidmark, Notary Carl Ström</td>
<td>25 March / 7 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Bernard Hebbe</td>
<td>Mayor of Justice (and knight of the order of the north star) Anders Wallin, Councilman Johan Michaelsson, Assistant Carl Lidmark, Notary Carl Ström</td>
<td>26 February / 23 Juni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Pasch</td>
<td>Court Auditer (Same signature as both Krafft and Lychou), Court Notary (Same signature as Lycho)</td>
<td>15 June / 16 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Ernst Oldenburg</td>
<td>Mayor of justice (and knight of the order of the north star) Anders Wallin, Councilman Johan Hendrik Hochschild, Assistant Abraham Gottfried Blix, Assistant Carl Hidmarck, Estatenotary Councilman Håkan Carl Ekebom</td>
<td>21 November / 25 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Tobias Sergel</td>
<td>Illegible signatures, 1 or 2)</td>
<td>26 February / 21, 22, 24, 26, 31 March &amp; 1, 2 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pehr Hilleström</td>
<td>Court Auditer (New signature), Court Notary (Same signature as Lycho and Pasch)</td>
<td>13 August / 16 September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D, Map of Residences

Illustration 1: Map of Stockholm, 1733 annotated with the residences of the investigated burghers

2. Anders Bengtson Lüberg. Adolph Fredrik's Församling, kv. Ormträsket, just outside the map
3. Carl Ernst Oldenburg. Helgehandsholmen, kv Norbro
4. Carl Gottfried Küsel, St Nicolai Församling, Skeppsbron
5. Erik Noer, St Nicolai Församling, Stadsholmen. Unknown, somewhere on the central island.
9. Johan Pasch, St Nicolai Församling, Stora Nygatan
10. Johanna Gustava Rehn. Adolph Fredrik's Församling, Malmskillnadsgatan
12. Pehr Hilleström. St. Maria Församling, Kv. Rosendal
14. Simon Bernard Hebbe, Riddarhomen, house F (approximately), "Hebberska Huset"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Ordered alphabetically)</th>
<th>Mahogany tables</th>
<th>Other mahogany furniture</th>
<th>Tea-tables</th>
<th>Game-tables</th>
<th>Dinner chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lorentzon Westman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>c. 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders Bengtsson Lüdberg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Ernst Oldenburg</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Gottfried Küsel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Noer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Röhl</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Abraham Grill</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Tobias Sergel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Pasch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Gustava Rehn</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nils Lychou</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pehr Hilleström</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Krafft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Bernard Hebbe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix F, Traditional objects of Cultural refinement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Ordered alphabetically)</th>
<th>Number of Books</th>
<th>Book-cases, -shelves, -cupboards</th>
<th>Paintings</th>
<th>Paper prints</th>
<th>Musical instruments</th>
<th>Scientific instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lorentzon Westman</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>Barometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders Bengtsson Lüdberg</td>
<td>c. 108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Ernst Oldenburg</td>
<td>Unknown (probably many)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73 37 copper engravings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>Camera Optica Magnets Barometer Electricity machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Gottfried Küsel</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>Barometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Noer</td>
<td>c. 78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Base violin Alto violin</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Röhl</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Abraham Grill</td>
<td>c. 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (more removed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Harpsichord</td>
<td>Barometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Tobias Sergel</td>
<td>c. 220</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Pasch</td>
<td>Unknown &quot;few&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>2 portfolios*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Gustava Rehn</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nils Lychou</td>
<td>Unknown (probably few)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Barometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pehr Hilleström</td>
<td>c. 42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Krafft</td>
<td>Unknown &quot;small&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41*</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Bernard Hebbe</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Thermometer Barometer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only counted are those found within the home proper, and not in studios. How many of these that might have been of the artists own making is, however, unknown.
## Appendix G, Dinner- and Tea-ware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Ordered alphabetically)</th>
<th>Flat plates</th>
<th>Flat plates</th>
<th>Sets of knives and forks (silver)</th>
<th>Dessert-ware (silver utensils)</th>
<th>Tea-sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lorentzon Westman</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>288 English</td>
<td>72 forks no knives</td>
<td>46 spoons 28 knives, forks</td>
<td>Chinese cups English pots Saxony cups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders Bengtsson Lüdberg</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24 forks no knives</td>
<td>24 knives, forks, spoons.</td>
<td>Chinese pot and cups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Ernst Oldenburg</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>167 Swedish</td>
<td>36 12 “smaller”</td>
<td>54 spoons, 36 knives, forks 35 plates</td>
<td>Chinese cups English pot Swedish cups “other” pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Gottfried Küsel</td>
<td>Set of 105</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24 knives, forks 49 spoons 18 knives, forks 102 plates</td>
<td>Chinese pots and cups other cups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Noer</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>360 60 earthenware</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18 spoons 16 cups for chocolate</td>
<td>Chinese cups Swedish pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Röhl</td>
<td>Set of 9</td>
<td>About 23 dozen Swedish</td>
<td>4 sets of 12</td>
<td>12 plates</td>
<td>Chinese cups Swedish pot and cups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Abraham Grill</td>
<td>Set of 216</td>
<td>54 English</td>
<td>37 forks 36 knives</td>
<td>24 spoons, forks 48 plates</td>
<td>Chinese pots and cups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Tobias Sergel</td>
<td>84 English</td>
<td>22 forks</td>
<td>12 knives</td>
<td>Chinese pots and cups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Pasch</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>“Pair of knives” unclear material</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Gustava Rehn</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>144 English</td>
<td>24 forks 18 knives 24 knives in “False silver”</td>
<td>18 forks, spoons 36 plates</td>
<td>Chinese pot and cups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nils Lychou</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>84 English</td>
<td>29 forks Set of 36 knives and forks</td>
<td>24 spoons, 14 plates</td>
<td>Chinese cups Swedish pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pehr Hilleström</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11, old or cheap material</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Swedish pot and cups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Krafft</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>72 English</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12 plates</td>
<td>Saxony pots and cups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Bernard Hebbe</td>
<td>Set of 60</td>
<td>Up to 36 English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24 knives, forks, spoons</td>
<td>Chinese pot and cups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>