

THE ROUTLEDGE HISTORY OF THE DOMESTIC SPHERE IN EUROPE

16th to 19th Century

Edited by Joachim Eibach and Margareth Lanzinger

 Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

 FWF
Der Wissenschaftsfonds.



universität
wien

u^b

UNIVERSITÄT
BERN

First published 2020
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2020 Joachim Eibach and Margareth Lanzinger

The right of Joachim Eibach and Margareth Lanzinger to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Eibach, Joachim, 1960- editor. | Lanzinger, Margareth, editor.

Title: The Routledge history of the domestic sphere in Europe : 16th to 19th century / edited by Joachim Eibach and Margareth Lanzinger.

Description: Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY : Routledge, 2021. | Series: The Routledge histories | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2020028664 | ISBN 9780367143671 (hardback) | ISBN 9780429031588 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Families--Europe--History. | Households--Europe--History.

Classification: LCC HQ611 .R68 2021 | DDC 306.85094--dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020028664>

ISBN: 978-0-367-14367-1 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-429-03158-8 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by River Editorial Ltd, Devon, UK

18

FROM OPEN HOUSE TO PRIVACY?

Domestic life from the perspective
of diaries

Joachim Eibach

Introduction

When understood as a changeable social space, the history of the modern family forms interconnections with the history of the domestic sphere. For a long time, it has been an uncontested assumption that the emergence of a genuinely new family type resulted from the privatization of family life. According to this view, we can observe a fundamental shift from an early modern open and socially heterogeneous ‘household family’ to a modern closed and homogeneous ‘nuclear family’.¹ With the closure of private family life towards its social environments, the co-presence of other actors disappeared. At the same time, distinctive separate spheres of men and women emerged. While men acted in public and fulfilled their roles as breadwinners outside the household, the daily life of female housekeepers within newly erected and embellished homes was domesticated. In this process, which from the mid-eighteenth century onwards successively affected all European countries, the bourgeois – or rather the middle-class – family was attributed a pioneering role.

What on initial inspection could be regarded as a rather simple change in the sense and the practice of family life, at a second glance turns out to be a transformation, intertwined with the manifold economic, socio-cultural and political shifts of the transitional period around 1800. It should be mentioned here that not only the rise of the bourgeoisie but also a new definition of ‘work’ in the emerging age of capitalism and new legal statutes had an impact on family and gender roles. Furthermore, a new emphasis on both emotions and refined education (*Bildung*) emerged at the core of spousal and parent–child relations. While privacy is a multi-semantic concept, the new bourgeoisie with its hegemonic cultural aspirations, combined with a desire for social distinction, celebrated and propagated domesticity. In this sense, domesticity “denotes not just a pattern of residence or a web of obligations, but a profound attachment: a state of mind as well as a physical orientation”.² It encompasses a specifically arranged family space, pleasant comfort and, moreover, a hideaway from the daily hassle of work and

society at large. The new and at first genuinely bourgeois concept of domesticity was based on closure and the demarcation between the home (*Daheim, Zuhause*) and its social environments.

The construct of the private/public-dichotomy has been criticized as being all too simplistic. Regarding social interaction, not only the early modern household but, to some extent, also the nineteenth-century bourgeois home was open. Still, many issues need to be researched in more depth. Did everyday life in the domestic sphere mirror the underlying idea of privatization of the home, and if so, in what ways? To what extent did husband and wife act in separate spheres? How was this spelled out in different milieus? In order to gain insight into domestic life, self-narratives provide excellent source material. This chapter will rely on three diaries from Switzerland and Germany. The first source is the diary of Henriette Stettler-Herport (1738–1805), a woman from the patrician elite of the city republic of Bern.³ At the age of 17 she married the future councilman Rudolf Stettler. They had eight children, five of which survived the first year of life. Her *Journal de mes actions*, written from 1771 to 1789, partly in French, partly in German bears witness to a complex personality. We can distinguish between two major influences: her family, kin and social relations were patrician, but her mind was Pietist. Other from this, she uses well-known concepts of the Enlightenment in her diary: ‘morality’, ‘virtue’, ‘thriftiness’ and ‘bettering’. Although Henriette Stettler-Herport never visited Pietist meetings, her diary is clearly based on Pietistic self-reflection and confessions, and is primarily directed by the wish to spiritualize her unsatisfactory domestic life as the wife of the bailiff Rudolf Stettler in the Bernese bailiwick Frienisberg.⁴ In 1777, she and her family moved to the city of Bern, where Stettler pursued his career in the city republic’s administration. Overall, she wished to give her days a pious discipline by keeping record of deviance and disturbances. Peculiarly, beside her written entries she also used checklists to record the state of her emotional life, her vices and mistakes, and the number of visitors the family received.

The diary of Ursula Bruckner-Eglinger (1797–1876) serves as our second source. She was the wife of a Reformed pastor in the village of Binningen, located just outside Basel and kept the diary from 1816 to 1833.⁵ Ursula Bruckner-Eglinger was born into a family of pastors that belonged to the ‘Brethren’s Congregation from Herrnhut’. The *Herrnhuter* were not a marginal protestant sect, and her family was accordingly related to the affluent Basel bourgeoisie. The affinity between the city’s *Bürgertum* and Pietism gave the city the reputation of ‘the pious Basel!’⁶ In 1819, Ursula Eglinger married Abraham Bruckner, a pastor from *Basel Landschaft*, of whom, when he proposed marriage to her, she hardly knew. She subsequently gave birth to four children. Like the wife of the bailiff, she was supported in keeping the household of the parsonage (*Pfarrhaus*) by several female servants, and sometimes by additional day labourers from the village. An important aspect in Ursula’s life, before and during marriage, were her numerous social contacts. She spent much of her time with her siblings, cousins and close female friends from Basel. In her diary she recorded her visits and encounters, events of family life, and also her changing state of mind. Like Henriette, in the given framework of Pietist beliefs, Ursula perceived her domestic life as becoming increasingly unsatisfactory.

The third source is the voluminous diary of the Hamburg lawyer Ferdinand Beneke (1774–1848). Making entries almost every day, Beneke kept his journal over several decades. Although not particularly well off and in spite of coming from another town, he, in 1807, managed to marry Caroline von Axen, the granddaughter of a Hamburg senator from the social and political elite of the Hanseatic city republic. Together they had six children. Beneke’s diary served several purposes. Meticulously he kept track of his daily life,

noting all events of family life, recording his immensely numerous social contacts, of which many took place in the home of the Benekes, and reflecting on his sense of self. In many respects, the diary of the jurist, with strong links to the Hamburg merchant elite, may also be read as a typical testimony of bourgeois subjectivity. Beneke was deeply engaged with his *Beruf* (profession) and held several honorary posts, seeking self-affirmation through *Bildung* (refined education) and self-reflection, and pursuing happiness through emotionalized relations with his wife and children. The examination of his diary will focus on the years from 1811 to 1816, which encompassed several years of routine family life and a year of separation of the spouses due to the French occupation of Hamburg and Beneke's subsequent flight out of town from May 1813 until May 1814.⁷ During this time Beneke's wife Caroline was in charge of the family affairs.

The selection of these three diaries is the result of comparative research in archives and libraries. In German-speaking countries, during the transition from the *Ancien régime* to bourgeois society, the old elites of affluent cities, the protestant *Pfarrhaus* and the new learned free professions were pivotal milieus for the formation of the new *Bürgertum*.⁸ Remarkably, women wrote numerous diaries during this period from a Pietist background.⁹ Diverging from Beneke's daily notes, their chief purpose was the wish to lead a truly pious life and keep a journal of their dialogue with God. However, perhaps unnoticed, other purposes could emerge. Explicit entries or reading between the lines of the diaries allow the researcher to observe social practices in the domestic sphere. So far, the diaries of Stettler-Herport and Bruckner-Eglinger have never been analysed as a source of family history. Beneke's journal has been highlighted in terms of a gender history of the bourgeoisie.¹⁰

State of research: diaries, demarcation and the question of privatization

Diaries as source

For the author, the diary can fulfil different functions. It may serve as a confession, with the aim of bettering one's sinful life, or merely as a family chronicle. The implicit recipient can be God or the alter ego of the author. Clearly, writing a diary in the nineteenth century had other ideological and symbolic implications than in the early modern period. Diaries were written within certain frameworks and with underlying narrative conventions. During the course of modern history, these contexts and conventions changed. Michel Foucault counted diaries amongst the "technologies of the self" with roots which he traced back to ancient times.¹¹ From a different perspective, the increasing number of diaries in the age of Enlightenment, of Pietism and of rising bourgeois values proves the unfolding of modern subjectivity.¹² It is unlikely to be a mere coincidence that the same period of time counts as the age of the awakening modern family, which fostered individuality, self-reflection and demarcation from the outside world.¹³ Leaving that discussion aside, diaries provide rich source material with regard to daily practice in the domestic sphere.¹⁴ They are not confined to a protocol of interaction within the nuclear family, but also cover other types of encounters in the domestic sphere. Frequently mentioned in the examples under observation are close relatives and servants, living with the 'nuclear family', clients and colleagues, friends and guests who enter the household (whether invited or not).

Diaries certainly offer more information to the reader than the authors may realize themselves. The fact that these texts often lack coherence may be seen as another advantage: even if the author follows a consistent narrative – she or he might as well not – entries made after a long day of work and activity may still deviate from it. Diaries include surprise

and paraphernalia. The fact that the pastor's wife from Basel wrote her diary to improve her deficient Christian life clearly corresponds with Foucault's 'technologies of the self'. Yet, Ursula Bruckner-Eglinger's diary documents, among other things, how much she cherished sociability with her family and friends. According to an entry on 2 September 1824, she "enjoyed [...] a glass of magnificent beer" without any sign of repentance.¹⁵

While during the age of social history researchers hardly made use of such self-narratives, diaries and letters have, with the advent of cultural and family history, become preferred sources. Ground-breaking studies in the United Kingdom and in the German-speaking countries were based on – or at least included evidence from – diaries. Meanwhile, the classic study of Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall on *Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780–1850*, first published in 1987, not only included quantitative sources but also drew on diaries, letters and family records.¹⁶ Amanda Vickery's inquiries into the homes of Georgian England relied on diaries and correspondence to shed light on *Women's Lives* and supplement the bare notes and numbers recorded in inventories and account books.¹⁷ Diaries proved valuable when reassessing the role and place of men in the context of bourgeois domesticity both in the German *Sattelzeit* and in Victorian England, as analysed by Anne-Charlott Trepp and John Tosh.¹⁸ Following this approach, the microhistory of a bourgeois family in South Germany by Rebekka Habermas scrutinized diaries and other ego documents with regard to bourgeois family culture.¹⁹ As for the history of the domestic sphere in Swiss bourgeois society, the comprehensive studies of Albert Tanner and Elisabeth Joris must be mentioned.²⁰ In short, a systematic reading of diaries, among other self-narratives, has led to a new understanding of social interaction in the domestic sphere at the turn of the eighteenth into the nineteenth century, particularly challenging the public/private dichotomy.

Grand theory and macro-sociology

Several influential philosophers and sociologists – with otherwise diverse approaches – appraise demarcation in the sense of privacy, or rather intimacy, as the crucial aspect of the emerging modern family. According to Jürgen Habermas's theory of *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, the emergence of the 'public sphere' was inextricably linked to the formation of a 'private sphere'. For Habermas, critical reasoning first started in the age of Enlightenment with the advent of subjectivity in the homes of the bourgeois "conjugal family", whose "private sphere" and "permanent intimacy" he sees existing in a genuinely different manner from both the habitus of prestigious representation of the nobility and the openness of the "extended family" of the lower strata.²¹ Of particular interest here are two aspects: in contrast to family sociologists, Habermas delineates the family home not as a *Refugium*, entirely opposed to the constraints of capitalist society but rather as "an agency of society", responsible for the observance and the seemingly voluntary introduction of the family members into overall social rules.²² The public/private demarcation does not always separate the family home from its social environment but may run through the fabric of the domestic sphere. While the living room belonged to the sphere of family intimacy, the *salon* served as a site for invitations and public, quasi-political conversation.²³

While emotions and gender in Jürgen Habermas's model bear no importance, in other theories the transformation of emotions, ascribed to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, is linked not only to the history of the home but also to changing gender roles. For

Anthony Giddens, the rise of intimate “romantic love” corresponded with “the creation of the home” and the introduction of separate spheres for men and women.²⁴ Accordingly, women’s daily lives were secluded from public life and romantic love appears to have been feminized love. Conversely, men had limited access to the new sphere of intimacy in the home, which was dominated by emotionalized motherhood.

For Niklas Luhmann, the emergence of love as a specifically modern code of intimised communication was preconditioned by processes of functional differentiation of society and therefore by demarcation of the loving couple from strict social control in the elites. This happened from the late seventeenth century onwards. Emotionalized love of individual actors became the chief reason for marriage. According to Luhmann, the loving couple’s intimate communication is situated in a bubble of seclusion (“circular closedness”, “self-referential closedness”).²⁵ At this point, he introduces demarcation of the domestic sphere to his argument. Only through the loss of its productive and political functions is the formerly all-responsible household transformed into a home with a private sphere, which allows the family members enclosed intimacy. “Any intimacy one could hope for was related to the household.”²⁶

The history of the modern family in overviews and cultural studies

With regard to privacy, or rather social demarcation as the crucial aspect in the initial phase of the modern family, overviews and classical texts of the history of the European family correspond, to a large degree, with the above-mentioned sociological narratives. At an imagined starting point, functional differentiation or even the loss of functions of the early modern household in terms of production, education and political rights, etc. allowed for the demarcation of a private sphere, now open to emotionalized family relations.²⁷ Of decisive importance was “the separation of home from work”.²⁸ The contemporary construct of ‘the domestic realm’, proclaimed with the aspiration of moral superiority, must be seen against the backdrop of an emerging capitalist and industrialized society. According to Mary Jo Maynes,

the creation of a corresponding ‘private’ mirrored and opposed the ‘public’. It was apolitical and anti-competitive, centred on homes that were increasingly segregated from workplaces, scrutiny, and traffic of all sorts. It was a world of particularity, accessible by invitation only. It was a world dominated by women and children.²⁹

Initially, the bourgeoisie, in particular the English middle class, played a leading role in advocating the new model of domesticity. Following this both the nobility and the working class more or less copied the bourgeois role model.³⁰ According to volume IV of the *Histoire de la vie privée*, edited by Michelle Perrot, the nineteenth century was “the golden age of private life”.³¹ Select sociability, intimate emotions and separate spheres of men and women were interwoven aspects of a specific lifestyle. In other words, privatization came along with a tightening of distinct gender roles of the male breadwinner and the female housewife.³² Separate gender spheres and strict gender roles were observed in otherwise rather diverse European societies, not only in England and Germany but also in the urban contexts of a society without a landed aristocracy and a comparatively late industrialization such as Switzerland.³³

Yet, from the late 1980s onwards, when new knowledge on clear-cut private spheres and gender roles had just reached the heights of handbook chapters, it was challenged by

a number of monographs based on the analysis of diaries and private correspondence. As mentioned above, the cultural historical turn towards actors and social practice in history proved very productive. Inspired by ongoing gender debates, the fresh perspective yielded several surprising results. In particular, the concept of 'private life' turned out to be questionable and only partly useful. As for the English middle class Davidoff and Hall had already argued: "Public was not really public and private not really private despite the potent imagery of 'separate spheres'".³⁴ As for the mushrooming populace, Arlette Farge's study *La vie fragile* shed light on everyday life in the neighbourhoods of the metropolis of Paris. Relying mainly on criminal court records, Farge highlights the fact that for the urban poor, open living spaces and intense social control hardly allowed for any private sphere.³⁵ Without a doubt, the study of domestic spheres throughout the nineteenth century must distinguish carefully between different milieus and social contexts.

In short, the following arguments have been raised against the twofold aspect of intensified privacy and new separate spheres as key issue of the age of transition. The first argument addresses continuity. In terms of patriarchal structure and cooperation in daily practice, continuity as opposed to change prevailed from the seventeenth to the mid-nineteenth centuries.³⁶ "In some respects, there was an accentuation of differences as men withdrew from some household tasks, motherhood became more highly valued"; but overall, "the continuities in gender roles across this long period remain striking".³⁷ The second argument points to an obvious discrepancy between theory and practice. Despite the gendered cult of domesticity, men spent considerable time in the home while women left their home to participate in sociability outside. "The domesticates of the morning were the polite adventurers of the afternoon."³⁸ In line with Jürgen Habermas's theory, the third argument highlights the public – or quasi-public – functions of the allegedly purely private domestic sphere. On a number of occasions the home was turned into a stage of representation and beyond: ritualized family reunions, coffee parties including female neighbours, domestic devotion taking place in religious circles, repeated conversation over newly published novels, meetings of political allies and business friends. Such occasions included men as well as women. As hostesses, genteel women of Georgian England, women from the Swiss urban aristocracy and the wives of entrepreneurs in nineteenth-century Germany played a highly visible role in society.³⁹ Moreover, women often fulfilled the task of ensuring social ties and family solidarity to the extent that we can speak of a "feminization of private sociability".⁴⁰ Yet, the culture of visit was not confined to women and men of society. The social scope, professional routines, regional characteristics and historical trajectory of the actors remain open, as does the question of innovation and polarization in gender roles.⁴¹

Work in the domestic sphere

Was work in the process of transforming early modern households into modern private spheres abandoned in the domestic realm? Here, it makes a difference to define work either solely as paid work or rather as different undertakings, not necessarily paid, with which the actors tried to "secure a living for themselves and those close to them".⁴² If sustenance activities in a broader sense, managerial tasks and representational efforts are included, the picture changes drastically. Following this vein, the three diaries from Bern, Basel and Hamburg prove that the domestic was the place of intense work activity. At the same time, work in the observed middle-class milieus cannot simply be confined to activities inside or outside the home.

For example, the local bailiff Rudolf Stettler spent most of his time at his mansion-like domicile in the rural bailiwick of Frienisberg, a former monastery which encompassed office rooms, rooms for the family and for guests. During the latter part of the eighteenth century, in principle the rooms for administration and the domestic space were separated, however the father could still use the room set aside for official hearings to read to his family.⁴³ While Stettler held audiences, made ordinances and visitations, acted as judge and met other officials of the district, Henriette Stettler-Herport coordinated the household, which comprised her and her husband, the growing number of children, about seven servants and an ever-changing number of guests. In 1772, after a long pause, she took up her diary again and explicitly listed her obligations: "I have to keep my household in order, educate my children, save them from bad examples, watch my servants, live economically and modestly, do good to my next, work with my hands".⁴⁴ The wife of the bailiff did not cook herself, but instructed her servants, shopped frequently in the nearby city of Bern and took care of all invoices. She also educated their children through home schooling and played the role of hostess, serving and entertaining the often high-ranking visitors. The revenues of the bailiff encompassed the fields and pasture of the bailiwick. During harvest, as Henriette Stettler-Herport noted with some pride, the household employed up to 70 harvesters.⁴⁵ Other taxing jobs were the big wash, which in spite of the help of several washing and ironing women could – in the case of bad weather – take up to two weeks, and the slaughtering of pork at the beginning of the year.⁴⁶ Overall, the sustenance activities of the bailiff's wife are more reminiscent of those of the manager of a medium-sized enterprise than of a typical bourgeois housewife.

Fifty years later, the requirement profile of the Reformed pastor's wife from Basel included both similar and different tasks. While Ursula Bruckner-Eglinger hardly mentioned details of her husband's working life – Abraham Bruckner appeared primarily as a *Berufsmensch*, deeply engaged and focused on his pastoral obligations – she repeatedly provided insight into her own daily activities. As the pastor's wife Ursula was expected to fulfil certain duties: she went to service and Communion, to Bible class and sang in church. She also undertook pastoral visits in the homes of the parish. On Sundays, when the weather was bad, she would act as a substitute for the housefather and read a sermon to all members of the household: *der sämtlichen Hausgenossenschaft*.⁴⁷ Aside from such participatory and pastoral duties, a large garden with potatoes and vegetables was attached to the parsonage, and chickens were kept in an adjoined building. With the help of the servants, Ursula looked after the garden and the agricultural produce.⁴⁸ She also involved herself in tasks that required manual labour, again, washing duties were described as extremely taxing, despite the help of the three servants and additional washer women from the village. To get things done, the washing day would start at half past two in the morning.⁴⁹ As in the bailiwick, the preparation of meals and the serving of visitors were very time-consuming. Meetings of the pastors, *Herren* and friends in the home could take on a rather formal character. On 6 September 1832, Ursula noted, "Tonight, we had the association of friends at our place, so I had to prepare things all day long".⁵⁰ The following day she remarked: "The whole morning, I was very busy with clearing and cleaning up".⁵¹ Other than this, she worried that although the evening in general seemed to have gone well, the starter of the course had been insufficient, while, as her husband mentioned, the dessert was too heavy.⁵²

In contrast to the *Ancien régime* Frienisberg, the children of Ursula and Abraham went to school in Basel. Nonetheless, the upbringing and education of the four children was a heavy burden on the mother's shoulders. Not confining herself to reading passages from the Bible

or singing songs with her children, Ursula was very concerned with teaching her children literacy, and she noted in her diary their successes and failures in school.⁵³ In tears, she bemoaned the fact it was only up to her and the nanny to look after the children while her husband was always busy with his theological studies.⁵⁴ Clearly, it is difficult to draw a direct line between work in a strict sense and other activities, indeed, Ursula Bruckner-Eglinger definitively described her daily activities as ‘work’. Increasingly, she felt stressed due to her heavy workload, causing her to miss her daily prayers: “This week, nothing came about except work. Sometimes, I got up and lay down again without praying, I can only sigh, always with work on my mind. I felt like a beast of burden”.⁵⁵ Despite the introduction of public schooling it is hard to discern a loss of functions of the household, which allowed for more private time and intimate relations in the domestic sphere.

Prima facie, the multi-volume diary of the Hamburg lawyer differs considerably from the first two examples. It is written from the perspective of a male housefather. Though a religious person, Ferdinand Beneke was not a Pietist, but a member of the educated bourgeoisie, an outright *Bildungsbürger*. While in terms of profession and social standing, patrician office-bearers and Protestant pastors bridged the gap between the early modern and nineteenth-century bourgeois society, learned jurists clearly belonged to the new elite. Beneke’s normal working day involved getting up at 7 a.m., spending a “coffee and family hour” with his wife Caroline until 9 a.m., receiving clients in his home study, going to court or to the stock exchange, sometimes taking a walk, having lunch with his family around 4 p.m., continuing to work alone at home, receiving more clients or going out, doing more work in his study until 9 or 10 p.m., then spending time with his wife (*bey Karoline*) and often with friends, and finally going to bed at 11 p.m.⁵⁶ It was not unusual to have 20 or 30 visits of clients in his home per day. The fact that Beneke worked and received clients on Christmas Day in 1811, instead of spending time with his children was remarked on with sorrow. The amount of clients made him think of fixed consultation hours, which he actually did not have or observe.⁵⁷ Beneke’s diaries hardly mention the daily household chores such as going shopping, preparing the meals or doing the washing. Moreover, it is much harder to reconstruct the agenda of Caroline Beneke. Although the Benekes were in debt, they kept two female servants and one male servant.⁵⁸ Even during the time of Ferdinand’s exile, a result of his position as a leader of the Hamburg burgher militia, and the French occupation – which exacerbated the financial situation of the family enormously – Caroline employed a female cook named Marie.⁵⁹ After her husband’s return to Hamburg and their joint return to their home at the end of May 1814, it was her task to reinstate the household.⁶⁰ However, it was also Caroline who took care of their finances during his long absence and repeatedly urged him to make his clients pay their outstanding bills. When in 1816 Ferdinand finally managed to reach the lucrative position of a syndic of Hamburg, he owed this advancement not least to his wife Caroline. Firstly thanks to her family background, in particular the influence of her well-known and well-connected father, and secondly as a good wife, household manager and eloquent hostess, she contributed to his standing as *Bürger* and *Patriot*.

Evidently, these three examples shed light on the domestic sphere as a location of hard work, the largest part of the occupational activities of Rudolf Stettler, Abraham Bruckner and Ferdinand Beneke being accomplished at home. The activities of their wives contributed immensely to the sustenance of the household and family and to their advancement.

Private family life or all-penetrating co-presence?

These three sources highlight the fact that, in the milieus under observation, the domestic sphere was still ‘open house’ to an amazing degree.⁶¹ At the same time, the diaries demonstrate

a wish for more privacy, in the general sense of spending 'quality time' with one's spouse and children, without the company of others. The latter is primarily evident for Henriette Stettler-Herport, and to a lesser degree for Ursula Bruckner-Eglinger and Ferdinand Beneke.

As briefly mentioned above, Henriette kept checklists of her vices and mistakes against God, her husband, her children and servants with the aim of perfecting her life. However, she also kept a record of the numerous visitors and visits that she and her husband received and made. Somewhat surprisingly, in her diary she juxtaposed lists of her mistakes on one page with lists of visits and sociability on the other page. But why did she keep records of both and in the same way? The answer is that every guest and visitor, both in the Frienisberg domicile and after the family's move to nearby Bern in 1777, took time away from her which she rather would have spent reading on her own, teaching her children and keeping her household in good order. This increased when visitors and guests came unannounced, which happened frequently. At times it is not fully clear what she counted: days, events or visitors. But with her lists at hand we can distinguish between visitors who stayed for one night or for several days, guests coming for dinner or tea, short and long visits, etc. She also listed her own sociable activities and the days or nights when she and her family were on their own. The outcome is quite clear: the lists prove an enormous number of visits and visitors. In 1776, still in the bailiwick, the Stettler-Herports welcomed 90 visitors who stayed overnight and 362 visitors without overnight accommodation. In 1780, now living in the city, they had only 47 guests who stayed overnight, however, throughout the year they had to cope with 812 daytime visitors. During the same time period, the number of visits with meals increased from 371 to 595.⁶²

Above that, patterns of domestic sociability changed with the move from the countryside to the city. While the hitherto large number of visitors with overnight stays decreased, the burden due to more short visits increased. Aside from this, the number of days that Henriette spent entirely on her own, or with her family, decreased, the quantified results matching the daily statements in her diary. Time and again, Henriette Stettler-Herport complained about too many visitors and lack of time for herself and her family. Her entries shed light on the practice of sociability in the Bernese *haute société*. A few months after the family's return to Bern she remarked:

Very rarely I go out during the morning – very rarely too I eat out of home – once in months at my mum's – the children once a week, in the afternoon at times there are dealings and little visits to be received, I myself do as few visits as possible and if possible rather work until 4 o'clock, then I get dressed to go into company at evening, since I have about 70 homes and good relatives and friends at whose places I spend the evening and vice versa they at mine, so for me few evenings remain to stay at home on my own, could I live according to my likings, I went out in big company very rarely.⁶³

One year later, she noted again:

I withdraw from everything as much as I can, but because I have to do almost 80 visits – I rarely can stay home alone – if I went to every place only once [...] and on top of that the days at which I receive visits at home, the winter would be almost over, [...] rarely can I read, I can hardly dedicate time to my children, all that makes me reluctant – then I am discouraged, sad – crabby.⁶⁴

Henriette Stettler-Herport was not unsociable. She particularly appreciated time spent with her husband, with her oldest daughter and with a few female friends among her cousins. So, why did she participate in the culture of visit and sociability at all? Here, her ambitious husband and the prevailing social environment come into play. In the preface of her diary, she already mentions a constant conflict between her and her husband: “a real chagrin for my husband, who in contrast likes to have people over often”.⁶⁵ For Rudolf, who wanted to climb the ladder of administrative aristocracy, the distinct culture of hospitality of the Bernese society was indispensable. In sharp contrast, Henriette preferred and asked for more privacy. Shortly after their move to the remote bailiwick, the 34-year-old mother of two children expressed her idea of family life:

I am awaiting with impatience the return of my husband, I would like to always have my husband and my children at home, hence live quiet *en famille*, have only visits of my next relatives or the most intimate friends, and that only once a week, the other time I would like to spend in my household, for the education of my children, for the promenade, reading, work, that would be the greatest happiness.⁶⁶

For the pious Henriette Stettler-Herport, more privacy meant more time for contemplation, the study of sermons and the education of her children. Aside from this, the above statement can be read as an agenda on the path towards bourgeois family life.

The contrast between the time-consuming co-presence of different actors due to the necessity of sociability, and an eminent wish for more privacy appears less sharp in the other two journals. Above that, the diary of Bruckner-Eglinger suggests we should not consider the transition from the early modern open house to the modern family home a one-way road with a clear-cut end. Other than her heavy workload managing the household of the parsonage, Ursula enjoyed most of her social life. Her core social network encompassed strong and deeply emotional ties with her parents, her brothers and sister and long-time female friends. Apparently, most of them were members of the *Herrnhut* congregation and many were akin to the bourgeois elite of Basel. Semantics of friendship, explicitly the need for an “intimate friend”,⁶⁷ is much more evident than in the first diary, 50 years earlier. As mentioned above, the get-togethers could have a rather formal character. Yet, more typical were informal visits after shopping in Basel city centre and the frequent *Familientage*, which mostly fell on Sundays. Though the “family day”, which started at noon after service, could as well bring about a “labyrinth” of stress in preparing the roast and other dishes for all relatives, Ursula never questioned the event and her role as part of it.⁶⁸ On one of the rather rare Sundays, spent alone with her husband and children, she even remarked: “We then were together on our own. It is always depressing to think that no one wants to be with us”.⁶⁹

In terms of co-presence in the domestic sphere, one must not forget the nearly constantly present servants and other ancillary staff such as washer women, day labourers, artisans, medical practitioners and quartered soldiers, who came and went, or who stayed for several days. The relationship between the housemother and her three female servants was tense. Further to the obligation of sociability within the parish, with kin and friends, Ursula felt recurrent problems with both the servants and her children were a severe burden. Evidently, she regarded the often dismissed and substituted nannies as rivals in winning her children’s affections,⁷⁰ and she appreciated family time with her husband and their children. Both the Stettlers and the Bruckners loved to read and go for family walks, which allowed the women to leave chores and servants behind for a while. In addition to mentions in

Henriette's diary, numerous entries of Ursula's journal shed light on a *Bildungspaar*, which constructs family identity through education and culture. They read aloud to each other and their children, not only sermons and religious novels but also the works of Friedrich Schiller. She played the piano, they chanted songs together at home or went to an art exhibition in Basel.⁷¹ Yet, it is evident that for Ursula Bruckner-Eglinger her family encompassed more than the nuclear family. Even on precious Sundays, as on any other day, the nearest relatives and dearest friends were not regarded as intruders of family privacy.

In the case of the Benekes, the distinction between the public and the private is clearer in theory than in practice. However, the practice of domesticity looks different. Living under the same roof with the immediate family were Ferdinand's mother and his sister, and at least one servant. Most notably, the Hamburg lawyer not only received numerous clients in his home office every day but he and his wife maintained an enormous social network. Like the domicile of the bailiff, their home functioned as a quasi-permanent turntable, albeit more informally. The 37-year-old Ferdinand Beneke put it this way: "It goes like this every day. Our home without invitation like a guesthouse".⁷² Closer and more distant friends came in and out, in addition to so-called *Hausfreunde*, numerous relatives and colleagues from the rising Hamburg bourgeoisie. Thus, with a focus on Beneke's diary one can "examine the development of social milieus in which social distinctions, representations, and styles were worked out in everyday exchanges".⁷³ Evidently, a relevant location for these exchanges were socially open domestic spheres. What is special about Beneke is not the frequency and the amount of visitors – like in Bern and Basel, sociability in Hamburg worked reciprocally. As a matter of fact, the Benekes not only received visitors in their own home but also attended get-togethers elsewhere. However, the unique thing about Beneke is that he kept a record of his daily contacts with others. Among these were festivities and formal invitations, however, the great majority of meetings were of a rather informal nature, without the exchange of cards in advance. Clearly, sociability was not confined to special days or visiting timeslots. Being both in debt and of a rather melancholic and hypochondriac nature, Beneke strongly disliked sumptuous festivities. With four of his closest friends he instead founded the *Sparklubb* (in literal translation the Saving Club), which was devoted to refined private and intellectual sociability and met mostly on Sunday afternoons.⁷⁴

Ferdinand Beneke's relation to private family life was ambivalent. Without a doubt, he loved his precious coffee and reading hours with Caroline. He closely observed the development of his children, and when he felt bored by his guests, he would leave the table to play blindman's buff (*Blindekuh*) with the kids.⁷⁵ During the time of separation throughout his exile from Hamburg he missed "that quiet, homely LoveLife" with his family.⁷⁶ But that was part of the propaganda and only one aspect of his personality. On the other hand, when Caroline celebrated her birthday with friends and family, Ferdinand sat in his study writing.⁷⁷ Likewise, on Sunday mornings he often spent time in his study; clearly he needed time for himself to keep up with his diary. The enormous significance of sociability in the domestic also placed considerable demands on the time available for private family life. Surprisingly, Beneke did not complain so much about the enormous amount of time spent with friends and like-minded people, so long as the conversation at these get-togethers met his expectations. What could easily be overlooked in examining the diaries, but is rather noteworthy in terms of privacy and the concept of the family is a short phrase, in many entries: *unter uns* or rather *unter uns mit* or *unter uns incl.* (entre nous, in private with) denotes co-presence of the family members living in Benekes' home with dear relatives and best friends.⁷⁸

Separate spheres?

Domestic life as seen through the lens of these three diaries had many facets. Overall, the interrelated constructs of the public/private dichotomy and of separate spheres must be rejected as far too simplistic. Women were neither immured in the house, nor were men excluded from the domestic realm. Men not only spent a great amount of their time in the home but women also ventured out every day or so. As a household manager of the rural bailiwick, Henriette Stettler-Herport regularly travelled to Bern to go shopping. After the family's move to Bern, she left the home every afternoon and most evenings, making visits and accepting invitations. Ursula Bruckner-Eglinger frequently used shopping trips to Basel as an opportunity to meet relatives and friends. In contrast to her husband, who sometimes preferred to stay at home in his study, Caroline Beneke loved to dance, occasionally with other men, at the great balls of Hamburg.⁷⁹ The social life of all three women was anything but confined to the domestic sphere. Notably – and here agency comes into play – one of them, Henriette Stettler-Herport, detested the somewhat compulsory sociability both in her own and in other homes, instead longing for more privacy with her family. In contrast, Ursula Bruckner-Eglinger enjoyed her social life in the parsonage and in the city of Basel. Her family-oriented sociability appears to be less determined by quasi-aristocratic necessities.

Examining gendered spaces both within the home and outside, and in terms of the corresponding time management of the spouses is a more fruitful approach than one which advocates separate spheres.⁸⁰ All three diary authors regarded their privately shared hours without visitors as precious: having tea or coffee together, joint reading and reading aloud or going for a walk. However, Ferdinand Beneke's silence about the preparation of meals, shopping and the washing is telling. While the men had their own office or study,⁸¹ for the women a room of their own was far from self-evident. Although the mansion-like domicile of Frienisberg encompassed numerous separate rooms, Henriette only shared a room with Rudolf and one of their children.⁸² In contrast, Ursula appreciated "my dear little parlour", which she regretfully left for some time while they accommodated a surveyor.⁸³ In all three cases, the culture of visit offered manifold occasions for either mixed gender or gender-separate sociability. In Hamburg, the *Damen* met in the garden, for tea or at childbed.⁸⁴ The *Sparklubb* of Beneke's most intimate friends met sometimes with and sometimes without their wives, Beneke remarking that conversation at their meetings gave him "real pleasure".⁸⁵ However, on 5 May 1811 he lamented to his imaginary readers that over the summer they would meet without their *Damen* "partly because no interesting conversation develops between them and the men, partly because they feel bored among themselves".⁸⁶ Overall, the practice of domestic sociability was much more flexible and open to interpretation than the premise of separate spheres suggests.

Conclusion

Three major aspects defined domestic life: first, home-based work; second, the co-presence of family members with close relatives and servants, and, third, domestic sociability. Work in the sense of undertakings to secure a living remained a central pillar of domestic life even after 1800. To put it somewhat anachronistically, the bailiff, the pastor and the lawyer accomplished most of their work in their home offices, a space that could be more or less separate from the rooms of the family. Given that sociability was not accidental but in many respects intertwined with career plans and opportunities to increase one's social capital, the domestic sphere was certainly not a refuge from the world of business, and even whilst the men undertook paid work at home, their wives and children were next door.⁸⁷

To separate the idea and the actual practice of family life, diaries proved a valuable source. In practice, the domestic sphere allowed much less space for intimate communication than expected. Diverging from macro-sociological expectations, in comparison with the all-encompassing early modern household, the process of functional differentiation of society due to state building and industrialization did not automatically yield relief through a reduction of tasks for the spouses. More typical was daily hassle and taxing work. Manifold aspects of openness counterbalanced the cult of domesticity that emerged with the appreciation of privacy. The domestic sphere offered a refuge for intimate togetherness only at certain times and on few occasions. This precious time was used for reading, studying, writing and educating the children. Not to mention quarrelling: couples needed time to themselves to 'debate' family matters, questions of faith, the controversial matter of invitations or inappropriate behaviour of their children.⁸⁸

Yet, the willingness to accept other actors into one's domestic realm, either quasi-permanently, as with servants or close relatives who lived with the family, or temporarily, as relatives, friends and guests, is striking. At this point, the question of historical change must be raised. A high degree of accessibility and visibility of the domestic was already a relevant feature of the early modern open house. With regard to social control, a great deal of scrutiny was placed on the households of the bailiff and the pastor. The household of a lawyer in debt may have enjoyed a little more latitude. Two aspects are important, but need researching in more depth: first, co-presence in the new bourgeois milieu became socially more select. With only a few exceptions, in the diaries under study neighbours are missing. When, for instance, the *Herren* of the *Freundeverein* arrived for dinner in the parsonage, a neighbour, present only by chance, had to leave at once.⁸⁹ Moreover, the pastor's wife never mentioned that she let her children play with the village children. Instead, the children were invited to play with middle-class families from their social network in Basel.⁹⁰ The one neighbour of importance for the Benekes was William Alexander Burrowes, a Hamburg merchant, explicitly called *Freund Burrowes*, who in 1814 offered Beneke's brother Fritz a position in his business.⁹¹ In terms of co-presence in the domestic, the diaries from the decades 1770–1830 bear witness that both kinship and friendship, often inter-related, gained importance.

Second, the question of whether during the course of the nineteenth century the culture of visit became not only socially more distinct but also more formalized is raised. Overall, the discussed diaries shed light on different kinds of social activities with a whole range from very informal get-togethers to more formal events, of which the former were certainly more numerous. Yet, frequently the reader comes across terms such as 'association of friends' (*Freundeverein*), 'club' (*Klubb*) or 'members' (*Mitglieder*), even when describing gatherings of a few close friends on Sundays.⁹² It was the nineteenth-century liberals, inheriting the ideas of the Enlightenment, who wanted to reconstruct society from scratch, with the idea of free associations as their key principle. In terms of co-presence and conversation, the domestic sphere was not really private but public, and above that *in nuce* political. The manifold purposes of domestic practice and the openness of the domestic sphere in the age of transition give substantial evidence to rethink not only the history of the modern family but also possibly the chronology of bourgeois society.

Notes

- 1 Naomi Tadmor, *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship, and Patronage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); the term 'nuclear family' was coined by anthropologists: George Peter Murdock, "Anthropology and Human Relations", *Sociometry* 4, 2 (1941), pp. 140–49 (146); for recent different approaches see the contributions in Joachim Eibach and

- Inken Schmidt-Voges (eds.), *Das Haus in der Geschichte Europas: Ein Handbuch* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015).
- 2 John Tosh, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1999), p. 4.
 - 3 Henriette Stettler-Herport, *Journal de mes actions*, Burgerbibliothek Bern (BBB), FA Stettler 12 (1–5); cf. Brigitte Schnegg, "Tagebuchschreiben als Technik des Selbst: Das 'Journal de mes actions' der Bernerin Henriette Stettler-Herport (1738–1805)", in Daniela Hacke (ed.), *Frauen in der Stadt: Selbstzeugnisse des 16.–18. Jahrhunderts* (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke, 2004), pp. 103–30.
 - 4 Anne-Marie Dubler, "Landesherrschaft und Landesverwaltung", in André Holenstein et al. (eds.), *Berns goldene Zeit: Das 18. Jahrhundert neu entdeckt* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2008), pp. 446–52.
 - 5 Bernadette Hagenbuch (ed.), "Heute war ich bey Lisette in der Visite": *Die Tagebücher der Basler Pfarrersfrau Ursula Bruckner-Eglinger 1816–1833* (Basel: Schwabe, 2014).
 - 6 Gisela Mettele, *Weltbürgertum oder Gottesreich: Die Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine als globale Gemeinschaft 1727–1857* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009); Thomas K. Kuhn, "Basel – ein 'Liebling Gottes': Die Stadt am Rhein als Ort der Erweckungsbewegung", *Theologische Zeitschrift* 56 (2000), pp. 165–85; Erika Hebeisen, *Leidenschaftlich fromm: Die pietistische Bewegung in Basel 1750–1830* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2005).
 - 7 Frank Hatje and Ariane Smith (eds.), *Ferdinand Beneke (1774–1848), Die Tagebücher III/1–6* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2016); for an introduction into Beneke's life see *ibid.*, *Begleitband I* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012), pp. 58–100; see also Frank Hatje's chapter in this volume.
 - 8 Lothar Gall, *Vom alten zum neuen Bürgertum: Die mitteleuropäische Stadt im Umbruch 1780–1820* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1991); Jürgen Kocka, "Das europäische Muster und der deutsche Fall", in Kocka (ed.), *Bürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), pp. 9–76; Albert Tanner, *Arbeitsame Patrioten – Wohlanständige Damen: Bürgertum und Bürgerlichkeit in der Schweiz 1830–1914* (Zurich: Orell Füssli, 1995).
 - 9 Ulrike Gleixner, "Familie, Traditionsstiftung und Geschichte im Schreiben von pietistischen Frauen", in Hacke (ed.), *Frauen*, pp. 131–63.
 - 10 Anne-Charlott Trepp, *Sanfte Männlichkeit und selbstständige Weiblichkeit: Frauen und Männer im Hamburger Bürgertum zwischen 1770 und 1840* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996); Frank Hatje, "Ferdinand Beneke und seine Zeit: Der Kosmos eines Tagebuchs und die Geschichte des Bürgertums zwischen Aufklärung und Romantik", in Vorstand der Patriotischen Gesellschaft von 1765 (ed.), *Doppeljahrbuch 2011–13 der Patriotischen Gesellschaft von 1765: Von der Bürgerlichkeit zur Zivilität* (Hamburg, 2014), pp. 19–29.
 - 11 Michel Foucault, "Technologies of the Self", in Luther H. Martin et al. (eds.), *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1988), pp. 16–49.
 - 12 For an overview see Kaspar von Greyerz, "Observations on the Historiographical Status of Research on Self-Writing", in Claudia Ulbrich, Kaspar von Greyerz and Lorenz Heiligensetzer (eds.), *Mapping the 'I': Research on Self-Narratives in Germany and Switzerland* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 34–57; for a critical perspective see Gabriele Jancke and Claudia Ulbrich, "Vom Individuum zur Person: Neue Konzepte im Spannungsfeld von Autobiographietheorie und Selbstzeugnisforschung", *Querelles: Jahrbuch für Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung* 10 (2005), pp. 7–27.
 - 13 Richard van Dülmen, *Die Entdeckung des Individuums 1500–1800* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1997), pp. 118–21.
 - 14 Mareike Böth, "'Ich handele, also bin ich': Selbstzeugnisse praxeologisch lesen", *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 69, 5–6 (2018), pp. 253–70.
 - 15 Hagenbuch (ed.), "Heute war ich", 2 Sept. 1824 (204): "ich erlabte mich dort (...) an einem Glase herrlichem Bier."
 - 16 Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780–1850* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).
 - 17 Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (New Haven: Yale Nota bene, 1998); Amanda Vickery, *Behind Closed Doors: At Home in Georgian London* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).
 - 18 Trepp, *Sanfte Männlichkeit*; Tosh, *A Man's Place*.
 - 19 Rebekka Habermas, *Frauen und Männer des Bürgertums: Eine Familiengeschichte 1750–1850* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).

- 20 Both use diaries among other sources: Tanner, *Arbeitsame Patrioten*; Elisabeth Joris, *Liberal und eigen-sinnig: Die Pädagogin Josephine Stadlin – die Homöopathin Emilie Paravicini-Blumer: Handlungsspielräume von Bildungsbürgerinnen im 19. Jahrhundert* (Zurich: Chronos, 2010).
- 21 Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bour-geois Society* [1962] (Cambridge: Polity, 1989), pp. 43–44.
- 22 Habermas, *The Structural Transformation*, p. 47.
- 23 Habermas, *The Structural Transformation*, p. 45; cf. Christopher Clark, *Iron Kingdom: The Rise and Downfall of Prussia, 1600–1947* (London: Penguin Books, 2006), pp. 247–57.
- 24 Anthony Giddens, *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies* (Cambridge: Polity, 1992), pp. 38–47 (38, 42).
- 25 Niklas Luhmann, *Love as Passion: The Codification of Intimacy* (Cambridge: Polity, 1986), pp. 140–41.
- 26 Luhmann, *Love as Passion*, p. 100.
- 27 Michael Mitterauer and Reinhard Sieder, *The European Family: Patriarchy to Partnership from the Middle Ages to the Present* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1982), pp. 71–92; Heidi Rosenbaum, *Formen der Familie: Untersuchungen zum Zusammenhang von Familienverhältnissen, Sozialstruktur und sozialem Wandel in der deutschen Gesellschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1982), pp. 275–76; Andreas Gestrich, *Geschichte der Familie im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1999), p. 10; Andreas Gestrich, Jens-Uwe Krause and Michael Mitterauer, *Geschichte der Familie* (Stuttgart: Kröner, 2003), pp. 387–91.
- 28 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, p. 364; see also Tosh, *A Man's Place*, p. 13.
- 29 Mary Jo Maynes, “Class Cultures and Images of Proper Family Life”, in David Kertzer and Mario Barbagli (eds.), *The History of the European Family*, vol. 2 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), pp. 195–226 (201).
- 30 Michelle Perrot, “Introduction”, in Perrot (ed.), *A History of Private Life*, vol. 4: *From the Fires of Revolution to the Great War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), pp. 9–11; Lynn Hunt and Catherine Hall, “The Curtain Rises”, in *ibid.*, pp. 87–91; Maynes, “Class Cultures”, pp. 196, 225–26; Gestrich, Krause and Mitterauer, *Geschichte*, pp. 469, 472.
- 31 Perrot, “Introduction”, p. 2; cf. for a different perspective Eibach and Schmidt-Voges (eds.), *Das Haus*.
- 32 Gestrich, *Geschichte*, pp. 5–6; often cited in German research: Karin Hausen, “Die Polarisierung der Geschlechtscharaktere – Eine Spiegelung der Dissoziation von Erwerbs- und Familienleben”, in Werner Conze (ed.), *Sozialgeschichte der Familie in der Neuzeit Europas* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1976), pp. 363–93.
- 33 Tanner, *Arbeitsame Patrioten*, pp. 167–68.
- 34 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, p. 33.
- 35 Arlette Farge, *La vie fragile: Violence, pouvoirs et solidarités à Paris au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1986).
- 36 Vickery, *Behind Closed Doors*, p. 292; cf. often cited: Amanda Vickery, “Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History”, *The Historical Journal* 36 (1993), pp. 383–414.
- 37 Robert B. Shoemaker, *Gender in English Society 1650–1850* (London: Longman, 1998), pp. 144, 318.
- 38 Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter*, p. 9; cf. Tosh, *A Man's Place*, pp. 2–5; Trepp, *Sanfte Männlichkeit*, pp. 238–41, 391; Habermas, *Frauen*, p. 316; for a different argument see Tanner, *Arbeitsame Patrioten*, p. 269.
- 39 Vickery, *Behind Closed Doors*, pp. 292–301; Gisela Mettele, “Der private Raum als öffentlicher Ort: Geselligkeit im bürgerlichen Haus”, in Dieter Hein and Andreas Schulz (eds.), *Bürgerkultur im 19. Jahrhundert: Bildung, Kunst und Lebenswelt* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1996), pp. 155–69; Trepp, *Sanfte Männlichkeit*, pp. 174–80; Habermas, *Frauen*, pp. 182–84.
- 40 Elisabeth Joris, “Kinship and Gender: Property, Enterprise, and Politics”, in David W. Sabeau, Simon Teuscher and Jon Mathieu (eds.), *Kinship in Europe: Approaches to the Long-Term Development (1300–1900)* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), pp. 231–57 (242).
- 41 Maynes, “Class Cultures”, p. 202.
- 42 Maria Ågren, “Introduction: Making a Living, Making a Difference”, in Ågren (ed.), *Making a Living, Making a Difference: Gender and Work in Early Modern European Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 1–23 (3); cf. now Raffaella Sarti, Anna Bellavitis and Manuela Martini (eds.), *What Is Work? Gender at the Crossroads of Home, Family, and Business from the Early Modern to the Present* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2018).

- 43 BBB, FA Stettler 12 (4), 25 Dec 1774.
- 44 BBB, FA Stettler 12 (3), prologue, 1772, point 14: “je dois tenir mon Ménage en ordre, élever mes Enfants, les préserver des mauvais Exemples, veiller sur mes domestiques, vivre avec économie et sobriété, faire du bien a mon prochain, travailler de mes mains”.
- 45 BBB, FA Stettler 12 (4), 13 Aug. 1775.
- 46 Home washing: BBB, FA Stettler 12 (3), 17 April – 1 May 1772; home slaughtering: BBB, FA Stettler 12 (3), 13 Feb. 1772; BBB, FA Stettler 12 (4), 30 Jan. 1774, 14 Jan. 1776.
- 47 Hagenbuch (ed.), *‘Heute war ich’*, 17 June 1831 (470); 10 Jan. 1830 (396).
- 48 Hagenbuch (ed.), *‘Heute war ich’*, 5 Oct. 1829 (384); 16 April 1831 (463); 22 April 1831 (464); 3.1.1832 (494); agriculture in a bourgeois household was no exception, cf. Habermas, *Frauen*, p. 43.
- 49 Hagenbuch (ed.), *‘Heute war ich’*, 3 March 1830 (403).
- 50 Hagenbuch (ed.), *‘Heute war ich’*, 6 Sept. 1832 (520): “Diesen Abend war Freundeverein bey uns, weshalb ich den ganzen Tag genug darauf hin vorzubereiten hatte.”
- 51 Hagenbuch (ed.), *‘Heute war ich’*, 7 Sept. 1832 (520): “Ich hatte diesen ganzen Morgen genug mit Auf u. wegräumen zu thun.”
- 52 Hagenbuch (ed.), *‘Heute war ich’*, 6 Sept. 1832 (520): “es lief eigentl[ich] alles gut u. vergnüg[lich] ab, als dass m[ein] Gefühl sagte dass unser Voressen etwas schmal war u. der Nachtschiff zu chargiert wie AB. bemerkte.”
- 53 Hagenbuch (ed.), *‘Heute war ich’*, 20 May 1826 (277–78); 12 May 1827 (314).
- 54 Hagenbuch (ed.), *‘Heute war ich’*, 6 Jan. 1827 (302).
- 55 Hagenbuch (ed.), *‘Heute war ich’*, 13 Feb. 1830 (401): “Diese Woche kam ausser der Arbeit nichts zu wegen. Ich stuhnd bisweilen auf u. legte mich wieder ohne zu beten, wohl seufzend, aber stets die Arbeit vor dem Gemüth. Ich kam mir vor wie ein Lastthier”.
- 56 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/2, 27 June 1814: “Die vorläufige TagesOrdnung”; the actual practice often differed from this ideal agenda.
- 57 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 25 Dec 1811; 24 Feb 1812.
- 58 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 6 June 1811.
- 59 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 3 July 1813; Beilagen 1813, p. 285.
- 60 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/2, 1 June 1814: “Wiedereinsetzung” of the house; 2 June 1814: “Karoline wirtschaftet unterdeß ruhig auf dem Holl. Brok”.
- 61 For the approach see Joachim Eibach, “Das offene Haus: Kommunikative Praxis im sozialen Nahraum der europäischen Frühen Neuzeit”, *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 38 (2011), pp. 621–64; Joachim Eibach, “Das Haus in der Moderne”, in Eibach and Schmidt-Voges (eds.), *Das Haus*, pp. 19–37.
- 62 BBB, FA Stettler 12 (4), liste de péchés, mauvaises façons, Jan. – June 1776; liste de mes fautes, July – Dec. 1776; BBB, FA Stettler 12 (5), fautes que je commets, Jan. – June 1780; fautes que je fais, July – Dec. 1780.
- 63 BBB, FA Stettler 12 (5), 18 Jan. 1778: “sehr selten gehe ich am morgen aus – sehr selten auch esse ich außerst dem Hause – alle monat einmahl bei meiner Mama – die Kinder ein mahl in der Woche, nachmittag gibt es hin und wieder geschäfte auch einst und andere kleine visiten zu empfangen, ich mache derselben so wenig als möglich, arbeite lieber wann es sein kann bis um 4 Uhr, da ich mich dann ankleide um den abend in Gesellschaft zu gehen, da ich gegen 70 Häuser u wohl Verwandte und Bekante habe bei denen ich im Kehr den Abend zubringe und sie bei mir, so bleiben mir wenig Abende um allein bei Hause zu bleiben, könnte ich nach meinem geschmak leben, so giengte ich sehr wenig in große gesellschafften”. Cf. Brigitte Schnegg, “Soireen, Salons, Sozietäten: Geschlechterspezifische Aspekte des Wandels städtischer Öffentlichkeit im Ancien Régime am Beispiel Berns”, in Anne-Lise Head-König and Albert Tanner (eds.), *Frauen in der Stadt* (Zurich: Chronos, 1993), pp. 163–83.
- 64 BBB, FA Stettler 12 (5), 10 Jan. 1779: “ich entziehe mich so viel möglich von allem, doch da ich nahe bei 80. visiten zu machen habe – kann ich wenig bei Hause alein sein – giengte ich an jedes ort nur ein mahl (...) und dann die tage da ich bei hause visiten habe so ist der winter fast gar vorbei, (...) selten kan ich lesen, meinen kinderen kan ich fast keine Zeit geben, dieses alles macht mich unwillig – da bin ich muth-loos, traurig – mürrisch”.
- 65 BBB, FA Stettler 12 (3), 1772, prologue, point 14: “un chagrin réel a mon Mari, dont le gout tout oposé est porté a avoir souvent du Monde”.
- 66 BBB, FA Stettler 12 (3), 11 Oct. 1772: “j’atends avec impatiance le retour de mon Mari, je voudrois avoir toujours mon Mari et mes Enfants a la maison, vivre ainsi tranquillement en fammille,

- n'avoir des visites que de mes proches parants, ou amis, les plus intimes, et cela une fois par semaine seulement, le réste du tems je voudrois le donér a mon mènage, a l'education de mes Enfants, a la promenade, la lecture, l'ouvrage, ce seroit lá mon plus grand Bonheur".
- 67 Hagenbuch (ed.), *'Heute war ich'*, 26 May 1826 (278): "intime Freundinn".
- 68 Hagenbuch (ed.), *'Heute war ich'*, 19 Oct. 1828 (362); cf. Joris, "Kinship and Gender", pp. 242–46.
- 69 Hagenbuch (ed.), *'Heute war ich'*, 30 Sept. 1827 (327): "wir waren dann allein beysammen. Es ist mir immer ein drückendes Gefühl zu denken, dass Niemand gerne bey uns seyn sollte."
- 70 Hagenbuch (ed.), *'Heute war ich'*, 26 Dec 1826 (300); 17 May 1827 (315); 26 Dec 1827 (335).
- 71 Hagenbuch (ed.), *'Heute war ich'*, 23 July 1825 (243); 14 Feb 1824 (174); 19 June 1826 (281–82); 24.3.1827 (310); cf. for the "Bildungspaar" Habermas, *Frauen*, p. 400.
- 72 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 7 May 1811: "So geht das nun alle Tage. Unser Haus ohne eig. Einlad. wie ein GastHof." With regard to sociability in the home of the Benekes cf. Frank Hatje's chapter in this volume.
- 73 David W. Sabean, "Kinship and Class Dynamics in Nineteenth-Century Europe", in Sabean, Teuscher and Mathieu (eds.), *Kinship in Europe*, pp. 301–13 (304).
- 74 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 18 Jan. 1811; 1 Dec 1812; 18 June 1813.
- 75 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 21 Feb. 1813.
- 76 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/2, 11 June 1814: "jenes stille, häusliche LiebeLeben".
- 77 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 1 Nov. 1812.
- 78 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 25 Feb. 1812; 2 March 1812; 6 March 1812; 20 March 1812.
- 79 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 6 April 1813.
- 80 Amanda Flather, "Space, Place, and Gender: The Sexual and Spatial Division of Labor in the Early Modern Household", *History and Theory* 52 (2013), pp. 344–60.
- 81 Cf. the chapter of Maria Ågren in this volume.
- 82 BBB, FA Stettler 12 (4), 14 Aug. 1774.
- 83 Hagenbuch (ed.), *'Heute war ich'*, 19 April 1830 (410): "mein liebes Stübchen".
- 84 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 22 May 1811; 28 Oct. 1811; 16 Oct. 1812.
- 85 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 5 May 1811: "wirkliche Erheiterung".
- 86 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 5 May 1811: "theils weil kein interessanter Verkehr zwischen ihnen, u. den Männern aufkommen kann, theils, weil sie untereinander LangeWeile haben".
- 87 Cf. Trepp, *Sanfte Männlichkeit*, pp. 19, 238–41; Vickery, *Gentleman's Daughter*, pp. 9–10; Shoemaker, *Gender*, pp. 305–14; Tosh, *A Man's Place*, passim; Habermas, *Frauen*, p. 316.
- 88 BBB, FA Stettler 12 (4), 30 Jan. 1774; FA Stettler 12 (5), 10 Jan. 1779; Hagenbuch (ed.), *'Heute war ich'*, 18 March 1830 (405); 16 Feb. 1831 (453–54).
- 89 Hagenbuch (ed.), *'Heute war ich'*, 6 Sept. 1832 (520).
- 90 Hagenbuch (ed.), *'Heute war ich'*, 18 Nov. 1832 (525–26).
- 91 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/2, 20 June 1814.
- 92 Beneke, *Tagebücher* III/1, 9 Feb. 1812; according to Frank Hatje, Beneke even set up written statutes for a 'Winterklubb' he founded with a handful of near friends; cf. Hatje's chapter in this volume.