

*Martina Rauchenzauner*

## **Food Related Regional Traditions and Cultural Transfer in the Archiepiscopal City of Salzburg, 1500–1800 Otto Brunner’s Theory of the Entire House of the Merchant Bourgeoisie**

In March 2016, the FWF-project „Food and Diet in the Early Modern Period: Regional Traditions and Cultural Transfers in the Prince-Archiepiscopal City of Salzburg, 1500–1800“ started at the Center for Gastrosophy at the Paris-Lodron University in Salzburg. The main questions of this study are: What did people eat and drink in the Early Modern Period? How was the food supply organized? What do eating habits say about the social life and the social structure? Sociology compiled various theses to answer these questions, first and foremost Eva Barlösius with her well received introduction to the *Sociology of Food*.<sup>1</sup> Her hypotheses remain mostly empirically unverified although the lines of reasoning seem to be legit. A group’s social structure is represented by the sharing of food within a certain group of the community.

Each social class has its own distinct cuisine. Every way of preparation is associated with cultural characteristics typical for one of the social classes. Next to meals there are no other social indicators that symbolize unity, community, and belonging in a similar manner. The cuisines were mainly used for realising two social processes: firstly, to create a mutualizing cultural identity, and secondly, to separate social, political, and foreign identities. Until now, these and various other theses were not verified by the examination of a broad range of historical source material. The project is determined to close the research gap for the Early Modern Period.

The research strategy is to divide the topic into several study areas in order to reconstruct the numerous varieties as well as the class and gender specific symbolism of eating

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Eva Barlösius, *Soziologie des Essens. Eine sozial- und kulturwissenschaftliche. Einführung in die Ernährungsforschung* (Weinheim: Juventa-Verlag, 2011).

habits in the prince-archiepiscopal city of Salzburg. The main fields of research are: the ‚archiepiscopal court‘, the ‚monasteries and convents‘, the ‚gastronomy‘, the ‚urban bourgeoisie‘, and ‚institutional kitchen for the poor‘. Parallel questions are posed to the source material to gain comparable results for each area. Only this approach may answer the question whether traditional customs were maintained or if outward influences and tendencies for an internationalisation predominated the developments in the cuisine.

My research field is the urban bourgeoisie of Salzburg. The definition of the ‚urban bourgeoisie of Salzburg‘ is maybe of utmost importance. A first analysis of probate inventories<sup>2</sup> unveiled the wide range of social differences between the townspeople. For the wealthy ones household objects and especially objects for food preparation and consumption as well as representative objects were listed. For the impoverished households, there were barely any objects mentioned to analyse the current research field. A comparison between these very different households would lead to no usable results, therefore I had to narrow down the research field to comparable datasets. For this reason, I focus on the merchant class within the city. Since the 15th century the citizenship was closely linked to particular conditions: male gender, legitimate birth, marriage within one year after the nomination, defence and preservation of the city, obedience to the common rules, aid for the poor, holding a chair at the court council or business, run an own company, paying a fee for the right to be a member of the bourgeoisie, a fortune with an appropriate amount, being Catholic and attending the service at the cathedral every Thursday.<sup>3</sup> This analysis focuses on the holders of citizenship, but also on their family members and staff, in other words their household. Two exceptions have to be made, firstly the family Mozart. The family Mozart did not possess the state of bourgeoisie but was closely connected to it. Furthermore, the letters written by the Mozarts from 1774 to 1881<sup>4</sup> give a broad range of aspects of daily life in the archiepiscopal city of Salzburg in early modern period. Secondly Johann Baptist Joseph Joachim Ferdinand von Schidenhofen zu Stumm (1747–1823), was part of the local nobility but also became friends with members of the bourgeoisie. In his diary (kept from 10th October 1774 to 17th April 1778) he described his social network within local traditions, feasts and daily life.<sup>5</sup>

This analysis of the urban bourgeoisie of Salzburg is separated into two aspects: on the one hand the bourgeoisie as mercantile members and provider of good and their private life within their families and on the other hand their household. In this paper, I am

2 SLA, Stadtsyndikat Verlassenschaften Nr. 346–385 u. 520–562.

3 Ludwig Pezolt, „Über Bürger und Bürgertum in der Stadt Salzburg“, *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde* 45 (1905) 23–36, hier: 31–34.

4 Cf. Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum, Mozart Briefe und Dokumente – Online-Edition, <http://dme.mozarteum.at/DME/briefe/doclist.php>, (07.02.2017).

5 Cf. Hannelore Angermüller u. Rudolph Angermüller (Hrsg.), Günther G. Bauer (Mitarb.), *Joachim Ferdinand von Schidenhofen. Ein Freund der Mozarts. Die Tagebücher des Salzburger Hofrats*, *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde*, 24. Ergänzungsband (Bad Honnef: Bock, 2006).

going to focus on the private aspect. The main question is how one household organised the annual food supply. This issue was considered by Otto Brunner in the concept of the entire house (*ganzes Haus*).

The Austrian medievalist Otto Brunner (1898–1982) served in the Austro-Hungarian army in the First World War in Italy from 1916 to 1918, afterwards he began to study at the University of Vienna. In 1921 he also was admitted at the *Österreichisches Institut für Geschichtsforschung* as an archivist, in 1929 Brunner habilitated in history. Due to his positive attitude to the Nazi regime he obtained the chair of the professor for Medieval and Austrian History at the University of Vienna in 1941. He also became part of the *Südostdeutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft*, which provided statistical data concerning the Jewish population of Yugoslavia,<sup>6</sup> and the *Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschland* as counsellor of the research department for Jews.<sup>7</sup> After the Second World War and the following denazification he had to leave the University of Vienna<sup>8</sup> and started in 1954 as professor for Early Modern History at the University of Hamburg.<sup>9</sup> The two most important publications concerning the concept of the entire house (*ganzes Haus*) were „Adeliges Landleben und Europäischer Geist. Leben und Werk Wolf Helmhards von Hohberg 1612–1688“<sup>10</sup> and „Das ‚ganze Haus‘ und die alteuropäische Ökonomik“.<sup>11</sup> Brunner argues the modern term ‚Wirtschaft‘ (economy) has nothing to do with the original meaning of this word. The original meaning of this word should be seen in the agriculture and patriarchy of the peasantry and the nobility instead.<sup>12</sup> As a proof of his theses, he uses Aristoteles’s classifications. Aristoteles defined economy (meaning chrematistics) as ethical reprehensible. Therefore he described it in his Nicomachean Ethics. According to Aristoteles’, foreign trade is the duty of the polis, the state. Housekeeping economy wasn’t mentioned at all in Aristoteles’ book about economy.<sup>13</sup> The other type of sources he is referring to is the so-called household literature. As example Brunner picks the books „Georgica curiosa“ written by the Austrian country aristocrat Wolf Helmhard von Hohberg. Hohberg describes every possible form

6 Stefan Weiß, „Otto Brunner und das Ganze Haus oder Die zwei Arten der Wirtschaftsgeschichte“, *Historische Zeitschrift* 2 (2001) 335–369, hier: 336–338.

7 Alfred Haverkamp u. Friedrich Prinz, Gebhardt: *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte. Perspektiven des Mittelalters. Europäische Grundlagen deutscher Geschichte, 4.–8. Jahrhundert*, Bd. 1, (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta 2001) 76.

8 Harald Zimmermann, „Nachruf Otto Brunner“, *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* (1983), 352–353.

9 Stefan Weiß, „Otto Brunner und das Ganze Haus“, wie in Anm. 6, 338.

10 Vgl. Otto Brunner, *Adeliges Landleben und europäischer Geist. Leben und Werk Wolf Helmhards von Hohberg 1612–1688* (Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag 1949). For this paper the first edition is used.

11 Otto Brunner, „Das ‚ganze Haus‘ und die alteuropäische Ökonomik“, *Ökonomie und Gesellschaft. Eine Sammlung von Studententexten*, hrsg. von Johann August Schüle in u. Gerda Bohmann (Wien u. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1994) 72–82. For this publication the original text was shorten.

12 Ebd., 72–73.

13 Brunner, „Adeliges Landleben“, wie in Anm. 10, 248–250.

of agriculture in Lower Austria and how it can be improved; in addition, he also refers to the different fields of duties of every family member and attendants. The central message is how to run a farm under the control of the housefather.<sup>14</sup> Brunner believes Aristoteles' separation of chrematistics and housekeeping is still relevant in the 18th century. He claims the peasantry lived on the base of their production. He admitted that there were certain dependencies on local markets but in times of crisis they lived on their own products – ‚a so called autarchy‘ – and avoided any kind of consumption. He argues the peasantry is still working even the wage is lower than the average wage because farming is not just their job but also their life and the life of their relatives. There is also no separation of workplace and private space.<sup>15</sup> The opposite of the peasantry sees Brunner in the urban bourgeoisie. Their workplace and private space is more or less separated and they do follow the system of chrematistics. So, their motivation is to earn money out of trade. Otto Brunner limited the peasantry to the primary production. Another aspect is mercantilism which was implemented by the authority in the 18th century. Concerning any kind of trade and earning money he is still using Aristoteles' classification in ethical and political parameters. Due to the increasing trade and mercantilism the system of the entire house become less and less important and finally disappeared in the age of industrialisation.<sup>16</sup>

Otto Brunner's theory of the entire house was fulminantly accepted but also highly criticized since its publication. Different aspects of Brunner's work and his political attitude were praised or denounced. I don't want to unroll the whole discourse of the scientific world, instead I am going to outline the debate as well as the different arguments and points of criticism on two contrary texts. On the one hand Claudia Opitz's essay „Neue Wege der Sozialgeschichte? Ein kritischer Blick auf Otto Brunners Konzept des ‚Ganzen Hauses‘“: She sees Brunners concept of the entire house negative therefore she declines the theory.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand Stefan Weiß acknowledges the points of criticism in his essay „Otto Brunner und das Ganze Haus oder Die zwei Arten der Wirtschaftsgeschichte“ but he doesn't exile the whole concept.<sup>18</sup>

Claudia Opitz's criticism is subdivided into the following aspects: private versus work space, the autarchy of the peasantry, the authority of the housefather, the negation of long-term change processes, regressions or asynchronicity and most of all Brunner's positive attitude to the Nazi regime. Her first point of criticism discusses the entity of private and work space. Opitz says that there was a separation between these two

---

14 Ebda., 238–239.

15 Brunner, „Das ‚ganze Haus‘“, wie in Anm. 11, 75–76.

16 Brunner, *Adeliges Landleben*, wie in Anm. 10, 307–309.

17 Vgl. Claudia Opitz, „Neue Wege der Sozialgeschichte? Ein kritischer Blick auf Otto Brunners Konzept des ‚Ganzen Hauses‘“, *Geschichte und Gesellschaft 1* (Aspekte der österreichischen Sozialgeschichte) (1994) 88–98.

18 Weiß, „Otto Brunner und das Ganze Haus“, wie in Anm. 6.

spaces especially between 1500 and 1800 when a high number of day peasant labourers from the countryside floated into the cities daily. Even the nobility wasn't homogenous. Another aspect is the autarchy of the peasantry in the late middle ages. She claims a specialization of agriculture took place. Farmers specialised in dairy, winegrowing etc. an entire self-supply was not possible anyway. She also argues labourers depended on the local market and the supply by the local peasantry since space for cultivating vegetables was limited.<sup>19</sup> Additionally, Opitz criticises Otto Brunner for his strict focus on the authority of the housefather. The household literature stresses all members of a household, especially also the housemother. And also cultural scientists and historians like Natalie Zemon Davis demonstrate the key role of women in the household as well as co-workers.<sup>20</sup> The concept of the entire house by Brunner idealises and romanticises the picture of the life of the peasantry. It seems like no change appears between the beginning of the Middle-Ages and the 18<sup>th</sup> century, no regressions or asynchrony happened. The whole peasantry in the Holy Empire was treated as one like no regional and seasonal differences existed.<sup>21</sup> But Otto Brunner's involvement with the Nazi regime is criticised in the strongest term by Claudia Opitz: „Als Wegweiser auf den fraglos notwendigen neuen Wegen der Sozialgeschichte erscheinen sie [Anglo-American and French studies] mir weit hilfreicher, als das in so besonders ‚deutscher‘ Weise vorgeprägte und belastete Brunner'sche Konzept des ‚ganzen Hauses‘.“<sup>22</sup>

On the other hand, Stefan Weiß's article which is also quite critical but instead of expelling he scrutinises the theory and its time of origin. Weiß started with a biography of Otto Brunner and the circumstances he lives in. Otto Brunner took part in the First World War and was influenced by the ideas of the All-German solution by his role models at university.<sup>23</sup> This is not an excuse for his behaviour but it explains it. The philosophy of the Nazi regime is strongly present in his works<sup>24</sup> „Land und Herrschaft“<sup>25</sup> and „Adeliges Landleben und europäischer Geist“.<sup>26</sup> After the fall of the Nazi regime Otto Brunner adjusted the language of his works for example in changing the word ‚Volk‘ (people) into ‚Struktur‘ (structure). This led to the accusation he was still supporting the philosophy of the Nazi regime and simply changing the terminology from ethnic history to structural history.<sup>27</sup> Brunners publications after the Second World War

19 Opitz, „Neue Wege der Sozialgeschichte?“, wie in Anm. 17, 89–90.

20 Ebda., 91–94.

21 Ebda., 94–96.

22 Ebda., 97–98.

23 Weiß, „Otto Brunner und das Ganze Haus“, wie in Anm. 6, 336–338.

24 Ebda., 339–341.

25 Otto Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft. Grundfragen der territorialen Verfassungsgeschichte Südostdeutschlands im Mittelalter* (Brünn u. Wien: Rohrer Verlag, 1942).

26 Brunner, *Adeliges Landleben*, wie in Anm. 10.

27 Weiß, „Otto Brunner und das Ganze Haus“, wie in Anm. 6, 340.

„Adeliges Landleben und europäischer Geist. Leben und Werk Wolf Helmhards von Hohberg 1612–1688“<sup>28</sup> and his article „Die alteuropäische Ökonomik“<sup>29</sup> have been criticised because his theory of the entire house was seen as ideology with ethnical background.<sup>30</sup> Stefan Weiß argues that the theory of the entire house wasn't an invention by Otto Brunner but by Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl in the 19th century. Riehl was also an ethnical historian but he uses the theory to describe the life of the traditional peasant family without ethnical intentions. His theory was highly common in the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century and was used by economic scientists as well as sociologists with the keyword ‚geschlossene Hauswirtschaft‘ (closed housekeeping).<sup>31</sup> This term was already used by the economist Johann Karl Rodbertus in the 19th century for analysing economy in ancient times especially based on Xenophone's ‚Oikonomia‘. His main interest was housekeeping, how it was organised, which goods were produced and what was consumed.<sup>32</sup> Out of Rodbertus' concept of the closed housekeeping the economist Karl Bücher developed a theory of stages: first there was a subsistence agriculture, on the second level a net of market relationships followed by the third stage, a national economy.<sup>33</sup> Otto Brunner knew Rodbertus' and Bücher's approaches but he refused them both, as a new way he framed his theory of the entire house which has in fact only little variance of the theory of the closed housekeeping. By comparing the theory of the closed housekeeping with Brunner's entire house, Stefan Weiß demonstrates the points of criticism of the entire house. Firstly, Brunner does not include any mechanism of change, the society stayed the same from ancient times to the French Revolution in 1789. Secondly the reader as such is taken into consideration. Otto Brunner's theory bases on the housefather literature especially on Wolf Helmhard's *Georgica Curiosa*. Weiß argues that this book describes every kind of agriculture and how it could be improved, but Helmhard did not describe an average farm of the peasantry, what he discusses is large scale land-holding by the country gentry. Therefore, the average peasantry could not use this kind of literature because it does not depict their work environment. Thirdly illiteracy affected most of the peasantry so they were not able to read the housefather literature in the first place.<sup>34</sup> Fourthly the homogeneity of the household of the peasantry and the nobility. Weiß says no study has been conducted on such a question so there is no proof for that. Fifthly he argued that the rural community played an important role in daily life of the peasantry but wasn't considered by Brunner. Sixthly case studies from various historians showed that the inclusion of the peasantry at the local markets was

28 Brunner, *Adeliges Landleben*, wie in Anm. 10.

29 Brunner, „Das ganze Haus“, wie in Anm. 11.

30 Weiß, „Otto Brunner und das Ganze Haus“, wie in Anm. 6, 341–344.

31 Ebda., 344–345.

32 Ebda., 354–355.

33 Ebda., 355–356.

34 Ebda., 359–362.

higher as expected. Stefan Weiß comes to the conclusion that both theories, the closed housekeeping and the entire house, used the wrong social scale, they are taking the nobility as well as the upper-class – bourgeoisie into consideration.<sup>35</sup> Stefan Weiß finally comes to the following conclusion „Dieses Konzept hat den Vorzug, daß es die Deutung aufgreift, mit der die europäische Oberschicht selbst in Antike, Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit ihre ‚Wirtschaft‘ zu begreifen suchte. [...] Eine Untersuchung sollte aber am geeigneten Objekt beginnen: den Haushalten des Adels, des reichen Bürgertums, des hohen Klerus, insbesondere an den Königs- und Fürstenhöfen. Dort ist das ‚Haus‘ oder die ‚Hauswirtschaft‘ in der Tat zu finden.“<sup>36</sup>

I follow Stefan Weiß's opinions and his appeal to conduct a case study by testing it on the urban bourgeoisie of the archiepiscopal city of Salzburg in the Early Modern Age. Of course the points of criticism cannot be ignored therefore some adaptations have to be made which are shown on the concrete example of the urban bourgeois family Spängler of Salzburg.<sup>37</sup> Otto Brunner sees the medieval and early modern economy in Europa characterised by Aristoteles's classifications politics, ethics and the housekeeping. This classification leads him to the exclusion of the urban bourgeoisie because it is due to the chrematistic aspect part of ethics and not housekeeping. Since Aristoteles's classification is not taken into consideration, Brunner's exclusion of the bourgeoisie is not valid anymore.

As an important condition, Brunner sees the unity of work and private space which is typical for the peasantry and the nobility but not for the urban bourgeoisie. Already Claudia Opitz emphasized that especially between 1500 and 1800 the onward progress of separation between work and private space also took place on the countryside.<sup>38</sup> But this separation is not as clear as Brunner stated. The case study of the family Spängler does not show a clear division of the entire house or a separation between private and work space. Based on the analysed housekeeping books and the journal of his fabric

35 Ebda., 363–365.

36 Ebda., 368.

37 Recently the economic and social historian Reinhold Reith of the Paris-Lodron University Salzburg and his team elaborated the sources about the family Spängler. The results of this study are five publications in the last four years, which are the basis for this article. Cf. Reinhold Reith, Luisa Pichler-Baumgartner, Georg Stöger u. Andreas Zechner, (Hrsg.), *Haushalten und Konsumieren. Die Ausgabenbücher der Salzburger Kaufmannsfamilie Spängler von 1733 bis 1785*, Schriftenreihe des Archivs der Stadt Salzburg 46 (Salzburg: Stadtgemeinde Salzburg, 2016); Jürgen Wöhry, *accordiert mit mir die Zimer über 3 Stiegen gegen dem Wasser hinauß. Mieten und Wohnen in Salzburg zur Mozartzeit am Fallbeispiel des Spänglerhauses am Alten Markt*, Masterarbeit (Paris-Lodron Universität Salzburg 2016); Reinhold Reith (Hrsg.), *Das Verlassenschaftsinventar des Salzburger Tuch- und Seidenhändlers Franz Anton Spängler von 1784. Einführung und kommentierte Edition*, Schriftenreihe des Archivs der Stadt Salzburg 42 (Salzburg: Stadtgemeinde Salzburg 2015); Doris Hörmann, *Regionale und überregionale Handelsnetze im 18. Jahrhundert. Das Hauptbuch der Salzburger Tuch- und Seidenhandlung Franz Anton Spänglers (1767–1777)*, Masterarbeit (Paris-Lodron Universität Salzburg 2015); Cf. Maria Falkner, *Köchin, Kuchlmensch und Kindmensch. Die Dienstboten eines Salzburger Kaufmannshaushaltes im 18. Jahrhundert*, Masterarbeit (Paris-Lodron Universität Salzburg 2014).

38 Cf. Opitz, „Neue Wege der Sozialgeschichte?“, wie in Anm. 17, 89–90.

company a clear separation between the private household and the company isn't possible. The journal of the fabric company lists a so called ‚Haushaltsunkostenkonto‘ which is an account for the owner and for its removals for the household. It follows that Anton Spängler (1705–1784), the owner, took cash withdrawal out of the cashier's office. Also three bills for foodstuff are booked: on the 14th of September 1767 lard for 50 Salzburger Gulden, on the 8th of September 1767 135 Salzburger Gulden for wine and on the 25th of February 1768 41 Salzburger Gulden for rice.<sup>39</sup> Anton Spängler's probate inventory from 1784 shows a large scale of wine and grain inventory within the stock of the company.<sup>40</sup> But the costs for the service to store the wine barrels as well as the payments for the excise, a kind of a tax on alcohol, were payed through the household and were therefore listed in the housekeeping books. Doris Hörmann also mentioned the contract between Franz Anton Spängler and his business partners from 1777 where the payment for the employees of the company was settled. They are entitled to the payment with money and also a payment in kind which included drink, food and a bed. The wine and the grain were purchased as part of the payment for the employees.<sup>41</sup> But the victuals were consumed within the context of the household of the family Spängler, where the employees lived.<sup>42</sup> Another example is Spängler's tenant master tailor and merchant burgess Joseph Reisinger. He lived on the fourth floor together with his wife, his son and two daughters, two fellow guild members, one trainee and one maid.<sup>43</sup> These examples illustrate that the separation of private and work space wasn't as strict as Brunner claimed for the urban bourgeoisie.

One of the most criticised points of Brunner's theory is the autarchy of the peasantry. For the archiepiscopal Salzburg this autarchy has to be highly scrutinised. Heinz Dopsch underlines the important role of the local food supply. At the different markets, like the general market, the milk market, the cattle market etc. products from the hinterland of the city were sold. Especially milk and dairy products as well as vegetables and fruits were produced by local farmers. The choice of products were remarkable, different sorts of cheese,

39 Doris Hörmann, „Für Reiß Unkosten des Bedienten Antoni. Die Haushaltsbücher und das Hauptbuch der Tuch- und Seidenhandlung, Haushalten und Konsumieren“, *Die Ausgabenbücher der Salzburger Kaufmannsfamilie Spängler von 1733 bis 1785*, hrsg. von Reinhold Reith, Luisa Pichler-Baumgartner, Georg Stöger u. Andreas Zechner, Schriftenreihe des Archivs der Stadt Salzburg 46 (Salzburg: Stadtgemeinde Salzburg 2016) 165–177, hier: 168–169.

40 Reinhold Reith (Hrsg.), *Das Verlassenschaftsinventar*, wie in Anm. 37, 88. For the grain supply the following was registered: „Lauth Notar von dem Getreideschreiber Gregor Lakner sind vorhanden 33½ Schaaf Körner, das Schaaf zu 7 fl betr zusammen pr => 234 Salzburger Gulden and 30 Salzburger Kreuzer“. For the vine supply the following was registered: „28 Emmer Oesterreicher Wein, der Emmer zu 8 fl betr pr => 224 Salzburger Gulden“. The conversion of historical measure of capacity of ‚Eimer‘ is 56,6 liter. Vgl. Fritz Koller, *Das Salzburger Landesarchiv*, Schriftenreihe des Salzburger Landesarchivs 4 (Salzburg: Universitätsverlag Anton Pustet, 1987) 188.

41 Hörmann, „Für Reiß Unkosten des Bedienten Antoni“, wie in Anm. 39, 169.

42 Wöhry, *accordiert mit mir*, wie in Anm. 37, 56.

43 Ebd., 72.



curd, butter, fat, root vegetable, fruit, salt, meat, fish, grain etc.<sup>44</sup> These products were produced and sold by local farmers. The urban population depended on the local food supply; maybe the farmers also depended on the urban market, where they were able to sell their goods in exchange for other goods or cash. In Salzburg, there is another aspect which gives reason to criticise the theory of the autarchy of the peasantry. Especially in the alpine regions farmers had a second string to their bow. Besides their duties as farmers they also took an active part as provider of goods transported over the Alps in off-seasons. Instead of only feeding the animals they were used to transport goods over the mountains to destinations in the lowlands and cities.<sup>45</sup> Another example is Anna Maria Rottmayrin (died in 1732) from Bramberg am Wildkogel in Salzburg. She was farmer, landlady and merchant. She also had more than one profession to make her living. After the death of her husband Severin Senninger in 1691 Anna Maria Rottmayrin continued to trade with beer until Mathias Schmerold inherited her businesses in 1720.<sup>46</sup> These examples show that the peasantry was also interested in chrematistics and profit from different developments. It is possible that the peasantry had more than one way of income like the example of Anna Maria Rottmayrin shows. Maybe the peasantry is characterized by more tasks within the society. Therefore, Brunner's exclusion of the urban bourgeoisie and his theory of autarchy aren't general at all.

Let us now move to the next point of criticism, the authority of the housefather. This authority can't be confirmed using the example of the family Spängler. Franz Anton Spängler was a member of the merchant bourgeoisie of Salzburg, he owned a company and was the head of his family, but only on the first sight. A closer look at his biography unveils different aspects. Franz Anton Spängler was born on the 4th April in 1705 in Dietenheim close to Bruneck in what is known today as South Tyrol. His father was a custodian for the local baron Andre von Sternbach and his uncle a merchant in Venice, from whom Franz Anton probably got first introductions in commercial activities. In 1729 Franz Anton is traceable in Salzburg for the first time, where he worked as an accountant for the Laimprucher Company.<sup>47</sup> So he had no direct family connections in Salzburg. In July 1731 Franz Anton married the widow Maria Katharina Prötz, née Ingerl, she was the owner of the factory Prötz und Ingerl. Conditioned by the marriage

44 Cf. Heinz Dopsch, „Die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung“, *Geschichte Salzburgs. Stadt und Land, Bd. 1 Vorgeschichte – Altertum – Mittelalter, 2. Teil*, hrsg. von Heinz Dopsch (Salzburg: Universitätsverlag Anton Pustet Salzburg 1983) 757–835, hier: 764–765; Aleksander Panjek et. al. (eds.), *Integrated Peasant Economy in a Comparative Perspective: Alps, Scandinavia and Beyond* (Koper: 2017).

45 Cf. *ibid.*, 808–809.

46 Cf. Hans Hönigschmid, *Bramberg am Wildkogel. Besitzerreiben der Servitutberechtigten in Bramberg am Wildkogel*, Band 2 (Bramberg: Gemeinde Bramberg 1993) 11.

47 Reinhold Reith, „Es stehet an ihm selbst, diße guete Gelegenheit zu seinen Glick zu machen. Familie, Haushalt und Handlung – Akteure, Netzwerke und Strategien, Haushalten und Konsumieren“, *Die Ausgabenbücher der Salzburger Kaufmannsfamilie Spängler von 1733 bis 1785*, hrsg. von Reinhold Reith, Luisa Pichler-Baumgartner, Georg Stöger u. Andreas Zechner, Schriftenreihe des Archivs der Stadt Salzburg 46 (Salzburg: Stadtgemeinde Salzburg 2016) 23–61, hier: 23–24.

with the widow of a former member of the merchant class Franz Anton could apply for this status. Furthermore, after the marriage he was not the owner of the company but the director who ran the business. Maria Katharina Prötz insisted that after her death the ownership of her factory goes to her children of the first marriage. Without a company, he would even lose his status as merchant burgess.<sup>48</sup> In 1737 Franz Anton Spängler was able to buy the Auer Company due to the family connections of his wife, so he wouldn't longer rely on the company of his wife. After the death of Maria Katharina Spängler on the 25th May 1743 Franz Anton married again. His second wife was the widow Anna Elisabeth Lang, née Egger,<sup>49</sup> she was owner of a company for devotional objects. She also ran the company until she died in 1754 at the age of 52 years. In 1755 the 49-year-old Franz Anton Spängler married the 25-year-old daughter of a company for luxury food product, Maria Theresia Traunbauer. Together with her Franz Anton they had nine children but only four reached the adulthood. As wives of a merchant burgess they had to fulfil different functions. In context of the household the wife powered the keys, organised and disposed various tasks as well as represented the family.<sup>50</sup> But Spängler and his wives were also working couple. All three wives came from a merchant family and had insight into the necessary daily activities. In times of absence, when Franz Anton delivered several markets in Austria, Italy, Germany etc., his wives acceded him on his function as entrepreneurs. In terms of housekeeping Franz Anton Spängler wanted to have a close look on what and how much he spent on expanses, therefore he kept an account for the household. His wives also made entries even for high-priced expenses, this was confirmed by a scripture comparison.<sup>51</sup> This comparison also revealed the active part of Spängler's third wife Maria Theresia concerning lease transactions. It seems that she negotiated the rent with tenants and also settled the basic information in the so called „Hauszinsbuch“.<sup>52</sup> The three wives played an important role concerning organising the household as well as managing the daily issues regarding the company. A third aspect is the social role of the wives of the merchant bourgeoisie. They organised house parties, dinners, board game parties, maintained networks and had an eye on the reputation of the family as well as the company.<sup>53</sup>

The readership of the housefather literature is the next point I want to focus on. This topic has already been stressed by different researchers. I want to focus on the fact

---

48 Ebda., 26–28.

49 Ebda., 30–34.

50 Cf. Sabine Veits-Falk, „Jedem Theill die Helfte eigenthümlich zuständig. Wirkräume und Rollen der Ehefrauen“, *Die Ausgabenbücher der Salzburger Kaufmannsfamilie Spängler von 1733 bis 1785*, hrsg. von Reinhold Reith, Luisa Pichler-Baumgartner, Georg Stöger u. Andreas Zechner, Schriftenreihe des Archivs der Stadt Salzburg 46 (Salzburg: Stadtgemeinde Salzburg 2016) 93–106, hier: 93–94.

51 Ebda., 100–102.

52 Wöhry, *accordiert mit mir*, wie in Anm. 37, 100.

53 Veits-Falk, „Jedem Theill die Helfte eigenthümlich zuständig“, wie in Anm. 50, 100–103.

that also the merchant bourgeoisie had interest in this kind of literature. By the well conducted housekeeping books we know that Franz Anton Spängler or his wife Anna Elisabeth bought the *Oeconomia rualis et domestica* written by the protestant priest Johann Coler (1566–1639) on the 28th June 1749.<sup>54</sup> This opus was a guidebook for every aspect of daily life. Due to his wide range of discussed topics these books were very popular in various social classes.<sup>55</sup> Copies can be found in inheritances of major bourgeois families like the Fuggers' in Augsburg, Ottilia Pettenbeck in Biberach, Hieronymus Paumgärtner the younger in Nürnberg<sup>56</sup> and the family Spängler in Salzburg. We don't know if the books were used and if they were used, for what reason, but we do know that Franz Anton Spängler had interests in this kind of literature otherwise he wouldn't have bought it. Surprisingly the housefather literature by Coler is also addressed to all the members of a household. Coler stressed the important role of every member regarding household management. Everybody is conductive with his allocated tasks to keep everything going and everybody depended on his housemate and his/her performances.<sup>57</sup> This picture is also drawn by Spängler's housekeeping books. For example the manservant, was maintenance of the house. In 1750 the manservant was sent to Frankenthal by order of the Spängler Company, for this service he got an extra payment in the amount of one Salzburger Gulden and 20 Salzburger Kreuzer. Since 1780 the manservant was also sent to the market to buy bread, the ‚Hausknecht Zedln‘ and the appropriate notes in the housekeeping books prove these processes.<sup>58</sup> The family Spängler also employed a female cook and a cookmaid. Their tasks were to buy groceries, to write bills, to preserve the different foodstuff, to provide the family with food, to overlook the stock as well as to prepare representing meals for special dinners and parties.<sup>59</sup> Concerning the servants the gender aspect is as well significant. Eva Barlösius underlined the difference between a male and a female cook. Since the 16th century the work of a male cook has been considered as art in contrast to the female cook. Her work serves the daily need of food. The male cook worked for the nobility, his cooking was professional, representative, exclusive and expensive. In the households of the bourgeoisie we find female cooks, those had to be more economical, she had no professionalised education, she had more

---

54 Ebda., 100.

55 Cf. Philip Hahn, *Das Haus im Buch. Konzept, Publikationsgeschichte und Leserschaft der ‚Oeconomia‘ Johann Colers*, Frühneuzeit-Forschungen, Bd. 18 (Diss., Universität Frankfurt am Main: bibliotheca academica Verlag 2009) 13.

56 Ebda., 406–414.

57 Ebda., 106–112.

58 Maria Falkner u. Reinhold Reith, „Den Khindsmenschen vor der Lißerl ihrn ersten Zan. Das häusliche Personal“, *Die Ausgabenbücher der Salzburger Kaufmannsfamilie Spängler von 1733 bis 1785*, hrsg. von Reinhold Reith, Luisa Pichler-Baumgartner, Georg Stöger u. Andreas Zechner, Schriftenreihe des Archivs der Stadt Salzburg 46 (Salzburg: Stadtgemeinde Salzburg 2016) 153–163, hier: 154.

59 Ebda., 155.

task fields and her position as cook wasn't as representative as the one of a male cook.<sup>60</sup> These aspects will also be a topic of our analyses since the gender already gives reference about culture of food and eating in the archiepiscopal city of Salzburg.

Concerning the criticism of Brunner's negation of long-term change processes, regressions or asynchronicity, these points are a major topic of every project member. For the bourgeoisie, not only the Family Spängler with their housekeeping books, which allow a study of 53 years, but also long-term developments from 1500 to 1800.

The last remaining point of criticism is Brunner's positive attitude to the Nazi regime and the use of Nazi terminology. This point gives reason to stress the distinction of the ideology of the Nazi regime which is very important especially for this project. Cuisine, eating and drinking habits are associated with local traditions. Particularly tradition and also food are adopted by various neo-Nazi groups. A critical approach with sources as well as theories and methods is therefore necessary to avoid any kind of estrangement of results.

Finally, I would like to take a very short glimpse at the housekeeping books of the family Spängler and the food related entries. Birgit Pelzer-Reith, who worked on this topic recently, gives a first insight in her essays „Für 28 £ Kölbernes samt dem Kräb. Lebensmittelkonsum und Ernährung“<sup>61</sup> and „Für 1 Huetl Zucker, Caffé et Gewirtz. Genussmittel und Kolonialwaren“.<sup>62</sup> Out of the 21.700 entries between 1733 and 1783 there are only 6850 for nutrition. In this period the family Spängler spent 65.000 Salzburger Gulden for food and drinks, which is about 50 percent of all the expenses. The annual expenditure amounts between 830 and 1645 Salzburger Gulden.<sup>63</sup> These figures illustrate the important status of nutrition at this time. The food related entries allow also a sight on what the family ate. The majority of the expenses were used for meat (14.560 Salzburger Gulden), venison (340 Salzburger Gulden) and poultry (1550 Salzburger Gulden). The meat purchases were often registered as „Fleischgelt“, „Fleischzettel“ or „Fleischpanckh“, sometimes accurate terms give an insight what was bought. Sometimes the family bought a little pig which was registered as „Värckl“. Concerning the meat, we know for some time periods the supply source, Anton Spängler utilised

60 Cf. Eva Barlösius, „Köchin und Koch. Familial-häusliche Essenzubereitung und berufliches Kochen“, *Haushalt und Familie in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit*. Vorträge eines interdisziplinären Symposions vom 6.-9. Juni 1990 an der Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, hrsg. von Trude Ehlert (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag 1991) 207-218, hier: 208-209.

61 Birgit Pelzer-Reith, „Für 28 £ Kölbernes samt dem Kräb. Lebensmittelkonsum und Ernährung“, *Haushalten und konsumieren: Die Ausgabenbücher der Salzburger Kaufmannsfamilie Spängler von 1733 bis 1785*, hrsg. von Reinhold Reith, Luisa Pichler-Baumgartner, Georg Stöger u. Andreas Zechner, Schriftenreihe des Archivs der Stadt Salzburg 46 (Salzburg: Stadtgemeinde Salzburg 2016) 179-201.

62 Birgit Pelzer-Reith, „Für 1 Huetl Zucker, Caffé et Gewirtz. Genussmittel und Kolonialwaren“, *Haushalten und konsumieren: Die Ausgabenbücher der Salzburger Kaufmannsfamilie Spängler von 1733 bis 1785*, hrsg. von Reinhold Reith, Luisa Pichler-Baumgartner, Georg Stöger u. Andreas Zechner, Schriftenreihe des Archivs der Stadt Salzburg 46 (Salzburg: Stadtgemeinde Salzburg 2016) 203-217.

63 Pelzer-Reith, „Für 28 £ Kölbernes samt dem Kräb“, wie in Anm. 61, 179.

therefore his family relations. Since spring 1745 he purchased the meat from the butcher of the archiepiscopal court Hans Adam Egger, the brother of his second wife Anna Elisabeth. After the death of his wife we know that in 1770 Spängler bought a pig from Büchner, another butcher of the archiepiscopal court.<sup>64</sup> In baroque period poultry was very prestigious and representative, also in Salzburg. We can find pigeons, capons and the very exclusive turkey, especially at the Christmastime, but also chickens. The poultry was bought by flying dealers or women who offered especially chickens. The expenses for poultry seem relatively small in comparison to meat considering the costs for luxury products like turkey. This fact is associated with the assumption that there was a hen house in the court yard of the house. Expenses for a ladder for the chickens justify this theory.<sup>65</sup> So the family Spängler didn't only depended on the food supply by the various markets in the city, they were also in some aspects self-supporter.

The family Spängler was one of the richest in Salzburg at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Therefore, they showed their social status by buying representative things. The most expressive things were products from overseas like wines, chocolate, coffee, tea, tobacco, sugar or spices.<sup>66</sup> The consumption of beer was common, it was basic food. Wine consumption was only possible for the rich. Due to the housekeeping books, we know that Spängler bought beer in larger quantity for the daily use, but he also bought bottles of wine. These bottles came from Burgundy, Cyprus, Wertheim, Tyrol or Austria. Very expensive and highly popular were sweet wines like the „Mußcat“ which the burgess purchased also like herbal wines.<sup>67</sup>

Besides the victuals and luxury foods there are more components to make a representative dinner. A household like the family Spängler was expected to have the latest trends in dishes, tableware, pots etc. Especially for the popular coffee and chocolate new and stylish cups were necessary. The probate inventory from Franz Anton Spängler allows an insight on available utensils. Unusual seems the division into an „ordinari“ (common) and a „schöne“ (good) kitchen. The common kitchen was for the daily use; in there we find mainly objects for the table. In the good kitchen, more and more expensive objects can be found like objects for sugar, wine, special dishes for fish, pewter plates a wash basin etc. Extra listed were dishes of china, clay, brass, cooper and others. In these two kitchens we find objects worth 271 Salzburger Gulden 101 and Salzburger Kreuzer without the silver objects, which are listed under ‚Silber Geschmeid‘ (1786 Salzburger Gulden and 8 Salzburger Kreuzer). Out of silver were candelabras, cutlery, chocolate and coffee cups, bowls and plates, salt and sugar boxes etc. For an appropriate dinner tablecloths and napkins are also indispensable.

---

64 Ebda., 180–181.

65 Ebda., 183–184.

66 Pelzer-Reith, „Für 1 Huetl Zucker, Caffé et Gewirtz“, wie in Anm. 62, 203.

67 Ebda., 204–205.

Of course, we find them in different quality categories in the household of the family Spängler – after all he dealt with cloth and silk.<sup>68</sup>

Eating and drinking in the early modern age concerned everybody not only for the need of nutrition but also for the process from buying respectively produce groceries to the cooking process as well as other aspects like tableware. Looking at one city and trying to analyse the whole process of food supply and its social meanings it is necessary to bring the social classes into focus. But to understand the social meaning of eating and drinking it is not helpful to split up the society in the different professional groups, essential are the networks and the households where the culture of food can be found. For example, the servants; it does not make sense to study the eating and drinking habits of this group because they cannot develop an independent cuisine or table rituals, their supply was organised in the individual households of their employers. Also, the aspect of the daily dinner or special occasions like feasts, which were organised and conducted by/ within one family sometimes with friends. To understand feasting and dining in the urban bourgeoisie it is necessary to study the circumstances like facilities, equipment, furniture, responsibilities etc. inside a family. The household – I prefer the term household instead of entire house – was the centre of the daily sustenance. Of course, networks like the various markets and shops have to be taken under consideration as well.

Although the theory of the entire house by Otto Brunner is highly criticised I think it still offers a possibility to study diverse aspects of the daily routine – under the condition of adaption and inclusion of current research results. The points of criticism – private versus work space, the autarchy of the peasantry, the authority of the housefather, the negation of long-term change processes, regressions or asynchrony, the readership, and Brunner's positive attitude to the Nazi regime – have to be considered, updated and scrutinised, only then a theory of the household is possible.

---

68 Reith (Hrsg.), *Das Verlassenschaftsinventar*, wie in Anm. 37, 81–86.