

Women and the Material Culture of Food in Early Modern Germany

SHEILAGH OGILVIE, MARKUS KÜPKER, AND JANINE MAEGRAITH

The material culture of housework is a paradoxical blind spot in the history of early modern women. Contemporary commentators—as in the German “house-father literature”—described men’s possessions as essential capital equipment but dismissed women’s domestic goods as unnecessary luxuries.¹ Even modern women’s history says relatively little about the material culture of domestic work.² This essay uses a new database for early modern Germany to illuminate the material culture of women’s domestic activities, specifically their work processing food.

We now know that early modern women worked actively in every economic sector from which they were not legally barred.³ But about 20% of all observed work by females in this German region consisted of housework, and approximately another 20% involved gathering food, running household errands, and tending children and invalids; in this, women were almost never assisted by men.⁴ Housework, then, not only absorbed a significant share of women’s time, but also remained an exclusively female sphere. How was this reflected in material culture?

Our findings come from a new project which is analyzing personal inventories for two communities in the southwest German territory of Württemberg.⁵ Württemberg is well-known for the extraordinary quality of its marriage and death inventories, which were compulsory for ordinary people from c. 1600 until 1899, and covered a substantial proportion of those who married or died in adulthood.⁶ They listed not just moveable goods, but land, buildings, livestock, vehicles, and financial instruments, and did not in principle exclude items below a certain value.⁷ Württemberg

inventories are well-suited to explore gender-specific material culture since they typically distinguished the assets of brides and grooms at marriage and were drawn up for both sexes at death.⁸

Our project is still in its first stages, so this essay is based on the earliest surviving inventories for one locality—the small Black Forest community of Wildberg—from 1602 to 1662.⁹ These inventories reveal clear gender differences, with women owning a larger number of items of a lower average value.¹⁰ This pattern reflects the fact that the world of moveable objects was disproportionately a female sphere. Men brought more real estate and financial instruments into marriage, and kept more of them into widowhood,¹¹ while women owned more mobile goods and held a higher share of their assets as moveable objects.¹² Conversely, the majority of moveable objects were owned by women, reflecting their decisions and their material culture. This female dominance of the world of objects was recognized, but strongly criticized, by educated male contemporaries such as Wolfgang Helmhard Freiherr von Hohberg, who in his influential 1682 advice manual included control over “Fahrnus” (moveables) as a major responsibility of the “house-mother” but warned that she should “not fall in love with superfluous unnecessary moveable goods.”¹³

What were these moveable goods that early modern women so overwhelmingly owned? Here we focus on items used in processing food.¹⁴ Counter to the view that early modern kitchen equipment was quite basic, our inventories reveal a remarkable quantity and variety of food-related items.¹⁵ Even the poorest inventories (with assets below 50 *Gulden*) listed an average of 16 food-related items (worth over 5 *Gulden*), while the richest (over 1000 *Gulden*) listed an average of 203 food-related items (worth 112 *Gulden*).¹⁶ These early modern Germans evidently recognized that domestic work was more productive if women had appropriate equipment. It was largely women themselves who were responsible for obtaining and retaining this equipment. Women had higher absolute numbers of food-related items than males, and devoted a larger share of their moveable objects to these items, across the entire social spectrum—even at fairly low wealth levels.¹⁷

Women’s cooking equipment included not just generic necessities, such as cauldrons and knives, but also a surprising array of more special-

ized items. Baking tools, for instance, emerge as particularly important, with nearly half of all first-time brides bringing them into marriage, three-quarters of widows recording them at death, and women owning significantly more than men across the wealth spectrum.¹⁸ Dough-tubs for bread-making were listed in nearly one-quarter of marriage inventories and over one-third of death inventories, were mainly brought into marriage by brides, and were owned significantly more often by females than males.¹⁹ Kneading-troughs, likewise, were listed in over one-quarter of marriage inventories and over one-half of death inventories, and again were mainly owned by women.²⁰ In owning bread-making equipment, couples resembled females but differed significantly from males, suggesting that couples' household equipment adopted a distinctively "female" pattern.²¹ Although dough-tubs were owned equally across the wealth spectrum whereas kneading-troughs were commoner among the better-off, some women even in the poorest wealth-groups owned these baking items, indicating their centrality to female material culture.²²

Arguably the most intriguing aspect of food-related material culture is the surprising importance of specialized cake-making equipment. Thus *Straubentrichter*—small funnels used to direct dough into simmering fat in making snail-shaped funnel-cakes (*Strauben*)—appear in about one-third of all Wildberg inventories.²³ Items of female material culture *par excellence*, they were brought into marriage by 28% of first-time brides but only 2% of first-time grooms, and treasured till death by 40% of widows (compared to 27% of widowers).²⁴ Wealthier people owned them more often, but these cake-funnels were not very expensive and were brought into marriage by 20% of first-time brides even in the poorest wealth group.²⁵ Likewise, *Mutschelsiebe*—fine sieves used to sift the flour to make festive mussel-cakes (*Mutscheln*)²⁶—appear in 16% of marriage inventories and 22% of death inventories, again mainly provided and retained by women.²⁷ Mussel-cake sieves were owned widely across the social spectrum, and were brought into marriage by 17% of first-time brides even in the poorest wealth category.²⁸

Why did even quite poor women own these specialized cake-making tools? Cakes were not merely food, but forms of cultural communication. Funnel-cakes, for instance, were baked by women on festive occasions

and played a central role in narratives such as "Das Hennenpfösl" ("The Poultry-Maid"), a Cinderella variant in which the funnel-cake is both the medium by which understanding is reached between heroine and hero, and a dish which even the meanest of females can make for even the noblest of males as his "Leibspeise" (meaning "favorite dish," but literally "body-food").²⁹ Mussel-cakes had an even denser set of cultural meanings in Württemberg, where communities often celebrated an annual Mussel-Cake Day (*Mutscheltag*), on which men shot or diced for mussel-cakes to bring home to wives, or young men signaled love by presenting their sweethearts with mussel-cakes.³⁰ Cakes were thus culturally central in communicating and symbolizing the relationship between the sexes.³¹ Small wonder, then, that we find cake-funnels and mussel-cake sieves as treasured objects for women even of the poorest strata—in the teeth of contemporary advice-manuals warning "house-mothers" against excessive indulgence in cake-making.³²

This essay has sought to illuminate the material culture of the early modern German woman's domestic "workshop" by investigating how well it was equipped with tools and who was responsible for obtaining them. Counter to the prevailing picture of early modern cooking equipment as very basic, even the poorest women in this relatively poor rural community owned a surprising number and variety of food-related items. Such objects not only increased women's productivity, but also reflected their skills, their tastes, and their self-esteem. Baking equipment in particular emerges as central to these women's material culture. Even the poorest women brought into marriage and treasured until death specialized tools for making particular types of cake, which, in contemporary narratives and festivities, symbolized and communicated the relationship between the sexes. This suggests that these objects were not only economically important, but also had a wider cultural resonance that made them central to women's material culture.

Notes

1. Thus Wolfgang Helmhard von Hohberg, *Georgica curiosa aucta, Das ist: Umständlicher Bericht und klarer Unterricht Von dem Adelichen Land- und Feld-Leben*

(Nürnberg: Endter, 1682), vol. 3, ch. 16, p. 276, warned wives that they should “not come every day with new demands” (“nicht alle Tag mit neuen Begehren kommen”), and on p. 289 admonished women about their desire for “unnecessary” (“unnöthwendige”) things.

2. Exceptions are exhibitions such as “At Home in Renaissance Italy” (Victoria and Albert Museum, 5 October 2006–7 January 2007), http://www.vam.ac.uk/vastatic/microsites/1487_renaissance/index.html; and publications such as Mark Overton, Jane Whittle, Darron Dean, and Andrew Haan, *Production and Consumption in English Households, 1600–1750* (London: Routledge, 2004); or Sara Pennell, “The Material Culture of Food in Early Modern England, circa 1650–1750” (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1997).

3. On Europe as a whole, see Merry Wiesner, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); on the German region studied here, see Sheilagh Ogilvie, *A Bitter Living: Women, Markets, and Social Capital in Early Modern Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

4. These figures are based on observations of actual work being carried out, extracted from over 7000 pages of communal church court minutes for two Württemberg communities, Wildberg and Ebhausen, between 1646 and 1800. For a detailed description of this database, see Ogilvie, *A Bitter Living*, 22–36; for the results reported here, see Sheilagh Ogilvie, “Women and Labour Markets in Early Modern Germany,” *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 2004, no. 2 (2004): table 4.

5. The project, entitled “Human Well-Being and the ‘Industrious Revolution’: Consumption, Gender and Social Capital in a German Developing Economy, 1600–1900,” is supported by the UK Economic and Social Research Council (RES-062-23-0759), <http://131.111.16510%1/faculty/ogilvie/ESRC-project-English.pdf>.

6. See Rolf Bidlingmaier, “Inventuren und Teilungen,” in *Serielle Quellen in südwestdeutschen Archiven*, ed. Christian Keitel and Regina Keyler (Stuttgart: Württembergische Geschichts- und Altertumsvereins, 2002). Württemberg law mandated inventories at death from 1550 to 1899 and at marriage from 1610 to 1899. Inventories were optional for the elite, but compulsory for ordinary people who married or had heirs. Unlike, for example, in England, the legal obligation to be inventoried did not in principle exclude those below a certain wealth. For the Württemberg village of Laichingen between 1766 and 1799, Hans Medick, *Weben und Überleben in Laichingen 1650–1900. Untersuchungen zur Sozial-, Kultur- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte aus der Perspektive einer lokalen Gesellschaft im frühneuzeitlichen Württemberg* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1996), 614–15, found marriage inventories for over 94% of fully reconstituted families (and over 85% of partially reconstituted ones) in his family reconstitution. For Wildberg, the community under analysis in this essay, the number of surviving inventories listed in the archival repertoria is about 60% of the number of marriages plus the number of adult deaths (of individuals over age 21) in the parish registers, for a sample of 14 scattered years between the early seventeenth and the early nineteenth century (1617, 1651, 1661, 1671, 1681, 1691, 1701, 1711, 1721, 1741, 1761, 1781, 1801, and 1825).

7. Approximately 80% of Wildberg inventories in the 1602–1662 period record

monetary values for all items, and the proportion approaches 100% toward the end of the period. Since it is impossible to prove a negative, we cannot say that those drawing up the Wildberg inventories did not regard some items as not valuable enough to include. What we can say is that our inventories do include some items worth as little as 1 Heller (the smallest currency unit), and that the practice of listing values at the Heller level became more widespread in the Wildberg inventories as the seventeenth century progressed.

8. Objects owned at first marriage provide the clearest view of gender-specific material culture, since they reflect individual choice uncontaminated by residues from a previous marriage, so we are fortunate in having inventories for 184 first-time brides and 161 first-time grooms. Most of the death inventories were drawn up for married individuals and reflect the assets of a couple, but 20 are for widows and 11 for widowers, enabling tentative comparisons of the objects women and men decided to retain into widowhood, although numbers are almost always too small for statistically significant results at the conventional (5%) level.

9. The other selected community is the village of Auingen on the Swabian Jura. For Wildberg, a total of 513 marriage and death inventories survive for this period (1602–1662), consisting of 227 marriage inventories and 191 death inventories. Inventories were also sometimes drawn up on other occasions, such as marital conflict, marital desertion, divorce, or court order, but these took special forms and require separate analysis. The present essay restricts itself to the ordinary marriage and death inventories. This essay focuses on the 415 inventories (80% of the surviving marriage and death inventories) that recorded full monetary values. This decision was motivated by a pilot analysis revealing that the sexes allocated wealth to different types of objects and that both sexes' material culture varied significantly across wealth groups. The criterion for inclusion in the analysis was that an inventory recorded monetary values for over 95% of items listed. This meant that 98 inventories were excluded because they lacked values for over 5% of items. All surviving inventories will be included in future analyses once we have generated a price series on the basis of the inventories that do record item values, which will enable us to impute values to those items that lack them.

10. The average first-time bride brought in significantly more items than the average first-time groom (112 compared to 46, significant at the 5% level), but at an approximately equal total value (147 *Gulden* compared to 144 *Gulden*, not significant even at the 10% level). The average bride (first-time plus remarrying widows) brought into marriage significantly more items than the average groom (first-time plus remarrying widowers) (125 compared to 98, significantly different at the 5% level), but these were not worth significantly more money (the values were 210 *Gulden* for brides and 247 *Gulden* for grooms, not significantly different even at the 10% level). Widowed females died with 262 items worth 1032 *Gulden*, compared to widowed males with 196 items worth 1355 *Gulden*. Neither difference is significant even at the 10% level, not surprisingly since we have inventories for only 20 widows and 11 widowers.

11. Thus the average first-time bride brought into marriage significantly more moveables than the average first-time groom (110 compared to 43, significant at the 1%

level), and also of a significantly higher value (110 *Gulden* compared to 67, significant at the 1% level). The average bride (including remarrying widows) brought significantly more moveables into marriage than the average groom (122 compared to 91, significant at the 5% level) but there was no significant difference in their total value (122 *Gulden* compared to 104, not significant even at the 10% level). Widows owned more moveables than widowers (235 compared to 174), but of a similar total value (131 *Gulden* for widows, 125 *Gulden* for widowers), but neither difference is significant even at the 10% level.

12. The share of moveables in total number of items was significantly higher for all brides than for all grooms (97% compared to 92%, significant at the 1% level), and for first-time brides compared to first-time grooms (98% compared to 92%, significant at the 1% level). The share of moveables in total *value* was significantly higher for all brides than for all grooms (81% compared to 71%, significant at the 1% level), and for first-time brides compared to first-time grooms (85% compared to 77%, significant at the 1% level). Over the life-cycle, moveables fell from 95% to 92% of items (for couples in marriage inventories compared to couples in death inventories, significant at the 1% level), and from 72% to 46% of value for the average couple (significant at the 1% level). However, the gender gap survived into widowhood, with moveables' share of items higher for widows than widowers (89% compared to 76%, significant only at the 7% level, and so of borderline significance); the difference in moveables' share of *value* (39% for widows compared to 33% for widowers) was not statistically significant even at the 10% level. In a multivariate Tobit regression with moveable goods as percentage of total assets as the dependent variable, and inventory type (marriage or death inventory), marital status (single, married, or widowed), total wealth (in *Gulden*), and sex (female, male, or couple) as independent variables, women as a whole held a higher share of their assets (both total items and total value) as moveables than did men. The difference between females and males was significant at the 1% level for items and at the 5% level for value. Comparing female with male *widows* did not result in statistically significant differences, even at the 10% level, because of the small number of cases.

13. Hohberg, *Georgica*, vol. 3, ch. 16, p. 289: "Zweytens / soll sie sich / nach Gelegenheit und Vermögen ihres Einkommens / in die überflüssige unnothwendige Fahrnis nicht verliehen. . . ." Few ordinary people in Wildberg were likely to have read von Hohberg; his book does not appear in the Württemberg inventories for Wildberg and Bissingen an der Enz listed in Petra Schad, *Buchbesitz im Herzogtum Württemberg im 18. Jahrhundert. Am Beispiel der Amtsstadt Wildberg und des Dorfes Bissingen/Enz* (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2002), 195–221, 236–42. However, analyses of the reception of Hohberg's book, such as that in Julius Hoffmann, *Die "Hausväterliteratur" und die "Predigten über den christlichen Hausstand." Lehre vom Haus und Bildung für das häusliche Leben im 16., 17., und 18. Jahrhundert* (Weinheim: Beltz, 1959), suggest that it was often included in the reading matter of educated elites (pastors and bureaucrats), from whose orders and sermons his ideas may have filtered down to ordinary people.

14. Contemporary advice manuals of the "house-father literature" placed cooking foremost among women's responsibilities, with von Hohberg entitling his chapter on

the work of the house-mother, "What is to be done in the house and in the kitchen" (see Hohberg, *Georgica*, ch. 16, pp. 288–90: "Was im Hause und in der Kuchen zu thun"), while Christian Friedrich Germershausen, *Die Hausmutter in allen ihren Geschften* (Hannover: Bei den Gebruedern Hahn, 1782ff.), vol. 1, ch. 1, p. 3, stated explicitly that the kitchen "is ultimately the workshop in which the house-mother must apply the most part of her daily efforts for the maintenance of the entire household" ("ist endlich auch die Werksttte, in der die Hausmutter ihre meisten und tglichen Bemhungen, zur Erhaltung des ganzen Hauswesens, anwenden mu.") Although Wildberg women did much more non-domestic work than this, food preparation was unquestionably an important component of their housework and a nearly exclusively female responsibility; on this, see Ogilvie, *A Bitter Living*, esp. ch. 4.

15. See, for instance, http://www.vam.ac.uk/vastatic/microsites/1487_renaissance/cucina.html, (accessed October 31, 2008), where the Renaissance Italian house is described as one in which "Even in large kitchens, the equipment was quite basic."

16. All objects in the Wildberg inventory sample were categorized according to whether they were related to food and its processing for household consumption: foodstuffs themselves, food storage, food hygiene, food preparation, food serving, kitchen fires, and kitchen furnishings. Objects were defined as either "definitely" or "potentially" food-related, but it emerged that the latter category was small and the patterns for the two categories did not differ significantly; the discussion that follows therefore combines both categories into a single group of "food-related" items.

17. In a multivariate Tobit regression, controlling for total wealth, inventory type, and marital status, we find that the share of food-related items in moveables was significantly higher for females than males. Both for number of items and for value of items, the difference between females and males was significant at the 1% level. Specifically comparing the sexes in widowhood, we find that the difference between widows and widowers was not significant, even at the 10% level. Females also owned higher absolute numbers of food-related items than males (holding constant other characteristics, such as wealth, marital status, and inventory type).

18. Baking equipment was brought into marriage by 45% of first-time brides and 6% of first-time grooms, a difference significant at the 1% level. By the time a marriage was broken up by death of one partner, 83% of couples owned baking equipment. Women retained such equipment into widowhood, with 75% of widows owning baking-related objects at death; men, by contrast, got rid of baking equipment after their wives died, with only 45% of widowers (and those only in the richest wealth-groups) owning baking equipment at death. Although in general most comparisons between widows and widowers are not statistically significant because of the small number of observations, this particular difference is so large that it is significant, albeit only at the 10% level. In a logit regression with ownership of baking tools as the dependent variable, and sex, marital status, inventory type, and wealth as the independent variables, the difference between females and males was significant at the 1% level, but there was no significant difference between widowed females and widowed males. The ownership of baking equipment also

increased significantly as wealth rose (the effect of wealth was significant at the 1% level). Ownership of baking equipment was higher for married and widowed persons than for the unmarried: the difference between the unmarried and the married is significant at 1% level, as is the difference between the unmarried and the widowed.

19. Dough-tubs were recorded in 23% of marriage inventories and 37% of death inventories. They were listed for 12% of first-time brides but only 2% of first-time grooms, a difference significant at the 1% level. Although numbers are too low for statistical significance, widows also slightly exceeded widowers in ownership of dough-tubs (20% compared to 18%). In a multivariate logit regression, controlling for wealth, inventory type and marital status, the difference between the sexes in ownership of dough-tubs is significant at the 1% level. Among widowed individuals, there was no significant difference between the sexes in a multivariate context.

20. Kneading-troughs were listed in 26% of marriage inventories and 52% of death inventories. Women were mainly responsible for bringing them into marriage, with 12% of first-time brides but only 2% of first-time grooms recorded with them, a difference significant at the 1% level. Although numbers are too low for statistical significance, widows also slightly exceeded widowers in ownership of baking troughs (50% compared to 45%). In a multivariate logit regression, controlling for wealth, inventory type and marital status, the difference between the sexes is significant only at the (borderline) 7% level. Among widowed individuals, there was no significant difference between the sexes in ownership of these bread-making tools in a multivariate context.

21. In a multivariate logit regression, the difference in ownership of dough-tubs between males and females and between males and couples was significant at the 1% level; the difference between females and couples was not significant even at the 10% level.

22. In multivariate logit regressions, the effect of wealth on ownership of dough-tubs was not significant even at the 10% level, while the effect of wealth on ownership of baking troughs was significant at the 1% level. Nonetheless, dough-tubs appear in the death inventories of 60% of couples of the lowest wealth category (below 50 *Gulden*); the corresponding figure for kneading-troughs is 40%.

23. *Straubentrichter* are listed in 38% of marriage inventories and 31% of death inventories. The word "funnel-cake" (*Strauben*) in the name of this object does not, of course, exclude its having been used for other purposes for which a small funnel would come in handy. That the small funnel was named after *Strauben*, however, is a strong indication that this was perceived by contemporaries as its main purpose.

24. The difference between first-time brides and first-time grooms is significant at the 1% level. Because of the low number of inventories for widowed individuals, the difference between widows and widowers is not statistically significant. In a multivariate logit regression, controlling for wealth, inventory type, marital status, and sex, the difference between females and males was significant at the 1% level. As with other baking equipment, couples resembled females (no significant difference in ownership of dough-funnels) but differed from males (difference significant at the 1% level), suggesting that couples' ownership of these objects was due primarily to female influence. Ownership

of dough-funnels differed significantly between the widowed and the unmarried, but not between the widowed and the married, suggesting again that this was an object that was obtained at or during marriage and then treasured into widowhood. The difference between widows and couples was significant at the 9% level; between couples and the unmarried not even at the 10% level; between widows and the unmarried it was significant at the 1% level.

25. In a logit regression, controlling for inventory type, sex, and marital status, wealth had a positive effect on ownership of dough-funnels that was significant at the 1% level.

26. Angelika Bischoff-Luithlen and Christel Köhle-Hezinger, *Von Amtsstuben, Backhäusern und Jahrmärkten. Ein Lese- und Nachschlagebuch zum Dorfalltag im alten Württemberg und Baden* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1979), 180–81; Hermann Fischer, *Schwäbisches Wörterbuch* (Tübingen: Laupp, 1914), 4:1846. The word “mussel-cake” in the name of this object does not mean that it could not be used for other purposes, of course, and presumably a mussel-cake sieve would have come in useful for any baked good delicate enough to require very finely sifted flour. That this particular sieve was named after *Mutscheln*, however, is a strong indication that this was perceived by contemporaries as its main purpose.

27. Mussel-cake sieves were recorded for 14% of first-time brides and no first-time grooms, a difference significant at the 1% level. Ownership of these items increased slightly during marriage, so they appear in 22% of inventories for couples at the death of one spouse. Interestingly, however, they appear in only 5% of death inventories for widows compared to 18% for widowers, indicating no tendency for them to be treasured into old age more by women than by men, although this difference is not statistically significant. In a multivariate logit regression, controlling for wealth, inventory type, and marital status, ownership of mussel-cake sieves was significantly higher among females than males, holding constant other characteristics (significant at the 1% level).

28. In a logit regression, controlling for inventory type, marital status, and sex, the effect of wealth on ownership of mussel-cake sieves was not significant even at the 10% level.

29. Best-known from the collection of Ignaz Zingerle and Josef Zingerle, *Kinder- und Hausmärchen aus Tirol* (Innsbruck: Ignaz Vinc. von Zingerle, 1852): “Eines Tages befahl der Schloßherr seiner Köchin, auf Mittag Strauben zu kochen. ... Mittags wurden die Strauben aufgetragen, und der Schloßherr aß mit großem Appetit, denn sie waren seine Leibspeise.” [One day the lord of the castle ordered his cook to make funnel-cakes for the midday meal. . . . At midday the funnel-cakes were dished up, and the lord of the castle ate with great appetite, for they were his *Leib Speise* (favorite dish/body-food).] The heroine, disguised as a poultry-maid, reveals herself to the hero, the lord of the castle who has given her a golden ring at a ball, by cooking the ring into a funnel-cake which is served up to him at dinner. The heroine has to beg permission from the castle cook to be allowed, despite her mean and dirty appearance, to cook just one funnel-cake for the lord.

30. A multitude of cultural practices surrounded Mussel-Cake Day in Württemberg and the wider Swabian cultural region, but a common theme was "bread-winning" and sexual display. For discussion of the cultural meanings and practices associated with Swabian mussel-cakes, see Fischer, *Schwäbisches Wörterbuch*, 4:1846; Bischoff-Luithlen / Köhle-Hezinger, *Von Amtsstuben*, 181; Christine Knauer, "Von den Glanzzeiten der mürben Sterne," *Reutlinger General-Anzeiger Sonderveröffentlichung*, 5 Jan. 2007, 15; Heinz-Eugen Schramm's poem "Der Reutlinger Mutscheltag"; Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Wander, *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1867/1880), vol. 3, col. 802; <http://www.mutscheln.de/>; and <http://www.ebbes-guats.de/mutscheln.html>.

31. Although we have as yet no direct evidence of the cultural practices surrounding mussel-cakes in Wildberg, it seems likely that they shared in some of these wider Swabian cultural meanings. One evident difference which requires further elucidation, however, is that the presence of mussel-cake sieves in Wildberg inventories shows that mussel-cakes were baked at home in this locality at this period, rather than (or in addition to) being diced for in bakeries or taverns.

32. Germershausen, *Hausmutter*, vol. 2, part 1, ch. 1, p. 192: "Endlich so muß es auch eine Hausmutter klüglich überlegen, ob es ihr Stand und Vermögen auch leidet, sich viel mit Kuchenbacken abzugeben" ("finally, a house-mother must also consider intelligently whether her status and wealth are such that she can afford to devote herself very much to cake-making"); and p. 194: "Kuchen sind Leckerbissen, und man muß es öfters gehört haben, daß man gesagt, dieses oder jenes Haus hat sich in Kuchen arm gegessen, oder dieses oder jenes Haus kann zu nichts kommen, es wird darinn alles verbackt" ("cakes are delicacies, and one must have often heard it said that a certain household has eaten itself into poverty with cakes, or that another household will never come to anything because everything in it gets baked away").