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This Online Appendix presents additional calculations based on the probate inventories database used in the paper, as well as on church books and cadastral registers that provide complementary information on ages and household sizes of the study’s sample. More specifically, this Online Appendix begins by discussing stratification within the broad groups of farmers and labourers that are the main focus of the paper. In Table A1 we present descriptive information on the wealth differentials between the various subgroups as well as for various kinds of natural geographical areas, and the evolution over time. Table A2 continues on the discussion on differences between different kinds of farmers, and shows that tenants of the nobility were less wealthy, and had a less advantageous growth of wealth 1780–1865, than freeholders and tenants of the crown. Table A3 discusses the development of wealth inequality among farmers, showing the Gini coefficient of wealth for our three benchmark periods. Here we relate to a large previous literature on the degree of stratification within the Swedish farmer class. Table A4 breaks down the wealth evolution for the three subgroups of the labourers.

The second section of the Appendix focuses on how we have estimated the age of the probated individuals and gone about to guarantee that we in our main analyses study people of working age. We explain that procedure, involving not only probate inventories but also the church books from parish archives, and discuss the presence and material living standards of retirees. Table A5 describes the wealth development for retired farmers, while Tables A6 and A7 document their (diminished) productive capacity.

Since the probate inventories capture the productive capacity of households rather than individuals, we might consider that findings on expanding and diversified productive capacity on the household level are driven by expanding household size, with more available workers, rather than reallocation of the labour of the core people of the household – spouses and adult children (cf. Keibek and Shaw-Taylor 2013). For this reason, the third and final section of the Appendix presents original calculations of household size over time in three parishes from our sample, building on cadastral registers. This investigation, presented in Tables A8 and A9, shows that household size was stagnant over time in our studied areas, and this conclusion is also supported with references to studies from other areas.

## The social groups, wealth and its evolution in more detail

In the main body of the paper, Table 2 shows the geographical composition of the dataset, and Table 3 shows the sample for labourers and farmers. There we focus only on the two broad groups, labourers and farmers. In this Appendix we also present more differentiated results, for sub-groups.

Here, in one version of the calculations we break down the peasant farmer group into three subgroups (On farmer stratification cf. Gadd 2000, pp. 72–9; Bengtsson and Svensson 2019). The biggest group, which we will use as a baseline category, consists of owner occupiers and crown tenants, who had relatively stable tenure. The second category is a more privileged category, which we create by merging two relatively well-off farmer groups. The first is that of local trustees (jurors and churchwardens), who can be expected to possess a high level of social capital and thereby stand out from the rest of the peasant community. The second is the farmers who did not pay their annual tax to the crown but instead were obliged to hire and maintain a horseman (*rusthållare*, literally armour holder). For this task, farms assessed as especially viable had to a high degree been allocated (Olsson 2005, pp. 155–8), and these farmers were often the same people who were appointed as local trustees. Since the local trustees are quite few, we often merge these two groups in the further analysis. The last farmer subgroup consists of the tenants of the nobility who were less privileged, as they had insecure tenancies and had to perform *corvée* labour (Dribe et al 2012).

In the same way, we break down the rural labourers into three subgroups. The first group is crofters and cottagers, who had rudimentary land tenure and could produce some food. For this reason, this group is considered to be the most well-off (or least poor) among the landless and semi-landless groups (cf. Söderberg 1978; Ahlberger 1988; Bengtsson and Svensson 2022). The second subgroup is annually hired workers or live-ins, such as farmhands, maids, and later married contract workers (*statare*). The third subgroup is unspecified landless with no titles. This is a problematic group in that it can be poor proletarians who subsist on wage labour, but can also collect groups with less dependency on wage labour – the infirm and the old (cf. discussion in Söderberg 1978, pp. 126–133).

Table A1 shows the composition of the dataset in detail: in terms of social class with subgroups, but also period, natural geography conditions, and gender. Regarding the social composition, the aim of the paper is specifically to study living standards and productive capacity within the two groups of farmers and rural labourers, so we are not overly worried about the class representativeness of our sample, as long as both groups have enough absolute numbers for us to be able to draw conclusions about their productive capacity. (The social representativeness of probate inventories is a large debate in Swedish economic history: cf. Bengtsson and Svensson 2022, pp. 65–67.) Table A1 shows that, as expected, farmers and rural elite (especially clergymen) are overrepresented in the first period, while the sample in the last period is quite well balanced to the real rural population. (The social restructuring in rural Sweden in the period is discussed in Section III in the main body of the paper.) We want to stress that if the wealth bias of the probability of being probated decreases over time, which is likely, then we will *underestimate* the growth of wealth in the probated households. We find rising wealth in both main types of households – farmers and labourers – over time, so it is very unlikely that the results would be reversed had there been no wealth bias for being probated. Instead, the results would probably become even stronger.

**Table A1. Distribution of the sample together with three OLS regressions with gross wealth (logarithmized) as the dependent variable**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | No. | Reg1 | Reg2 | Reg3 |
| Farmers, reference group | 683 | (ref) | (ref) | (ref) |
| Farmers, local trustees | 37 | 1.207\*\*\* | 1.195\*\*\* | 1.140\*\*\* |
| Farmers, allotted to cavalry | 148 | 0.355\*\*\* | 0.437\*\*\* | 0.383\*\*\* |
| Farmers, tenants of the nobility | 80 | -0.356\*\*\* | -0.459\*\*\* | -0.485\*\*\* |
| Retirees | 138 | -1.490\*\*\* | -1.783\*\*\* | -1.760\*\*\* |
| Labourers, crofters and cottagers | 138 | -1.222\*\*\* | -1.613\*\*\* | -1.597\*\*\* |
| Labourers, rural workers | 304 | -1.372\*\*\* | -1.687\*\*\* | -1.682\*\*\* |
| Labourers, unspecified landless | 122 | -1.958\*\*\* | -2.137\*\*\* | -2.129\*\*\* |
| Fishermen | 4 | -1.220\*\* | -1.518\*\* | -1.511\*\*\* |
| Artisans and skilled workers | 63 | -0.476\*\*\* | -0.695\*\*\* | -0.720\*\*\* |
| Middle class: sextons, toll staff | 36 | -0.356\* | -0.454\* | -0.434\*\* |
| Merchants and innkeepers | 24 | 0.728\*\*\* | 0.543\*\* | 0.612\*\*\* |
| Rural elite: priests, inspectors | 70 | 1.466\*\*\* | 1.709\*\*\* | 1.683\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1670–1720 | 475 |  | (ref) | (ref) |
| 1780–1785 | 634 |  | 0.446\*\*\* | 0.436\*\*\* |
| 1860–1865 | 741 |  | 0.869\*\*\* | 0.857\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 1,053 |  | (ref) | (ref) |
| Women | 793 |  | -0.058 | -0.054 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Plain land | 653 |  |  | (ref) |
| Intermediate | 785 |  |  | -0.295\*\*\* |
| Wood land | 409 |  |  | -0.409\*\*\* |
| Constant |  | 5.501\*\*\* | 5.140\*\*\* | 5.366\*\*\* |
| Number of observations |  | 1,846 | 1,846 | 1,846 |
| Adjusted R-squared |  | 0.388 | 0.433 | 0.446 |

Sources: Database, built on probate inventories from 12 judicial district archives, as described in Table 1 in the main body of the paper. The reference group consists of freeholders and crown tenants.

Note: Significance: \* P ≤ 0.05; \*\* P ≤ 0.01; \*\*\* P ≤ 0.001.

In Table A1, to check for possible effects of imbalances between the social classes, over time, in natural conditions and gender, we start by running three simple regressions with the logarithm of gross wealth as the dependent variable. The first regression focuses on the difference in wealth between the different social groups; the second regression also controls for time and for sex; and the third regression also adds the type of geography in the district. Regarding the differences between and within social groups, they are in line what we expected from the discussion in the previous section. Farmers allotted to the cavalry and local trustees were richer than the reference group (freeholders and crown tenants), while tenants of the nobility were poorer. The rural elite was the only groups with considerably greater wealth than the peasant farmers; on average, the elite was 1.5–1.7 times richer. Merchants and innkeepers were somewhat richer than the reference group, but rural artisans and middle class were poorer than the farmers. As expected, the rural labourers, were the least fortunate group. Within the group of the labourers, as expected crofters and cottagers were the least poor, while workers and unspecified landless without a title were the poorest. For gender, the results are also as expected, as there is no significant difference between probated women and men; this reflects the fact that the inventory is for the household, not the individual. This strengthens our confidence that we are right to treat the probate inventory as a source for the household, and not gender-specific depending on whether a woman or a man has died.

Regressions 2 and 3 show that average wealth rose from the first period with about 45 per cent up to the 1780s, and with 85 per cent up to the 1860s. This is in stark contrast to the stagnation of GDP per capita (Edvinsson 2013; Schön and Krantz 2015), and we discuss this discrepancy in the main body of the paper. In regression 3, we furthermore see the variety between different economic geographies: all other things equal, the inhabitants on intermediate ‘scrub’ lands are on average about 30 per cent poorer than the plains dwellers, and the wood landers are about 40 per cent poorer. This accords with expectations, and results of Bengtsson and Svensson (2019, p. 136–137) for Swedish farmers more generally, and with Söderberg’s (1978, pp. 23–28) research on poverty frequency (defined as the share of the households who were tax-exempt).

For the evolution of workers’ and farmers’ respective wealth, the two time periods show a crucial difference. Both the farmers’ and the workers’ gross wealth increased by roughly 50 per cent between 1700 and the 1780s. But from the 1780s to the 1860s, the farmers tripled their wealth, in a time of agrarian revolution (Olsson and Svensson 2010) while the workers basically stood still. This correlates with the well-known finding that the nineteenth century was a time of increasing wealth inequality in Sweden (Bengtsson et al. 2018).

Table A2 provide a more detailed calculation of wealth development over time for the various subgroups of farmers, compared to the presentation in Table 3 in the main body of the paper.

**Table A2. Wealth development for farmer subcategories**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Period | No. | Age at death | Gross value | Net value | Real estate value | Production assets, share of gross | Consumable assets, share of gross | Claims, share of gross | Debts, share of gross |
| Farmer  reference  group | 1700 | 292 | 50 | 196 | 115 | 15 | 80% | 18% | 4% | 54% |
| 1780 | 204 | 51 | 290 | 197 | 33 | 65% | 31% | 5% | 40% |
| 1860 | 202 | 52 | 1,253 | 659 | 619 | 58% | 39% | 36% | 51% |
| Local trustees or *rusthållare* | 1700 | 70 | 57 | 400 | 231 | 48 | 81% | 17% | 4% | 72% |
| 1780 | 98 | 50 | 602 | 432 | 160 | 63% | 33% | 6% | 33% |
| 1860 | 17 | 54 | 4,425 | 2,823 | 1,572 | 65% | 29% | 42% | 41% |
| Tenants of  the nobility | 1700 | 6 | – | 147 | 81 | 0 | 89% | 11% | 6% | 60% |
| 1780 | 60 | 48 | 211 | 125 | 0 | 72% | 26% | 3% | 51% |
| 1860 | 14 | 46 | 264 | 162 | 1 | 69% | 28% | 21% | 59% |

Sources: Database, built on probate inventories from 12 judicial district archives, as described in Table 1 in the main body of the paper. All values in 1800 prices. Consumer price index from Edvinsson and Söderberg (2010). Ages estimated using probate inventories (age when stated; age of children), complemented with deathbooks from 161 parish archives.

Farmers’ wealth grew quite rapidly over time, but there was a great deal of inequality among farmers. Like Table A1, Table A2 also shows that tenants of the nobility were poorer than other farmers. In our first period of analysis (1670–1720), the wealth of the tenants of the nobility (*frälsebönder*) was a third lower than the wealth of the freeholders and crown tenants (*skattebönder* and *kronobönder*).

This finding contrasts with earlier research, which has often seen both groups as equivalent up to the mid-eighteenth century (Olsson 2005) and attributed the divergence to the favourable development of taxes (paid by freeholders) compared to the land rents paid by tenants of the nobility in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The land rent, in the form of tax, fell for owner-occupiers and crown tenants successively, from 30–35 per cent of the household's gross return at the end of the seventeenth century to less than 10 per cent 200 years later. This is in sharp contrast to the tenants of the nobility whose landowners were able to increase the *corvée* labour and other rent forms; consequently, their land rent remained at the level of 30–40 per cent of the household's gross production (Olsson 2005). The increase in wealth up to 1780 (Table A2) was quite similar for the various peasant groups, but a renewed strong differentiation took place thereafter until 1860. In the 1860s, the owner-occupiers and crown tenants were almost four times richer than those of the tenants of the nobility. Their advantage was the direct result of more favourable taxation and of the fact that productivity developed more favourably for freeholders compared to tenants of the nobility during the agrarian revolution — the latter driven by the former, by the incentives given by taxation and land rents (Olsson and Svensson 2010, p. 293).

An interesting difference within the peasant farmer group is that the livestock of the tenants of the nobility actually outnumbered the livestock of the peasant farmer reference group in the 1780s and 1860s. This is not shown in the tables, but the reference farmers had on average 2.8, 3.7, and 2.3 horses at the three benchmark years, and tenants of the nobility 3.0, 4.5, and 2.9. The same figures for cattle (including oxen) were 10.1, 7.9, and 4.8 as compared to 6.8, 7.8, and 6.1. This is most likely an effect of the *corvée* system. The tenants of the nobility would plough and tend not only the fields of their own farm, but also the demesne of the manor, which required more draught animals. It was exactly during this time, from the late eighteenth century to the mid-nineteenth century, that the number of *corvée* days per tenant increased sharply, from around 100 to more than 300 days per year. To meet these demands, they were also forced to hire extra farmhands (Olsson 2006).

The uneven development among the farmers was partly due to real estate values, which in 1860 constituted about half of the freeholder and crown tenant group’s gross values and just over a third of the trustees’ (Table A2). But the differentiation was equally strong when it comes to movables. For the differentiation among the peasant farmers, earlier research has pointed at explanations like security in tenure, natural conditions and productive capacity, and the ability to adapt production to the growing markets for agricultural produce (Bengtsson and Svensson 2019).

As differences grew between different kinds of farmers, inequality within the farmer group grew. Table A3 shows that the Gini coefficient among the farmers in our sample increased from 0.45 in the 1670–1720 period and 0.48 in the 1780s to 0.60 in the 1860s. The initial low level of inequality found among farmers fits with some previous research, such as Linde’s (2000) argument based on tax data that stratification among farmers in Närke county in the 1710s was limited. Lindström (2008), on the other hand, studying a parish in central Sweden, found a high level of inequality already in the 1620s, with a relatively stable level until the 1820s. Using taxes on animals, Lindström found, for example, that a single farmer in 1631 could own 8 horses, 12 oxen, 19 cows, 30 sheep, and 17 pigs. This was more animals than the wealthiest farmer in the parish had in 1812, and Lindström (2008, p. 92) argued that inequality within the farmer class in this parish had no growing tendency over this period.[[1]](#footnote-1) For Sweden as a whole, Bengtsson et al. (2018) found a Gini coefficient of net wealth of 0.57 of farmers in 1750, 0.71 in 1800, 0.77 in 1850, and 0.80 in 1900. Since these figures are on the national level, they are not directly comparable to ours, but the trend of growing inequality at least from the 1780s to the 1860s is similar in our sample.

**Table A3. Inequality among peasant farmers**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Period | Top 10% share of wealth | Gini coefficient |
| 1670–1720 | 35% | 0.45 |
| 1780s | 37% | 0.48 |
| 1860s | 48% | 0.60 |

Sources: Database, built on probate inventories from 12 judicial district archives, as described in Table 1 in the main body of the paper.

Table A4 breaks down the wealth development of Table 3 in the main body of the paper, for various working-class groups*.* For the unspecified landless and semi-landless, we lack titles. They are the poorest of all the groups in our sample, and in 1780 and 1860 they are also the oldest, apart from retired farmers. The unspecified landless thus increasingly consisted of elderly poor people without any organized pension benefits or with very low ones; in most cases, they were former crofters and labourers. (Cf. Söderberg’s discussion of the difference between “proletarian” and “marginal” groups in the Swedish countryside of the nineteenth century: Söderberg 1978, pp. 126–133.)

**Table A4. Wealth development for labourer subcategories**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Period | No. | Age at death | Gross value | Net value | Real estate value | Production assets, share of gross | Consumable assets, share of gross | Claims, share of gross | Debts, share of gross |
| Crofters and cottagers | 1700 | 6 | – | 135 | 119 | 19 | 78% | 22% | 7% | 21% |
| 1780 | 108 | 52 | 102 | 76 | 21 | 43% | 54% | 4% | 32% |
| 1860 | 194 | 55 | 92 | 52 | 34 | 30% | 67% | 30% | 66% |
| Workers | 1700 | 4 | – | 84 | 14 | 5 | 37% | 63% | 6% | 51% |
| 1780 | 60 | 52 | 118 | 101 | 4 | 29% | 60% | 15% | 32% |
| 1860 | 82 | 41 | 144 | 101 | 36 | 10% | 82% | 52% | 55% |
| Unspecified landless or semi landless | 1700 | 29 | 45 | 47 | 6 | 0 | 60% | 34% | 8% | 113% |
| 1780 | 29 | 63 | 43 | 25 | 0 | 32% | 59% | 6% | 83% |
| 1860 | 68 | 66 | 49 | 25 | 10 | 22% | 74% | 62% | 79% |

Sources: Database, built on probate inventories from 12 judicial district archives, as described in Table 1 in the main body of the paper. All values in 1800 prices. Consumer price index from Edvinsson and Söderberg (2010). Before 1720, the unspecified landless is the biggest group in the working-class sample, which must be attributed to lack of titles in the sources. Their (low) mean age is built on only seven individuals.

## The role of retirees

A classic methodological critique of studies based on probate inventories is that they disproportionally capture old people who are not economically active anymore (Gadd 1983, p. 54). This would be a big problem for our research, as we are interested in productive capacity and strategies of economically active households, and so we have spent much energy and time on finding the ages of the probated people in the church books. Altogether, 161 parishes’ church books were used; the full list is in the reference list of this Appendix.

Combining information from the probates with information from the church books, we found the certain age for 16 per cent of the probated for the first period, 76 per cent for the second period, and 93 per cent for the third period. Given the importance of the probate inventory for the distribution of inheritance, the inventory almost always states if the deceased had children, and we have used this information to code if any children were adult or minor. This information can be used to roughly classify the age of the deceased when the exact age is missing in the sources. To ascertain that the households we analyse in the main analyses are of working age, we combine stated age, children’s ages, and, in the lack of that information, the lack of expected goods. For example, a deceased man with the stated occupation farmer but without farming tools is most likely a retiree.

**Table A5. Wealth development for retired farmers**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Period | No. | Age at death | Gross value | Net value | Real estate value | Production assets, share of gross | Consumable assets, share of gross | Claims, share of gross | Debts, share of gross |
| Retirees (*undantag*) | 1700 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 1780 | 30 | 65 | 63 | 39 | 2 | 39% | 54% | 4% | 39% |
| 1860 | 108 | 72 | 187 | 158 | 8 | 23% | 71% | 58% | 48% |

Sources: Database, built on probate inventories from 12 judicial district archives, as described in Table 1 in the main body of the paper. All values in 1800 prices. Consumer price index from Edvinsson and Söderberg (2010). Ages estimated using probate inventories (age when stated; age of children), complemented with deathbooks from 161 parish archives.

Table A5 shows that in the nineteenth century, the retirees show a similar wealth development to the farmers, an increase of two to three times depending on whether we count gross or net, but from a lower level. It testifies that most of them were former farmers who left the farm in exchange for guaranteed sustenance until their death, usually but not always to a son or daughter. Persons listed as retirees are completely missing in the material from the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. This can have two explanations. Firstly, the retirees’ estates were not particularly interesting for probate in the early period, as they usually already got rid of any debts as well as the most essential parts of their possessions, precisely in exchange for old age subsistence and care. When probate later became mandatory, they appear in the sources. Second, this group de facto increased during the eighteenth and especially the nineteenth century, with rising prosperity among the farmers combined with pressure from their increasingly surviving children who needed to take over the farm to marry. It became, so to speak, both possible and necessary to retire. Contemporary nineteenth century writings also reported with some horror the retiree system to promote that the old ‘often longed much too early for the comfort of the quiet pension croft’ (Lundh and Olsson 2002, p. 388).

Tables A6 and A7 summarize the holdings of retired farmer households. (These tables correspond to Tables 4 and 5 in the main body of the paper.) In preindustrial Sweden, it was common practice for farmers to “retire” around the age of 60 and hand over the farm to children. These retired households will still be titled farmers in the probate inventories, but will not own the goods necessary to keep a farm running. For example, it is likely that certain tools were passed over to the next generation in advance, either before death or during the weeks or months between dies mortis and the day when the inventories were set. Since these items were highly needed, but had relatively low values, compared, for example, to livestock, this could be held secret or pass without remarks from the assessors. Thus, as Table A6 shows, only 50 percent of retired farmer households in the 1780s held a plough and a harrow, and in the 1860s, the proportion was only 30 percent.

**Table A6. Percentage of households with items showing engagement in productive activities, retirees**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Period | No. | Farming | Fishing | Hunting | Brewing,  distillation | Spinning | Weaving |
| Retirees (*undantag*) | 1700 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 1780 | 30 | 50% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 50% | 40% |
| 1860 | 108 | 30% | 2% | 6% | 2% | 44% | 46% |

Sources: Database, built on probate inventories from 12 judicial district archives, as described in Table 1 in the main body of the paper. Measured as ownership of tools for each activity. For ‘farming’ that is a plough and a harrow. Ages estimated using probate inventories (age when stated; age of children), complemented with deathbooks from 161 parish archives.

**Table A7. Means of production held by retirees**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Period | Farming tools, values | Wagons, values | Spinning wheels, values | Looms, values | Horses,  mean # | Cattle,  mean # |
| Retirees (*undantag*) | 1700 | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 1780 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.9 |
| 1860 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.7 |

Sources: Database, built on probate inventories from 12 judicial district archives, as described in Table 1 in the main body of the paper. All values in riksdaler specie, 1800 prices. Consumer price index from Edvinsson and Söderberg (2010). Ages estimated using probate inventories (age when stated; age of children), complemented with deathbooks from 161 parish archives.

## Household size

As discussed in the main body of the paper, the probate inventories are sources that tell us about the resources of the household rather than the individual. Therefore it is crucial to know something about the household composition to make inferences about who was working with the tools held by the household (cf. discussion in Keibek and Shaw-Taylor 2013). As we state in the main body of the paper, there is no reason to believe that average household size grew in Swedish rural households in the period of investigation, about 1670–1865. Beyond Lundh’s (1995) survey, local studies by Söderberg (1978) for two parishes in southern Sweden – one forested, one plains parish – and Lindström (2008) for one parish in central Sweden support this conclusion. Lindström (2008, pp. 51–53) found for his central Swedish parish stagnating or falling household size c. 1640–1820.

To ascertain that the overall conclusion holds in our studied areas, we have investigated household composition in four parishes in the investigated area, two from the plains type, one from the shrub land type, and one from the forest type. We picked two from the plains because the parishes normally are much smaller than in the two other types. Table A8 shows the crucial data. The 1670–1720 registers are less detailed in that they do not enumerate children under the age of 15. In this first period, as in the other two, there is a clear pattern in that there are more adults in the households of the wealthier plain land parishes Knästorp and Tottarp than in the poorer scrub and forest parishes Getinge and Glimåkra. This contrasts to the pattern found by Söderberg (1978, p. 108) for 1862 that wealthier households – farmers – had larger households than the labouring classes had, but that there was no difference between the wealthier plain land parish investigated by Söderberg, Fleninge, and the poorer forested parish Loshult. Among our four parishes in Table A8, the difference is quite stable over time.

**Table A8. Household sizes in four parishes in the sample.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1700 | | 1780 | | | | 1860 | | | |
|  | Adults, mean | N | Adults, mean | Children, mean | Total, mean | N | Adults, mean | Children, mean | Total, mean | N |
| Plains: Knästorp and Tottarp | 3.19 | 42 | 3.15 | 1.78 | 4.93 | 87 | 2.99 | 2.03 | 5.02 | 164 |
| Scrub lands:  Getinge | 2.46 | 54 | 2.29 | 1.26 | 3.55 | 151 | 2.61 | 2.03 | 4.64 | 168 |
| Forests:  Glimåkra | 2.68 | 206 | 2.75 | 1.22 | 3.97 | 402 | 2.06 | 1.31 | 3.37 | 1010 |
| Total | 2.72 | 302 | 2.70 | 1.30 | 4.00 | 640 | 2.24 | 1.49 | 3.73 | 1342 |

Note. Sources are cadastral registers (*mantalslängder*) for the four parishes.

For our purposes, it is more important to discover if there are changes over time. In Table A8, we see that the number of adults per household slightly decreases over time, from 2.72 in the first period and 2.7 in the second to 2.24 in the third. The total number of persons, including children, is only possible to show in the latter two periods, between which the total number slightly decreases, from 4.00 to 3.73. The change over time is small, and statistically not very conclusive, but if anything, households became smaller over time. This indicates that the growth in the ownership of spinning and weaving tools found in the paper wasn’t driven by the availability of more household members. Rather, it is about the core household members’ use of their time.

A concern about the calculations of Table A8 is that the forested parish is much bigger than the others. Table A9 presents reweighted calculations, reducing the weight of Glimåkra in the sample by randomly reducing the treated number of households to the average between the two other categories. As expected, the weighted mean total increases a little, but the general conclusion holds – the households rather shrank than grew over time.

**Table A9. Household sizes in four parishes in the sample, weighted.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1700 | | 1780 | | | | 1860 | | | |
|  | Adults, mean | N | Adults, mean | Children, mean | Total, mean | N | Adults, mean | Children, mean | Total, mean | N |
| Plains: Knästorp and Tottarp | 3,19 | 42 | 3,15 | 1,78 | 4,93 | 87 | 2,99 | 2,03 | 5,02 | 164 |
| Scrub lands:  Getinge | 2,46 | 54 | 2,29 | 1,26 | 3,55 | 151 | 2,61 | 2,03 | 4,64 | 168 |
| Forests:  Glimåkra | 2,77 | 48 | 2,71 | 1,00 | 3,71 | 119 | 1,96 | 1,34 | 3,31 | 167 |
| Total | 2,78 | 144 | 2,64 | 1,30 | 3,94 | 357 | 2,52 | 1,80 | 4,32 | 499 |

Note. Sources are cadastral registers (*mantalslängder*) for the four parishes.

# Appendix references

## Archival sources

Probate inventories from the following district archives (*häradsrätter*), held at Riksarkivet i Lund and accessed through ArkivDigital (arkivdigital.se): Bara, Bjäre, Frosta, Halmstad, Höks, Norra Åsbo, Oxie, Rönnebergs, Skytts, Södra Åsbo, Vemmenhögs, Östra Göinge.

Church books (death books and catechetical interrogation books (*husförhörslängder*)) from the following parish archives, held at the National Archives (*Riksarkivet*) in Lund and accessed through ArkivDigital (arkivdigital.se): Lunds domkyrkofösamling; Anderslöv, Annelöv, Arrie, Asige, Asmundtorp, Ausås, Bara, Barkåkra, Björnekulla, Bodarp, Borlunda, Bosjökloster, Bunkeflo, Burlöv, Båstad, Börringe, Bösarp, Dalköping, Emmislöv, Enslöv, Esarp, Eskilstorp, Fagerhult (Skånes-Fagerhult), Finja, Fjelie, Flackarp, Flyinge, Fosie, Fru Alstad, Fuglie, Fulltofta, Färingtofta, Färlöv, Förslöv, Genarp, Getinge, Gislöv, Glimåkra, Glostorp, Glumslöv, Grevie, Gryt, Gråmanstorp, Grönby, Gårdstånga, Gärdslöv, Gässie, Halmstad, Hammarlunda, Hammarlöv, Harlösa, Harplinge, Hassle-Bösarp, Hasslöv, Hemmesdynge, Hishult, Hjärnarp, Hjärsås, Holm, Holmby, Hov, Hurva, Husie, Hyby, Hyllie, Hällestad, Härslöv, Hästveda, Höja, Hököpinge, Hörby, Höör, Kinnared, Knislinge, Knäred, Knästorp, Konga, Kvibille, Kvidinge, Kviinge, Kvistofta, Kyrkoheddinge, Kyrkoköpinge, Kågeröd, Källna, Laholm socken, Lemmeströ, Lilla Beddinge, Lilla Isie, Lilla Slågarp, Lockarp, Lomma, Loshult, Lyby, Lyngby, Maglarp, Mellan-Grevie, Munka-Ljungby, Kunkarp, Nevishög, Norra Rörum, Norra Strö, Norra Vram, Oderljunga, Osby, Ottarp, Oxie, Perstorp, Rebbelberga, Riseberga, Rya, Räng, Rännselöv, Rävinge, Röstånga, Saxtorp, Simlinge, Sireköping, Skabersjö, Skivarp, Skummeslöv, Skurup, Slimminge, Slättåkra, Slöinge, Snöstorp, Solberga, Starby, Stenestad, Steninge, Stora Hammar, Stora Slågarp, Strövelstorp, Svalöv, Svedala, Svensköp, Säby, Södra Rörum, Södra Sallerup, Söndrum, Tirup, Tjärby, Tofta, Torekov, Torup, Tottarp, Trelleborg, Trönninge, Tullstorp, Tygelsjö, Tåstarp, Tåssjö, Uppåkra, Vadensjö, Vapnö, Vedby, Veinge, Våxtorp, Västra Alstad, Västra Broby, Västra Ingelstad, Västra Karup, Västra Klagstorp, Västra Sallerup, Västra Sönnarslöv, Västra Tommarp, Ysby, Äspinge, Ängelholm, Örkelljunga, Örkened, Örja, Örkelljunga, Örkened, Össjö. Örsjö, Östra Broby, Östra Grevie, Östra Karup, Östra Ljungby, Östra Sallerup, Östra Strö, Östra Torp, Östra Vemmenhög, & Övraby parishes.

Cadastral registers (*mantalslängder*) for Knästorp and Tottarp, Getinge, and Glimåkra 1700, 1780, and 1860: Kammararkivet, Malmöhus läns landskontor, Hallands läns landskontor, Kristianstads läns landskontor, Häradsskrivaren i Torna, Bara och Harjagers fögderi, Häradsskrivaren i Halmstads fögderi, and Häradsskrivaren i Östra och Västra Göinge fögderi. Kammararkivet is held at the National Archives (*Riksarkivet*) in Stockholm, the other archives in Lund. All accessed via ArkivDigital (arkivdigital.se).
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1. On the other hand, he argued that overall inequality probably grew, through growth of the underclasses and an increasing concentration of wealth among the non-farmer landowners (Lindström 2008, p. 92). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)