

Lund University
Department of History
HISS33, VT2017
Ulf Zander (Examiner)
Eva Helen Ulvros (Supervisor)



LUND
UNIVERSITY

THE CEREMONIAL BODY

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF BODIES IN DYNASTIC CEREMONIES OF THE SWEDISH
MONARCHY, 1782–1818¹

Alexander Isacsson

¹ This essay has been modified into an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Scandinavian Journal of History* on 17/08/2018, available online:
<http://tandfonline.com/10.1080/03468755.2018.1501418>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Sammanfattning</i>	i
<i>Abstract</i>	ii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	iii
<i>Note on Translations</i>	iii
Glossary	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Outline of the Essay	2
Research Questions	2
Approaching the Source Material	3
II. SCHOLARLY PERSPECTIVES ON ROYAL COURTS, CEREMONIES AND BODIES	6
Monarchy in the Late Eighteenth and the Early Nineteenth Century	6
Revisiting the Body in Court Society	8
Ceremony as Public Theatre	9
Ceremonial versus Everyday Life	11
Les Techniques du Corps	13
Body and Costume	16
Summary: A Specification of Theory and Method	17
III. DYNASTIC CEREMONIES IN THE GUSTAVIAN ERA	19
The Death of Louisa Ulrika in 1782	19
The Parental Rhetoric of Mourning	19
Various Attitudes in the Public Theatre	22
The Funeral	26
The Death of Gustav III in 1792	27
Deviation and Education	28
The Dress of the Royal Order of the Seraphim	29
The Issue of Crowding Bodies	30
Removal to the Chapel and Funeral	31
Gustav IV Adolf's Assumption of Power in 1796 and Coronation in 1800	34
Errors and Oath-Taking	34
Detailing a Ceremonial Procession	36
The Coronation and Celebration Ceremonies	37
The Presence of a Russian Ambassador	41
Summary: Dynastic Ceremonies in the Gustavian Era	44

IV.	DYNASTIC CEREMONIES IN THE POST-GUSTAVIAN ERA	46
	<i>The Coronation Ceremony of Charles XIII and Queen Charlotte in 1809</i>	47
	A Ceremony for the People and not the Monarch	47
	The Coronation and Celebration Ceremonies	49
	<i>The Death of Sofia Magdalena in 1813</i>	51
	Precedents and Deviations	51
	Lying in State	52
	The Funeral	53
	<i>The Deaths of Charles XIII and Queen Dowager Charlotte in 1818</i>	54
	Deviations in Mourning Attire	54
	The Funeral of Charles XIII	57
	Grief and Gender	59
	The Funeral of Queen Dowager Charlotte	61
	<i>The Coronation Ceremonies of Charles XIV John in 1818</i>	63
	A Body Technique of Walking?	63
	Continuity and Discontinuity	66
	The Public and the Private	73
	<i>Summary: Dynastic Ceremonies in the Post-Gustavian Era</i>	76
V.	CONCLUDING REMARKS	78
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	80

SAMMANFATTNING

Det sena 1700- och tidiga 1800-talet var en omvälvande tid för Europas monarkier, och så även för den svenska. Sedan statskuppen 1772 arbetade Gustav III idogt för att stärka kungamakten och ceremonier var centrala inslag i monarkins mäktspråk och legitimitetssträvanden. 1792 avled dock kungen till följd av ett attentat provocerat av en utbredd adelsopposition. Gustav IV Adolf förde vidare faderns gustavianska arv men oförmågan att uppnå diskursiv auktoritet i kombination med det svåra politiska och ekonomiska läget resulterade i hans avsättning 1809. Riksdagen samlades och utarbetade en ny regeringsform, vilken markerade Sveriges övergång till en ny form av konstitutionell monarki under Karl XIII:s försyn. Som det nya men ålderstigna kungaparet saknade arvingar behövde en ny tronföljare utses och valet föll, efter missöden och politiska maktkamper, på en fransk marskalk. 1818 kröntes han till Karl XIV Johan och sålunda installerades den nya Bernadottedynastin på Sveriges och Norges tron.

I föreliggande uppsats är det denna monarki som studeras. Mer specifikt analyseras dess dynastiska ceremonier, åsyftande krönningar och begravningar, vilka identifierats som väsentliga i monarkins språkbruk. Med utgångspunkt i det huvudsakligen undersökta källmaterialet är tidsavgränsningen satt till 1782–1818. Det innebär en djupdykning i Lovisa Ulrikas begravning 1782, Gustav III:s begravning 1792, Gustav IV Adolfs övertagande av riksstyrelsen 1796 och sedermera kröning 1800, Karl XIII:s och Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas kröningsceremoni 1809 och begravningar 1818, Sofia Magdalenas begravning 1813, samt Karl XIV Johans krönningar i Sverige och Norge 1818. Ceremonierna betraktas som en offentlig teater genom vilken monarker strävade efter att genomträffa människors medvetande i syftet att omvandla centrala myter och teman till verklighet. Den teoretiska ansatsen anknyter till ett perspektiv benämnt som ”den kroppsliga vändningen”. I centrum för undersökningen står således frågor om vilken betydelse kroppar hade i den offentliga teatern, vilka meningar som tillskrives den ceremoniella kroppen samt hur det kroppsliga bruket i ceremonier relaterade till större politiska, sociala och kulturella kontexter. För att nära sig den ceremoniella kroppen har ämbetsjournalerna från hovets ceremonimästare och sedermera överceremonimästare studerats samt tryckta ceremoniel och utgivna dagböcker från den studerade tidsperioden.

Studien visar att kroppar och deras tekniker var av stor betydelse i monarkins ceremonier och offentliga teater. Myter och teman som var viktiga att förmedla – dynastiska förbindelser, genus, en överordnad ställning men även maktdelningen mellan kung och medborgarsamhälle, en personlig relation mellan styrande och styrda, iakttagandet av rang och företrädesrätt, tradition men också modernitet och folkligt stöd – behövde inte bara uttalas utan manifesteras, produceras och reproduceras i ceremoniernas kroppar. Kontinuitet mellan den gustavianska och postgustavianska eran är släende. Skillnaderna i ceremoniell kroppsmanifestation relaterade till specifika kulturella, sociala och politiska förändringar men kropparnas funktion överensstämde på så sätt att de brukades för att förmedla och göra kännbar förlikningen mellan monarkins många och inneboende motsägelser. Det framgår dock tydligt att kroppsighet inte var den enda komponenten av stor betydelse i den offentliga teatern. Avslutningsvis konstateras således att kroppsighet inte kan förbises i hov- och monarkiforskning, men behovet av att vidare undersöka kroppens komplexa relation till materiell kultur och plats understryks.

ABSTRACT

The late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century was a turbulent time for the monarchies of Europe, the Swedish included. Since Gustav III's coup in 1772, the king strove to enhance the royal prerogative. Ceremonies were crucial in the monarchy's language of power and establishment of legitimacy but oppositional forces within the nobility nevertheless provoked the regicide of Gustav III in 1792. His heir, Gustav IV Adolf, managed the Gustavian legacy but a failure in attaining discursive authority and the disastrous economic and political circumstances resulted in his dethronement in 1809. The *Riksdag* gathered and elaborated a constitutional reform, marking Sweden's transition to a new form of constitutional monarchy under Charles XIII. The elderly king and queen consort had no living heirs and a successor to the throne needed to be appointed. After several misadventures, power struggles and intrigues a French marshal was elected. In 1818 he was crowned Charles XIV John and a new dynasty was inaugurated on the throne in Sweden and Norway.

The aforementioned monarchy is the subject of this thesis. More specifically, the analysis concerns a selection of royal dynastic ceremonies, i.e. coronations and funerals, apprehended as vital in the language of monarchy. Emanating from the manuscript sources, the scrutinised time period is set from 1782 to 1818. Consequently, the in-depth study concerns Louisa Ulrika's funeral in 1782, Gustav III's funeral in 1792, Gustav IV Adolf's assumption of power in 1796 and subsequent coronation in 1800, the coronation ceremony of Charles XIII and Charlotte in 1809 and their respective funerals in 1818, Sofia Magdalena's funeral in 1813 and, lastly, the coronations of Charles XIV John in Sweden and Norway in 1818. The ceremonies are comprehended in terms of public theatre, in which the monarchy strove to penetrate the perceptions of participants and turn myths and themes of kingship into reality. A theoretical perspective is applied, inspired by 'the corporeal turn', emphasising the role of bodies throughout history. The main questions thus regard the significance of bodies in ceremonies and the public theatre, the various meanings ascribed to the human body and the ceremonial body's relation to greater political, social and cultural contexts. The advised source material mainly consists of official journals produced by the court's Grand Master of Ceremonies, but the office journals are supplemented with printed ceremonial instructions and published diaries.

The analysis shows that bodies and their techniques were of great significance. The myths and themes imperative to mediate – dynastic stability, gender, royal superiority and magnificence but also division of power between king and commonwealth, the personal relation between the ruler and the ruled, popular support, observance of rank and precedence, tradition as well as modernity – needed not only to be uttered but inhabited in the body, i.e., manifested, produced and reproduced through bodies. Continuity between the Gustavian era and post-Gustavian era is palpable. Discernible differences related to political, social and cultural transformations but the functions of ceremonial bodies corresponded. Thus, the body was employed to mediate the reconciliation of the many inherent contradictions of monarchy. However, it stands clear that bodies were not the sole components of importance in the public theatre. It is emphasised that court studies cannot neglect the significance of bodies, but at the same time further research is needed to clarify the complex relation between bodies, material culture and space.

ABBREVIATIONS

CÖR	<i>Ceremonimästaren/Överceremonimästaren.</i>
	<i>Rikshäroldssämbetet 1697–1825</i>
	Record series kept at Riksarkivet
KB	Kungliga biblioteket (Stockholm)
LUB	Lunds universitetsbibliotek, handskriftsavdelningen (Lund)
RA	Riksarkivet (Stockholm)

NOTE ON TRANSLATIONS

The names of Swedish royal personages are transcribed in accordance with their spelling in *Encyclopædia Britannica*. For example, Lovisa Ulrika av Preussen is referred to as Louisa Ulrika and Karl XIV Johan as Charles XIV John. Consequently, the spelling Gustav III is retained rather than Gustavus III. When the analysis concerns a time period before the monarchs' inauguration, or when their status has shifted, they are referred to with their held titles at that specific time. For example, before 1809 Charles XIII is referred to as Duke Charles and Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta as Duchess Charlotte. After 1809 however, the Duchess is referred to as Queen Charlotte and, following the death of Charles XIII in 1818, as Queen Dowager Charlotte.

The names of courtiers and diplomats have retained their Swedish spelling.

GLOSSARY²

The Administrative Courts of Appeal	Kammarrevisionen
Baron	Friherre
Cabinet Minister	Statsråd
Chamber Gentleman	Kammarherre
Chamber Groom	Kammarjunkare
Chamber Woman	Kammarfru
The Chancellery	Kunglig Majestäts kansli
Chancellor of the Judiciary	Riksdrots
Chief Chamber Gentleman	Överste kammarherre/ Överkammarherre
Chief Chamber Groom	Överkammarjunkare
Chief Court Hunt Master	Överhovjägmästare
Chief Governor	Överståthållare
Chief Mistress	Överhovmästarinna

² Regarding the titles of offices and institutions, the glossary in Fabian Persson's dissertation *Servants of Fortune* has been advised (See Persson, 1999, pp. iii–v) However, since several offices in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century are not accounted for in Persson's dissertation (which studies the court up until the 1720s) an extensive glossary is provided. In order not to deviate too far from the original connotations of the sources the Swedish term is in some instances retained, for example 'af tromans wärdighet'.

College of Accounts	Kammarkollegium
The Council for the General Affairs of the Realm	Rikets allmänna ärendes beredning
The Council of the Realm	Riksrådet
Councillor of the Realm	Riksråd
Councillor of Justice	Justitieråd
County Governor	Landshövding
Court Cleric	Hovpredikant
Court Fourier	Hovfurir
Court Gentleman	Hovjunkare
First Court Marshal	Förste hovmarskalk
First Court Stable Master	Överhovstallmästare
Furnishing Master	Husgerådsmästare
Gentleman	Kavaljer
Gentleman of the Court	Hovkavaljer
The Gentlemen-at-arms	Livdrabantcorpsen
Grand Marshal	Lantmarskalk
Grand Master of Ceremonies	Överceremonimästare
Herald of the Realm	Rikshärold
Herald of the Chancellery	Kanslihärold
Lady-in-waiting	Statsfru
Lord High Chancellor	Rikskansler
Lords of the Realm	Rikets Herrar
Marshal of the Realm	Riksmarskalk
The Minister for Foreign Affairs	Statsministern för utrikes ärenden
The Minister for Norwegian Affairs	Statministern för norska ärenden
The Minister of Justice	Justititestatsministern
The Office of the Chancellor of Justice	Justitiekanslern
Orderly Officer	Ordonnansofficer
The Parliamentary Ombudsman	Justitieombudsmannen
Royal Household	Hovstat
Secretary of State	Statssekreterare
Servant of the Wardrobe	Klädkammardräng
Supreme Commander	Överkommendant
Treasurer	Räntmästare

INTRODUCTION

After the regicide of Gustav III in 1792, the courtier Clas Julius Ekeblad remarked in a memorandum that the late king had regarded Louis XIV the foremost of heroes. The Gustavian court had thus been fashioned after that of Versailles and, according to Ekeblad, Swedish court life resembled that depicted in the Duke of Saint-Simon's memoirs (although the less resourceful Swedish state necessarily engendered observable limitations to Louisquatorzian splendour).³ Inspired by the court of Louis XIV, Gustav III employed the practice of *lever*. In descriptions of the ceremonial rising, the body of the Swedish king and his subjects and the procedures surrounding the king's body – such as the grooming of his hair, the rinsing of his mouth, the handing over of his shirt and sword, the kissing of his hand and the nodding of his head – emerge as crucial in eighteenth-century court society.⁴ The writer and editor Mara Naselli has summarised it all quite well in a text about the Duke of Saint-Simon's memoirs, describing them as

a collection of portraits, one after another, with thin transitions, and scant overarching narrative. Most interesting, each portrait is unequivocally embodied. Saint Simon enacts for us the dance of court life: the sitting, the standing, the bowing, the washing, the dressing, the kissing, the confiding, the eating, the removing of hats, the donning of hats, the touching of hats, the screaming, the moaning, the kneeling, the whispering, the wringing of hands. Open to a random page in the memoirs: you will find living, breathing, thriving, ailing, moving bodies.⁵

The notion of embodiment is along the lines with a perspective that, since the 1980s, has become prominent within historiography and termed 'the corporeal turn'. What this 'turn of the body' entailed, owing much to Michel Foucault, was a non-essentialist comprehension gazing beyond the biologically constituted body in order to see the historicised body constructed primarily by language and discourse. Incorporated in the 'new cultural history', historiographic focus was shifted from coherent narratives and objectifications to the many sensibilities, images and symbolic practices marking the human body and its history. The inclination of referring merely to language and discourse was later challenged within the same tradition by scholars emphasising the need to also incorporate the subjects' lived experiences of the body.⁶ Theorists and empiricists working in the disciplines of historiography, philosophy, sociology and anthropology have since suggested various apprehensions of the relation between bodies and societies from the perspectives of social constructivism, phenomenology and structuration.⁷

The aim of this thesis is to examine dynastic ceremonies of the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Swedish monarchy from the perspective of a cultural history that put the human body on the scholarly agenda. A more fundamental historiographic and scientific

³ Ekeblad, 1871, p. 5.

Count Anders Fredrik Skjöldebrand, as well as Count Lars von Engeström, also remarked the court of Gustav III was copied from a French model. See Skjöldebrand, 1903, p. 57; and Engeström referenced in Sandin, 2011, p. 81.

As for the discernible similarities between the Swedish and the French *lever*, Norbert Elias noted, when discussing the Duke of Saint-Simon's memoirs, that those included in the *entrée familière* and *grande entrée* 'were admitted while the king was still in bed. The king wore a small wig; he never showed himself without a wig, even when lying in bed'. Likewise, Skjöldebrand and Ehrensvärd stated that no entry was granted to the king's bedchamber until his hair was groomed. Elias, 1983, p. 84; Skjöldebrand, 1903, p. 58; Ehrensvärd, 1877, p. 262.

⁴ See Skjöldebrand, 1903, pp. 56–57; Ehrensvärd, 1877, pp. 262–263.

⁵ Naselli, 2014, <http://www.3quarksdaily.com/3quarksdaily/2014/06/duc-de-saint-simon-and-courtly-bodies.html>, accessed 4 February 2017.

⁶ Cooter, 2010, pp. 393–398.

⁷ Smith & Riley, 2009, pp. 261 and 278–279.

problem can hereby be identified concerning the basic categories or concepts of human existence, experience and communication in political, social and cultural systems; in this particular case that of the royal court.

OUTLINE OF THE ESSAY

Following these introductory remarks, the research questions are presented in the light of scholarly perspectives on early modern courts and ceremonies. The source material is presented as well as a brief methodological assessment. The method is further discussed in the summary of chapter two, as it specifies theoretical considerations.

The second chapter presents and discusses scholarly perspectives on early modern courts, ceremonies and bodies. The chapter begins with a brief presentation of advised research dealing with the Swedish and European monarchies in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. The discussions in the succeeding sections build the foundation for theoretical and methodological considerations specified in the summary.

The analysis is divided into two chapters studying a selection of dynastic ceremonies in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Sweden. More specifically, the analysis centres on the bodies of rulers and subjects as they were (re)presented and perceived in the dynastic ceremonies of royal funerals and coronations. Due to the adopted definition of ceremony (see Chapter 2), activities of court life in general are largely excluded except when they provide contextualisation. Thus, the primary focus of the analysis is put on the more extraordinary characteristics of ceremony. The two chapters are chronologically separated by the end of Gustavian rule in 1809. The division is a practical rather than an analytical construction, i.e. the notion of discernible change is a question being put to the test. Although the constitutional reform of 1809 is seen as significant, the idea of profound change (which the outline might appear to suggest) is not a preconceived conception shaping the reading of the sources. The prevalence of continuities as well as discontinuities is demonstrated throughout the analysis.

The final chapter is dedicated to a discussion and critical assessment of the results, and considers the implications of the findings for further research.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The aim of this thesis is to analyse the significance of bodies in royal ceremonies. However, court studies rigidly focusing on one particular discursive concept run the risk of aligning with a scholarly tradition that has been much criticised and, by Jeroen Duindam, deemed as ‘dead ends of the first generation of aulic history’.⁸ With the publication of *The Court Society*, Norbert Elias did much to re-establish interest in the royal court but less in providing an empirically

⁸ Duindam, 2007, p. 12.

solid argument regarding the main functions of early modern courts.⁹ According to Duindam, the study of court societies, as suggested by Elias, thus generated ‘a tradition of aulic history with a strong partiality for conceptual ornament and eclectic discourse’ which ‘strengthened the inclination to wrestle with concepts rather than with concrete data’.¹⁰ The critique somewhat resounds that of David Cannadine who has called for a merger between cultural and political history.¹¹ Indeed, from the historian’s point of view, the study of ceremonies cannot conform to a strict Geertzian notion of ceremonies being ‘indépendant de tout sujet, de tout objet, et de tout contexte’.¹² As Barbara Stollberger-Rilinger points out, it is unfortunate that a divide has been maintained between the ‘soft’ themes of symbolic representation and the ‘hard’ themes of political history.¹³

This thesis will mainly occupy itself with the study of eclectic discourse, that of the body, which means the research questions, in order to break away from the highly criticised scholarly tradition of ceremonies, need to consider the wider political and contextual implications carried, represented and reproduced by notions of the body. The research questions are formulated thus:

What was the significance of bodies in dynastic ceremonies of the Swedish monarchy, 1782–1818? What meanings did ceremonies try to convey, and why these in particular? What meanings were ascribed or attached to the body in these ceremonies?

What constituted the ‘education’ of bodies and how did ‘techniques of the body’ relate to ‘tradition’? How was gender manifested and what implications did these manifestations bear?

How did the ceremonially used and displayed bodies, and the meanings ascribed to them, relate to greater political, social and cultural contexts? If change over time can be discerned concerning the ceremonial body, why did it occur and how did it relate to social and political developments and transformations?

APPROACHING THE SOURCE MATERIAL

The analysed manuscript sources primarily consist of the official journals produced by the court’s Master of Ceremonies and Grand Master of Ceremonies. The preserved journals cover the years 1697–1825 but the writings predating 1782 are infrequent and less comprehensive.¹⁴ The office Master of Ceremonies was in 1782 occupied by Jean de Bedoire. In 1790, the courtier Leonhard von Hauswolff was appointed to the office and took over the responsibility of keeping the journals. Hauswolff was further promoted to Grand Master of Ceremonies in 1802 (while maintaining the office Herald of the Realm, to which he was appointed in 1791).¹⁵ The office

⁹ Duindam, 2007, p. 8; Persson, 1999, pp. 6-7.

¹⁰ Duindam, 2007, p. 9.

¹¹ Cannadine, 1992a, pp. 2–18.

¹² Cannadine, 1992b, pp. 104–105 (translation of the quotation: ‘independant of every subject, object and context’).

¹³ Stollberger-Rilinger, 2015, p. 9.

¹⁴ See RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 1.

¹⁵ af Petersens & Clason, 1909, p. xii.

journals account for various ceremonial activities at court up until the year preceding Hauswolff's death in 1826. In addition to official documents, Hauswolff's private journal covering the years 1792–1795 is preserved, as are scattered writings in the form of letters and anecdotes. In approaching the court's ceremonial bodies, the (Grand) Master of Ceremonies constitutes the prism through which they are primarily viewed and analysed.

The office journals have not been absent in Swedish historiography as useful sources in the study of court ceremonial. In many instances however, Hauswolff (who kept the official journals for thirty-five years) has been treated as an anecdotal commentator rather than a prominent figure in court society.¹⁶ In regard to representativeness, limiting the analysis to the views presented by the Grand Master of Ceremonies does not constitute a sufficient foundation to analyse different meanings ascribed to ceremonially displayed bodies. The manuscript sources are therefore supplemented with printed source material, mainly printed ceremonial instructions and diaries, in order to capture a bigger picture. In most cases, questions of tendency should not be considered an issue since competing conceptions of bodies, over time and between individuals, are at the centre of the analysis.

Accordingly, the applied method may be described as a comparative textual analysis. It is however not a pure textual analysis since the focal point of the scholarly endeavour is not the examination of texture, i.e. form and organisation. Thus, a more appropriate description of the applied method may be comparative intertextual analysis. The intertextual approach, as discussed by Norman Fairclough, approximate to discourse analysis as it rather attempts to establish connections between texts and society.¹⁷

The comparative elements are implemented through the in-depth study of a few years between 1782–1825, the time period in which the grand master of ceremonies' office produced frequent and exhaustive journals. Several dynastic ceremonies were performed in these years. Reminiscent of Malin Grundberg's dissertation, studying royal ceremonies in sixteenth- and seventeenth century Sweden, the analysed dynastic ceremonies in this thesis mainly consist of royal coronations and funerals.¹⁸ The in-depth study thus concerns Louisa Ulrika's funeral in 1782, Gustav III's funeral in 1792, Gustav IV Adolf's assumption of power in 1796 and subsequent coronation ceremony in 1800 (in which his consort Frederica of Baden also was crowned Queen), the coronation ceremony of Charles XIII and Charlotte in 1809 and their

¹⁶ Parallels could perhaps be drawn between Hauswolff's ascribed role in this thesis and My Hellsing's insightful use of Duchess Charlotte and her writings. Hellsing states that ever since Carl Carlsson Bonde with great success published the Duchess's diary in 1902, an easily accessible description of court life in the later eighteenth and the early nineteenth century was made available, which presumably contributed in clouding the view of the Duchess as a significant political agent in court society. Hellsing, 2013, pp. 13–14.

However, Hauswolff is not regarded as a significant political agent but rather a revealing figure in the court machinery.

For historians' use of Hauswolff as commentator, see for example Alm, 2008, p. 33; Persson, 2010, p. 55; Sandin, 2011, p. 88.

Carl-Gustaf Thomasson claimed in *Svensk Tidskrift* in 1944 that Hauswolff had been somewhat forgotten, not least indicated by the modest space given to him in the encyclopedias. Since then Hauswolff has perhaps become more discussed, but to my knowledge the circumstances of 1944 regarding the mentioning of him in the encyclopedias are still prevailing. In the preface of the published transcript of the Chief Chamber Gentleman's journal, the editors Alm & Vahlne (2010, p. xii) state the journal kept by the Master of Ceremonies have a more distinct character of diary when compared to the records of the Chief Chamber Gentleman. Perhaps this has contributed to his anecdotal representation.

An elaborate use of Hauswolff can be found in Rangström's book *Dödens teater* (2015), though, insightful as it is, the book is of a distinct descriptive character. In addition, af Petersens & Clason (1909) used Hauswolff's correspondence to depict the political upheaval in the revolutionary year of 1809.

¹⁷ Fairclough, 1992, pp. 194–195.

¹⁸ See Grundberg, 2005.

respective funerals in 1818, Sofia Magdalena's funeral in 1813 and, lastly, the coronations of Charles XIV John in Sweden and Norway in 1818.

These specific years and ceremonies constitute the core of the analysis. However, grand ceremonies related to the approach of regents to ceremony and court society in general. An intertextual reading of the sources suggests wider contexts must be considered in order to present a nuanced picture. While not being systematically analysed, other forms of dynastic ceremonial activities (such as openings and closings of the Diet) are advised to contextualise the understanding of the primarily analysed ceremonies. Literature on the subject of ceremonies in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Sweden is also incorporated to contextualise the reading of the body in dynastic ceremonies.

Despite the fact that the Master of Ceremonies was mostly involved in diplomatic ceremonials these have not been studied systematically and are not presented in this thesis. The subject is briefly discussed when the treatment of diplomats related to a dynastic ceremonial, but the scope of the thesis project necessitated its general exclusion. Furthermore, domestic ceremonials are largely excluded from the analysis. Using Leonhard von Hauswolff (and Jean de Bedoire in the case of 1782) as a prism through which the court is analysed, and emanating from the office's journals, justifies the exclusion of domestic ceremonies and everyday court life since the Grand Master of Ceremonies principally occupied himself with dynastic and diplomatic ceremonial. The practice of *lever* for example is therefore excluded from the thesis as it did not preoccupy the master of ceremonies.

SCHOLARLY PERSPECTIVES ON ROYAL COURTS, CEREMONIES AND BODIES

MONARCHY IN THE LATE EIGHTEENTH AND THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY

The late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century was a turbulent time for the monarchies of Europe, the Swedish included. Since Gustav III's coup in 1772, the king strove to enhance the royal prerogative. Ceremonies were crucial in the monarchy's language of power and establishment of legitimacy but oppositional forces within the nobility nevertheless provoked the regicide of Gustav III in 1792. His heir, Gustav IV Adolf, managed the Gustavian legacy but a failure to attain discursive authority and disastrous economic and political circumstances resulted in his dethronement in 1809. The *Riksdag* gathered and elaborated a constitutional reform, marking Sweden's transition to a new form of constitutional monarchy under Charles XIII. Since the new king and queen consort had no living heirs a successor to the throne needed to be appointed and after several misadventures, power struggles and intrigues a French marshal was elected. In 1818 he was crowned Charles XIV John and a new dynasty was inaugurated on the throne in Sweden and Norway.¹⁹

The Swedish monarchy in this period has been the subject of extensive research and not least the publication of biographies has been a popular enterprise.²⁰ This thesis mainly draws on research carried out by Henrika Tandefelt, Mikael Alm, Per Sandin and Fabian Persson. Common denominators can be found between their respective works. Their scholarly interests when dealing with the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century concern not only the composition of the monarchical institution but also, most tangibly, the staging of monarchy, its 'making' and public image. Thus, they address the proposition made by Peter Burke twenty years ago in which he urged Scandinavian historians to embrace the greater European trend of studying the representation and image-making of kingship.²¹ Henrika Tandefelt has been especially inclined to the analysis of Gustav III's exercise of power through favours and ceremonial constituents.²² Mikael Alm has analysed the discursive construction of legitimacy, encompassing rhetoric and ceremonial language of power in the reigns of Gustav III and Gustav IV Adolf. Alm has also been dedicated to study the ceremonial making of the Bernadotte dynasty under Charles XIV John.²³ Per Sandin's focus is on the Bernadotte monarchy and its relation to civic society, analysing how the new dynasty constructed an image of being in keeping with the time. Sandin's dissertation *Ett kungahus i tiden* furthermore contains comparisons to the monarchical structures of the Gustavian era.²⁴ Fabian Persson has in various texts discussed the royal court of the Bernadottes with an interest in manners, etiquette and

¹⁹ For a brief textbook exposition, see Hedenborg & Kvarnström, 2015, pp. 151–173; See also Tandefelt, 2011; Regarding the significance of discursive authority, see Alm, 2002.

²⁰ See for example Lönnroth, 2008; Carlsson, 1946; Höjer, 1960.

²¹ Burke, 1997, pp. 1–8.

²² Tandefelt, H. (2008) *Konsten att härska. Gustav III inför sina undersåtar*; Tandefelt, H. (2011) 'The Image of Kingship in Sweden 1772–1809'; Tandefelt, H. (2014) '"Enlightened Monarchy" in Practice, Reforms, Ceremonies, Self-Fashioning and te Entanglement of Ideas and Values in Late Eighteenth-Century Sweden'.

²³ Alm, M. (2002) *Kungsord i elfte timmen. Språk, makt och självbild i det gustavianska enväldets legitimitskamp, 1772–1809*; Alm, M. (2008) 'Dynasty in the Making. A New King and his "Old" Men in Royal Ceremonies, 1810–1844'; Alm, M. (2010). 'Riter och ceremonier kring Karl XIV Johan'.

²⁴ Sandin, P. (2010) 'Monarken möter medborgarna'; Sandin, P. (2011) *Ett kungahus i tiden. Den bernadotteska dynastins möte med medborgarsamhället, c:a 1810–1860*.

ceremonies.²⁵ The subject of bodies and bodily practices are inevitably touched upon by these scholars but is seldom elaborated on further.

In an international perspective, the anthology *From the Royal to the Republican Body* has a primary objective of studying the body in a monarchical context. From various points of view the significance of bodies in France during the *Ancien Régime* and the time of the French revolution are scrutinised.²⁶ As demonstrated by several authors gender posited itself as an imperative category. The various roles of women in the absolutist monarchical public sphere and in the bourgeois public sphere have been discussed in detail by Joan B. Landes.²⁷

Literature more specifically dealing with the monarchies and courts of Europe in the late eighteenth and the nineteenth century is advised for an international outlook. Although the impact varied, no European courts were unaffected by the developments, currents and upheavals of the time. The royal and imperial houses faced these challenges by adopting various strategies in reform and image-making. Seeking the reconciliation of ‘tradition’ and ‘modernity’ was imperative to ensure survival of the monarchical institutions in an age of revolution. Philip Mansel has studied transformations of the French court from Louis XVI to Louis Philippe as well as developments of court dress.²⁸ Richard S. Wortman has analysed the ceremonial cultivation of myths in the Russian monarchy from Peter the Great to Nicholas II.²⁹ The Hanoverian monarchy in Britain has recently been the subject of reassessment in *The Hanoverian Succession: Dynastic Politics and Monarchical Culture*, an anthology highlighting representation, imagery and politics of the Georgians.³⁰ In addition, a variety of articles are advised concerning the applied strategies of the British monarchy in the nineteenth century.³¹ As for the Habsburg monarchy of Central and Eastern Europe, Paula Sutter Fichtner’s exposition on the dynasty’s long history is advised.³² In general, the diverse publications have in common their belonging to, what Per Sandin calls, the ‘new research on monarchy’, i.e.

²⁵ Persson, F. (2010) ‘Min Gud, tocket hov! Det svenska hovet mellan Napoleon och Louis Philippe’; Persson, F. (2011) ‘En bal på slottet: Hovbalernas sociala funktion i ett föränderligt 1800-tal’.

²⁶ Several contributions in the anthology provide insightful discussions. Jeffrey Merrick demonstrates how theorists of absolutism compared the relationship between the monarch and his subjects or society to that of the relationship between a master and his family or household. Thomas Kaiser argues the demystification and desacralisation of the king’s body was a result of devastating legitimising strategies, associating legitimacy with popularity, in combination with the king’s inability to control the passions of his body. Melzer & Norberg (eds.), 1998.

On the whole, however, most chapters are dedicated to the study of rather specific cases (such as the king’s androgynous appearance in court plays, the ability of music to technologise the body through rhythms or the king’s endeavour to extend his body to incorporate the bodies of slaves in Louisiana) making the arguments difficult to apply in a context of Swedish dynastic ceremonies. Nevertheless, the ambition and subject of the body is inspiring.

²⁷ In *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution* (1988), Landes argues norms of female domestic propriety were a prerequisite for the development of the essentially masculine bourgeois public sphere. Critique against women’s social power, their evasion of domestic propriety and the emasculating effects of monarchical power in the absolutist public sphere was an integral part in its structural transformation. Women ‘out of place’ came to signify the disorder of society.

²⁸ Mansel, P. (1982) ‘Monarchy, Uniform and the Rise of the Frac 1760–1830’; Mansel, P. (1988) *The Court of France, 1789–1830*; Mansel, P. (2005) *Dressed to Rule. Royal and Court Costume from Louis XIV to Elisabeth II*.

²⁹ Wortman, R. S. *Scenarios of Power. Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy from Peter the Great to the Abdication of Nicholas II*.

³⁰ For example, Robert Bucholz (2015) studies the representations of the Georgian bodies, primarily those of George I and George II, and the implications carried by their distortion in Jacobite critique. G. M. Ditchfield (2015) analyses the image-making of George III and George IV, demonstrating the interconnected use of an Anglo-Hanoverian vision, military vision and Protestant vision.

³¹ David M. Craig (2003) has studied the currents of anti-monarchy in Britain and the monarchy’s resilience 1790–1901. William Kuhn (1987; 1993) has studied various dimensions – ceremonial, economical and cultural – in the reign of Queen Victoria. Although Victoria’s reign lies outside the time period analysed in this thesis, the challenges faced by Charles XIV John were somewhat similar. By comparing the success of Queen Victoria with the failure of Isabella II of Spain, Isabel Burdiel (2004) has demonstrated that it was a determining factor for monarchies in the nineteenth century to accommodate the growing bourgeois society.

³² In *The Habsburgs: Dynasty, Culture and Politics* (2014), Fichtner recounts the dynamics of the Habsburg monarchy from the late thirteenth century till the twentieth century. Most relevant for this thesis are the chapters dealing with the monarchy’s adaptability and strategies in the eighteenth and the early nineteenth century, thus the reign of Maria Theresa and her successors until Francis II.

historiographic endeavours inclined to view monarchy in terms of ideology, regard it as an arena for wielding of powers and examine its constitutional relations.³³

The notion of a ‘theatre of death’ has been elaborated by Jennifer Woodwork, analysing royal funeral ceremonies in Renaissance England. The staging of monarchical death rituals in the early modern period functioned as manifestation of political power as it was an integral part in the dynastic succession process. These aspects have been demonstrated in the case of early modern Sweden by Malin Grundberg and Fabian Persson.³⁴ However, the time period of this thesis is set much later. Amy B. Oberlin has argued that royal funerals of British monarchs became more ‘private’ in the early eighteenth century as the result of an expanding print culture and Paula Sutter Fichtner has pointed out Joseph II’s radical simplification of funeral ceremonies in the late eighteenth century.³⁵ Yet, Lena Rangström’s *Dödens teater*, depicting Swedish royal funeral ceremonies from 1560 till today, suggests this was not the predominant development in Sweden where lavish display continued throughout the eighteenth century. Rangström’s work is a detailed exposition though not aimed primarily at the scholarly community. The ambition to attract wider audiences has resulted in the book’s more descriptive character, although insightful points are suggested.³⁶ Applying a theoretical perspective allows for the staging of death and dead bodies to be analysed more profoundly.

REVISITING THE BODY IN COURT SOCIETY

The perspective of the body has not been absent in historiography of royal politics and court culture.³⁷ Nevertheless, as underlined by Robert Bucholz, the actual and physical monarchical bodies, the flesh and blood rather than their sacred, legal and constitutional bodies have only recently become the subject of academic scholars.³⁸ Furthermore, notions of space largely appear to have taken precedence over notions of body within court studies.³⁹ In an article published in 1980, William Roosen stressed the importance of non-verbal communication in early modern diplomatic ceremonials and body language was pointed out as a significant, albeit ambiguous, component. Even more important however, Roosen stressed, was ‘situational’ language, a communication contingent on the circumstances of the situation, e.g. the physical structures of buildings.⁴⁰ While this certainly seems to hold true in many instances,⁴¹ it might be erroneous to categorically subordinate the importance of body language to that of spatiality.

³³ Sandin, 2011, p. 19.

³⁴ Woodwork, 1997; Grundberg, 2005; Persson, 2015.

³⁵ Oberlin, 2014; Fichtner, 2014, p. 144–145.

³⁶ Rangström, 2015.

³⁷ Much cited are Marc Bloch, *The Royal Touch: Sacred Monarchy and Scrofula in England and France*, 2015 [1924] and Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*, 1997 [1957].

³⁸ Bucholz, 2015, p. 147–148.

³⁹ The anthology *Beyond Scylla and Charybdis: European Courts and Court Residencies Outside Habsburg and Valois/Bourbon Territories 1500–1700* (2015) edited by Birgitte Bøggild Johannsen & Conrad Ottenheim, and the scholarly community or network in which the volume was produced can represent a school of thought greatly influenced by spatial perspectives.

⁴⁰ An interesting observation concerns the relationship between status and the right hand respectively the left hand side. In diplomatic ceremonials involving Europeans and Ottomans, walking together provided no conflict over precedence since the different cultures had different appraisals of right and left. Roosen, 1980, pp. 466–467.

⁴¹ For example, in a letter to his mother, the queen consort of Sweden Louisa Ulrika, Crown Prince Gustav expressed an awareness of spatial significance when visiting the court of Louis XV, writing on 18 February 1771: ‘J’ai fait un voyage ces jours derniers à Marley, où le Roi m’a reçu encore plus gracieusement que la première fois. Nous avons été logés dans les appartements des Enfants de France, ce qui est ici un très grande distinction et un marque particulière des bontés du Roi.’ *Gustav III:s och Lovisa Ulrikas brevväxling*, 1919, p. 261.

It might even be erroneous to assume body language was not, in itself, a ‘situational’ language. In fact, Roosen’s discussion seems to imply this was the case.

In any respect, the relation between space and body was most intricate. Janet Dickinson has demonstrated the complex interplay of space and body in the relationship between Robert Devereux, second Earl of Essex, and Elisabeth I. In 1599 the Earl’s bold transgression of space and body boundaries would mark his ultimate falling from the queen’s favour.⁴² The turn to spatiality can perhaps be interpreted as a consequence of the critique against Norbert Elias’s idea of a fundamental opposition between sovereigns and elites. Subsequently, scholars have become more interested in the comprehension of the court as a ‘point of contact’ and an arena characterised by a struggle for, and culture of, access.⁴³ The spatial perspectives in court studies have proven fruitful. What Dickinson shows however is that bodies constitute an indispensable variable in the equation. This argument is also emphatically proposed by Sara Melzer and Kathryn Norberg in *From the Royal to the Republican Body*, stressing that ‘if the king’s body had great political significance, so too did the bodies of his subjects’.⁴⁴

Besides arguing for relevance, considering scholarly perspectives on courts, ceremonies and bodies is imperative from the viewpoint of practicality. In adhering to the methodological requirements of historiography a comparative analysis requires consistent demarcations of key concepts.⁴⁵ *Ceremony* and *body* constitute the central concepts in this thesis. In order to define them and reinforce the validity of the comparative analysis, theoretical considerations are necessary.

CEREMONY AS PUBLIC THEATRE

Conceptions of ceremony have been discussed briefly, emphasising the need for interpretations deeply rooted in contextual comprehensions of the time, culture, politics and social milieu of specific societies.⁴⁶ In a concrete sense, the concept of ceremony is rather more ambiguous. Janette Dillon has argued that ceremony occurred wherever and whenever a personage was present, that ceremony ‘operated all the time in royal and noble households’.⁴⁷ The idea of royal courts and households being imbued with performativity can also be found in Erin Griffey’s views on the materialisation of magnificence. In regard to the court of Henrietta Maria of France, Griffey claims that

[d]isplay permeated every aspect of the early modern court: in the bodily presence of the monarch, whose heart provided the pulse for the court, and in the ceremonial clothing and crown jewels that embodied authority [...] The monarch was, in this sense, always on display.⁴⁸

⁴² Referencing the incident of September 1599 when the Earl ‘went so boldly to her Majesties’ presence, she not being ready and he so full of dirt and mire’ and ‘found the Queen newly up, the heare about her face; he kneeled unto her, kissed her handes, and her faire neck, and had some privat speach with her’. Dickinson, 2016, p. 41.

⁴³ See for example Raeymaekers & Derkx, 2016; Raeymaekers, 2013.

⁴⁴ Melzer & Norberg, 1998, p. 3.

⁴⁵ Dahlgren, 1996, pp. 196–198.

⁴⁶ See Bloch, 1992, pp. 271–272 and 294–296.

⁴⁷ Dillon, 2010, p. 3.

⁴⁸ Griffey, 2015, p.1.

Thus, conceptualising the royal court in terms of the analytical concept *public theatre* might be beneficial. Accordingly, ceremony was acted out as part of a ritual visualisation meant to penetrate the perceptions of audiences and participants. Its purpose was to establish a cult around the monarch and transform myths into reality.⁴⁹ Naturally, one must keep in mind that preconditions for court life in the seventeenth century differed from those in the late eighteenth century. Interestingly though, Duchess Charlotte wrote in her diary in 1792 that the court must resemble a theatre to every spectator with a philosophical disposition.⁵⁰ Nevertheless, the relation between public and private was most intricate in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century.⁵¹ Joan B. Landes has described the eighteenth-century absolutist court of France in terms of a semi-public in which the nobility and the royal family functioned as both actors and audiences in the performances of monarchy.⁵²

In any respect, the notion of public theatre is suggestive and not least in regard to Gustav III. The historian Erik Lönnroth advocated in a biography of the king that Gustav III regarded kingship as intrinsically associated with theatre. To be king inevitably entailed playing the great part of a ruler.⁵³ Gustav III's theatrical peculiarities are well-documented. His idolising tendencies certainly contributed to an appreciation for theatrical display. When Gustav III disembarked for a campaign in Finland in 1788 he appeared dressed up as his hero Gustavus Adolphus.⁵⁴ The court of his successor retained many Gustavian characteristics. Gustav IV Adolf as well as the guardian during his minority – Gustav III's brother Duke Charles, later to become Charles XIII – were diligently interested in questions of etiquette.⁵⁵ According to Mikael Alm, it is somewhat unfortunate that the successive reign of Charles XIV John 'almost routine-like' has been described 'as Bourgeois in nature'. Although the formality of court etiquette was reformed by Charles XIV John, such claims tend to divert attention from persisting and significant ceremonial constituents.⁵⁶ As underlined by Fabian Persson, discontinuity was a prevalent aspect to the court of Charles XIV John but continuities were also tangible.⁵⁷

⁴⁹ Madeleine Hurd uses the concept of public theatre when analysing the bodies of the Sturmabteilung in the staging of power in Nazi Germany. The analytical concept is described here in a general and transferred sense. Hurd, 2005, p. 228.

⁵⁰ Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. III, 1907, p. 494.

⁵¹ Birgitte Bøggild Johannsen & Konrad Ottenheyen stress national differences in the distribution of space to the private or the public. The English and the Spanish (or Habsburg) courts traditionally kept a strict division between private and public spaces whereas the French courts were more fluid, the royal apartments and chambers having a more public character. This assertion is along the lines with Hugh Murray Baillie's seminal article from 1967 on the planning of state apartments in Baroque palaces. Baillie argued the British courts were more persistent in the separation between private and public spaces whereas the French courts were more inclined to differentiate between public and private time. Johannsen & Ottenheyen, 2015, p. 18; Baillie, 2014.

⁵² Seeing how the Swedish monarchy drew inspiration from the French court, the latter circumstances were perhaps more applicable to Gustavian court culture.

⁵³ Landes, 1988, pp. 18–20.

⁵⁴ Lönnroth, 2008, p. 9.

⁵⁵ One of the King's secretaries, Gudmund Jöran Adlerbeth, noted 'ceremonies and ceremonial performances' were considered of the highest importance and Gustav III 'regulated a procession as he would a campaign or an alliance'. Alm & Vahlne, 2010, p. xiii.

⁵⁶ Bergman, 1938, p. 12–13; Ekeblad, 1871, p. 5.

⁵⁷ However, new court ordinances were drawn up in 1801 in order to drastically reduce the expenses of court life and royal grandeur which made the court less extravagant. It has furthermore been suggested Gustav IV Adolf was an introvert person who did not share his father's anticipation for grand ceremonial display. This became quite evident at a *grand couvert* at the Chinese Pavillion at Drottningholm in 1802 when the King, infuriated over the disturbing audiences, left the table to upbraid them himself. See Alm & Vahlne, 2010, pp. xiii and 432–439; Sandin 2011, pp. 83–85; 'Gustav IV Adolf', urn:sbl:13318, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (article by Sten Carlsson), accessed 7 March 2017.

⁵⁸ Alm, 2008, p. 24.

⁵⁹ Persson, 2010, 55–59.

From a methodological point of view, it is imperative to recognise the various components existing within the concept of public theatre. Discrepancies existed between the ceremonial theatre's various participants. Some took on the parts of producers, others that of actors or spectators. Ian Archer has emphasised, in regard to early modern processions of royal funerals or *joyeuses entrées*, that material splendour of a parade might have impressed an audience but it is uncertain how much of the performance an individual observer could actually understand, hear or see.⁵⁸ Contemporaries appear to have been somewhat aware of the conditions and problematics surrounding ceremonial communication. After the funeral of Adolf Frederick in 1771 a chapbook by the royalist Johan Benedict Busser was printed, telling the story of a fictive *tête-à-tête* between a priest and a peasant. The pamphlet's descriptive subtitle informed the reader of its content and purpose: to explain and describe, among many things, the magnificent ornaments decorating the church on this woeful occasion. The priest enlightened the unversed farmer, telling him the funeral was dignifying, 'splendid, yet with proper thrift'. The farmer then acknowledged his ignorance as to the significance of the paintings hanging above the late king, and the priest explained that

[t]he large and beautiful picture of the man, above whose head an angel held a crown, represented and indeed resembled the late King, in whose right hand a circle or a ring was seen, a symbol, that the hero's glorious life was accomplished, and that he now should be crowned with the imperishable crown of the blessed eternity.⁵⁹

The chapbook likely reflected the ongoing politicised strife over the societal balance between monarchy, aristocracy and democracy which contributed in dividing the political landscape of the Swedish Age of Liberty into factions.⁶⁰ As an artefact, the pamphlet even more explicitly illustrates the prominence of public theatre while at the same time demonstrating the prevalence of ambiguity and the royalist attempt of its abolishment.

CEREMONIAL VERSUS EVERYDAY LIFE

As opposed to Janette Dillon's notion of ceremony constantly taking place in royal households, Jeroen Duindam has argued that a division between court life and ceremony should be maintained. Duindam contends that 'court life and ceremony were two extremes within the same continuum: they shared a preoccupation with rank and deportment, but nevertheless remained quite distinct'.⁶¹ Consequently, Duindam further differentiates between three kinds of ceremonials: dynastic (e.g. coronations, funerals, baptisms and marriages), domestic (e.g. concerning stable, chamber, table and chapel) and diplomatic.

⁵⁸ Archer, 2008, pp. 166–167.

⁵⁹ LUB, *I Anledning Af Kongl. Begräfningen, Ett Märkvärdigt Samtal Emellan En Präst och en Bonde; Om orsaken til Hänen Maj:ts Änke-Drottningens fränvaro därwid, Jämte Kort och tydlig Beskrifning Om Riddareholms Kyrkans förträffliga prydnader vid detta sorgeliga tilfället, Samt Om anledningen til Likprä dikans hållande af Biskopen i Linköping Och Kongssringningens uphörande öfwer hela Riket m.m,* 1771, p. 4 (original quotations: 'hon war lysande; men med anständig hushållning' and 'Den stora wackra Mans bilden, öfwer hwilkens hufwud en Ängel höll en Krona, betecknade och wärckeligen liknade salig Kungen, i Hwars högra hand sågs en cirkel eller ring, till tecken, at Hiel tens ärofula lefnads lopp war fullbordat, och at Han nu borde krönas med den sälla ewighetens öförwanskliga Krono'); 'Johan Benedict Busser' *urn:sbl:17201, Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (article by Hj. Alying.), accessed 21 March 2017.

⁶⁰ Bodensten, 2016, pp. 94 and 348.

⁶¹ Duindam, 2007, pp. 182–187 (quotation, p. 187).

The official journals kept by the Swedish Grand Master of Ceremonies correspond to the sources on which Duindam builds his argument in so far as they do not contain detailed descriptions of daily court procedures, such as the *lever* or *grand couvert*. However, when regarding for example the *lever*, distinctions between court life and ceremony may appear somewhat blurred.⁶² Methodological difficulties in defining ceremony might be seen as a result of the tensions between, in anthropological terms, etic and emic approaches.⁶³ The complexities of definition are tangible in the source material. In 1792 several foreign ministers, their wives and accompanying gentlemen arrived at the Royal Palace to see the late Gustav III lying in state. In the journal Hauswolff wrote ‘as this was without ceremony, I accordingly had, on behalf of the office, nothing to concern myself with’. At the same time, in the capacity of Herald of the Realm, he was standing guard fully clothed in ceremonial dress.⁶⁴ Hauswolff apparently did not conceive this particular occasion in terms of ceremony, yet the display of a deceased king’s body entailed conspicuous elements of public theatre. However, it is plausible Hauswolff regarded the practice of a monarch’s *lit de parade* as ceremony, only that the specific arrangement with the ministers and their wives did not require diplomatic ceremonial. Three days later, when the military companies came to see the royal body and pay their respect in connection to its removal to the chapel, the event was highly ceremonial.⁶⁵ The state of things becomes even more complex if one considers the potential lack of unanimous perceptions among contemporaries as to whether ceremony was applied or not.⁶⁶ Therefore one might reasonably argue that Dillon’s comprehension of ceremony may appear too wide whereas Duindam’s may appear to narrow.

Nevertheless, demarcations need to be made. From a methodological point of view, Duindam’s definition of ceremony provides the historian with a manageable concept for comparisons. Hence, the method of this thesis applies Duindam’s categorisation and largely considers the more extraordinary characteristics of ceremony. More specifically, the thesis considers dynastic ceremonies. Court ceremonials all had in common an intention to publicly represent monarchical power and contained the elements of royal glorification (*repraesentatio maiestatis*), a meticulous observance of the hierarchical order amongst those serving the regent and an assertion of the ruler’s connection to the commonwealth. The distinguishing characteristics of dynastic ceremonies were their highly public nature (they often took place outside of the court), the presence of dynasty and representatives of the realm.⁶⁷ The exclusion of everyday court life, despite its illustrative qualities from the perspective of the body, can be justified through the use of Hauswolff as a prism through which royal ceremonies are analysed.⁶⁸ Emanating from Hauswolff and his office, using him as a prism through which ceremonial bodies are analysed, warrants this exclusion since the Grand Master of Ceremonies

⁶² See Skjöldebrand, 1903, pp. 56–57; Ehrensvärd, 1877, pp. 262–263.

⁶³ See Zoltan Boldizsar, 2009.

⁶⁴ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, p. 140 (original quotation: ‘Som detta war utan ceremoni, så hade jag å ämbetets vägnar ej något dermed att befatta’).

⁶⁵ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Bisättning I Riddarholms Kyrkan Den 13 April 1792*).

⁶⁶ For example, a lengthy discussion arose in October 1792 when a spectacle was arranged as part of Duke Charles’s birthday celebration. Believing the event was an *amusement de Societé* without ceremony, the Russian ambassador seated himself next to the Duke of Östergötland. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, pp. 237–238 and 248–252.

⁶⁷ Duindam, 2007, pp. 181–182.

⁶⁸ The specific act of displaying a royal body on *lit de parade* is, regardless of the conceivable ambiguity in Hauswolff’s remark, regarded as part of the dynastic ceremony based on the practice’s close connection to the ‘theatre of death’.

did not occupy himself with describing activities of everyday life. In accordance with Duindam's categorisation of ceremony, a selection of dynastic ceremonies – coronations and funerals – are analysed in this thesis.

LES TECHNIQUES DU CORPS

In regard to the body, Marcel Mauss's theory of *les techniques du corps* constitutes the primary source of inspiration. The essay, first published in 1935, was concerned with 'les façons dont les hommes, société par société, d'une façon traditionnelle, savent se servir de leur corps.'⁶⁹ What Mauss called attention to by emphasising the physio-psychosociological aspects of body experience and human movement was not only, as Margaret Lock and Judith Farquhar point out, the 'use of the body and body parts as classificatory devices that inform the social order' but also that 'it is through the body that, as individuals, we experience and transform the world around us'.⁷⁰ From this perspective, Mauss's reservation that 'l'erreur peut être un principe' is most stimulating when he argues that education, i.e. the way people learn how to inhabit their bodies, posits itself as the dominant disciplining mechanism of human bodies. His reservation is suggestive since ceremony in practice not always corresponded to ceremony in theory. Conflicts and struggles over precedence frequently occurred and differing customs or perceptions could generate much confusion and error.⁷¹

In addition to education, Mauss stressed that the ever-present physio-psychosociological behaviour patterns were 'plus ou moins habituels et plus ou moins anciens dans la vie de l'individu et dans l'histoire de la société'.⁷² The idea of ancientness is not unproblematic if one considers invention of tradition, or sometimes renovation of tradition, to be prominent characteristics of not only court society but of society as a whole.⁷³ The funeral arrangements after the passing of Gustav III for instance contained an element of invention when his body was adorned with artificial glass eyes.⁷⁴ One of the research questions therefore aims at exploring the relation between tradition and innovation in the ceremonial approach to bodies.

Analysing the history of bodies suggests an obligation to discuss the influential thoughts of Michel Foucault. When considering the thought provoking potential of an error principle, the Foucauldian notion of ubiquitous exertion of power with ever-successful disciplining discourses may appear somewhat askew. Melzer & Norberg highlight this fact, arguing that studying 'the flaws and contradictions inherent in Bourbon body politics' is what engenders

⁶⁹ Mauss, 1950 [1935], p. 365. For an English translation of Mauss's essay, see Mauss, 1973, pp. 70–88. The translator, Ben Brewster, translates this particular quote as 'the way in which men from society to society know how to use their bodies'. Mauss, 1973, p. 70.

However, this translation omits Mauss's emphasis on tradition and ancientness, i.e. the way in which men from society to society, *in a traditional way*, know how to use their bodies.

⁷⁰ Lock & Farquhar, 2007, p. 22

⁷¹ Mauss, 1950, p. 384 (translation of the quotation: 'error may be a principle'); Duindam, 2007, p. 186.

⁷² Mauss, 1950, p. 384 (translation of the quotation: 'more or less habitual and more or less ancient in the life of the individual and in the history of the society').

⁷³ Hobsbawm, 1992, pp. 1–15; Kuhn, 1987, pp. 150–152.

⁷⁴ Although, this was perhaps not an 'invention of tradition' but rather an innovation relating to tradition as the practice of using glass eyes was not adopted by Gustav III's successors. However, Rangström stress the particular case of Gustav III arouse associations to the effigies used in royal funerals and processions of the past. These effigies had both biological and ideological functions. On the one hand, acting as a substitute for the decaying body and on the other hand underlining the monarch's immortality. Rangström, 2015, pp. 149–150; Johannsen, 2004, p. 101.

fruitful insights vis-à-vis ‘the emergence of a new kind of body in late eighteenth century’.⁷⁵ However, some scholars have pointed out that Foucault’s conception of power encompasses the existence of counter discourse or alternative discourses, i.e. discourses of resistance within the system of power.⁷⁶ Adopting a theoretical position predominantly influenced by either Mauss or Foucault may ultimately concern the implementation of either structuration theory or social constructivism.⁷⁷ Turning to Mauss rather than Foucault for inspiration has been a deliberate choice. Mauss’s emphasis on ‘le triple point de vue’ – the sociological, physiological and psychological as ‘les trois éléments indissolublement mêlés’ – appears to encompass the study of *l’homme total* in a more comprehensive manner.⁷⁸

The three aspects emphasised by Mauss are somewhat difficult to demarcate from each other due to their complex intermingling, but Nick Crossley has recounted a definition of the various viewpoints in an article on Mauss’s contribution to sociology. The physiological aspect considers the biological and material body, i.e. the constraints engendered by anatomical structures. It is a body that can be seen and felt by others. The sociological, or social, aspect regards the techniques as emerging from social interaction, making them a collective propriety encompassing a logic which needs to be learned. In that sense, bodies are contingent on social contexts, i.e. the *habitus*, normative regulations and social origins by means of diffusion or transference through interaction. Thus, bodies are never completely universal nor completely individual. The psychological, or mindful, aspect is the least elaborated dimension but Crossley stresses its emphasis on the body’s deployment as embodiments of understanding and knowledge.⁷⁹ It can thus be regarded as interpretations and meanings ascribed to bodies and their practices. A central point in Crossley’s assessment of *Les techniques du corps* is that subjectivity, agency and the room for improvisation and flexibility needs to be considered more seriously than Mauss did.⁸⁰ By applying a different understanding of the *habitus* (see the discussion below) and by introducing the error principle, this thesis endeavours to meet these demands.

Some theoretical issues need to be resolved, however. In the preface of an anthology with Mauss’s collected essays Claude Lévi-Strauss claimed ‘nous recueillons des textes écrits ou oraux. Mais les possibilités si nombreuses et variées dont est susceptible cet outil, pourtant universel et placé à la disposition de chacun, qu’est le corps de l’homme, nous continuons à les ignorer’.⁸¹ The much available bodies of individuals are not, to the historian, as accessible as

⁷⁵ Melzer & Norberg, 1998, p. 5.

⁷⁶ See Järvinen, 1997.

Furthermore, it is plausible that the architectonic elements in Foucauldian conceptualisation of power exertion would have been suggestive in regard to court ceremonial if one for example considers the significance of Versailles’s architectural structure in the shaping of the relationship between monarchs and French elites in the eighteenth century. Jay M. Smith has even described Louis XIV’s bureaucratic enterprise as a ‘panoptic’ monarchy. See Nilsson, 2008, p. 126; Price, 2003, pp. 441–442; Smith, 1993, p. 412.

⁷⁷ Smith & Riley, 2009, p. 260.

⁷⁸ Mauss, 1950, p. 369 (translation of the quotation: ‘the three elements indissolubly mixed together’).

Although Nick Crossley has argued that discourse has no place in Mauss’s conception of bodies and that sociological methods require ‘observant participation’ when studying techniques of the body, it is possible (perhaps even necessary) from the historian’s perspective to argue that the sociological and psychological aspects entail the discursive element suggested by Foucaudian theories. The ‘triple viewpoint’ can thus be said to involve a study of disciplining discourse and internalisation through the notion of ‘education’ without neglecting the existence of a material body which is, to some extent, accessible. See Crossley, 2007, pp. 87–88.

⁷⁹ Crossley, 2007, pp. 85–87.

⁸⁰ Crossley, 2007, p. 86.

⁸¹ Lévi-Strauss, 1950, p. xii.

Lévi-Strauss might suggest is the case for field-working ethnographers or anthropologists, and the historiographic enterprise largely limits itself to the collection of texts. From the source material used in this thesis a paradox arises: the analysed journals are nothing but written texts, yet they are strikingly concerned with actual, physical bodies that are sometimes heavy, ill or foul-smelling.⁸² The inevitability of textual representation makes the discourse oriented study of bodies anticipated by Foucault much understandable, but several scholars have endeavoured to move beyond discourse in order to examine the lived and experienced bodies of the past. Barbara Duden's pioneering work *The Woman Beneath the Skin* can be mentioned in this context. It furthermore highlights the fact that, in weighing the benefits of structuration against those of social constructivism, the perspective of phenomenology also needs to be considered.⁸³

Mauss introduced the notion of *habitus* when elaborating on the techniques of the body. The concept, which was later developed by Pierre Bourdieu, signified to Mauss the habitual and customary social idiosyncrasies of peoples' inhabiting of their bodies which vary between societies in education, fashions and prestige. Philip Smith and Alexander Riley assert that Bourdieu understood the *habitus*, in which bodily capital is cultivated with much practice and strategy, as 'a structured and structuring structure, i.e., as a long-lived element of human identity that is both the product of an already-existing set of objective social and cultural facts and the ground possibility for new experiences and practices'.⁸⁴ While clinging to the thought-provoking reservation of the potential error principle, reading Mauss with a Bourdieusian *habitus* entails the insertion of a more nuanced description of agency. The central point of education, conceived by Mauss as 'un des moments fondamentaux de l'histoire' somewhat resonates with Elias's civilising process and provides a basic understanding to the formation of techniques.⁸⁵ As stimulating as these thoughts may be, education and civilising appear to suffer from similar inadequacies as Foucauldian power conceptualisation. Hence, the stimulating implications of Maussian *error* and Bourdieusian *capital*.⁸⁶

Phenomenological perspectives elaborated further on the issue of agency and individual experiences. The French philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty's apprehension of a fundamental relationship between the body, experience and perception became seminal.⁸⁷ Nick Crossley drew on Merleau-Ponty when formulating the concept of reflexive body techniques as separate from the techniques of the body proposed by Mauss. The latter views the techniques, in all instances, as having 'some practical or symbolic purpose beyond the body itself' whereas the former stresses the direction 'toward the body itself' and degrees of individuality due to the fact that two individuals' experiences, crucial in shaping the 'corporeal schemas' behind the

For an English translation of Lévi-Strauss's introduction, see Lévi-Strauss, 1987. The translator, Felicity Baker translates the quotation as 'We are collectors of the products of human industry, and of written or oral texts. But as for the very numerous and varied possibilities of that instrument which is the human body, we are as ignorant as ever, even though the body is universal and is at everyone's disposition'. Lévi-Strauss, 1987, p. 6.

⁸² See for example RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 2, p. 22; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordnning Wid Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Bisättning I Riddarholms Kyrkan Den 13 April 1792*).

⁸³ Duden, 1991.

⁸⁴ Smith & Riley, 2009, pp. 268 and 265 (quote).

⁸⁵ Mauss, 1950, p. 385 (translation of the quotation: 'one of the fundamental moments in history').

⁸⁶ Still, some of the exciting ideas presented by Elias in *The History of Manners* resonate those of the Bourdieusian *habitus*, such as the belief that individuals' external features represented their inner qualities. Elias, 1989, p. 144.

⁸⁷ Marshall, 2008, p. 95.

techniques, are never completely identical.⁸⁸ In accordance with an intertextual reading and the emphasis on ceremonies and ceremonial bodies relating to wider contexts, the Maussian comprehension is regarded as more warranted but the prevalence of individual discrepancy is not rejected.

BODY AND COSTUME

Costume history situates itself in a somewhat difficult position in relation to the theoretical premises of this thesis. Using Mauss's *les techniques du corps* as the main source of inspiration means that the act of dressing may very well be covered by these techniques, but dress and clothes in themselves are perhaps less applicable.

However, clothing behaviours appear most relevant in a discussion of the body and its social implications.⁸⁹ In *From the Royal to the Republican Body*, Lynn Hunt analyses freedom of dress and revolutionaries' conflicting values in their sense of liberty, regulation and gender when it came to new legislation and cultural policies. While being persistent in abandoning the habits and social demarcations of the *Ancien Régime*, legitimisation of post-revolutionary society was contingent on body politics. The issue of dress became crucial when sovereignty was no longer tied to the king's body but dispersed among 'the multiple bodies of the nation'. When 'the old codes of readability broke down [...] new ones had to be elaborated'.⁹⁰ Similar to a Maussian comprehension, Hunt shows the implications of bodies and clothes beyond themselves. Philip Mansel has demonstrated the vital importance of dress at European courts in the eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. Clothing functioned as means of expression for political alliances, wealth, rank and status but, Mansel argues, 'in this period, clothes could not only indicate but also decide their wearer's status'.⁹¹ The notion is along the lines with Mauss's understanding that bodies both inform the social order and are fundamental for individuals' experiencing of the world.⁹²

In addition to a widened comprehension of Mauss's *habitus*, i.e. a system allowing the cultivation of various forms of capital, Henri Lefebvre's discussion of the relationship between space and body encompasses, according to Kirsten Simonsen, 'a conception of social practice and its objects as an extension of the body' including 'everyday utensils and tools' which 'take place through performance of gestures and development of gestural systems [...] invested with

⁸⁸ Smith & Riley, pp. 266–268.

⁸⁹ See Crane, 2000, pp. 26–27.

⁹⁰ Hunt, 1998, pp. 224–225 and 230–231.

⁹¹ Mansel, 1982, p. 103.

The famous satirical drawing of Louis XIV by William Thackery is quite illustrative in this context. The picture shows three figures next to each other: a mannequin with magnificent royal garments; the unimpressive, feeble body of the bald Louis with humble clothing and a cane; and the King's weak body dressed in the magnificent garments thereby transforming him into the grandiose Sun king. In one edition the first figure is labelled 'Rex' and the second 'Ludovicus', coming together in the third figure as 'Rex Ludivicus'. In another edition the caption reads: 'You see at once, that majesty is made out of the wig, the high-heeled shoes, and cloak... Thus do barbers and cobblers make the gods that we worship.' See Alm, 2010, p. 51; Burke, 1992, unnumbered page.

Theorists of costume furthermore stress the importance of dress in shaping identities and communities, and its qualities as a means of communication. Thus, clothes have not only been regarded as reflecting societal change but also as agents of change, for example in the context of power struggles between the bourgeoisie and aristocracy. Hurd & Olsson, 2005, pp. 14–22.

⁹² Lock & Farquhar, 2007, p. 22.

In a study of elite dressing in early modern England, Susan Vincent writes that 'given clothing's complex and important position in relation to human experience, it is surprising how many of its studies are prefaced by justifications' and she further draws on Fernand Braudel's notion that 'the clothing practices of an age are a window onto its underlying *mentalité*'. Vincent, 2003, p. 2.

meaning and codes [...] specific to a particular society'.⁹³ It does not seem unreasonable to regard clothes as objects functioning as an extension of bodies. Hence, the resemblance between Lefebvre and Mauss – the concern with gestures, or techniques, particular to specific societies – does not appear too farfetched and clothing can be connected to the Maussian theories of body in a less conflicting manner.

SUMMARY: A SPECIFICATION OF THEORY AND METHOD

In this thesis Jeroen Duindam's demarcation of ceremony is adopted, which means that the extraordinary characteristics of ceremonies are emphasised. More specifically, the primary focus is put on the highly public dynastic ceremonies. The comprehension of ceremony furthermore concurs with the theoretical conception of public theatre. Consequently, the main purpose of ceremonies is understood to function as image-making, propagation and representation: to transform myths into reality. Methodologically these premises result in a qualitative reading of the sources with an attempt to discern, and compare over time, which myths – or perhaps themes, since the myths could be imagined or founded in reality – the ceremonies intended to mediate and transform into reality in the perceptions of participants. The emphasis on bodies results in a focus on how the myth-making materialised or manifested itself in the ceremonial bodies of royal personages and subjects. Through the reading of memoirs and alike, there is also an aim (to the extent the sources allow) to discern how various participants, actors and spectators, perceived this myth-making, i.e., whether the bodily propagation was effective.

In regard to the body, the position of this thesis is eclectic but Mauss constitutes the main inspiration. Subsequently, the body is understood as a fundamental construct or site through which individuals reproduce and produce reality. This reflects a perspective influenced by structuration, which is along the lines with an intertextual reading of the sources and the need to connect discourses of the body, as well as the implications of ceremony, with greater societal contexts. From a methodological point of view, this means that the discerned myths, themes and perceptions need to be related to political, social and cultural circumstances. Although the various contexts are difficult to separate from each other, the political context is understood as mainly concerning the problematics of legitimacy in an age of revolution. The social context is understood as mainly involving the various relationships within court society, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the relationship between the actors in this society (principally the monarchs) and those outside of it. The cultural context is mainly seen as concerning fashions, norms and ideals (e.g. those existing and changing within court society or those originating in the growing bourgeois civic society).

The triple viewpoint emphasised by Mauss means psychological aspects need to be considered besides physiological and sociological. To some extent, the phenomenological notion of individual variation is therefore seen as having a valid point. The techniques of bodies, the way

⁹³ Simonsen, 2005, p. 6.

people inhabited and used their bodies, are, in accordance with Mauss, regarded as having implications beyond the body itself but education is not conceived as creating, in all instances of a particular society, complete and uniform social idiosyncrasies. Inherent contradictions in the political, social and cultural milieu as well as limitations of practical life imply the principle of error cannot be neglected. Consequently, the qualitative and intertextual reading requires a sensibility to detect individual variations, that is, a cultivation of various forms of capital through body practices. Furthermore, if error could function as a mechanism or agent of change, this requires a consideration of whether mistakes brought about discernible changes to ceremonial body practices in the future.

In order to analyse the education of bodies, the notions of ancientness and invention of tradition are considered. Methodologically this means the analysis cannot strictly limit itself to the time period 1782–1818. These years constitute the core of the analysis, but comprehending the implications of ceremony requires brief retrospect. Reference to tradition in the sources and literature pointing out the traditional or inventive qualities in the scrutinised ceremonies must therefore be taken into account.

Clothes and costumes are viewed as extensions of the body, imperative for peoples' inhabiting of their bodies and their reproduction of reality. Methodologically this entails a comparison as to how the bodies of the court were dressed at ceremonial occasions and a consideration of clothing behaviours' greater implications. Leonhard von Hauswolff was much interested in how monarchs and subjects dressed and his remarks allow for comparisons to be made.

The remarks made by Leonhard von Hauswolff in the printed ceremonials and in the office journals are of vital importance to discern change over time. Hauswolff began his career at court in 1767 as a court gentleman and descriptions have emphasised him being 'a true Gustavian, of the old order' to which 'ceremonial and etiquette was considered the foremost of all things'.⁹⁴ As a representative for 'the old order' the notes in which he expressed distaste for breaches of etiquette or disregard of custom and tradition are illustrative in demonstrating transformation of ceremonials and court culture.

⁹⁴ af Petersens & Clason, 1909, pp. xii-xiii (original quotation: 'en äkta gustavian av den gamla stammen'); *Svenskt Biografiskt Lexikon, 1863–1864, femte bandet* referenced in Sandin, 2011, p. 88 (original quotation by Sandin: 'ansåg ceremonielet och etiketten såsom det förnämsta av allt'); See also Thomasson, 1944, p. 42.

DYNASTIC CEREMONIES IN THE GUSTAVIAN ERA

The reign of Gustav III has traditionally been referred to as enlightened absolutism but in recent decades this notion has been called into question. Henrika Tandefelt has treated enlightened absolutism rather as ‘an image Gustav III strived to develop himself’. Maintaining a critical stance towards the idea of Gustav III’s absolute reign, Tandefelt claims the concept of absolutism is more applicable to the time period 1789–1809 if one considers political reforms, the maintaining of the Council of the Realm and the practice of assembling the Diet.⁹⁵ Nevertheless, Gustav III managed to strengthen the monarchy in comparison with the time period 1719–1772, termed the Swedish Age of Liberty. Through image-making, language and discursive strategies, political reform, favours and, to use a concept employed by Norbert Elias, the ‘royal mechanism’ (i.e. the monarchy’s ability to balance different interest groups against each other) Gustav III managed to tie political power more closely to his own person. But the Gustavian era was not a period without political turbulence. Legitimisation of the rule was contingent on the monarchy’s ability to relate to the discursive rhetoric of the time. Ceremonies and ceremonial events and festivities were employed to gain authority and legitimacy. Gustav III was initially successful in this endeavour but ultimately oppositional forces within the nobility caused a conspiracy resulting in an attempted assassination which led to the king’s demise in 1792. Legitimacy and authority was somewhat restored but successively undermined in the reign of Gustav IV Adolf, culminating in the king’s dethronement and banishment in 1809.⁹⁶

THE DEATH OF LOUISA ULRIKA IN 1782

THE PARENTAL RHETORIC OF MOURNING

The first dynastic ceremony to take place in the scrutinised time period was the funeral of Queen Dowager Louisa Ulrika. The queen dowager died on 16 July 1782 at Svartsjö Palace and two days later the court was dressed in mourning. A declaration was given, detailing how the gentlemen and ladies of the court were supposed to wear the mourning attire. The Master of Ceremonies, Jean de Bedoire, noted in the office journal that the mourning was to be worn in the same manner as it was ‘after parents’. He furthermore remarked that the foreign emissaries and their wives conformed to this prescription.⁹⁷

To be in mourning was not unusual at court. In order to lighten up grander occasions, specific notifications were sometimes handed out declaring that mourning would be put aside on particular days.⁹⁸ Regardless of whether the deceased monarch was a king or queen the prescribed mourning attire was the same and with few exceptions the declared prescriptions of

⁹⁵ Tandefelt, 2014, p. 7.

⁹⁶ See Alm, 2002; Nordin, 2008; Tandefelt, 2014; Tandefelt, 2008; Hedenborg & Kvarnström, 2015, pp. 153–160; On the ‘royal mechanism’ see Koenigsberger, 1978, p. 199.

⁹⁷ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 2, p. 14.

⁹⁸ Such as at the celebration of Duke Charles’s birthday in 1800 or when the chapter of the orders (*ordenskapitel*) was ceremoniously celebrated in 1809. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, p. 129; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, p. 89.

mourning attire was more or less the same throughout the scrutinised time period.⁹⁹ However, a change was introduced by Gustav III in 1782. Following the death of Queen Dowager Louisa Ulrika, the king decided to reduce the length of mourning from approximately one year to six months. A six month mourning period was at the time in accordance with the prescribed length of mourning after the death of a parent, but the king's decision brought about a dispute between the royal siblings. Gustav III's brother, Prince Frederick Adolf, Duke of Östergötland, and his sister Princess Sofia Albertina wished to be in mourning for a full year as they had been after the death of their father Adolf Frederick in 1771. Eventually they were granted to do so personally, but their respective courts needed to follow the practice of the king's court.¹⁰⁰

The nature of the relationship between Gustav III and Louisa Ulrika can probably explain the shortening of the mourning period. Louisa Ulrika had difficulties in submitting to and accepting the reduced influence her role as queen dowager entailed and since Gustav III's inauguration in 1771 the mother-son-relationship was strained. Her politics and financial situation further distanced her from the son and his court. A definitive schism took place in 1778, caused by a controversy emanating from rumours that Gustav III was not Crown Prince Gustav's legitimate father.¹⁰¹ A harsh but moderate reconciliation ultimately came about when Louisa Ulrika was on her deathbed. However, the Chamber Gentleman Adolf Ludvig Hamilton claimed in his journal that the king was relieved by the queen dowager's demise, making him feel as he was given *carte blanche* and it did not take long before Gustav III returned to his occupation with theatre and amusements.¹⁰² Count Lars von Engeström furthermore recounted in his memoirs that the four-year-old Crown Prince Gustav had told a secretary of state that his father did not mourn the late queen dowager and according to Baron Fredrik Axel von Fersen, Duke Frederick was the only member of the royal family who genuinely mourned the loss.¹⁰³ This claim does not stand unchallenged, however. Duchess Charlotte wrote in her diary that she had been 'absorbed by deep sorrow' and mourned Louisa Ulrika sincerely since the queen dowager had always shown her kindness. The duchess furthermore recounted the strong emotional reactions of Princess Sofia Albertina (and Duke Frederick) when Louisa Ulrika drew her last breath.¹⁰⁴ So, the queen dowager was perhaps not held in particularly high esteem by the king but her death was not met with complete indifference. In any respect, the mourning period at court was shortened but nevertheless corresponded to that prescribed following the death of a parent.

⁹⁹ See RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 2, p. 14; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, p. 137; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 25, unnumbered page; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, pp. unnumbered pages.

¹⁰⁰ Rangström, 2015, p. 160 and 170.

¹⁰¹ 'Lovisa Ulrika', urn:sbl:9719, Svenskt biografiskt lexikon (article by Olof Jägerskiöld), accessed 13 April 2017.

The Baron Fredrik Axel von Fersen gave an example of how this tension expressed itself in 1782 when the King refused to grant the Queen Dowager funds to travel with the Princess Sofia Albertina to Spa or Aachen, out of the King's fear his mother would ruin his reputation in all European states she travelled through. von Fersen, vol. V, 1870, p. 80.

¹⁰² Hamilton, 1901, p. 110 (the wording used by Hamilton was 'Ånkedrottningens fränfälle var en lisa för monarken. Han tyckte sig få ännu friare händer, och då teaterpassionen omöjligent helt och hållet kunde öfvergivva honom, sammansatte han nu teaterpjäser'); For an anecdote of the King and Queen Dowager's reconciliation, see Ekeblad, 1871, pp. 24–32; Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. I, 1902, pp. 370–418; See also von Fersen, vol. V, 1870, pp. 95–103. To some extent, Fersen's account nuances the harsh words written by Hamilton since he claims many festivities and tournaments were cancelled by the King; Jean de Bedoire furthermore noted the King did not practice *lever*, *cour* or *grand couvert* until 11 August. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 2, p. 27.

¹⁰³ Engeström, vol. I, 1876, p. 48; von Fersen, 1870, p. 104.

¹⁰⁴ Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, 1905, vol. III, p. 370 (original quotation: 'försänkts i djup sorg'), 413 and 410. However, the Duchess also noted her death was perhaps for the best since the relationship between the King and Queen Dowager had caused her so much pain.

The wearing of mourning and the bodily manifestations following the death of a queen or king thus symbolised the monarch's status: placed at the top of the hierarchy corresponding in its functions to those of the father or mother in a family or household. The significance of a paternal – or parental – rhetoric, as manifested in the mourning attire, also became evident when Duke Charles accepted the appointment to succeed Gustav IV Adolf in 1809. An announcement from the king to-be was published in the periodical *Inrikestidningar* on 8 June 1809 in which the 'loyal subjects' were addressed with Charles's assurance that he would 'rule the Svea dominion and its people, as would a gentle father over devoted children'.¹⁰⁵ The paternal rhetoric was a prevalent characteristic in several monarchies. Empress Maria Theresa cultivated a maternal imagery, attempting to establish a connection between herself and the subjects by embodying a motherhood extending to all 'nations' over which she ruled. The *Doppelkaiser* Francis II similarly, but from a male position, strove to represent himself as a benevolent father.¹⁰⁶ The rhetoric was also prevalent in early modern Spain and France. Luis Corteguera has argued the language and metaphor had legitimising functions by referring to traditional themes in Spanish thought and was efficient in mediating the relationship between monarchs and subjects as being personal rather than juridical.¹⁰⁷ The latter was important in France as well during the *Ancien Régime*. Increasing bureaucratisation and expanding administration depended on the king's ability to, as Jay M. Smith has put it, 'generalize the royal gaze'.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, Claude de Seyssel had contrasted a monarchy based on 'paternal love, justice and fair treatment' with that of 'tyrannical domination'.¹⁰⁹

However, Lynn Hunt has argued that the revolutionary attitudes in France entailed the 'implicit murder of the symbolic father', but apparently the Swedish monarchy made use of this symbolism (as did Francis II) even after the revolutionary year of 1809.¹¹⁰ The language of parenthood, expressed through the bodies in prescribed mourning, contained an ambiguity which related to circumstances pertinent in a Swedish context as well as a greater European. On the one hand, the parental rhetoric of bodies and utterances in monarchical image-making corresponded well to the much influential ideology of society's ordained structure presented in Luther's small catechesis.¹¹¹ On the other hand it might have possessed redeeming qualities, giving the juridical relationship between monarchy, state and people a more personal character. Establishing a personal connection between subjects and monarchs was vital in order to gain popular support, and its endeavour could for example manifest itself through the royal personages' interest of being visible in the public spaces of Stockholm. Jonas Nordin has underlined that the significance of establishing, or affirming, the hierarchical order of dominance and subjection could be even more important at times when the authority of monarchy was disputed.¹¹²

¹⁰⁵ *Inrikestidningar*, no. 64, 8 June 1809 (attached in RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21) (original quotation: 'Wi skole regera öfver Svea Land och Folk, som en mild Fader öfver tillgifna barn').

Furthermore, when Charles XIII died in 1818 and a deputation from the Uppsala Academy was received by Charles XIV John, *Posttidningar* reported on the exchanged speeches, writing the deputation had uttered 'Twice he was our saviour, but he was even more: he was our Father'. *Posttidningar*, no. 23, 23 February 1818 (original quotation: 'Två gånger war han vår Räddare; han war ännu mer: Han war vår Fader').

¹⁰⁶ Fichtner, 2014, pp. 129–130 and 171.

¹⁰⁷ Corteguera, 2009, pp. 52–53.

¹⁰⁸ Smith, 1993, p. 410.

¹⁰⁹ Kaiser, 1998, p. 133.

¹¹⁰ Hunt is referenced in Landes, 1988, p. 104.

¹¹¹ See Lindstedt Cronberg, 2009, pp. 37–38.

¹¹² Nordin, 2009, pp. 198–206; See also Hellsing, 2015.

Having the mourning correspond to that prescribed after the death of parents could thus be interpreted as an enterprise to gain legitimacy, authority and popular support by the symbolic fabrication of a personal bond and manifestation of hierarchical order. In the turbulent times of the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century this endeavour appears to have been of great significance and the body was employed in its rhetoric and myth-making.

VARIOUS ATTITUDES IN THE PUBLIC THEATRE

On 25 July the body of Louisa Ulrika was moved from Svartsjö Palace to the Royal Palace. A printed ceremonial was given with instructions as to how the procession would proceed. Once the body had been opened and medically examined it was, as the queen dowager had requested, shrouded in silver fabric with pieces of golden lace and put in a coffin draped with black velvet. The body was then put on display in a hall draped with black velvet and guarded by appointed courtiers until the arrangements were ready for the body's removal to Stockholm. All serving at the queen dowager's court, high and low, were ordered to appear at Svartsjö early in the morning on 25 July. The counts and barons who had announced they would assist the Councillors of the Realm to carry the body and coffin were also supposed to appear in the morning.¹¹³ The Councillors of the Realm lifted the body from its *lit de parade* and carried it to the Palace's gates where the assisting counts and barons waited. They then proceeded to the sloops which would transport the parade to the Royal Palace. When the procession passed by Drottningholm Palace the royal family, walking in a procession, boarded the sloops only to disembark at Munkbron and ceremonially march towards the palace. The body was then put on its *lit de parade* in Rikssalen where the general public was permitted to see the late queen dowager between seven and nine o'clock in the evenings until the funeral took place on 31 July.¹¹⁴

Count Lars von Engeström, who participated in the procession, remarked in his memoirs it was unfortunate that the parade did not arrive in Stockholm before nightfall. He noted that the Crown Prince had been very beautiful in his mourning attire and it had been very touching to see him walk in his long black coat whose train was carried by his gentlemen, who assisted him and weighed him down at the same time. Since the residents of the capital loved to see their crown prince it was a pity they were now, due to the dark, unable to do so.¹¹⁵ Fabian Persson has shown that cherishing the memory and body of a deceased royal personage was of great importance in the early-modern period since they were imbued with dynastic interests.¹¹⁶ The demise of a monarch signified the commencement of a theatre of death.¹¹⁷ When reading the ceremonial procession from Svartsjö Palace in terms of dynastic ceremonial and public theatre, Engeström's remark implies the dynastic importance. Through the physical presence of the

¹¹³ Jean de Bedoire handed on 24 July out notifications and invitations to the concerned Lords of the Realm. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 2, p. 15; LUB, *Wid Inflytningen Af Högstsal. Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke-Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Lik Ifrån Svartsjö Slott Till Kongl. Slottet i Stockholm Then 25 Juli 1782, I akt tages följande Ordning*, paragraphs 1–2.

¹¹⁴ LUB, *Wid Inflytningen Af Högstsal. Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke-Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Lik Ifrån Svartsjö Slott Till Kongl. Slottet i Stockholm Then 25 Juli 1782, I akt tages följande Ordning*, paragraphs 3–13.

¹¹⁵ Engeström, vol. I, 1870, p. 49.

¹¹⁶ Persson, 2015, p. 96.

¹¹⁷ See Woodward, 1997.

young crown prince (despite the fact that he barely knew his grandmother due to the quarrels between her and Gustav III) the memory of the queen dowager was cherished and the dynasty – its past and its continuation – was displayed to the people of Stockholm. Crown Prince Gustav was an important symbol and politically charged body in the Gustavian monarchy, thus explaining Gustav III's harsh treatment of his mother when she involved herself in rumours of his illegitimacy.¹¹⁸ The spatial preconditions were evidently of importance in this bodily display. The location of Svartsjö Palace in the Stockholm archipelago made the procession route at sea a natural decision, which had its advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, a great deal of the general public would be able to witness the procession from the shores or, if they had the opportunity, from boats.¹¹⁹ On the other hand, the inevitable setting of the sun meant that the public theatre's staging of dynasty was to some extent diminished.

Six days later, on the day of the funeral, Gustav III was dressed in 'deepest mourning', covering his hat and face with crepe, and wearing a long black coat whose train was carried by his Chief Chamber Gentleman and chamber pages. Crown Prince Gustav, Duke Charles, Duke Frederick, and Duchess Charlotte were dressed in the same manner but Queen Sofia Magdalena and Princess Sofia Albertina did not attend.¹²⁰ According to the duchess, Sofia Magdalena was excused due to her pregnancy whereas Louisa Ulrika before she died explicitly had requested that Sofia Albertina would not attend her *lit de parade* or funeral.¹²¹ In the printed ceremonial it was stated that the queen dowager had forbidden the princess to participate.¹²²

The queen dowager's request is interesting since the practice of displaying deceased monarchs on *lit de parade* and in ceremonial funerals bore significant dynastic implications and was in keeping with custom and tradition. The death of a monarch was not a private but a public affair since royal bodies were tied up with dynastic stability. Therefore, displaying the body of a deceased king or queen and arranging ceremonial funerals were tradition¹²³ At the same time, the physiological aspect of the body could not be neglected. Jean de Bedoire noted that the late queen dowager had been publicly displayed for five days 'though in a closed casket to prevent nasty odour'.¹²⁴ The inevitable physiology, the decay of the body, appears to have hindered the mediation of dynastic stability in 1782. Forty years prior to Louisa Ulrika's death, when the late Ulrika Eleonora was lying in state, the physiological body was of great significance to demonstrate stability. In order to abolish rumours claiming that Ulrika Eleonora had been poisoned, it was imperative for the subjects to see the marks on her face caused by the severe case of 'pox' which had led to her demise.¹²⁵

¹¹⁸ The birth of Crown Prince Gustav in 1778 secured the dynasty's succession, which was of political significance since it meant the impact of foreign state interests could be diminished at the accession of a new monarch. It was also of symbolic significance, associated with Gustav III's ambition of contributing to the great line of distinguished kings with the name Gustav in Swedish history. Tandefelt, 2008, p. 114.

¹¹⁹ Engeström noted all sorts of people – priests, burghers, sailors and women – could be seen from the sloops and in Stockholm the windows and rooftops were full of spectators. Engeström, vol. I, p. 49.

¹²⁰ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 2, p. 17–19.

¹²¹ Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. I, 1902, p. 418.

¹²² LUB, *Wid Högst Salig Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Begräfning, Then 31 Julii 1782, I akt tages följande Ordning*, paragraph 5:19.

¹²³ Persson, 2015, pp. 96–100.

¹²⁴ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 2, p. 22 (original quotation: 'dock med slutet kista, at förekomma elak lukt').

¹²⁵ Rangström, 2015, p. 138.

In addition to the body's physiological and sociological dimension, the psychological was prevalent. The large number of attending spectators from the general public suggests that the expositions were quite extraordinary events but at the same time *comme-il-faut*. Nevertheless, the practice was not without conflicting meanings among contemporaries. Diverging views might have arisen as a result of various attitudes towards death itself, body display or the deceased. Queen Ulrika Eleanora (who died in 1741) as well as Princess Sofia Albertina (who died in 1829) explicitly expressed wishes not to be put on display once they died. These wishes were not implemented, indicating the strength of tradition and the importance attached to the practice.¹²⁶ However, their wishes and Louisa Ulrika's request demonstrate the disputed elements of bodily court display and the existence of diverging attitudes. In a somewhat similar manner Duchess Charlotte wrote in her diary after the death of Gustav III in 1792 that she did not have 'the frame of mind' to visit his *lit de parade*.¹²⁷ Although the funeral of Adolf Frederick in 1771 lies outside the scope of the core analysis, Johan Benedict Busser's aforementioned fictive conversation between a priest and a peasant gives some further details on the subject of sensibility. In the conversation the farmer asks why Louisa Ulrika did not attend the funeral of her late spouse and the priest explains: 'the Queen Dowager, possessed by the most tender grief over her great loss, had not been able to bear attending this mournful ceremony, as her health and strength due to the long and wearying mourning were all too much weakened.'¹²⁸

Emerging from the various absences is a picture of death and dead bodies tied up with investments of personal and emotional distress. Deaths and royal bodies were not merely instruments in the dynastic representations of ceremonial display and public theatre but also sites for sensibility. Yet, the mediation of emotion could also function as a strategy to display the humanity of monarchs.¹²⁹ In the context of griefs and absences, however, one must naturally keep in mind that the relationship between royal family members differed fundamentally from the relationship between monarchs and subjects.

Contrasting the picture of royal bodies being tied up with emotional distress, the memoirs written by Count Engeström present an opposite attitude. Engeström remarked that the Secretary of State Elis Schröderheim on the morning of 25 July met with the king in his chambers and on the way out he encountered the four-year-old crown prince. The young Gustav asked Schröderheim if his grandmother would be put on *lit de parade* today, whereupon Schröderheim replied in the affirmative and the crown prince exclaimed 'That will be fun!'.¹³⁰ Due to the queen dowager's isolation from the crown prince, Gustav III's somewhat indifferent attitude and perhaps his young age, Crown Prince Gustav lacked emotional investment and

¹²⁶ See Rangström, 2015, p. 138; Bergström, 2011, p. 194.

¹²⁷ The Swedish wording used in Bonde's translation is 'för min del saknade jag mod därtill' which is somewhat ambiguous. Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. III, 1907, p. 462.

¹²⁸ The feeling of a need to explain in the chapbook why Louisa Ulrika had been absent corresponds to the notion of a great importance in demonstrating that the memory of the monarch as well as the dynasty was cherished. LUB, *I Anledning Af Kongl. Begräfningen, Ett Märkvärdigt Samtal Emellan En Präst och en Bonde; Om orsaken til Hännest Maj:ts Änke-Drottningens frånvaro därvid, Jämte Kort och tydlig Beskrifning Om Riddareholms Kyrkans förträffliga prydnader vid detta sorgeliga tillfälle, Samt Om anledningen til Likprädikans hållande af Biskopen I Linköping Och Kongssringningens uphörande öfwer hela Riket m.m.*, 1771 (original quotation: 'Änkedrottningen, uppfylld af ömmaste sorg öfwer sin stora frilust, hade ej uthårdat, at bewista denna bedröfliga Acten; hälst Hännest hälsa och krafter skola genom den långsama och tårande sorgen vara allt för mycket förswagade').

¹²⁹ See Fichtner, 2014, p. 154.

¹³⁰ Engeström, vol. I, 1876, p. 48 (original quotation: 'Det blir roligt!').

regarded the ceremony as a spectacle rather than a time of grief. Engeström himself appears to have perceived the removal of the queen dowager's body from Svartsjö Palace to Stockholm in terms of entertainment. In an entry dated the 24 July, he wrote in his memoirs:

I would not believe, that our Lord interfere with ceremonies, but I had planned to amuse myself tomorrow: I had planned with good company on Kersön watch the entire sad procession, I had planned to travel undressed to Stockholm, I had planned much, but all came to nothing; I received a letter from Schröderheim, saying I would officiate as herald. Now I must suffer a slow drying in the sun on a sloop; to participate in the procession of the body's removal, by sea, must be less entertaining than observing it.¹³¹

From the perspective of public theatre, the views presented by Engeström, who lacked family ties to the royal family and would prefer the role of spectator over that of actor, may have corresponded better to those held by the audiences in general, i.e. the subjects and populace. The death of a monarch may very well have been a sad occasion but the ceremonies connected to them were perhaps rather interpreted as amusing spectacles. The notion is supported from the description Engeström gave of what he witnessed from the sloop:

All shores were full of people and the procession was followed at sea by a great number of boats, all crammed with people dressed in black [...] If the procession's spectators were amused by a sad spectacle, they provided in the same more merriness to those participating in the procession. The black clothes were the only attributes of sorrow they displayed.¹³²

The conflicting elements – grief and sorrow as opposed to joy and entertainment – in ceremonial display of the body resonate with Birgitte Bøggild Johannsen's discussion of ceremonies. Johannsen emphasises that viewing ceremony from a strict Durkeimian perspective, i.e. rituals merely as means in political strategies to exercise power, does not encapsulate the complexities of ceremonies. The ambiguous and dynamic elements as well as the adaptive qualities to specific circumstances must also be considered.¹³³ From a Maussian understanding of the body, it demonstrates the significance of the triple viewpoint in, what may perhaps be termed, the technique of display.

From a gender perspective, Louisa Ulrika requesting the absence of Princess Sofia Albertina is interesting since it only concerned her daughter and not her son Duke Frederick who, according to Baron Fersen, was very affected by the queen dowager's death. However, Fersen also claimed that Louisa Ulrika was an 'affectionate mother to her children and especially the Princess' even though her erratic disposition was rather unpleasant for the royal siblings.¹³⁴ The queen dowager's attitude towards her daughter appears to have been more sensitive or protective than towards her son. Joan B. Landes has argued that women were 'largely unconcerned by the bourgeois norms of domestic propriety' during the *Ancien Régime* due to

¹³¹ Engeström, vol. I, 1876, p. 47 (original quotation: 'Jag tror väl ej, att vår Herre blandar sig i ceremonier, men jag hade tänkt roa mig imorgon: jag hade tänkt i godt sällskap på Kersön se hela den sorgliga processionen, jag hade tänkt resa oklädd till Stockholm, jag hade tänkt mycket, men allt försvann; jag fick bref af Schröderheim, att jag skall vara härold. Jag får nu undergå en långsam soltorkning på en slup; att bevista en likprocession, till sjöss, måste vara mindre roligt än att se på densamma').

¹³² Engeström, vol. I, 1876, p. 49 (original quotation: 'Alla stränder voro fulla af folk och likfärdens följdes på vattnet af en mängd båtar, alla fullproppade med svartklädda menniskor [...] Om åskådarna af likfärdens fornöjde sig åt ett sorgligt spektakel, så gäfvo de i och med detsamma ett mera muntert åt dem, som voro i likfärdens. Svarta kläderna voro de enda kännetecken till sorg hos dem.')

¹³³ Bøggild Johannsen, 2004, p. 98.

¹³⁴ von Fersen, 1870, pp. 79–80 (original quotation: 'en öm moder för sina barn och särdeles för Prinsessan') and 96.

their essential role in ‘generational reproduction of class power’. However, the eighteenth century became a turning point signifying ‘the construction of modern gender identity’ through a reinforcement of public-private oppositions which reduced women’s independence in the public spaces of the court.¹³⁵ This development is also indicated in the case of eighteenth century Sweden (these aspects are elaborated on further in the discussion of Queen Dowager Charlotte’s death in 1818 since a delicate treatment of the princess was also conspicuous at that time).¹³⁶

THE FUNERAL

The funeral took place on 31 July. The day before, Jean de Bedoire handed out invitations and printed ceremonials detailing the different functions assigned those invited. Some councillors of the realm were appointed to carry the regalia, others the body of the late queen dowager.¹³⁷ A conflict over precedence arose in regard to the issue of who was rightly supposed to carry the crown in the procession. According to Duchess Charlotte tradition stated that the crown ought to be carried by the oldest councillor of the realm, but the situation was complicated by the fact that several older gentlemen were present who had previously held a seat in the council. According to Count Engeström (although it is not mentioned in the printed ceremonial) a crown had been carried by the Councillor of the Realm, Carl Rudenschöld, in the procession from Svartsjö which implied his significant role when he, in the capacity of Swedish emissary in Prussia, acted as a marriage broker between Louisa Ulrika and Adolf Frederick. When the council was to decide who should carry the crown in the funeral ceremony the king decided not to meddle and since no settlement could be reached the two men who claimed precedence (Rudenschöld and Count Carl Scheffer) chose not to attend, excusing themselves with illness. In order to prevent conflict in the future Gustav III proclaimed that from now on, at similar occasions, the crown would be carried by the oldest present even if he no longer presided in the council.¹³⁸

Precedence was of great significance and manifested through the individual’s function and place in the ceremony.¹³⁹ The printed ceremonial describing in detail how everyone should inhabit their bodies – i.e. how and where they should walk, stand, sit etc., what they should carry and what they should wear – can therefore be interpreted as an education of bodies, a way to avoid conflict by carefully regulating body techniques which had implications to the manifestation of favour and rank. For example, the king’s Chief Chamber Gentleman, First Court Stable Master and Chief Court Hunt Master all belonged to the highest rank and were officiating in close proximity to the king. The first mentioned carried the train of his mantle and the other two walked immediately beside the king on his right hand side (which furthermore shows the entanglement between space and body).¹⁴⁰

¹³⁵ Landes, 1988, pp. 2 and 20–22.

¹³⁶ See the section ‘Grief and Gender’, pp. 59–61.

¹³⁷ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 2, pp. 16–17.

¹³⁸ Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. I, 1902, p. 418; Engeström, vol. I, 1876, pp. 50–52.

¹³⁹ See also Tandefelt, 2008, p. 98.

¹⁴⁰ LUB, *Wid Högst Salig Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Begräfning, Then 31 Julii 1782, I akt tages följande Ordning*, paragraph 5:13; Regarding the rank of various offices, see Rothlieb, 1828, pp. 16–17.

The main theme to be discerned in regard to Louisa Ulrika's funeral ceremony is the close observation of order, rank and precedence. The late queen dowager's court was unsurprisingly given a prominent position, as was the Councillors of the Realm and officials of state, but the central figures in the procession to the church were the royal family members (though, as previously mentioned, Princess Sofia Albertina and Queen Sofia Magdalena were absent).¹⁴¹ As for the discernible myths and themes of monarchy expressed through the body, the sources are less revealing. According to Lena Rangström the decorations of the church, such as the emblematic shields, resonated with a tournament shield Gustav III had once carried.¹⁴² This could perhaps be interpreted as an expression of dynastic connection through material splendour, but in regard to dynastic expressions through the body, the principal act was presumably when the king, crown prince and the dukes, walking in a procession together with some officiating functionaries, followed the queen dowager's body into the grave where the burial was performed. Furthermore, when the service came to a close and the procession ceremoniously left the church, the canopy which had been held above the body of the late queen dowager was now held above the king, which might symbolically have implied the transference of dynasty.¹⁴³

Jean de Bedoire, who accompanied the diplomats to the church, did not remark on any alterations from the printed ceremonial but noted that heavy rainfall made the procession troublesome, especially for the ladies. He also commented that the diplomats were quite touched by the solemnity and by the attention the king so graciously showed them. They were also impressed by the tasteful decorations of the church and the procedures of the ceremony.¹⁴⁴

THE DEATH OF GUSTAV III IN 1792

On 16 March 1792 Gustav III attended a masquerade ball and was subject of an attempted assassination carried out by a conspiracy of nobles opposing his political reforms of 1789 which restricted the nobility's political influence.¹⁴⁵ The king was shot in the back but survived. On the following day Leonhard von Hausswolff noted in the journals that the king held audiences with the diplomats at court and displayed an 'astonishing *tranquilité* and cheerfulness'.¹⁴⁶ It was not until 29 March the king's sustained injuries eventually led to his demise. According to the courtier and favourite Gustav Mauritz Armfelt the ultimate indication of the king's death was revealed when the physician Nils Dahlberg cried out it was over, that the king had fallen into an eternal sleep and 'lifted one of the eyelids and showed us the eye, which was already ruptured'.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴¹ LUB, *Wid Högst Salig Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Begräfning, Then 31 Julii 1782, I akt tages följande Ordning*.

¹⁴² Rangström, 2015, p. 131.

¹⁴³ LUB, *Wid Högst Salig Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Begräfning, Then 31 Julii 1782, I akt tages följande Ordning*.

¹⁴⁴ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 2, p. 21–22.

¹⁴⁵ Hedenborg & Kvarnström, 2015, p. 158.

¹⁴⁶ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, p. 124.

¹⁴⁷ Hennings, 1960, p. 373 (original quotation: 'lyfte på ett av ögonlocken och visade oss ögat, som redan brurst').

DEVIATION AND EDUCATION

The court was dressed in mourning following the death of Gustav III. In 1782 Jean de Bedoire had noted that diplomats wore the mourning attire in the same manner as Swedish courtiers, but in 1792 Leonhard von Hauswolff noted a deviation from the prescribed etiquette. In general, the foreign representatives conformed to the given instructions but the Russian, French, Prussian, Danish and British emissaries wore their mourning in a slightly different manner, influenced by French fashions.¹⁴⁸ In 1818, after the death of Charles XIII, this remark was brought up again in order to function as precedent when uncertainties arose regarding the diplomats' dress.¹⁴⁹

Why these deviations were not noticed in 1782 could on the one hand be due to Jean de Bedoire being less interested in clothing than Leonhard von Hausswolf, thus not noticing the slight variations or finding them superfluous to put in writing. On the other hand, if a change did occur and the diplomats in 1782 wore their mourning in the same manner as Swedish courtiers, it could perhaps be explained by Gustav III's obsessiveness with ceremonial order. The king's 'etiquette frenzy' has been noted by scholars and perhaps the diplomats did not dare challenge his prescriptions.¹⁵⁰ After the king's death in 1792 they could perhaps venture giving expression to their own tastes and to other fashions, distinguishing themselves from other courtiers through their bodily display.

The variation of mourning attire demonstrates that norm and practice was not always a perfect correlation. Deviations, confusions or uncertainties existed despite thorough instructions were given. For example, Hauswolff noted in his private journal that Countess Fersen did not cover her face with crepe when condolences were given to the royal family in 1792. The Master of Ceremonies remarked that it had been customary in the past for wives of councillors and those belonging to *le maison de Roi* to wear crepe. Several ladies of the court therefore expressed their willingness to lend Countess Fersen some but since its wearing was not prescribed in the printed ceremonial she declined. To put this in his diary, Hauswolff noted 'may appear less interesting, but as I have found my time 1771 at the death of King Adolf Frederick and following ceremonies acting as a good handbook at this occasion, without which I can (although with no conceit) guarantee many uncertainties would arise'.¹⁵¹ Besides ordinances and ceremonials, precedents functioned as education. The Maussian notion of ancientness being of importance for the techniques of bodies was to some extent valid in court society since the notion of precedent carried great significance. It was however not undisputed. The case with the condolences demonstrates an existing tension between different forms of education. Most ladies of the court, as well as Hauswolff, relied on precedent but Countess Fersen referred to printed instructions in defence of a deviating body. It is possible that the principle of error was

¹⁴⁸ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, pp. 137–138.

¹⁴⁹ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, p. 42.

¹⁵⁰ See Olausson & Skuncke, 2002, p. 339 (original wording: 'etikettraseri').

¹⁵¹ LUB, L. von Hauswolff, *Efterlämnade papper*, vol. 5, no. 1 *Dagboksanteckningar*, 16 May 1792, unnumbered pages (original quotation: 'synes wäl mindre intressante, men som jag funnit att mina år 1771 wid Kung Adolphs Fredrics död och åtföljande Ceremonier warit en god hjepreda wid detta tillfället utom hwilka jag (dock utan egenkjärlek) kan försäkra att många osäkerhet warit').

at play in regard to the given instructions if indeed Hauswolff was correct and Countess Fersen should have worn crepe. In any respect, conflicting educational systems caused errors.

Courtiers with perceived authority and great knowledge of precedents, such as Leonhard von Hauswolff, could play an important part in the education of bodies and to clarify confusions. This became particularly evident in regard to treating diplomats in a correct and respectful manner.¹⁵² According to Hauswolff, even the king himself could act as an educator and his direct instructions could function as education. In the printed ceremonial of 1792, detailing the procession of the body's removal to the chapel before Gustav III's funeral, he noted:

It was certainly more out of luck than out of skill the canopy did not topple over in the wind for the gentlemen appointed to carry it now found that the one who had previously given instructions in all ceremonies when a canopy was carried no longer existed for King Gustav always in secrecy told them during the walk how they should lower either the right or left side in order not to lose their balance.¹⁵³

THE DRESS OF THE ROYAL ORDER OF THE SERAPHIM

When Louisa Ulrika died in 1782, she was shrouded in silver fabric with golden lace. She had chosen the dress herself a few days before she died and silver fabric corresponded to what was used at grand ceremonial events at the Gustavian court since the introduction of the national dress in 1778.¹⁵⁴ The shrouding of Gustav III's body and the king's theatre of death would manifest even greater implications of dynasty, however.

In preparation for the king's *lit de parade* his body was shrouded in the dress of the Royal Order of the Seraphim, decorated with the order's collars and then placed for public display in the Hall of the Order of the Seraphim (Serafimerordens sal).¹⁵⁵ This practice was in accordance with a tradition originating in 1751. Frederick I had instituted the Royal Order of the Seraphim in 1748 and when he died in 1751 his body was shrouded in its exclusive dress. Previously the shrouding of deceased monarchs had varied, but Fredrick I's successors (Adolf Frederick had been shrouded in the Seraphim dress in 1771 as was Charles XIII in 1818) were accordingly shrouded in the dress of the Order of the Seraphim.¹⁵⁶ Evidently, the arrangements of body and space carried great dynastic implications and related to an invented tradition.

The order itself was much characterised by inventive qualities since the statutes proclaimed its ancient nature.¹⁵⁷ When promotions and appointments of knights and offices were declared following Charles XIII's and Duchess Charlotte's inauguration in 1809, the periodical *Inrikestidningar* wrote that the king advised an 'ancient and reliable manuscript' when

¹⁵² See for example RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, pp. 58–62; RA. CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, pp. 165–167.

¹⁵³ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordnning Wid Högtsalig Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Bisättning I Riddarholms Kyrkan Den 13 April 1792*) (original quotation: 'Det war wärckelig mer lycka än konst att ej himmeln blåste öfwer ända ty herrarna sattes bära nu fant att den som förr i alla Ceremonier der himmel bars, instruerat ej mera fants ty Kung Gustaf sade alltid i tyshet åt dem under gåendet huru de borde till höger eller vänster sienka för att ej förlora balance').

¹⁵⁴ Rangström, 2015, pp. 151–153.

¹⁵⁵ RA, CÖR, vol. I., no. 5, pp. 139–140; See also Alm & Vahlne, 2010, pp. 156–157; RA, CÖR, vol. I., no. 30, p. 32–34.

¹⁵⁶ Rangström, 1997, p. 256.; Tandefelt, 2008, p. 51.

¹⁵⁷ Tandefelt, 2008, pp. 50–51.

performing these ceremonies ‘which have been customary at the ancient Order of the Seraphim, when the very same was instituted by Magnus Ladulås’.¹⁵⁸ The propagation of the order’s ancientness functioned as a strategy to compete with the prestigious Russian, Danish and Prussian orders.¹⁵⁹

Gustav III had competently used the favour of knighting nobles in his wielding of power, but the success of the royal order’s propaganda was perhaps limited, at least in domestic, aristocratic circles.¹⁶⁰ In a register of the Lords of the Realm, Leonhard von Hauswolff wrote that it was said the Excellency Adlersparre refused to wear the Order of the Sword’s and the Order of the Seraphim’s dress, claiming they were established by Gustav III to which he bore ‘a great hatred’. Hausswolff pointed out Adlersparre’s ignorance by underlining that the dress was the same now as it had been in 1748 and that changes had been made only to some of the costumes when the Swedish national dress was adopted in 1778. Hauswolff concluded his notes by stating ‘the audacity’ when one disregards ‘le qu’en dira-t-on’.¹⁶¹ The rumoured views of Adlersparre’s misconception as well as Hauswolff’s historical accuracy somewhat undermine the idea of the order’s ancientness, at least when it comes to its dress. The case furthermore demonstrates how the body, its techniques and its dress in particular, functioned as means to express political sympathies, allegiances and identity. Adlersparre’s alleged refusal to dress up in the costume reflected him being part of the aristocratic opposition and an enthusiast for Enlightened thought on constitutional governance in which the aristocracy functioned as a crucial intermediary ensuring the distribution of power between the monarch and the people.¹⁶² To the Grand Master of Ceremonies it rather reflected a weak character and the deterioration of social order and etiquette. A multitude of meanings were clearly ascribed to the order’s ceremonial dress in various contexts.

THE ISSUE OF CROWDING BODIES

Serious accidents and deaths were not uncommon due to the massive crowding arising when the general public was admitted to see the deceased monarch on *lit de parade*. Duchess Charlotte wrote in her journal in 1792 the masses had flocked to the king’s *lit de parade* and in the turmoil a child had been trampled to death and ‘three or four persons’ had been squeezed to death.¹⁶³

Throughout the scrutinised time period crowding bodies caused ceremonial arrangers a lot of problems. In comparison with the monarch’s *lit de parade* in 1782 when the printed ceremonial

¹⁵⁸ *Inrikestidningar*, 6 July 1809 (attached in RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21) (original quotation: ’då Hans Majestät genom en åldrig och trowärdig handskrift inhämtat de ceremonier, hwilka warit oflige wid den urgamla Seraphimer Orden, då densamma af Konung Mahnus Ladulås stiftades’).

¹⁵⁹ Institution of the order had become a necessary measure in order to avoid embarrassment and degradation of honour when it was decided Adolf Fredrick, decorated with the Russian Order of St Andrew, would ascend the Swedish throne. Tandefelt, 2008, p. 51.

¹⁶⁰ The term ‘propaganda’ being treated with the same caution as discussed by Burke, 1992, pp. 4–5; On the use of royal orders as a strategy in the scenarios of power, see Tandefelt, 2008, pp. 52–63.

¹⁶¹ The register was initiated by the Baron Rosenhane but completed by Hauswolff. The register is undated but Hauswolff probably wrote the last entry in 1823 judging from the way in which the dates of deceased gentlemen have been noted. LUB, L. von Hauswolff. *Fortsättning af Baron Rosenhanes [förteckning] på de till En af Rikets Herrar kallade sedan 1793*, unnumbered page.

¹⁶² See ‘Georg Adlersparre’, urn:sbl:5563, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon*, (article by A. Brusewitz), accessed 13 April 2017.

¹⁶³ Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. III, 1907, p. 462.

stated the general public would be admitted for two hours in the evenings, the exposition hours in 1792 were extended to two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoons. However, Gustav III was lying in state for fewer days than Louisa Ulrika. Those of a ‘higher class’ were allowed to see the body in between the hours of admittance and could furthermore take Rikssalsvägen through the chambers belonging to the Marshal of the Realm.¹⁶⁴ As stated in Duchess Charlotte’s diary, the measures taken were inadequate to prevent accidents affecting the general public.

In the annotations to the printed ceremonial detailing the body’s ceremonial removal to the chapel, taking place 13 April 1792, Hauswolff noted that the Marshal of the Realm had allowed the spectators to arrive early and that a sufficient number of guards had been placed at the gates for this purpose, but ‘of the general public (not to say rabble) such a terrifying crowd that one should, as I have, seen it to form the correct idea of it’ which not only created disarray in the church but also an incredible heat.¹⁶⁵ Twenty-six years later, at the funeral of Queen Dowager Charlotte in 1818, the Russian general Suchtelen made his excuses for not attending, claiming he did not dare visit the ceremony ‘out of fear for the heat’. Hauswolff remarked that the heat in the church ‘surpassed all description’ and was not surprised when some diplomats stepped down from the gallery to get some fresh air.¹⁶⁶ The inability to neglect the physiological body’s strain could apparently bring about some understandable deviations in ceremonial procedures.

Ceremony was in part intended to prevent disorder and ensure that correct procedures were observed, but regulating the innumerable bodies of the general public through ceremonial protocols was presumably deemed impossible, impractical or unnecessary (since the court system of rank lacked importance in regard to the masses) in 1792 when the king was lying in state. When the military corpses were admitted to see the king’s body and pay their respect before its removal to the chapel the circumstances were rather different. The companies observed strict order although, which Hauswolff thought was rather touching, many could not stop themselves from crying loudly when they approached the body.¹⁶⁷

REMOVAL TO THE CHAPEL AND FUNERAL

Gustav III’s funeral ceremony was divided in two acts: the removal to the chapel on 13 April and the actual funeral on 14 May. In comparison with the other funeral ceremonies in the scrutinised time period, this only occurred in 1792 which perhaps reflected Gustav III’s inclination for theatrical and ceremonial display and appeal to tradition by following what had been observed at his father’s funeral in 1771.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁴ *Wid Inflytningen Af Högsal. Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke-Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Lik Ifrån Svartsjö Slott Till Kongl. Slottet i Stockholm Then 25 Julii 1782, I akt tages följande Ordning*, paragraph 13; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, p. 141; Alm & Vahlne, 2010, p. 158–159. (The wording used in the advert printed in *Dagligt Allehanda* and *Stockholmsposten* was ‘bättre folk’).

¹⁶⁵ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, unnumbered page (attached document: *Ordning Wid Högstsalig Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Begräfning I Riddarholms Kyrkan Den 14 Maji 1792*) (original quotation: ’af allmänheten (att inte säga packet) en så hisklig trängsel att man skall som jag hafva sedt den för att få rätt idéer derom’); LUB, L. von Hauswolff, *Efterlämnade papper*, vol. 5, no. 1, *Dagboksanteckningar*, 14 May 1792, unnumbered pages.

¹⁶⁶ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, p. 180–181 (original quotation: ’af fruktan för wärmen’ and ’öfwergår all beskrifning’).

¹⁶⁷ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Högstsalige Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Bisättning I Riddarholms kyrkan Den 13 April 1792*).

¹⁶⁸ See Rangström, 2015, p. 128.

The complete absence of women is noteworthy in the ceremony taking place on 13 April. Only gentlemen were invited and had prescribed functions in the ceremony.¹⁶⁹ Not even the duchess or the princess participated. Instead they watched the procession from the Royal Palace together with some ladies of the court.¹⁷⁰ In 1782, the wives of the councillors of the realm had been invited to the ceremonial transportation of Louisa Ulrika's body, but Jean de Bedoire remarked that a distinction had been made between men and women in the invitations. The Councillors of the Realm were supposed to appear at Svartsjö Palace to participate in the procession but their wives were only supposed to appear at the Royal Palace, there awaiting the parade's arrival. All participating women thus belonged to the late queen dowager's court (except for Duchess Charlotte).¹⁷¹ The sources are not revealing as to why women were excluded from the ceremonial removal to the chapel in 1792 or why the wives of the excellencies were not invited to Svartsjö Palace. However, if one searches for a parallel between the removal to the chapel in 1792 and the actual funeral in 1782 (not considering the voyage to Stockholm), the procession in the church, through which the body was moved from the catafalque to the grave, might be seen as corresponding. Those present belonging to the royal family participated in this specific procession to the grave, all but Duchess Charlotte.¹⁷² The ceremony of 13 April seems to have been regarded as a corresponding procession, hence women were excluded. From the perspective of public theatre and the importance to cherish the memory and body of dynasty this is somewhat surprising. However, women – including the duchess and the princess – were participating in the actual funeral ceremony on 14 May. Unfortunately, the sources only allow for unsubstantiated speculation since no conclusive details are given.¹⁷³

In general, the ceremonial was largely fashioned in a similar manner to that of 1782, although obvious differences are discernible. For example, a great emphasis was put on the king's decorations since the many orders' insignias were solemnly carried in the procession.¹⁷⁴ The royal orders and medals were crucial in the reign of Gustav III. They constituted means of favour through which the king could exercise power, gain support and manipulate opponents. But favours also signified a reciprocity, a mutual manifestation of loyalty and obligation.¹⁷⁵ The Chancellery was given a place in the procession and Gustav III's dissolution of the Council of the Realm in 1789 became palpable in the printed ceremonial. The body was not to be lifted from its *lit de parade* by the Councillors of the Realm, as had been the case in 1782, but by excellencies and knights of the Order of the Seraphim. Several officiating gentlemen were furthermore referred to in the printed ceremonial as 'former councillor of the realm' (however, Hauswolff referred to them as 'councillors of realm' in his comments). In regard to the lifting

¹⁶⁹ RA, CÖR, vol. I., no. 5, pp 141–142 and the attached document *Ordning Wid Högsstalige Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Bisättning I Riddareholms Kyrkan Den 13 April 1792*.

¹⁷⁰ The published version of the Duchess's diary contains a reprinted letter written by Princess Sofia Albertina in which she describes the sad event and her emotional distress when they watched the procession from *Pelarsalen*. Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. III, 1907, p. 462

¹⁷¹ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 2, p. 15; See also LUB, *Wid Högst Salig Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Begräfning, Then 31 Juli 1782, I akt tages följande Ordning*; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, attached document *Ordning Wid Högsstalige Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Bisättning I Riddareholms Kyrkan Den 13 April 1792*.

¹⁷² LUB, *Wid Högst Salig Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Begräfning, Then 31 Juli 1782, I akt tages följande Ordning*

¹⁷³ An unsubstantiated speculation might be that the removal of the body to the mortuary was seen primarily as a traditionally physical procedure thus disqualifying the participation of women in accordance with ascribed gender roles (although the moving of the body in the church was actually carried out with mechanics in the late eighteenth century and the carriers were only for show).

¹⁷⁴ RA, CÖR, vol. I., no. 5, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Högsstalige Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Bisättning I Riddareholms Kyrkan Den 13 April 1792*)

¹⁷⁵ Tandefelt, 2008, pp. 42–81.

of the body from its *lit de parade*, the physiological aspect emphasised by Mauss (besides the sociological and psychological, which was expressed through the shrouding of the body and its adornment with a locket the king had worn at the victory in the battle of Svensksund in 1790) as well as the principle of error were prevalent. Hauswolff remarked that the weight of the body and coffin required the assistance from men of lower rank before thirty-two generals and colonels, in accordance with the ceremonial, took over the function of carrying the body to the church. Further errors occurred. Due to the large number of carriers the ceremonial procession was delayed since they blocked the way for the gentlemen who were supposed to attach the royal crown on top of the coffin. Hauswolff furthermore noted these gentlemen ‘were so unversed in the art of tieing ribbons that they could not leave the place until the Furnishing Master Steckij was summoned’.¹⁷⁶

The circumstances surrounding Gustav III’s death might have made the physical presence of the royal family significant for the mediation of stability and monarchical strength. Duchess Charlotte wrote in her diary about a rumour concerning a conspiracy allegedly planning to murder her spouse, the regent Duke Charles, during the ceremony. The rumour turned out to be an unfounded plot by former favourites of Gustav III and no imminent threat supposedly existed. According to the duchess, due to the fact that Duke Charles was cherished by all, he had nothing to fear.¹⁷⁷ Nevertheless, if the rumour had spread it might have been imperative to demonstrate, through the presence of the royal bodies, fearlessness and continuity in turbulent times.

On 14 May, the king’s body was moved from the grave to the catafalque and *castrum doloris*. As had been observed in 1782 and on 13 April, several military corpsuses lined up in rows reaching from the Royal Palace to Riddarholmskyrkan and those invited, upholding functions in the procession gathered in the various chambers of the palace. The procession and the service was performed in much the same manner as in the preceding ceremonies (although the body of the late monarch was not carried since it had already been placed in the church) but on a somewhat grander scale: the entire royal family (except Queen Dowager Sofia Magdalena who was absent due to ‘illness’) and their courts participated, as did the military corpsuses in full uniform and the various members of the state administration. Hauswolff’s notes in the printed ceremonial show that the physiological body inevitably brought about deviations from given instructions since several of those listed in the parade did not appear due to illness. An interesting remark was made in regard to Count Joachim Beckfriis who did not appear although he had announced that he was well enough to participate. It was known however that he had suffered from a stroke and according to Hauswolff he had announced himself recovered only to have his name printed in the ceremonial.¹⁷⁸ Rank and precedence was materialised through

¹⁷⁶ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordnung Wid Högsstalige Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Bisättning I Riddareholms Kyrkan Den 13 April 1792*) (original quotation: ’så litet bewandrade i konsten att knyta band, så att de ej kommo utur stället förr än husgerådmästaren Steckij blef tillkallad’).

¹⁷⁷ Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. III, 1907, p. 462–463.

¹⁷⁸ This also occurred in 1796 when the very same Count Beckfriis had announced he was well enough to participate, only so that his name would be printed in the ceremonial. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordnung Wid Högsstalig Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Begräfning I Riddarholms Kyrkan Den 14 Maji 1792*); See also LUB, L. von Hauswolff, *Efterlämnade papper*, vol. 5, no. 1, *Dagboksanteckningar*, 14 May 1792, unnumbered pages; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, attached document *Ceremonial Som kommer i akt tagas Då Hans Majestät Konung Gustaf IV Adolf Emottager Riksstyrelsen Den 1 November 1796*.

body and space – the individuals place, function and applied body technique in the ceremony – but seemingly not only through a physiological body but also through a discursively constructed one. The limitations to public theatre, that is, the performance's enactment in limited or finite time and space, might explain why it was so important to be incorporated in the printed ceremonial besides actual participation. The finality and closure provided by print, as well as the potential for spatial and temporal dispersion, appears to have been of significance.¹⁷⁹

As for the rest of the ceremony, it generally corresponded to that in 1782. The most apparent bodily expression of dynastic continuity was manifested when the male royal family members accompanied the king's body into the grave (although, since the participants in the procession were more numerous, it was cramped for space and Duke Frederick was forced to remain on the upper step).¹⁸⁰

GUSTAV IV ADOLF'S ASSUMPTION OF POWER IN 1796 AND CORONATION IN 1800

ERRORS AND OATH-TAKING

The previously discussed issue of crowding bodies was not only prevalent at funerals and expositions but at grand ceremonial events in general. Gustav III had proclaimed in his testament that a regency, led by his brother Duke Charles, would reign in place of the crown prince until his majority.¹⁸¹ In November 1796 it was time for Gustav IV Adolf's ceremonial assumption of power. With the ceremony at hand, some adjustments had been made to the galleries in Rikssalen, which caused fear that a terrible crowd would arise. In the printed ceremonial Hauswolff remarked that the issue was handled by reducing the number of spectators and strictly limiting the distribution of tickets. As a result, 'it came about that besides the invited Chancelleries, Corpuses and Estates rather few spectators of both sexes were there, and surely there was room for 400 more people. The hall was, if one may say so, indecently empty at such a solemn occasion'.¹⁸²

For the ceremony in the church a gallery had been, as customary, reserved for the diplomats but since the seats were not particularly great, the Court Fourier decided not to mention the church service in the invitations. Hauswolff informed the foreign representatives, during the customary breakfast on ceremonial days, that the chambers of the Marshal of the Realm were at their disposal if they did not wish to attend the service, which Hauswolff made clear would not constitute a breach of etiquette. As a result, this gallery was empty (with the exception of the Polish Count Potockij who was no longer in official service of a foreign state and therefore

¹⁷⁹ For a discussion of the implications of print in general, see Ong, 2002, pp. 115–137; For a discussion of the importance of print in Gustavian ceremonies see Tandefelt, 2008, p. 225.

¹⁸⁰ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Högsalig Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Begräfning I Riddarholms Kyrkan Den 14 Maji 1792*).

¹⁸¹ RA, Statsrättsliga handlingar 1569-1957, vol. 63, *Tilläg til Wårt 1780 Författade Testamente som Stadgar Huru Riksens Styrelse under Wår Sons Minoritet Skal Förvaltas*.

¹⁸² RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 8, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Som kommer at i akt tagas Då Hans Majestät Konung Gustaf IV Adolf Emottager Riksstyrelsen Den 1 November 1796*) (original quotation: 'hände att utom de biudne Collegier, Corpser och Stater ganska litet antal åskådare af bågge kjönen woro der, och hade säkert 400 personer ännu kunnat rymmas. Salen war, om man får säga oanständigt tom wid ett så högtidligt tillfälle').

never received the information).¹⁸³ The absence of the diplomats was to Hauswolff an acceptable deviation from ceremonial procedures. Guaranteeing a correct and respectable treatment of the foreign emissaries was of great importance and a high priority. However, as for the absence of other spectators, the deviation or error of limiting the invitations was less acceptable because it ultimately undermined the magnificence of monarchy.

Despite the ceremony's modest audience, Hauswolff remarked that the arrangements were rather splendid. The king had made a few adjustments to the ceremonial such as requesting that the Chief Chamber Gentleman would walk together with the excellencies in the procession. The Chamber Groom thus officiated in his place by carrying the train of the king's mantle. The ceremony in Rikssalen largely took place as the printed ceremonial prescribed, but the grandeur of the occasion was somewhat diminished by an error. The declarations and oaths the king was supposed to sign had been misplaced and were nowhere to be found. Hauswolff remarked that the king faced the obstacle with dignity and so did Duchess Charlotte who noted that the king had been able to keep his otherwise unruly temper. After a very long and embarrassing silence the secretary of state fetched a copy of the documents which the king could then loudly cite, holding two fingers on the bible while swearing the oath. Consequently, an assembly was gathered on the following day so that the king could sign the misplaced *konungaförsäkran* and *säkerhetsakten*.¹⁸⁴

The error and solution demonstrate the importance attached to the act, or technique, of signing documents rather than to merely swear through utterances. The king's touching of the bible furthermore indicates that inviolable oaths needed to be sealed physically as well as orally. The commitments and assurances became binding through an employment of the body and its techniques. This aspect became evident – if, for a moment, we digress from the main focus of this thesis and regards the grand ceremonies coinciding with royal coronations – at the ceremonial openings of the *Riksdag*. In the reign of Gustav IV Adolf, the Estate Assembly was only gathered once, adjacent to his coronation in Norrköping in 1800.¹⁸⁵ The third and fourth paragraphs of the printed ceremonial, detailing the solemn opening procedures, proclaimed that the king was to appoint the Grand Marshal (the speaker or presiding officer of the noble estate) who then immediately swore his oath. The speakers for the rest of the estates would then be summoned to the House of Nobles (Riddarhuset) to take their oaths – first the archbishop representing the clergy, second the speaker for the burghers and third the speaker for the peasants.¹⁸⁶ How the oath-taking was performed in detail was not described by Hauswolff in 1800. However, he did describe the procedure in 1809, regarding the opening of the *Riksdag* in which the constitutional reform was elaborated (and which coincided with the coronation of Charles XIII and Duchess Charlotte). Hauswolff depicted the event:

¹⁸³ However, the diplomats would appear when the King gave his *cour* in Rikssalen. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 8, p. 129–132

¹⁸⁴ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 8, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Som kommer att I akt tagas Då Hans Majestät Konung Gustaf IV. Adolf Emottaget Riksstyrelsen Den 1 November 1796*); Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. V, p. 256.

¹⁸⁵ The *Riksdag* was gathered to address financial challenges. To Gustav IV Adolf's great displeasure, the remaining and widely spread opposition towards the crown as well as influences from the French revolution was expressed at the meeting. Hedenborg & Kvarnström, 2015, p. 159.

¹⁸⁶ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Riksdagens början I Norrköping, Den 10 Martii 1800*).

The Grand Marshal swears his oath in the King's hands, is kneeling before the King who is seated, having the Bible upon his lap, holding the Grand Marshal's hands in his while the Oath is taken. For the Archbishop a so called Prie Dieu is put out on which the open Bible is placed. He then kneels and with the hand on the Bible he takes the oath. When the other speakers are to swear their oath it takes place in front of the King, whereupon they one by one fall on their knees on the floor and with two fingers held up take the oath.¹⁸⁷

In the significant practice of oath-taking the employment of bodies and the existence of various techniques of the body – which produced and reproduced rank, subjection and religious motifs – were clearly visible.

DETAILING A CEREMONIAL PROCESSION

In the ceremony of 1796, through which Gustav IV Adolf assumed power in connection with his majority, it became particularly evident that ceremonial clothing of subjects and the use of their bodies was a major preoccupation. The eighth paragraph of the printed ceremonial prescribed in what order the regalia should be carried in the procession and by which Lords of the Realm, holding the five high offices in the regency's cabinet: first, the key was to be carried by the Chief Governor von Essen; second, the apple by the President of the Administrative Courts of Appeal, Baron Reuterholm; third, the sceptre by the former Captain Lieutenant and current Marshal of the Realm, Count Brahe; fourth, the sword by the king's former instructor and present Lord High Chancellor, Baron Sparre; and lastly, in fifth place, the crown was to be carried by the Chancellor of the Judiciary, Count Wachtmeister. According to Hauswolff's notes, this order deviated from the originally planned order and it would later be changed one more time.¹⁸⁸

Originally, the sceptre was supposed to be carried by the President of the College of Accounts, Baron Kurck. At a cabinet meeting on 27 October, Kurck made inquiries as to the ceremonial's prescription which proclaimed the five officials ought to wear the dress of the offices. Stating he had no knowledge of these garments since he had not received any information in the matter, he furthermore stressed it would be impossible to get a costume ready in time for the ceremony on 1 November. Count Wachtmeister already possessed the prescribed dress since he had one made in time for the *Riksdag* in 1792, when the ceremonial dress of the offices was first adopted. Baron Sparre had also been in possession of the said costume for some time. However, since the five officials carrying the regalia, as Hauswolff wrote, necessarily had to be uniformly dressed, the dress of the offices could not be used in the ceremony. This caused a disagreement since von Essen and Reuterholm somehow had been informed about the dress and thus spent

¹⁸⁷ RA. CÖR, vol. I, no. 21, unnumbered page (attached document: *Ordnning Wid Riksdagens början 1809*) (Original quotation: 'Landtmarskalken aflägger sin Ed uti Konungens händer, är på knä framför Konungen, som är sittande, har Bibeln på sina Knä, håller Landtmarskalkens händer uti Sina under det Eden aflägges. För Archebiskopen framställer en så kallad Prie-Dieu på hwilken Bibelm lägges öppen. Han faller der på knä med handen på Bibeln aflägges Eden. När de andre Talmännen skola aflägga skjer det framför Konungen, då de hwarefter annan faller på knä på golfvet och med twänne uppräckta fingrar aflägga Eden').

¹⁸⁸ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 8, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Som kommer att I akt tagas Då Hans Majestät Konung Gustaf IV. Adolf Emottaget Riksstyrelsen Den 1 November 1796*).

between 600 and 700 *riksdaler* on fashioning a costume. Not wanting their expenses go to waste the question became how they would find a proper ceremonial dress for Baron Kurck.¹⁸⁹

The issue was resolved by the king's intervention. Expressing his dissatisfaction with the design of the regalia procedure, the ceremonial was changed so that it would correspond to what was observed at Gustav III's opening of the *Riksdag* in 1792. In his image-making Gustav IV Adolf differed from his father. While Gustav III envisioned, represented and placed himself in a continuous line from Gustav I Vasa and Gustavus Adolphus, it was sufficient for Gustav IV Adolf's self-image to stress the immediate line from father to son.¹⁹⁰ The places in the procession would thus not be reserved for the five offices of the regency's cabinet and Count Wachtmeister was instructed to send out a note, procuring information as to who owned this particular dress and could replace Baron Kurck. A solution was found in which the Marshal of the Realm, Count Brahe, took Kurck's place in the procession. In reality, however, the order did not correspond to the printed ceremonial. It was said that Baron Reuterholm, originally appointed to carry the apple, had requested to carry the sceptre instead. In 1772, at the coronation of Gustav III, his father had carried the sceptre and rumour had it Reuterholm was informed by his spies that him carrying the apple had caused someone to utter 'det blef ett surt äpple för Excellence Reuterholm att bita uti'.¹⁹¹ Finally, the procession was arranged thusly: the key was carried by Baron von Essen, the apple by Baron Sparre, the sceptre by Baron Reuterholm, the sword by Count Brahe and lastly the crown by Count Wachtmeister. Though the demands made by von Essen and Reuterholm certainly must have been significant, the strict regulation of dress and the king's wish to find a solution in which continuity and dynastic connections could be expressed were also prevalent. The body and its dress became the means for visualising these aspects. Not only the king but also Baron Reuterholm wished to materialise dynastic connections through manifestations of the body, its place in the ceremonial walk and its carrying of the specific regalia. The monarch was not the sole agent in the public theatre. Courtiers also wanted to benefit in their capacity of actors and demonstrate dynastic continuities through their place and function in ceremonies.

THE CORONATION AND CELEBRATION CEREMONIES

In 1800 the *Riksdag* and adjoining coronation of Gustav IV Adolf and his consort Frederica of Baden took place in Norrköping. Locating the *Riksdag* outside of the capital was a politically informed decision, similar to Gustav III's gathering of a *Riksdag* in Gävle in 1792, a strategy aiming to minimise the influence of the widespread political opposition in Stockholm.¹⁹² According to Duchess Charlotte (who was not present but wrote in her diary from Stockholm)

¹⁸⁹ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 8, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Som kommer att I akt tagas Då Hans Majestät Konung Gustaf IV. Adolf Emottaget Riksstyrelsen Den 1 November 1796*).

¹⁹⁰ Alm, 2002, pp. 321–322; Tandefelt, 2011, p. 52.

¹⁹¹ The Swedish quotation is retained due to its play on words. It translates to an English expression claiming Reuterholm must have 'swallowed the bitter pill' but the Swedish proverb also refers to the apple he was supposed to carry, saying he must have been 'biting the sour apple' when he was not given the function of carrying the sceptre. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 8, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Som kommer att I akt tagas Då Hans Majestät Konung Gustaf IV. Adolf Emottaget Riksstyrelsen Den 1 November 1796*); see also *Ceremonial Wid Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Höga Kröning*, 1772, paragraph 32, which states the sceptre shall be carried by Baron Christian Reuterholm in Gustav III's coronation procession.

¹⁹² Alm, 2002, p. 274.

the coronation had been very simple, having no pomp, very few coaches and no festivities. She even claimed that never before had a ceremony of the sort been so poor.¹⁹³ However, Hauswolff made no such comments and in comparison to the ceremony in 1796, the coronation on 5 April 1800 signified a palpable enhancement in the display of royal magnificence. Although the dukes, the duchess and the princess were absent (the duchess and princess had not participated in the procession in 1796 either but watched the ceremony from a gallery in Rikssalen), the queen's presence made the procession rather grand.¹⁹⁴

Just like his father had done in 1772, Gustav IV Adolf rode on horseback from the palace to the church. The procession turned into a rather chaotic event when the king reached the city's sugar mill and his horse became anxious, refusing to take another step. Hauswolff noted that the king was forced to swap horses with the Excellency von Essen and the Chief Stable Master needed to use his spurs in order to get the unruly horse moving. The horse rushed past the procession thereby frightening the other horses and covering the excellencies and officials with dirt. Using all their force to keep the unsettled horses in check, the stable boys holding the reins almost laid on their backs while the excellencies and officials carrying the regalia perplexed watched the spectacle in great embarrassment. Hauswolff described the scene as 'both deplorable and ridiculous'.¹⁹⁵ Contemporaries considered the event quite comical and it gave rise to many amusing anecdotes. One of them was written down by Hauswolff in the ceremonial. Alledgedly the horse halted at the sugar mill because the Stable Master who, in preparation for the ceremony, had led the horse on the procession route the preceding days always stopped at that particular place to admire a beautiful woman in one of the windows.¹⁹⁶ According to Baron Gudmund Jöran Adlerbeth, Duchess Charlotte and Berndt von Schinkel some interpreted the many calamities of the coronation as an omen.¹⁹⁷ A lacking control of the techniques of the body, in this case that of riding, was apparently not without consequences.

As customary in all ceremonies, several military corpses formed rows, reaching from the palace to the church. The coronation ceremony's increasing degree of magnificence and royal splendour, when compared to the previously discussed ceremonies, was expressed and manifested in the procession through timpanists and trumpeters, and the number of officiators, horses and coaches. The procession can be said to have consisted of two parts. First came the king's court and functionaries (such as the royal household, heralds, Lords of the Realm, excellencies and the high officials carrying the regalia) all closely observing rank with the king

¹⁹³ Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. VII, 1936, p. 20.

¹⁹⁴ See RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 8, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Som kommer att I akt tagas Då Hans Majestät Konung Gustaf IV. Adolf Emottaget Riksstyrelsen Den 1 November 1796*).

¹⁹⁵ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Gustaf IV. Adolphs Och Drottning Fredrica Dorotea Wilhelminas Kröning Wid Riksdayen i Norrköping År 1800*).

¹⁹⁶ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Gustaf IV. Adolphs Och Drottning Fredrica Dorotea Wilhelminas Kröning Wid Riksdayen i Norrköping År 1800*); Alm & Vahlne, 2010, p. 328.

On top of it all, the grandeur of the occasion was compromised further when the service was ended and the procession marched back to the palace. Hauswolff noted 'the entire day was rather unfavourable for this grand ceremony, its splendour being diminished by the ugly weather'.

On the subject of bodies, Hauswolff further noted with an amused tone that one of the stable boys had made a mistake, not knowing which horse belonged to the Excellency Posse and which belonged to the Excellency Sparre. The latter gentleman was 'very short in stature' but steps were used when the horses were mounted so the mix-up was not noticed until they both sat up. Sparre, short as he was, could not reach the stirrups while the tall Posse suffered from them beating against his ankles. Hauswolff found this anecdote most entertaining. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Gustaf IV. Adolphs Och Drottning Fredrica Dorotea Wilhelminas Kröning Wid Riksdayen i Norrköping År 1800*).

¹⁹⁷ Alm & Vahlne, 2010, p. 328; Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. VII, 1936, p. 20; von Schinkel, vol. IV, 1854, pp. 86–87.

at the end, followed by Count Axel Fersen who carried the banner. Then came the queen's court and officiators. As opposed to the gentlemen, the queen and the ladies belonging to her court did not ride on horseback but in coaches.¹⁹⁸

When the procession arrived at the church all officiators took their places, according to rank, in the church. At the gates the king was received by the archbishop and the queen by the bishops, who led the royal couple to their seats in the chancel (the king sitting on the right hand side and the queen on the left). In the centre, in front of the altar, a silver throne was placed. The service began with the king and queen saying their prayers on a kneeler, followed by the archbishop's sermon and the singing of hymns. The king's anointment was then performed. He got up from his chair and walked over to the throne where his princely mantle and crown was removed and he kneeled before an opened bible. A royal mantle was put on the king's shoulders and he then swore his oath while holding three fingers on the scripture. With the king still kneeling, the archbishop performed the sacred act of anointing the king on the forehead, the temples, the chest and the wrists whereupon the king took his place on the throne. One by one, those carrying the regalia – the crown, the sceptre, the apple, the key and the sword – in the procession fetched the very same from the altar and handed the respective insignias to the king. The Herald of the Realm pronounced Gustav IV Adolf crowned and those present cheered 'long live the king'. Once hymns, prayers and blessings had been performed it was time for the queen's anointment. The procedure was similar to that of the king's but deviations existed. The Queen was not required to take an oath and the anointment was only performed on her forehead and wrists. Furthermore, as for the regalia, she only received the royal mantle, crown, sceptre and apple. The queen then returned to her seat and the king occupied the throne for the rest of the ceremony.¹⁹⁹ Gender was thus manifested in the procession and crowning procedure. The king's masculinity and his role as male sovereign was underlined whereas the queen consort, although elevated by God's grace, was a feminine inferior. All this is in accordance with Joan B. Landes's assertion that the nobility and royal family 'functioned as part of the elaborate machinery of absolutism' but 'the figuration of power was tied ineluctably to the masculine subject of the monarch'.²⁰⁰

Before the service was ended and the procession returned to the palace oaths were taken. Since the dukes were prevented from attending their oaths had to be read aloud by the Lord High Chancellor.²⁰¹ The high officials of state, the Lords of the Realm and excellencies then swore

¹⁹⁸ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Gustaf IV. Adolphs Och Drottning Fredrica Dorotea Wilhelminas Kröning Wid Riksdagen i Norrköping År 1800*).

¹⁹⁹ The symbolic meaning of the regalia was not fixed but varied over centuries and different reigns. Through the Archbishop's sermon and prays in 1800, uttered in connection with the regalia procedure, it was stated that the crown signified the honour and dignity given to the king by God's grace so that he may rule justly and one day receive the eternal crown. The sceptre was a symbol for justice, the king's just rule over his subjects. The apple symbolised the presence of God and functioned as a reminder of God's grace. The key implied the importance in accessing that which is good and keeping out that which is destructive or evil. Lastly, the sword was on the one hand a symbol of masculinity and on the other hand meant to emphasise the king's obligation to defend righteousness. When the regalia was handed to the Queen Consort, the archbishop's declarations of its symbolic meanings differed, signalling she was divinely ordained but not ruling the realm.

RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Gustaf IV. Adolphs Och Drottning Fredrica Dorotea Wilhelminas Kröning Wid Riksdagen i Norrköping År 1800*).

²⁰⁰ Landes, 1988, p. 20.

²⁰¹ The oaths were dated 3 March and 4 March, at which time Hauswolff was travelling to Norrköping. It is therefore uncertain whether the oaths were performed according to the embodied practices previously discussed as vital prior to the King's departure for Norrköping or if the limitations engendered by practical life required deviation and error. Duke Frederick was critically ill at the time so his physiological body necessitated a deviation from custom. In the case of Duke Charles, Gustav IV Adolf had appointed him Supreme Commander with unrestricted authority while the King was staying in Norrköping. The main function of bodily oath-practice, the demonstration of reciprocal loyalty, was

their oaths by kneeling in front of the king, one by one kissing his hand and then proceeding to kiss the hand of the queen. In the same manner as it had arrived, the procession made its way back to the palace.²⁰² According to Duchess Charlotte, the king had become furious and reprimanded several courtiers who, on the way back from the church, left the procession in order to take a short cut to the palace. In their defense, the duchess wrote, they were forced to be lightly dressed in the awful weather and many suffered from influenza.²⁰³ If the duchess was correctly informed, it appears that the physiological body brought about error and deviation even in a grand ceremony such as a coronation. However, it seems questionable that Hauswolff would not comment on such a severe transgression of etiquette.

Later that evening the newly crowned king and queen dined in public. As in all royal ceremonies, rank was meticulously observed through embodiment. For example, six chamber grooms were appointed to hold the washbowls, water pitchers and cloths. When the king and queen arrived at the table, after walking in a procession from their chambers, the chamber grooms handed over the objects to three chief chamber grooms who, in turn, gave them to the Chancellor of the Judiciary, the Lord High Chancellor and the Excellency who waited on the king. The process was the same for the queen but with other officiating excellencies.²⁰⁴ The coronation's ceremonial bodies thus manifested and publicly displayed the significance of rank and the magnificence and superiority of monarchy. Furthermore, emphasis was put on the divine characteristics of kingship. However, Richard S. Wortman has pointed out in the case of Russia that from the eighteenth century 'divine sanction provided constant but not sufficient grounds for absolute power'.²⁰⁵ Although the logic of God's grace survived the Swedish Age of Liberty, fifty years of Estate governance meant that the king no longer received his powers directly from God.²⁰⁶ The elevation of monarchy thus appear to have demanded embodied acts of superiority, such as the kissing of hands or elaborate waiting at the table.

On 7 April, two days after the coronation, a celebration ceremony was enacted. The queen and her court did not participate in the procession but arrived before the king at the place of the ceremony (which in Hauswolff's opinion was tastefully decorated but not as magnificent as that of Gustav III's celebration). The ceremony was centred around the king's speech to the Estates and their oath-taking, which had not been performed in the coronation ceremony. Once the king had finished his speech, the Marshal of the Realm called upon the Estates – first the nobility, second the clergy, third the burghers and fourth the peasants – to swear their oaths by holding up two fingers. When the oaths had been taken the Estates and their speakers, in the same order as mentioned, walked up to the king, sitting on a throne placed on a podium, and kissed his hand. When all representatives had kissed the king's hand (according to Hauswolff the hand-kissing lasted for one hour and twenty minutes) the procession – which the Estates did

thus already clearly expressed in their relation. However, it might also have sufficient to read the oaths out loud in their absence since they had both been swearing their oaths in 1796 through techniques of the body. See Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. VII, 1936, pp. 7–8.

²⁰² RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Gustaf IV. Adolphs Och Drottning Fredrica Dorotea Wilhelminas Kröning Wid Riksdagen i Norrköping År 1800*).

²⁰³ Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. VII, 1936, p. 21.

²⁰⁴ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Gustaf IV. Adolphs Och Drottning Fredrica Dorotea Wilhelminas Kröning Wid Riksdagen i Norrköping År 1800*).

²⁰⁵ Wortman, 2013, p. 2.

²⁰⁶ Tandefelt, 2008, p. 43.

not participate in, neither to nor from the celebration – ceremoniously returned to the palace where tables were set.²⁰⁷

Later that evening a ball was arranged at the palace. The notion of clothes not only mirroring but also deciding the wearer's status was apparent since Hauswolff mentioned in passing that those in gala dress did not need tickets in order to attend the ball. An aspect which also became tangible at the ball concerned the education of bodies and the idea of courtiers with perceived authority as imperative educators. To have held an office or to have been present at court for a long time gave some authority, and from the Grand Master of Ceremonies' perspective a long career at court was creditable. He wrote enthusiastically about the grace with which he was treated by the Chief Chamber Gentleman and Marshal of the Realm, Nils Posse. In addition to Hauswolff and Posse, the First Court Stable Master Claes Rålamb, were the only servants at Gustav IV Adolf's court who had also been present at the court of Adolf Frederick. So, when disputes arose as a result of the Russian ambassador and the excellencies keeping their hats on while dancing with the queen, the disagreement could be settled by looking to precedent and follow that which had been observed at Gustav III's celebration ceremony in 1772. Count Posse, Baron Rålamb and Hauswolff had all participated in the ceremony and informed the court as to what had taken place twenty-eight years ago.²⁰⁸

THE PRESENCE OF A RUSSIAN AMBASSADOR

Although the master of ceremonies had important functions in dynastic ceremonials, such as handing out invitations to the officiating excellencies and their wives, the office's main occupation throughout the scrutinised time period was to accompany foreign emissaries and diplomats in various ceremonial activities and ensure they were treated with duly respect. In March 1792, the emissary Count Stackelberg was promoted and appointed Russian ambassador (mentioned above in passing) by the Russian empress.²⁰⁹ The presence of an ambassador, who held higher rank than other diplomats at court, caused a few confusions and problems in dynastic ceremonials. This became particularly evident in connection with the ceremony of 1796, but issues of correctly observing precedence were apparent already in 1792.

At the funeral of Gustav III, conflicts over precedence arose since an armchair for Count Stackelberg had been placed on the gallery reserved for the diplomats. It was customary for diplomats to be seated on benches and the ministers from the diplomatic corpuses complained about the distinction made between them and Count Stackelberg. Since the newly appointed ambassador not yet had been given an audience in the capacity of his new position and thus not been presented to the king as an ambassador, they regarded it as out of order that Stackelberg would sit in an armchair. The conflict was settled by Stackelberg declining the precedence.²¹⁰

²⁰⁷ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, pp. 52–56 and the attached document *Ceremonial Wid Konung Gustaf IV. Adolphs Hyllning Under Riksdagen I Norrköping År 1800*.

²⁰⁸ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, pp. 74 and 58–62.

²⁰⁹ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, pp. 121–122.

²¹⁰ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, pp. 153–154.

While awaiting the oncoming audience he accepted sitting on a bench and the armchair was removed.

The notion of complex entanglements between space and body were particularly tangible when it came to the management of diplomats.²¹¹ Precedent functioned as guidance or education and the Grand Master of Ceremonies' office was important in ensuring they were respectfully and correctly treated, thereby avoiding quarrels and embarrassments. At the celebration of Duke Charles's birthday in 1792 a spectacle was arranged at the Royal Palace's theatre. Hauswolff noted that after the supper, the Russian ambassador seated himself on the tabouret closest to Duke Frederick. This seat had previously been intended for the French ambassador. Since no French ambassador was present at court Hauswolff remarked that he thought the king's instructor Count Gyllenstolpe ought to have taken the seat, but the Russian ambassador now forced Gyllenstolpe to sit next to the Lord High Chancellor. A few days later the ambassador asked Hauswolff where he rightly should have been sitting. He had heard that the seat next to Duke Fredric previously had been reserved for the French ambassador and as he thought the occasion was without ceremony, he had not made further inquiries at the time. Hauswolff politely answered that during his time at court such an occasion was unprecedented. He would therefore advise the journals of his predecessor in order to find out whether the Russian ambassador, the Lord High Chancellor or the Chancellor of the Judiciary took precedence. The matter was further complicated by the fact that Gustav III had re-established these offices in 1787, thus making the arrangement completely unprecedented. Without precedent Hauswolff was nonplussed. He asked the Lord High Chancellor what answer he should give the ambassador but was ultimately forced to tell him 'je ne pourrois donner des éclaircissements au sujet de leur places'.²¹²

The issue of the ambassador's seating in 1792 resurfaced after the dynastic ceremonial in 1796. Gustav IV Adolf's inauguration was to be celebrated at the opera house and in order to avoid uncertainty the king gave specific orders as to the seating of the ambassador. Instead of sitting together with the other diplomats, Count Stackelberg was given the tabouret placed next to the royal family, previously reserved for a French ambassador. When the Russian ambassador arrived and asked where he should seat himself Hauswolff passed on the king's instructions. Nevertheless, uncertainties of precedence arose since the re-establishment of the office Chancellor of the Judiciary in 1787 meant no precedent was to be found in the Grand Master of Ceremonies' journals as to which of the places next to the royal family should be occupied by the ambassador. His Excellency Wachtmeister, who held the office Chancellor of the Judiciary, thus approached Hauswolff asking how the matter should be resolved. Hauswolff thought it best to advise the Lord High Chancellor and stressed 'it must be done in a manner so

²¹¹ Although not concerning a dynastic ceremonial, Jean de Bedoire wrote in 1782 about an illustrative incident taking place in the Palace Chapel. When the diplomats seated themselves in the gallery, the English minister Wroughton became somewhat upset as the French chargé d'affaires St Croix had 'seated himself up in the ambassador's corner of the gallery, and thus above everyone else'. Wroughton complained to the Master of Ceremonies who, despite being reluctant to interfere in such a dispute, was forced to intervene. Politely pointing out St Croix's mistake, the French diplomat made his apologies to Wroughton and seated himself beneath the Imperial chargé d'affaires. According to Bedoire, Gustav III was informed by his Chamber Gentleman about the *aventure* and expressed his satisfaction as to how the dispute had been settled. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 2, pp. 1–3 (original quotation: 'hade satt sig up i Ambassadeurs hörnet af läktaren, och såleds öfver dem allesammans').

²¹² RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, pp. 236–238 and 247–252 (translation of the quote: 'I could not give elucidation on the subject of their places').

that the Ambassador does not notice any negotiation'. He further remarked: 'during our conversation we smiled and had a look of indifference and glanced at the boxes so that he could not perceive a serious matter was at hand'. Ultimately, a servant of the wardrobe moved the tabourets so that the ambassador could seat himself on the right hand side of the royal family and the three high offices could take their places on the left hand side.²¹³

The instructions written in 1754 concerning ceremonial diplomatic regulations appear to have remained intact throughout the scrutinised time period, which meant overarching developments of etiquette relaxation brought about disorder and conflict.²¹⁴ With the arrival of a new Russian ambassador at hand in 1813, Hauswolff thought it necessary to write a memorandum stressing the need that order would be observed and prescriptions adhered. His experience with the management of Count Stackelberg had made the Grand Master of Ceremonies aware that Russian gentlemen were very particular about etiquette.²¹⁵ Hauswolff's perception of the Russian diplomats extended to himself. To Hauswolff it was a disgrace if precedent, tradition and the etiquette of embodied practices – such as receiving the diplomat, leading him to the audience chamber and there open and close the door for him – which signified a respectful treatment of representatives of foreign sovereignties were not observed. To comply with given instructions and carefully observe etiquette was to the Grand Master of Ceremonies a sacred duty.²¹⁶

²¹³ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 8, pp. 137–140 (original quotation: 'det måtte skje på et sätt att Ambassadeuren ej märkte någon negociation' and 'under vårt samtal hade wi äfven en mycket leende och indifferent mine samt sågo up åt Logerne så att han visst ej kunde förmärka någon alfwarsam sak vara i fråga').

²¹⁴ In the diplomatic ceremonial this relaxation of etiquette became especially noticeable in 1818 when the British emissary Lord Strangford was received by Charles XIV John. Rather astonished Hauswolff remarked in the journal 'the King was without headgear, which was the first public audience I have seen since 1768 given by a king not covering his head'. The ceremonial of 1754 proclaimed the king should have his head covered and remain seated in his armchair during the public audience with a minister, lifting his hat when the minister made his first bow. If the public audience involved an ambassador, the king was to remove his hat upon the ambassador's entry to the room and for the duration of the bowing procedures the king would stand up, and not sit down nor put his hat on until the ambassador's speech commenced. According to Jean de Bedoire, at the public audience of a Dutch emissary on 20 May 1782 Duke Charles had received the gentleman 'sitting without a hat on his head, in an armchair'. But for a king to breach the etiquette was clearly, according to Hauswolff, quite remarkable.

Charles XIV John made further changes to the etiquette by officially reducing the number of required reverences from three bows to one. This marked a major deviation from tradition but is not unsurprising considering the circumstances surrounding the succession of the Bernadotte dynasty. As emphasised by John Adamson, the ceremonious three reverences were imbued with a religious narrative evoking the Trinitarian symbolism closely associated with the idea of an eucharistic prince and divinely ordained monarch. Jean-Baptiste Bernadotte, however, was evidently not appointed by God but rather elected king by the Swedish people. His authority and legitimacy was thus less contingent on divine structures – although he would not mind using a religiously themed language – and this expressed itself in the deportment of bodies in court ceremonial. RA, CÖR, vol. 30, pp. 65–66; RA, 1444 Ministrar 1600t–1800t, Utlandska ministrar i Sverige, vol. 31, 1700-tal; RA, CÖR, vol. 2, p. 7; Sandin, 2011, p. 90; Adamson, 2000, p. 28–30; von Schinkel, vol. X, 1868, p. 9.

²¹⁵ In 1792 for example, the Russian Ambassador Stackelberg was rather uneased about the fact that the ceremonial stated only one of the double doors would be opened upon his entry to an audience. As opposed to the Swedish ceremonial, the Russian prescribed 'on ouvre tous les battans par un passe L'Ambassadeur'. The issue resolved itself quite naturally since the hall at Drottningholm Palace, where the audience was to take place, was not equipped with the doors referred to in the ceremonial. RA, 1443 Ceremonialia, vol. 2, 'Ceremonialia vid dop, bröllop, begravningsar, riksdagsprocesser, häroldsutrop, torneringar m.m. i Sverige', unnumbered pages; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, pp. 165–167.

²¹⁶ A view corresponding to and shedding light on Hauswolff's dislike of Adlersparre's refusal to wear the dress of the Order of the Seraphim. KB, Brev till L.v. Engeström, vol. 10, 1811:5, A-M, unnumbered pages.

SUMMARY: DYNASTIC CEREMONIES IN THE GUSTAVIAN ERA

Bodies were of great significance in Gustavian dynastic ceremonies, not least indicated by the major preoccupation with body regulations in ceremonials. The bodies of rulers and subjects were employed in the public theatre of monarchy to turn various myths into reality. Important themes in the monarchical myth-making needed not only to be uttered but inhabited in the various participating bodies. The kissing of a king's hand, for example, manifested and embodied the hierarchical divide between superior and inferior. However, in accordance with a Maussian understanding of the body, its techniques and inhabitation not only informed a pre-existing social order but also produced and reproduced perceived realities. Body experiences and experiences of bodies were crucial in shaping peoples' interpretations of the world. In other words, the myth of royal superiority became a social reality through the employment of bodies: hand-kissing functioned as integral means in the myth-making but through the technique of kissing the king's hand the social reality of this superiority was produced and reproduced in material manifestations. The coronation of Gustav IV Adolf furthermore demonstrates that mediating the myth of royal magnificence and superiority was, to some extent, dependent on body control. Inadequate abilities in the techniques of the body, such as the technique of riding, undermined the glorification of the ruler and was by some interpreted as an omen.

After the death of Louisa Ulrika and Gustav III mourning was prescribed at court and it was to be worn in a manner equivalent to that after parents. The bodies of subjects were thus employed in a paternal rhetoric (adopted in various European monarchies) which intended to mediate a myth of monarchy as elevated, corresponding in its functions and hierarchical position to that of parents. In the coronation ceremony of Gustav IV Adolf and Frederica of Baden the attitude towards gender made it clear that the king was the patriarch and masculine superior and the queen his inferior, albeit elevated and divinely ordained above the subjects. Besides cultivating a myth of superiority the aim of the paternal rhetoric, manifested in body practices, was to contribute in the forging of a personal relationship between monarchs and subjects, imperative in the cultural and political context to sustain popular support. The myths of monarchy were not unilateral. As Jeroen Duindam points out, it was essential for dynastic ceremonies to demonstrate the monarch's ties to the commonwealth. Oaths of allegiance needed to be enacted through bodies regardless of whether the oath-taker was a subordinate swearing loyalty to a sovereign or a king assuring his responsible rule over subjects. Precedence given to those belonging to prestigious royal orders (expressed for example through the place in which they walked in Gustav III's funeral procession) also suggested elements of reciprocity. The magnificence of monarchy and glorification of the ruler was predominant but, as underlined by Duindam, not the sole myth in need of mediation.

As implied by the very term, dynastic ceremonies were imbued with dynastic implications. To cherish the memory and body of deceased monarchs indicated dynastic stability. In the theatre of death these aspects manifested themselves through the physical presence of royal family members or the display of a late monarch's body. However, the body's physiological limitations could not be neglected. It caused errors and affected the ability to manifest significant themes. The decaying body of Louisa Ulrika hindered ceremonial display and Gustav III's heavy body necessitated deviations from the vital observance of rank. Gender roles and the development towards reinforced oppositions between public and private also caused limitations to the demonstration of dynasty, expressed by the absence or exclusion of female royal family members in various procedures. Furthermore, the absences suggest bodies of late royal personages were not merely instruments in the propagation of monarchy. Various attitudes were dispersed among the participants within the public theatre. For those close to the late monarch,

death and dead bodies were tied up with emotional distress. Subjects could also apprehend the theatre of death as a sad event, but for a great deal of the general public the ceremonies following a monarch's death was rather perceived as entertainment or amusement and the lying in state of a monarch attracted many spectators from the populace. Dynastic funeral ceremonies strikingly illustrate the indispensable triple viewpoint emphasised by Mauss. The sociological (involving the dynastic, political and social implications and representations), psychological (involving the sensibilities and various perceptions and interpretations) and physiological dimensions were indissolubly intertwined and caused vicissitudes to ceremony and the ceremonial body.

In addition to affirming royal glorification or magnificence and asserting mutuality, a primary objective of ceremonies was to establish, manifest and materialise rank through the inhabitation of bodies, i.e. its placement, dress and applied technique in various ceremonial procedures. The observance of rank was imperative in the social, cultural and political milieu of the court society. The body and its techniques were crucial for the establishment of rank, for making precedence visible and, hence, real. However, not only physical bodies but also the discursively constructed body, i.e. the textual representation of a present body, was of some significance. The public theatre of monarchy was not exclusively employed by kings and queens but also by participating courtiers. In dynastic ceremonies they were given an opportunity to accommodate dynastic, social and political interests of their own.

Tradition and precedent were significant foundations for the education of bodies. To some extent Mauss notion of body techniques being ancient and habitual has a valid point. However, invented traditions were also regarded as tradition. Precedent and ancientness were not fixed concepts but ambiguous and complex. Tradition was furthermore not the only form of education. Confusions and errors occurred as a result of conflicting educational systems, e.g. differing customs in various states, disputed precedents, given instructions, altering fashions, opinions of courtiers with perceived authority and monarchs. Adhering to custom and precedent functioned as capital in the court society but deliberate deviations could also function as a form of capital, manifesting and demonstrating identity and political sympathies. Furthermore, education had its limits. Regulating the innumerable bodies of the masses in royal ceremonies was not an undertaken measure and caused serious accidents. It was nevertheless imperative for the grandeur of royalty, and its myth-making, that the public theatre was performed in front of an audience.

In addition, it is quite obvious that space and body were entangled in ceremonial display, simultaneously acting to materialise various myths of dynasty, superiority and rank. Walking in a procession or seating an ambassador was simultaneously a spatial and bodily practice.

DYNASTIC CEREMONIES IN THE POST-GUSTAVIAN ERA

In 1809 the relationship between the monarchy and the *Riksdag* was redefined in a new constitutional regulation, *regeringsformen*. According to Rolf Karlblom, *regeringsformen* was a ‘fundamentally new creation in relation to a domestic past’. Despite being masqueraded as continuity the statute signified a break in Swedish constitutional history, being greatly influenced by the British model but ‘as much French as the new Bernadotte dynasty’.²¹⁷ Although the king retained many of his political privileges, such as the rights to issue economic and administrative ordinances, the management of state resources and the assessment of taxation became exclusively tied to the *Riksdag*. Legislative power was further divided between the king and the Diet, and judicial authority was transferred from the king to the Supreme Court. Several civil rights were stipulated in the new declaration and the king became lawfully required to listen to and govern with advisors.²¹⁸

The constitutional changes resulted from revolutionary sentiments, arising from a discontent with Gustav IV Adolf’s politics. In the beginning of the nineteenth century, Sweden faced a difficult economic situation due to domestic strains caused by warfare, decreasing exchange rates and trade conflicts on the continent. In 1804 Gustav IV Adolf decided to diverge from the policy of neutrality predominating since 1792. In order to secure the vital export of ore and out of resentment towards Napoleon I, Sweden allied itself with Great Britain against France. Over the years, the war escalated and territories, such as Swedish Pomerania, were lost. The most decisive defeat occurred when Finland was occupied and eventually lost to the Russian empire. The king was singled out as responsible for the Swedish downfall and the domestic destitution. In 1809 Gustav IV Adolf was dethroned, imprisoned and banished. The aged Duke Charles was proclaimed regent and succeeded Gustav IV Adolf as king but since the newly allotted king and queen consort did not have any living children an heir needed to be appointed. After misfortunes (namely the sudden death of Charles August), power struggles and political intrigues the French marshal Jean Baptiste Bernadotte was elected crown pince, assuming the name Charles John and adopted by Charles XIII and Queen Charlotte. The hopes and ambitions to reconquer the Finnish territories were widespread in Sweden, partly warranting the choice of a non-noble marshal as heir to the throne, but in his foreign policies Charles John instead looked westwards. In 1814 Denmark was forced to give up its Norwegian dominions and, through military intervention, a union was proclaimed between Sweden and Norway; the two realms would be united under one royal dynasty.²¹⁹

²¹⁷ Karlblom, 1964, pp. 212–315.

Despite Karlblom’s conviction, it has been widely discussed in Swedish historiography whether the reform of 1809 is to be regarded a Swedish innovation or an import of international, mainly French revolutionary and British parliamentary thought. The question remains disputed. Hedenborg & Kvarnström, 2015, p. 165.

²¹⁸ Hedenborg & Kvarnström, 2015, pp. 165–166.

²¹⁹ Hedenborg & Kvarnström, 2015, pp. 159–163; See also Weibull, 1957.

THE CORONATION CEREMONY OF CHARLES XIII AND QUEEN CHARLOTTE IN 1809

A CEREMONY FOR THE PEOPLE AND NOT THE MONARCH

In 1796 the solution to the issue of crowding bodies had been solved in a rather unsatisfactory manner, reducing the solemnity and undermining the magnificence of monarchy. Finding a solution guaranteeing the safety of participants and audiences without diminishing the grandeur of royalty was a pressing issue. Having a ceremony take place outdoors could be advantageous, as partly demonstrated when the body of Louisa Ulrika was moved from Svartsjö Palace. In 1809 the ceremonial celebration was staged outdoors and Hauswolff described the majestic procession and the solemn atmosphere at Slottsbacken:

When the procession had passed by the soldiers, standing in lines, it halted and some of the soldiers marched to the bottom of the slope to keep the place tidy and free for the influx of the general public, which stayed behind the rows up the hill. Complete order was observed without racket, and with reason one can claim no such solemnness could take place at any other place where such a location could not be found, and where the populace is not as obliging as the Swedish.²²⁰

Hauswolff's attitude towards the general public in the celebration ceremony of 1809 widely differed from his remarks at Gustav III's funeral in 1792. Clearly, to Hauswolff order and self-restraint of the body (the inclination not to push one's way forward and disrupt the ceremonial order) was highly praised.

In the printed ceremonial detailing the actual coronation procedures of Charles XIII and Duchess Charlotte a few days before the celebration ceremony, Hauswolff noted that the procession procedure required a major alteration. Since several Lords of the Realm did not possess state coaches or liveries the route was rearranged and the procession was performed on foot.²²¹ Duchess Charlotte, who was crowned queen the same day, claimed that the measure was only in part a result of the excellencies not being able to get their coaches ready in time. It was also a measure of thrift. Due to the economic hardship which had caused great dissatisfaction with Gustavian rule, expenditure needed to be reduced so not to offend the general public.²²² The principle of error and the political dimension of bodies and ceremonies co-operated in shaping the specific technique of the royal body, in this case that of walking.

In accordance with the aim to save costs, as well as a measure to prevent disorder, Charles XIII furthermore decided to cancel the serving of wine and preparation of the traditional coronation ox. In Hauswolff's opinion the ceremony was nonetheless quite spectacular.²²³ Economic considerations also brought about a reduction of grandeur at the ceremonial Viennese court in

²²⁰ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21, p. 69 (original quotation: 'sedan Processionen gådt förbi soldaterna, som gjorde hay, uphörde den och en del soldater drogos nedest i backen att hålla platsen ren och fri för tillopp af allmänheten, som stodnade bakom denna hay upåt backen. All ordning blef i akttagen utan buller, och kan man med skjäl påstå att en dylik högtidelighet ej kan äga rum på något ställe der ej sådant läge finnes för platsen, och der ej en så beskedelig allmänhet, som den Svenska är') and the attached document *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Carl XIII:s och Drottning Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Kröning och Konungens Hyllning Wid Riksdagen i Stockholm År 1809*.

²²¹ A notification was given by the Chief Chamber Gentleman declaring that the procession would not go from the Royal Palace through the south arch and east gate of the churchyard, over *Riddarhustorget*, *Kornhamnstorg*, *Skeppsbron*, *Slottsbacken* and *Stortorget*, but through the north arch over *Mynttorget* and *Myntgatan* towards *Riddarhustorget* and the east gate of the churchyard. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21, unnumbered pages (the attached documents *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Carl XIII:s Och Drottning Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Kröning och Konungens Hyllning Wid Riksdagen I Stockholm År 1809* and *Underrättelse*).

²²² Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. VIII, p. 398.

²²³ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21, p. 64 and the attached document *Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Carl XIII:s och Drottning Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Kröning och Konungens Hyllning Wid Riksdagen i Stockholm År 1809*.

the eighteenth century but satisfying vanity and love of splendour remained imperative.²²⁴ In a letter to the Chief Chamber Gentleman Nils Posse, Hauswolff depicted how people filled the windows and constructed stands, and sat on the Medici lion statues on Slottsbacken when the coronation procession marched towards the church. The Grand Master of Ceremonies had been told by some of the spectators that they thought the procession looked rather grand, and he furthermore wrote:

His Majesty, experienced in representation since his childhood days, performed with much grace, inherited from both his father's and mother's side, and his old appearances along with his difficulty to walk truly instil respect for the majesty. The Queen, whose vivacity has not decreased much with age, carefully observed herself without relinquishing her amiability and all her bows, greetings etc. was performed with much *aisance gracieuse*.²²⁵

Charles XIII was sixty-one years old and Queen Charlotte fifty years old at the time of their coronations. Charles had off and on suffered from weak health which contributed in his difficulties to walk. It may therefore seem somewhat surprising that he appears to have walked on foot rather than riding in a coach. The ideal correspondence between politics and practicality seems to have taken precedence over the physiological body in this case, and, according to Hauswolff, his physiological impairment had the potential of increasing the veneration of monarchy. Nevertheless, the physiological limitations made themselves felt since the king and queen needed to rest before the ceremonial public dining took place at the Royal Palace in the evening.²²⁶

Märta Helena Reenstierna (better known as *Årstafrun*) made frequent visits to Stockholm from her estate located south of the city. On 29 June she was present in Stockholm to see the coronation procession and noted in her diary that it would be a ‘vain attempt’ to describe what she had seen because it surpassed everything she had previously witnessed in her life. She did however give a few descriptions, and she wrote that the royalties had chosen to walk so that ‘the general public would get the pleasure of seeing their gracious and loved superiors’.²²⁷ She thus reflected on the matter in a way similar to Hauswolff when he told Count Posse the procession had been planned so that no obstacles would hinder the the general public’s view. As had been the case in the reign of Gustav III, Hauswolff claimed, the ceremonial arrangers had considered that ‘a grandiose procession is not employed for the King’s own sake, but for a great number of spectators to make it impressive’.²²⁸ Furthermore, when the celebration ceremony was performed two days after the coronation, Hauswolff remarked that he thought it was lovely to see the large number of spectators in the windows of the Royal Palace and of the houses surrounding Slottsbacken.²²⁹

²²⁴ See Fichtner, 2014, pp. 130–133; Mansel, 1988, pp. 24 and 35–36.

²²⁵ af Petersens & Clason, 1909, p. 130 (original quotation: ‘Hans Maj:t, van ifrån sin barndom att representera, har uti det all gråce, som han bade på fäderne och möderne ärf, och hans äldre utseende samt svårighet att gå ingifver verkeligen vördnad för majestätet. Drottningen, hvars vivacité ej med åren stort aftagit, observerade sig på det nogaste utan att gå ifrån sin amabilité och hade uti alla sina bugningar, hälsningar etc. mycken aisance gracieuse’).

²²⁶ See af Petersens & Clason, 1909, p. 131.

²²⁷ Reenstierna, vol. I, 1993, p. 405 (original quotation: ‘på det allmänheten skulle få den glädjen att se sin Nådiga och Älskade överhet’).

²²⁸ af Petersens & Clason, 1909, p. 130 (original quotation: ‘ty man hade som i kung Gustaf den 3:djes tid funnit, att en pompös procession ej är anständlig för Kungens egen skull utan för att genom mängd af åskådare göra den imponerande’).

²²⁹ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Wid Deras Majestäters Komung Carl XIII:s och Drottning Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Kröning och Konungens Hyllning Wid Riksdagen i Stockholm År 1809*).

THE CORONATION AND CELEBRATION CEREMONIES

The coronation of Charles XIII and Queen Charlotte took place on 29 June. With the significant exception that the ceremonial procession was performed on foot, the ceremonial bodies largely corresponded to those in 1800. The magnificence and authority of monarchy was expressed through the great number of officiators participating in the ceremony. The timpanists and trumpeters were however excluded from the procession but present in the church, playing their instruments when the Herald of the Realm proclaimed the king and queen crowned. The ceremony in the church was fashioned in the same manner as in 1800; the anointment, the oath-taking and the hand-kissing signalled the king's and queen's elevated and divinely ordained position. The same myth was materialised in the celebration ceremony when the Estates took their oaths and kissed the king's hand.²³⁰

Although the technique of walking and the reduction of splendour manifested a slightly different approach to the commonwealth, the bodies in the crowning procedure in general presumably mediated the same myths as before. However, when the key was handed over to the king, the archbishop's wordings implied a minor shift of attitude. When Gustav IV Adolf received the key in 1800, the archbishop stated it was a symbol for the king's incentive to 'enclose what is good and keep out what is harmful [...] through kingly power and domination close the gates of Sweden to all heretics, foes and infidels [...] to open Your gates of mercy for the poor and those in distress' but in 1809 the archbishop pointed out that the meaning of the key was 'to justly keep out deceptions, vices and wicked thoughts from Your realm, to open the treasures of wisdom and truth to Your people, to cause well-being and improvement to the industrious and give comfort and relief to the suffering and distressed'.²³¹ Nevertheless, the effect of this shift in rhetoric was probably dampened by the fact that the proclamations following the king's anointment and reception of the crown, sceptre and apple was more or less the same as in 1800. Emphasis was put on God's given grace, divine sanction, the king's just rule and responsible reign over subjects.

The new constitutional regulation had been signed by the king on 6 June and the modifications were visible in the printed ceremonial. In 1800 the Chancellor of the Judiciary and Lord High Chancellor were prescribed to wear the white ceremonial gown but in 1809 these offices were abolished. From 1809, the cabinet ministers holding the highest rank were the Minister of Justice and the Minister for Foreign Affairs.²³² They were dressed in the grand ceremonial gown, with their hair let down and *panaches*. In regard to dress, the gentlemen of the court had in 1800 been prescribed to wear the blue and white gala dress but in 1809 the adopted uniforms

²³⁰ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Carl XIII:s och Drottning Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Kröning och Konungens Hyllning Wid Riksdagen i Stockholm År 1809*).

²³¹ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12, attached document: *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Gustaf IV. Adolphs Och Drottning Fredrica Dorothea Wilhelminas Kröning Wid Riksdagen i Norrköping År 1800* (original quotation: 'förvarandes hwad godt är, och hwad skadeligt är utelåtandes [...]igenom Konungsliga magt och wälde, må ignesluta Sveriges portar för alla kättare, fiender och otrogne [...] för fattiga och nödställda låta Edra Nådeportar vara öpne'); RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21, attached document: *Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Carl XIII:s och Drottning Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Kröning och Konungens Hyllning Wid Riksdagen i Stockholm År 1809* (original quotation: 'at rättwist utesättinga willor, laster och huglöshet ur Edert Rike, at öpna Wishetens och Sanningens skatter för Edert Folk, at bereda den idige trefnad och förkofran, lättnad och tröst för den lidande och bedröfwade').

²³² 'Justitiestatsminister'. *Nordisk Familjebok* (T.H. Westrin, ed.), vol. XIII, 1910, p. 335–336 (digitalised version, <http://runeberg.org/nfbm/0184.html>, accessed 9 May 2017).

were allowed in addition to the gala dress.²³³ This reflected the increasing militarisation of court culture which had been initiated in the reign of Gustav IV Adolf. It was expressed by the king's wearing of a uniform at the opening of the *Riksdag* in 1800 and the introduction of a civil uniform in 1805. It also mirrored the increasing popularity of uniforms at court, implying the shift towards a different attitude of court display in the nineteenth century.²³⁴

Furthermore, Hauswolff remarked on a breach of etiquette concerning how the Estates were dressed in the procession. He commented that it should have been explicitly stated in the printed ceremonial that hats were not supposed to be worn since many, even those who 'ought to know better' (i.e. the nobility) had kept their hats on.²³⁵ In a letter to Nils Posse, Hauswolff told his friend he had noticed that Count Samuel af Ugglas, who attended to the princess in the procession, had worn his hat on the way to the church despite the queen's escorts being hatless. Hauswolff had thus approached the count and informed him about the committed mistake so that he would remove his hat when the procession left the church. Although Hauswolff wrote that he had treated the count with respect, he had also made a sly at him. When Ugglas asked why he had not been informed beforehand, Hauswolff allegedly replied 'because it goes without saying one pays respect to women'.²³⁶ The confusion surrounding hats was also demonstrated when the public dining was performed later the same evening (with the same grandeur as in 1800). The officiating Lords of the Realm all kept their hats on, even Baron Ramel who waited on the king at the table. Hauswolff could not recall that Count Beckfriis in 1772 nor Wachtmeister in 1800 had kept their hats on, but according to Bramel the king had now given specific orders that the hats should remain on the excellencies' heads.²³⁷ These aspects to dress reflect inherent conflicts in court society and ceremonials of the early nineteenth century. It demonstrates the tension between humble and magnificent bodily display in the public theatre, the difficulties in finding a proper balance between an image of elevated monarchy and accommodation of elites. It also shows the tensions between various forms of education – printed ceremonials, tradition, precedent, courtiers with perceived authority and kings – which led to confusions or 'errors' in techniques of the body.

The celebration ceremony took place on 1 July. It was composed in the same manner as in 1800 but with a few noticeable differences engendered by the reform of 1809. The Councillors of Justice, Cabinet Ministers, the Minister of Justice and the Minister for Foreign Affairs were given prominent positions in the procession. In addition, a conspicuous dynastic element was present in 1809 since the ceremony was performed at Slottsbacken with the statue of Gustav III looming large behind the throne, which was placed so that the first part of the statue's inscription was visible: 'Gustav III, legislator'.²³⁸ The splendid decorations – the columns, canopies etc. – together with the presence of Gustav III's represented artificial body made the

²³³ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Carl XIII:s och Drottning Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Kröning och Konungens Hyllning Wid Riksdagen i Stockholm År 1809*).

²³⁴ See Mansel, 2005, pp. 77–110; 'adelsuniform', *Nationalencyklopedin* (online edition, accessed 3 May 2017); Alm & Vahlne, 2010, pp. 324–326.

²³⁵ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Carl XIII:s och Drottning Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Kröning och Konungens Hyllning Wid Riksdagen i Stockholm År 1809*); af Petersens & Clason, 1909, p. 132–133.

²³⁶ af Petersens & Clason, 1909, p. 131 (original quotation: 'Ty det förstår sig af sig själf, att man ha regard för fruntimret').

²³⁷ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Carl XIII:s och Drottning Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Kröning och Konungens Hyllning Wid Riksdagen i Stockholm År 1809*).

²³⁸ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21, pp. 66–68.

entire ceremony majestic and magnificent. Hauswolff wrote ‘it was the most beautiful sight one could see’ and claimed that the spectators certainly must have felt the same.²³⁹

THE DEATH OF SOFIA MAGDALENA IN 1813

PRECEDENTS AND DEVIATIONS

Looking to precedents was an important guidance and education in dynastic ceremonials. When Queen Dowager Sofia Magdalena died at Ulriksdal Palace in 1813, Hauswolff noted that the king had given orders to the Cabinet Minister Fleming, acting on behalf of the Chamber Gentleman, demanding that what was ‘observed at the late Queen Dowager Louisa Ulrika’s funeral in 1782 will carefully be pursued, as much as the changes of times can allow’.²⁴⁰

The most decisive differences in 1813 were presumably the ongoing Napoleonic wars and their repercussions in the North. This caused necessary deviations from the ceremonial adopted in 1782. When Queen Dowager Sofia Magdalena’s body was moved to the city from Ulriksdal Palace, the printed ceremonial proclaimed the coffin would be lifted from its *lit de parade* by her Chief Chamber Gentleman, Court Stable Master and gentlemen of the court and be carried by twenty-four officials in military and civil service ‘af Tromans wärdighet’.²⁴¹ According to Hauswolff this was a required measure ‘as most counts, barons and noblemen were, due to the march towards the Norwegian border, there and those present either of higher rank, frailty or youth in such a state the principles observed at Louisa Ulrika’s funeral could not be adhered’.²⁴² When the body of Louisa Ulrika had been moved from Svartsjö Palace to the Royal Palace, the coffin had instead been carried by councillors of the realm holding titles of either counts or barons.²⁴³

Precedents were clearly important but specific circumstances at given times necessitated deliberate changes. The principle of error was at play in these changes, at least when viewed from the Grand Master of Ceremonies’ perspective. At the funeral of Louisa Ulrika, the body had been put in a coffin covered with black velvet. In 1818, Hauswolff wrote regarding Queen Dowager Charlotte that her body was put in a coffin made of oak and ‘covered with red velvet, purple was not to be had and rightly it should have been black like that of Queen Dowager Louisa Ulrika, but now the same error was committed, as in 1813 with the Queen Dowager Sofia Magdalena’s coffin’.²⁴⁴ On 9 September Märta Helena Reenstierna was invited to watch

²³⁹ af Petersens & Clason, 1909, p. 133 (original quotation: ‘det var det vackraste man kunde få se’).

²⁴⁰ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 25, p. 60. (original quotation: ‘det, som iacktogs vid högstsalig Enkedrottning Lovisa Ulricas begravning 1782 ska noga fölljas, så mycket som tidernas omskifte kunna tillåta’).

²⁴¹ The term signified highly placed officials in the service of king and state. They held a rank corresponding to that of lieutenant colonels or major-generals. The title could refer to a county governor, director-general, accredited emissary, commander of the chivalric orders, member of the Swedish Academy or highly placed members of the clergy. ‘Troman’, SAOB (online edition published 2008, accessed 10 April 2017); ‘Konungens troman’, *Förvaltningshistorisk ordbok* (online edition, accessed 10 April 2017); See also Tandefelt, 2008, p. 98.

²⁴² RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 25, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordnings Wid Högstsäl. Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke-Drottningens Sophia Magdalenas Begravning den 30 September 1813*) (original quotation: ‘emedan de flästa grefwar, Friherrar och Adels män woro, i anledning af Täger mot norska gränsen, der och härstädens warande, antingn af högre rang, skräplighet eller ungdom i den ställning att man ej kunde följa den principe, som wid Lovisa Ulricas begravning observerades’).

²⁴³ LUB, *Wid Inflyttningen Af Högstsäl. Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke-Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Lik, Ifrån Svartsjö Slott Til Kongl. Slottet i Stockholm Then 25 Juli 1782, I akt tages följande Ordnung*, paragraph 7.

²⁴⁴ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, p. 164 (original quotation: ‘öfverklädd med röd sammet, purpurfärgat fanns intet och rättelig hade det bordt wara svart; ty sådan war EnkeDrottning Lovisa Ulricas, men man begic nu samma fel, som 1813 wid EnkeDrottning Sophia Magdalenas kista’).

the procession from a window on Drottninggatan when Sofia Magdalena's body ceremoniously arrived at the Royal Palace. Her diary confirms the difficulties of public theatre underlined by Ian Archer as she wrote she could not see the procession very clearly. She did however perceive the splendour of the many coaches, horses and people carrying torches. She also claimed to have seen the coffin draped in purple velvet with gold fringes, crowns and festoons.²⁴⁵ Evidently, the mistake commented on by Hauswolff was not noted by the observing Reenstierna. Furthermore, purple fabric had not been used in 1792 either. Hauswolff remarked that the coffin of Gustav III was decorated with crimson velvet since purple was nowhere to be found in the entire city.²⁴⁶ The principle of error appears to have been an agent of change in regard to this specific practice.

A palpable difference between the processions in 1782 and 1813 is that the ceremonial transport of the body from Ulriksdal Palace to the Royal Palace on 9 September 1813 was not performed at sea. In the journal Hauswolff attached a letter he had received (unsigned but dated from 9 September) informing him on the details of the procession. The anonymous sender remarked on the peculiarity that a major-general and commander drove the carriage with the body. Apparently this was a necessary deviation due to circumstances surrounding the Stable Master in the late queen dowager's royal household. It was nevertheless, according to the writer, out of order. If the ceremonial procession at sea had been advantageous in 1782 in regard to smoothness of the transportation and availability for spectators, the rainy weather would make the parade more troublesome in 1813, especially for those walking on foot.²⁴⁷

LYING IN STATE

Sofia Magdalena's body had been put on *lit de parade* at Ulriksdal Palace and the general public was admitted to the exposition. Hauswolff was told that many spectators appeared of both higher and lower class and of the peasantry. As opposed to custom, the Chief Marshal and Court Mistress with the ladies-in-waiting had not been sitting next to the body as guards, only the Chamber Gentleman and the officers of the Gentlemen-at-arms and the Svea life guards. Instead the others sat in an adjacent room which the spectators needed to pass through. Despite the large number of visitors Hauswolff had been told that no disorder occurred. At the Royal Palace, the body was again put on *lit de parade*. In comparison to the funeral in 1792, the exposition hours were extended, this time lasting from ten to one o'clock and in the afternoon from five to seven o'clock.²⁴⁸

On 11 September Märta Helena Reenstierna was told by two acquaintances who twice had visited the *lit de parade* that the late queen dowager's face was covered by a masque, and she was given a description of the room's decorations. A lieutenant friend arranged for Reenstierna to see the displayed body outside of the official admittance hours on 15 September. Reenstierna

²⁴⁵ Märta Helena Reenstierna, vol. II, 1993, p. 28.

²⁴⁶ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Högsalige Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Bisättning I Riddarholms kyrkan Den 13 April 1792*).

²⁴⁷ Attached documents in RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30.

²⁴⁸ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 25, pp. 65–66.

did not see a masque-covered face but instead noted ‘the Royal face was much decayed and the eyes and the upper lip much sunken’. What interested her even more than the body was the splendid accessories, the room’s decorations and the regalia which she described with much awe.²⁴⁹ Others appear to have been more emotionally distressed from witnessing the queen dowager’s body. Sarah Lyttelton, née Spencer, who visited Sweden with her husband in 1813 described in a letter the upset state of Mrs von Engeström:

Poor Mme. D’Engeström, who [...] was scarcely recovered from the *tiraillements* and *spasmes à la figure* and *vapeurs* into which she had been thrown by the sight of the old Queen Mother’s corpse lying in State, which she (Mme. d’E) was obliged to mount guard by in the morning – a duty belonging to her rank. “Et on m’a fait passer tout près de la tête! Ah, mon Dieu! Figurez-vous donc cela! J’ai fait une scène devant tout le monde; je n’en reviens pas!”²⁵⁰

Besides psychological aspects (i.e. potential sensibilities towards dead bodies in general), physiological aspects (i.e. the body’s decay) might have contributed to Engeström’s dismay. Colonel Salomon Brelin furthermore claimed rats had chewed on the queen dowager behind her ear, and on her gloves and shoes. Yet, distress was not universally prevailing. A great deal of people from the general public had, like Reenstierna, appeared to see the spectacle. According to Brelin, some of the women sat on the shoulders of the men to get a good look and could not step down due to the immense crowding.²⁵¹

THE FUNERAL

Sofia Magdalena’s funeral took place on 30 September. Queen Charlotte remarked that the queen dowager’s remains needed to be kept at the palace for three weeks because the arrangements in Riddarholmskyrkan took a long time to prepare.²⁵² The procession to the church was performed in much the same manner as in 1782, though with slight alterations. The most notable change was perhaps the absence of the king who could not participate due to health reasons. The royal family members who participated were Queen Charlotte, Duke Oscar and Princess Sofia Albertina, who had been forbidden to participate in 1782 but present in 1792.²⁵³ Another discernible change between the ceremonials in 1782 and 1813 was the mentioning of the Chancellery’s place in the procession, which had appeared in the ceremonial of Gustav III’s funeral. Its members were prescribed to walk behind the Court Marshal and royal household. The Chancellery’s place in the procession thus corresponded to that of 1792, despite it having enjoyed a restoration in the constitutional changes of 1809 when it was put under the Minister for Foreign Affairs.²⁵⁴ Seemingly, in this specific case, tradition rather than politics took precedence regarding the placement in the procession.

²⁴⁹ Märta Helena Reenstierna, vol. II, 1993, p. 29 (original quotation: ‘Det Kungl. Ansigtet vara mycket förfallnadt och ögonen samt öfrahäppen mycket insjunkna’).

²⁵⁰ Spencer, 1912, p. 160 (translation of the quotation: ‘And they made me pass very close to the face! Oh my God! Imagine that! I made a scene in front of everyone; I cannot get over it!’).

²⁵¹ Svenska memoarer och bref, vol. 1–2, 1900, p. 34.

²⁵² Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. IX, 1942, p. 219.

²⁵³ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 25, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordnning Wid Högsalsal. Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke-Drottningens Sophia Magdalenas Begräfning den 30 September 1813*); Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta, vol. IX, 1942, p. 225.

²⁵⁴ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordnung Wid Högstsalig Hennes Kongl. Maj:t Enke-Drottningens Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Begräfning den 16 Julii 1818*); See Fähræus, 1872, pp. 40–42.

The fact that high officials in civil and military service, and not the customary counts and barons, carried the body seems to have caused some deviations and confusions. Hauswolff noted in the printed ceremonial that it should have been made clear that those carrying the body was supposed to have crepe hanging from their hats and in the future it would be imperative for the carriers to decide beforehand in what order they should walk. Now they had been in complete disorder.²⁵⁵ Reenstierna who watched the parade did not remark on any disorder. She described the ‘solemn magnificence’ of the procession with the parading burghers on horseback and on foot, the two canopies held above the Queen Dowager’s coffin and the Queen, and the long train of the Queen’s mourning dress which was carried by nine ladies of the court.²⁵⁶

As had been the case in 1782 and 1792 a primary objective of regulating bodies in 1813 appears to have been the establishment of order and close observance of rank. However, dynastic connections were also demonstrated through an artificial presence of Gustav III’s body in the shape of a bust, placed on a pedestal among the decorations of the catafalque. Many of the decorations, including the statue, had been used in Gustav III’s funeral as well.²⁵⁷ According to Queen Charlotte the church was tastefully and splendidly decorated and the sight of Gustav III’s mausoleum in the foreground instilled the feeling that the late king waited to be reunited with his wife.²⁵⁸ This notion was largely echoed in the sermon, stressing Sofia Magdalena’s graciously performed role as queen consort.²⁵⁹ It seems reasonable to assume that the statue representing Gustav III was meant to function in a similar manner, i.e. as a manifestation of the late queen dowager’s female virtues of domesticity. As in the previously discussed funeral ceremonies, only the men of the royal family accompanied the late monarch into the grave. When considering the importance attached to the practice of displaying that dynastic memory was cherished, this is perhaps somewhat surprising. Since the attending royal family members were Queen Charlotte, Princess Sofia Albertina and Duke Oscar, only the duke participated in the procession through which the coffin was moved from the catafalque to the grave.²⁶⁰

THE DEATH OF CHARLES XIII AND QUEEN DOWAGER CHARLOTTE IN 1818

DEVIATIONS IN MOURNING ATTIRE

Charles XIII died on 5 February and some months later, on 20 June, Queen Dowager Charlotte also passed away. This meant that mourning was prescribed at court for almost a year since it was extended, or re-introduced, in June. As was pointed out in the section discussing the mourning dress after the death of Louisa Ulrika, the prescriptions of mourning attire were largely unaltered throughout the scrutinised time period. However, a few minor differences existed and these became evident in the declaration given after the death of Charles XIII. In

²⁵⁵ RA, CÖR, vol. I., no. 25, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Högstsal. Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke-Drottningens Sophia Magdalenas Begräfning den 30 September 1813*).

²⁵⁶ Märta Helena Reenstierna, vol. II, 1993, p. 30.

²⁵⁷ *Inrikestidningar*, no. 118, 12 October 1813 (attached in RA, CÖR, vol. I., no. 25); Rangström, 2015, p. 134.

²⁵⁸ *Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta*, vol. 9, 1942, p. 225.

²⁵⁹ *Wid Högstsalig Hennes Kongl. Majestäts Enke-Drottningens, Sophia Magdalenas Begräfning, I Kongl. Riddarholms-Kyrkan Den 30 Sept. 1813, Predikan Af Jacob Ax. Lindblom, Erke-Biskop*, 1813 (attached in RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 25).

²⁶⁰ See RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 25, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Högstsal. Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke-Drottningens Sophia Magdalenas Begräfning den 30 September 1813*); LUB, *Wid Högst Salig Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Begräfning, Then 31 Julii 1782, I akt tages följande Ordning*.

comparison to the declarations from the previous years, the one given in 1818 after the death of Charles XIII did not proclaim that the hair of courtiers was supposed to be unpowdered. Furthermore, it was mentioned (which previous prescriptions did not) how gentlemen in the adopted uniforms should wear crepe around the arm and the sword.²⁶¹

These changes presumably mirrored the cultural and social changes of the time: the decreasing popularity of wigs, powdered hair and the national dress (introduced by Gustav III in 1778 and abolished in 1823 with the introduction of a new and modernised court dress) and the increasing appeal of uniforms.²⁶² These cultural developments were visible in the appearances of the Emperor Joseph II who had a passion for simplicity. In public he preferred to wear his military uniform and he made the Spanish cloak of state non-obligatory in 1784. Francis II was also keen on adopting these simplifications in appearance. He rejected the wig and dressed down in trousers.²⁶³ Lynn Hunt has described the development of men's tendency to put aside make-up and wigs in post-revolutionary France as a diffusion of class boundaries and a strengthening of gender distinctions.²⁶⁴ The source material advised in this thesis is insufficient to support whether these arguments can be applied in the case of early eighteenth-century Sweden.²⁶⁵ What can be demonstrated from the office journals is rather, which has been pointed out by Philip Mansel, that the uniform caused dissolution of social class distinctions within the elite.²⁶⁶ When Hauswolff followed the British minister Mr Strangford from an audience with Charles XIV John in 1818, he remarked: 'I cannot knowingly state which of those who received and now followed us shall be regarded as gentlemen of the court officiating as His Royal Highness's guards, as all were dressed in uniforms and boots.'²⁶⁷ In Hauswolff's opinion, the widespread use of uniforms signified the breakdown of demarcations within court society.

The increasing militarisation of court culture and the growing dominance of uniforms was a development which left its mark in court society and its ceremonies.²⁶⁸ In the printed ceremonial from Charles XIII's funeral Hauswolff remarked that the commanders of the Order of the Sword who carried the canopies were dressed in deep mourning. As for the rest, many had not 'induced themselves to be in mourning'. The adjutant General Björnstierna had suggested they would instead wear uniforms with the order's collar or a ribbon fitting to rank, expressing mourning by wearing a belt of crepe, covering the epaulettes and swords with crepe, and having crepe hanging from the order's hat which generals would decorate with a white plume.²⁶⁹ The

²⁶¹ See RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 2, p. 14; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 5, p. 137; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 25, unnumbered page; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages.

²⁶² See Mansel, 2005, pp. 53–54; Bergman, 1938, p. 10.

²⁶³ Fichtner, 2014, pp. 142 and 159.

²⁶⁴ Hunt, 1998, p. 237.

²⁶⁵ Per Sandin has pointed out that the nobility continued to dominate the Swedish court scene throughout the reign of Charles XIV John. At the Norwegian court however, representatives from the commoner estates were much more palpable. Nevertheless, both courts functioned as arenas for interaction between the monarchy and civic society and Charles XIV John extended the bourgeoisies' access to the court, for example by allowing people from the commoner estates to dine at his table. Sandin, 2010, pp. 141–153.

²⁶⁶ Mansel, 1982, p. 111.

²⁶⁷ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, p. 68 (original quotation: 'Jag kan ej wättelig uppgifwa hwilka af de, som mötte och nu följde oss skulle anses såsom hofcawallierer att wara på wakt hos hans Kongl. Höghet, ty alla woro I uniformer och I stöflar').

²⁶⁸ See Mansel, 2005, pp. 77–110; 'adeluniform', *Nationalencyklopedin* (online edition, accessed 3 May 2017); Alm & Vahlne, 2010, pp. 324–326

²⁶⁹ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordnung Wid Högtsalig Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIII:s Begräfning i Riddareholms Kyrkan den 20 Martii 1818*) (the wording used by Hauswolff was 'men de andra kunde ej förmå sig att gjöra sig sorgedrägt').

uniform made its presence felt and somewhat blurred distinctions, but rank remained a major concern.

On the subject of mourning dress, Hauswolff's remarks that the mourning attire of the diplomats in 1792 differed from that of Swedish courtiers was brought up again in 1818. The purpose of advising the journal from 1792 was its capacity to function as precedent. On 28 February 1818 the diplomatic corpuses gathered to see Charles XIII on *lit de parade*. The Prussian minister, the Portuguese *chargé d'affaires* and American emissary were dressed in uniforms with black armbands, and the Egyptian agent wore his usual costume decorated with a black armband. The rest of the diplomats were dressed in fracs. Attending ladies were dressed in 'deep mourning' and a small cap with a veil, except for the Madame and Mademoiselle Russel who wore the court dress. Hauswolff remarked that 'rightly one should have been dressed as one would at court, but in this époque, when frac and boots are so highly valued, one deviates from etiquette'. Due to these variations in dress, the French *chargé d'affaires* approached Hauswolff with inquiries as to how mourning had been worn after the death of Gustav III, claiming he would like to follow what would be 'pleasant for the court'. The Grand Master of Ceremonies told the French diplomat he would advise his journals from 1792, although he recalled that the British Minister Lord Strangford had not worn his uniform at his audience with the queen dowager after the death of the Duke of Anhalt-Dessau in 1817. Therefore he believed that persons not holding a military office could wear *habit habillé* with pleureuses and crepe.²⁷⁰

The following day both men attended a luncheon arranged by Count von Engeström, now holding the office Minister for Foreign Affairs. Hauswolff gave the *chargé d'affaires* an excerpt from his journal and told him he believed that the proper thing to wear for non-military personnel was black clothes. Hauswolff wrote in the journal that the French *chargé d'affaires* 'said he wanted to advise His Excellency Mr State Minister [von Engeström] in the matter, which I could not oppose at the time, but as His Excellency is a lover of uniforms I can easily imagine his answer'.²⁷¹ Furthermore, when condolences were given to the royal family, Hauswolff noted that the Danish diplomats wore their mourning in a manner which the Danish minister explained corresponded to the way it was worn following the death of royal personages in Denmark.²⁷² The mourning attire which otherwise expressed the normative paternal bond between the ruler and the ruled seemingly differed when the subject was a foreign citizen, thus reflecting the diverging character of the relationship between the monarch and the diplomats.

As for the education of bodies, it may not be a surprise that the Grand Master of Ceremonies was seen as having some expertise in the matter of how bodies ought to be inhabited in ceremonial display. However, as demonstrated above, in 1818 the Grand Master of Ceremonies was not the sole advisor. The diplomat's wish to make further inquiries, despite Hauswolff giving him an exhaustive answer, implies that the Grand Master of Ceremonies' perceptions were deemed as inconclusive, perhaps even as antiquated opinions when it came to dress.

²⁷⁰ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, p. 42 (original quotations: 'rättelig hade man bordt vara klädd som till hofs, men i denna epoqua då frac och stöflor hafva så stort värde gifwer man sig afväga ifrån etiquette' and 'han gjerna wille rätta sig efter det som kunde vara angenämt för hofvet').

²⁷¹ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no 30 pp. 43–45 ('han sade sig villja fråga Hans Excellence Herr Stats Ministren derom, hwilket jag då intet kunde motsäga, men som Hans Excellence är älskare af uniformer, kan jag lätt föreställa mig svaret').

²⁷² RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, pp. 74–75.

Various forms of capital appear to have been accessible. Nevertheless, the Frenchman having asked him in the first place indicates that Hauswolff's office was still of importance, be it practical or symbolic (i.e. asking merely out of politeness).

THE FUNERAL OF CHARLES XIII

In his memoirs, Colonel Brelin gave a passionate account of Charles XIII's death on 5 February. Once the king had drawn his last breath, Brelin wrote, he arranged the king's mouth and facial muscles so to give him the 'good and kind mien which he always had in his lifetime' and according to the pamphlet describing the post-mortem examination, those present had remarked that 'death little or nothing had changed the features of benevolence, composure and dignity'.²⁷³ In death, the body of Charles XIII manifested a myth and reflection of his lifetime.

After the post-mortem examination was performed, the same procedures as in 1792 were observed: the late king was shrouded in the dress of the Royal Order of the Seraphim and put on *lit de parade* in Serafimerordens sal.²⁷⁴ As in the previously discussed ceremonies, the issue of crowding bodies was a major concern. When the diplomatic corpuses were to see Charles XIII's *lit de parade* the date and time was set by the Cabinet and the Minister for Foreign Affairs to 28 February at half past four. The immense crowding made this arrangement problematic. It caused Hauswolff to write a letter to the Chamber Gentleman Schulzenheim advising 'as the appointed time lies very close to that, appointed to the general public, it is dreadful that, at the entrance on the King's side, an awful crowd arises, and for that reason it should be safest advising them to enter on the Queen's side [...] I shall then be present to receive and accompany them to the room of the corpse and try to prevent all embarrassment'. The letter was concluded with Hauswolff wishing that the Chamber Gentleman would write to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, requesting that the diplomats were made aware they could enter on the queen's side, and 'avoid thereby all the tragedies a crowd could cause'.²⁷⁵ Although the death of Charles XIV John lies outside the scope of this thesis, a noteworthy solution to the issue of crowding bodies was suggested in 1844. When the periodical *Aftonbladet* reported on the death of an elder woman in the crowd at the king's *lit de parade* in 1844 a writer made the proposition to introduce a new technique of the body: the forming of queues. The article described the French phenomenon of forming queue, arguing an adoption of the practice in Sweden would be a reasonable measure to avoid the dangerous disorder arising at expositions and ticket sales.²⁷⁶ The technique of forming queues was suggested as a practical and feasible regulation of the uncontrollable bodies of the masses. Fatal errors inspired a new education.

²⁷³ Svenska memoarer och brev, vol. 1–2, 1900, p. 56 (original quotation: 'sin goda, vänliga min, som han i lifstiden alltid hade'); RA, CÖR, vol. I, no 30, attached document *Protocol, Hållt på Stockholms Slott den 7 Februarii 1818 vid Högsalig Konung Carl XIII:s Liköppning*, 1818 (original quotation: 'att döden föga eller allsintet förändrat de drag af Godhet, Lugen och Värdighet').

²⁷⁴ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, pp. 32–36.

²⁷⁵ RA, CÖR, vol. I., no. 30, pp. 38–39. (original quotations: 'som tiden går mycket nära den, som är för allmänheten utsatt, så är fruktansvärdt, att vid uppgången på konungens sida blifver en förfärlig trängsel, och i anledning deraf torde vara säkrast gifwa det råd att gå upp på Drottningens sida [...] Jag skall då vara der för att emottaga dem och beledsaga dem till likrummet samt försöka förhindra all förlagenhet' and 'undwika derigenom alla de ledsamheter, som en folksamling kan åstadkomma').

²⁷⁶ *Aftonbladet*, 19 April 1844; See also Rangström, 2015, p. 178–179.

The funeral took place on 20 March. As opposed to the royal funeral in 1792 the removal to the chapel and the funeral was merged into one ceremony. As had been the case in 1792, the queen dowager did not participate in the ceremony but Charles XIV John, Crown Prince Oscar and Princess Sofia Albertina attended. In the printed ceremonial from 1792 the queen dowager's absence had been explained by 'illness', but in 1818 the Queen Dowager could not participate due to her 'grief'.²⁷⁷

As mentioned above, the mourning dress of the knights of the Royal Order of the Seraphim considerably deviated. The most striking differences in comparison with all other ceremonies hitherto studied in the thesis were the prevalent expressions of the union between Sweden and Norway. Places were given to the Minister for Norwegian Affairs, the Swedish and the Norwegian chancelleries and Norwegian cabinet ministers present in Stockholm. Furthermore, a Norwegian crown was carried among the Swedish regalia by the Minister for Norwegian Affairs, Peder Anker. Behind the late king's body a Swedish as well as a Norwegian banner was carried by a Swedish Lord of the Realm and a Norwegian Cabinet Minister respectively.²⁷⁸

A new element in the procession was also the prominent place given to the Royal Order of Charles XIII. The order was instituted in 1811 and only granted to freemasons. In his lifetime the king had been much devoted to Freemasonry.²⁷⁹ Freemasonry has been assessed differently by various scholars. Some underline its foundation in Enlightenment thought, interpreting Freemasonry as part of the development of bourgeois associations. The intellectual tradition within the Freemasonry, and to which it belonged, has been regarded as a preliminary stage to modern civic society in which the involvement of citizens in democratic processes are stressed. Others have claimed that Freemasonry was a reactionary force, opposing modernity and rationality. Andreas Önnerfors argues that it is fruitful to understand how these contrary aspects existed in a dynamic relation within the fellowship.²⁸⁰ The physical presence of Freemasonry (in the procession as well as outside of it), through the Order of Charles XIII, thus suggests a subtle manifestation of a monarchy wrestling with a reconciliation of tradition and modernity.

Invitations to the ceremony were handed out to representatives of the Estates, fifty from the noble estate and twenty-five from the other three estates respectively. An extraordinary session of the *Riksdag* was held at the time of the funeral which perhaps rendered these invitations self-evident. At the same time however, the presence of the Estates in the public theatre of monarchy might have symbolically mediated the division of power between the king and the Diet. When Gustav IV Adolf was crowned in Norrköping the Estates had also been participating in the procession but given another place. In 1800 they walked behind those belonging to the royal household and the deputies from Pomerania and Wismar. The same was observed at the

²⁷⁷ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Högsalig Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIII:s Begräffning I Riddareholms Kyrkan 20 Martii 1818*).

²⁷⁸ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Högsalig Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIII:s Begräffning I Riddareholms Kyrkan 20 Martii 1818*).

²⁷⁹ In the 1770s and 1780s Gustav III had tried to use Charles's connections within the freemasonry for political gains but without much success. Through involvement with the freemasons Charles had, in the 1780s, come into contact with representatives from the noble opposition and in 1803 he furthermore acted as a patron for a member who, due to his practice of mysticism, was distrusted by Gustav IV Adolf. 'Karl XIII', urn:sbl:12358, *svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (article by Olof Jägerskiöld), accessed 7 May 2017.

²⁸⁰ Önnerfors, 2006, pp. 19–22.

coronation in 1809 (with the exception that no deputies from the provinces were present). In the funeral ceremony of 1818 however, they walked at the end of the procession in front of the Swedish and Norwegian cabinets, the Office of the Chancellor of Justice, secretaries of state, the Supreme Court and the colleges of the realm, the consistories and magistrates.²⁸¹ Their significance in the governance of the realm was thus underlined by the fact that they walked in close proximity to other important bodies of state. In relation to the Estates, Hauswolff noted in 1818 a disregard of tradition. Previously, county governors had always walked with the College of Accounts, but now they regarded it as beneath their dignity and rank. It had therefore been a necessity to grant them permission to walk immediately after the banners. According to Hauswolff this was completely out of order and in his opinion they should rightly have walked together with the Estates.²⁸² Representatives of civic society appear to have been making bold claims of precedence in 1818, manifested through their walking in the procession.

GRIEF AND GENDER

In the section concerning the funeral of Louisa Ulrika in 1782, the subject of Princess Sofia Albertina's absence and sensibilities towards dead bodies was briefly discussed. A cautious treatment of the princess is also discernible in the circumstances observed at the death of Queen Dowager Charlotte in 1818.

According to Hauswolff's official journal Queen Dowager Charlotte had spent 19 June dining with the king at Rosendal Palace, feeling quite well besides suffering from cramp in one foot. The gout pain had resolved itself by nightfall but early in the morning the queen dowager woke up and cried out for help. The Chamber Woman Betty Bramel, sleeping in the adjacent room in the Royal Palace, found the queen dowager experiencing immense pain in her feet. She had been suffering from similar attacks the last month or so, and with the assistance of Bramel she tried to walk it off. This endeavour was unsuccessful and instead the pain increased. The court physician arrived shortly before four o'clock in the morning at which time the queen dowager had begun to suffer from cramps in her chest and difficulties breathing. The cures he prescribed had no effect and it did not take long before Queen Dowager Charlotte had stopped breathing. Princess Sofia Albertina was not present at the Royal Palace when the sudden tragedy took place, but arrived in Stockholm from Tullgarn Palace late in the evening. Having the intention of visiting the queen dowager upon her arrival, Hauswolff remarked that the princess was told that the queen dowager had felt unwell during the day and was now asleep. The following day, a service was arranged in the Palace Chapel which the princess could not attend due to the fact

²⁸¹ See RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordnung Wid Högsalig Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIII:s Begräfning I Riddareholms Kyrkan 20 Martii 1818*); RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12 (attached document: *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Gustaf IV. Adolphs Och Drottning Fredrica Dorotea Wilhelminas Kröning Wid Riksdagen i Norrköping År 1800*); RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21 (attached document: *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Carl XIII:s Och Drottning Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Kröning och Konungens Hyllning Wid Riksdagen I Stockholm År 1809*).

²⁸² RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordnung Wid Högsalig Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIII:s Begräfning I Riddareholms Kyrkan 20 Martii 1818*).

that she, according to Hauswolff, would not be informed about the queen dowager's demise until later that day.²⁸³

Gender dimensions can certainly be discerned in this context. Hauswolff's private journal contains an account concerning the events surrounding the death of Gustav III in 1792. When news of the king's dire condition spread a large number of officials, officers, gentlemen and ladies gathered in the king's dining-hall. A select few were permitted to enter the king's chambers and the others anxiously awaited their return. According to Hauswolff, the Chancellor of the Judiciary had to be carried out from the king's apartments as his immense crying and whimpering impeded his ability to walk. When it was announced that the king had died, Duke Charles appeared with the crown prince and the latter was proclaimed king. The duke asked if all present would swear their new king fidelity and obedience whereby everyone affirmatively raised their hands; and Hauswolff noted in the journal that 'the Duke himself was rather touched and in the hall was a whimper of cries and light shrieks, so the Duke said that gentlemen our grief is justified but let us remember that we are men and put a damper on our lamentation'.²⁸⁴ In a synthesising exposé on the history of tears Peter Englund describes how the practice of crying underwent major changes in the nineteenth century. The act of crying and displaying emotions of grief became feminised and displaced to the private sphere. Since Antiquity the tears of women had been ascribed a passive role while violent and bodily display of men's affections were signs of masculinity. In the nineteenth century crying became essentially female and men's display of unfettered emotions outwardly and publicly was deemed inappropriate.²⁸⁵

The treatment of Princess Sofia Albertina and the death of Gustav III indicate the prevalence of old and new normative systems in a period of transition, which caused contradictions. In the eighteenth century it became customary for royal women close to the deceased monarch (such as Sofia Albertina in 1782, Sofia Magdalena in 1792 and Charlotte in 1818) not to attend the funeral and their grief became a somewhat private matter.²⁸⁶ Reminiscent of, yet also distinct from, the development described by Amy B. Oberlin, print somewhat overtook the bodily display of grief and thus the representation of sorrow reached a wider audience.²⁸⁷ In the case of Sweden however, death and funerals retained a public nature and the domination of printed grief only extended to women. The reinforcement of the oppositions between private and public, in which the female subject and physical body was foreclosed from the latter, became prevalent.²⁸⁸ At the same time, dynastic interests and cherishing of the monarch's memory meant that Sofia Albertina participated in the funerals of 1792, 1813 and 1818. Largely, the princess appears to have been considered a passive object who, especially in 1782 and 1818, was subjugated to the active decision-makers surrounding her (presumably acting with intentions of being protective). The emotional distress expressed through the body by the

²⁸³ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, pp. 147–153; 'Berättelse om Högtsalig Hennes Kongl Maj:ts Enke-Drottningens sista sjukdom och död' in *Protocoll, Hållt på Stockholms Slott den 22 Junii 1818 vid Högtsalig Enke-Drottningens Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Liköppning*, 1818 (attached in RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30).

²⁸⁴ LUB, L. von Hauswolff, *Efterlämnade papper*, vol. 5, no. 1, *Dagboksanteckningar*, 29 March 1792, unnumbered pages (original quotation: 'Hertigen sjelf war ganska toucherad och i salen war ett gy af gråt och just tjutande, så att hertigen sade mina herrar vår sorg är billig men låt oss komma ihog att wi äro karlar och sakta vår jämmer').

²⁸⁵ Englund's synthesis mainly builds on works by Hélène Monsacré and Anne Vincent-Buffault. Englund, 1993, pp. 224–225.

²⁸⁶ See Rangström, 2015, p. 134.

²⁸⁷ Oberlin, 2014, pp. 99–100.

²⁸⁸ See Landes, 1988, p. 28.

Chancellor of the Judiciary and the men present at the proclamation of the new king in 1792 conformed to pre-nineteenth-century predominant ideals of masculinity but in 1792 the oncoming ideals of the nineteenth century had slowly begun to materialise. Grief outwardly expressed through the body was becoming feminised and privatised. However, at the same time Hauswolff thought that it was rather touching to see the military corpuses crying in front of the late king's body in 1792.²⁸⁹ The contradictions are most tangible.

THE FUNERAL OF QUEEN DOWAGER CHARLOTTE

Queen Dowager Charlotte's funeral took place on 16 July. Seven days prior to the funeral the body had been shrouded and put in a coffin draped with crimson velvet (which had been observed in 1792 and 1813 but was, according to Hauswolff, an error in regard to 1782) and put on *lit de parade* in *Serafimerordens sal*.²⁹⁰ According to Colonel Brelin, the late queen dowager's Chief Mistress had been much affected by the loss. When the body was medically examined and the heart taken out of the body, Brelin claimed she had cried out 'Oh, that kind heart' and out of affection she had insisted that the body was kept in its warm bed until the hour of the examination. As a result the body had quickly decayed, generating a terrible stench and disfigurement of the face.²⁹¹ At times Brelin's anecdotal recounts appear somewhat exaggerated and Märta Helena Reenstierna, who went to the Royal Palace together with three acquaintances to see the queen dowager lying in state, did not – as she had done in 1813 – mention anything about decay or disfigurement. Reenstierna was, however, more interested in the lavish adornments: the silver fabric, the fringes, the incredibly long train of the dress, the jewels, diamonds and gold embroideries. Although she was impressed, writing it was all 'exquisitely splendid', the arrangements did not surpass those she had witnessed after the death of Charles XIII or at Charles XIV John's coronation.²⁹²

The body was put on display for four days and according to Hauswolff a lot of people appeared. On the day of the funeral, those participating in the ceremony gathered in the various chambers of the palace and formed the procession. In comparison to Charles XIII's funeral, Hauswolff remarked that it had been more clearly expressed what the commanders of the royal orders should wear since 'one cannot regard as customary that, which only once, or at the funeral of King Charles XIII for the first time the Commanders had worn'.²⁹³ Apparently, this time the principle of tradition took precedence over the principle of error.

Overall, the procession in 1818 was fashioned in a similar manner to that of 1813, but deviations existed. As had been the case in the funeral ceremony of Charles XIII, the union between Sweden and Norway was manifested but in fewer ways since the queen dowager's procession

²⁸⁹ RA, CÖR, vol. I., no. 5, pp 141–142 and the attached document *Ordning Wid Högsstalige Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Gustaf III:s Bisättning I Riddareholms Kyrkan Den 13 April 1792*.

²⁹⁰ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, p. 164.

²⁹¹ Svenska memoarer och bref, vol. 1–2, 1900, p. 62 (original quotation: 'Ack, det goda hjärtat').

²⁹² Reenstierna, vol. II, 1993, p. 197.

²⁹³ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Högstsalig Hennes Kongl. Maj:t Enke-Drottningens Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Begräfnings den 16 Juli 1818*) (original quotation: 'emedan man ej kan anse för wanlig det som endast en gång, eller wid Konung Carl XIII:s begräfning för första gång af Commendeurer burit').

was smaller than the king's. A place was given to the Swedish and Norwegian chancelleries in between the First Court Marshal and the royal households (whereas the ceremonial of 1813 only mentioned 'the Chancellery'). The Norwegian cabinet ministers present in Stockholm were also given a place.²⁹⁴ In Charles XIII's funeral ceremony the 'unification' of the realms was furthermore expressed through the presence of the Norwegian regalia, a Norwegian king's crown. However, the printed ceremonial of Queen Dowager Charlotte's funeral stated: 'as no Royal Norwegian queen's crown is to be had, the Royal Norwegian crown that otherwise should be carried by the Cabinet Minister Sommerhjelm, will not be carried in the procession.'²⁹⁵ The Norwegian regalia had been specifically made for Charles XIV John's Norwegian coronation in 1818 but Charles John's consort Desirée Clary had decided to stay in France and did not arrive in Sweden until 1822.²⁹⁶ Consequently, no regalia was ordered to be made for a queen and apparently a king's crown could not be used in Queen Dowager Charlotte's funeral ceremony. This is perhaps surprising since the customary regalia used in royal coronations from 1751 until Charles John decided to restore the crown of Eric XIV in time for his Swedish coronation had been the queen's crown of Maria Eleonora.²⁹⁷

Although the constitutional reform of 1809 had been pertinent in 1813 it became more palpable in 1818. Several places at the end of the procession were in the printed ceremonial explicitly given to representatives of the state machinery and bureaucracy, for example two heralds of the nobility, the Grand Marshal accompanied by the nobility and followed by the rest of the Estates and their speakers, the Supreme Court and the Council for the General Affairs of the Realm.²⁹⁸ In addition, the queen dowager's involvement in civic society was expressed in the procession. The procession was led by the 'Orphanage boys' who, for the duration of the parade, sang a hymn. Behind them walked the Institute for the Blind and the Deaf Mute, an establishment of which Queen Charlotte had been a patron since 1809. Through their physical presence several myths were manifested: the monarchy's foundation in civic society, the caring or protective characteristics of monarchy (resonating a parental rhetoric) and female virtues regarding voluntary dedication to charity work, which was an acceptable and accessible sphere for women somewhere in between the private and the public.²⁹⁹ The self-representation of a monarchy with philanthropic overtones and overt care for the less fortunate was a shared characteristic with King George III's and Emperor Francis II's culture of representation.³⁰⁰

²⁹⁴ See RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, attached document: *Ordning Wid Högstsalig Hennes Kongl. Maj:t Enke-Drottningens Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Begräfning den 16 Julii 1818*, paragraph 9:5 and 9:38; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 25, attached document: *Ordning Wid Högstsal. Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke-Drottningens Sophia Magdalenas Begräfning den 30 September 1813*, paragraph 5:5.

²⁹⁵ Rangström, 2015, p. 171; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, attached document: *Ordning Wid Högstsalig Hennes Kongl. Maj:t Enke-Drottningens Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Begräfning den 16 Julii 1818* (original quotation: 'Som ingen Kongl Norsk Drottning-krona är att tillgå, så kommer den Kongl Norska kronan hvilken I annat fall bordt föras af Statsrådet Sommerhjelm, att icke bäras i Processionen').

²⁹⁶ See Ulvros, 2012, unnumbered pages (e-publication, see the chapters 'Hur det började' and 'Den unge kronprinsen').

²⁹⁷ 'Erik XIV:s krona', *Nationalencyklopedin* (online edition, accessed 11 April 2017).

²⁹⁸ *Rikets allmänna ärendes beredning* had been established by Gustav III in 1789 but with the name *Rikets ärendes allmänna beredning*. It replaced the dissolved Council of the Realm and its propositions required the King's signature to be valid as governmental declarations. In 1809 its social composition was reformed with an equal division between noblemen and commoners. The name was changed and so was its status. It was now proclaimed an independant authority and decisions no longer needed to pass through the King but through the Cabinet.

'Rikets allmänna ärendes beredning', *Nordisk familjebok*, vol. XIII, 1889, pp. 1124-1125 (digitalised version, <http://runeberg.org/nfam/0568.html>, accessed 6 March 2017); RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, attached document: *Ordning Wid Högstsalig Hennes Kongl. Maj:t Enke-Drottningens Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Begräfning den 16 Julii 1818*.

²⁹⁹ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, attached document: *Ordning Wid Högstsalig Hennes Kongl. Maj:t Enke-Drottningens Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Begräfning den 16 Julii 1818*; Rangström, 2015, p. 173; See also Sandin, 2011, pp. 151-167; Ulvros, 1996, pp. 277-287.

³⁰⁰ Schaich, 2015, p. 14; Fichtner, 2014, p. 171.

Hauswolff made an interesting remark in the printed ceremonial regarding the customary practice (observed at all funerals and coronations) of distributing medals. The ceremonial prescribed that the Treasurer, on horseback and accompanied by a detachment of the cavalry, would throw the funeral medals to the public while the procession entered the church, and Hauswolff commented: ‘The funeral medal is the lousiest workmanship one can see of the sort, for no resemblance, very poor engraving and nothing signifying a royal person, though the widow’s veil but the tiara forgotten. It does no credit.’³⁰¹ Not only the actual, physiological bodies of monarchs needed to manifest and mediate their royal status but also in representations of bodies were characteristics of royalty imperative to demonstrate. As argued by Robert Bucholz in regard to representations of the Hanoverians’ actual bodies, they carried meanings of the ascribed inner qualities of the monarchs.³⁰²

THE CORONATION CEREMONIES OF CHARLES XIV JOHN IN 1818

A BODY TECHNIQUE OF WALKING?

The coronation of Charles XIV John in May 1818 signified the inauguration of a new dynasty on the Swedish throne. The making of the Bernadotte dynasty has been analysed from multiple perspectives in the anthology *Scripts of Kingship*.³⁰³ Mikael Alm analyses in his contribution the staging of state in a selection of ceremonies and inevitably touches upon the subject of the body. In regard to Charles XIV John’s coronation procession, Alm notes that as the king ‘solemnly strode along the designated route and entered the church, he was accompanied by all the main corpuses of state. It was, quite literally, a display of the state “on foot”’.³⁰⁴

The literature and the sources are somewhat ambiguous as to whether the king was actually ‘on foot’ in the procession. With strong conviction Alm explicitly states that the king did not ride to and from the church, but walked on foot.³⁰⁵ Indeed, much of the evidence suggest this was the case. In the ceremonial detailing the coronation of Gustav IV Adolf in 1800, the eighteenth paragraph meticulously described when the king was supposed to mount his horse and how the courtiers should place themselves around it. Likewise, the thirty-second paragraph of the ceremonial from Gustav III’s coronation in 1772 plainly spells out that the king sat up on his horse. No such paragraph exists in the ceremonial from 1818 (or in 1809 for that matter).³⁰⁶ Nevertheless, a coronation horse was used in 1818.³⁰⁷ However, it is implied that this horse was

³⁰¹ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, attached document: *Ordning Wid Högsalig Hennes Kongl. Maj:t Enke-Drottningens Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Begräfning den 16 Juli 1818* (original quotation: ‘Kastpenningen är det uslaste arbete man kan få se i den wagen, ty ingen likhet, eländigt graverad och intet som betecknar Kongl. Person, väl Enkeslöjan, men Diademe glömd. Den hedrar intet’).

³⁰² Bucholz, 2015, pp. 147–169.

³⁰³ The anthology is a product of an interdisciplinary project focusing on the establishment of the Bernadotte dynasty in Sweden. The various contributors highlight aspects to the nineteenth-century monarchy from the scholarly traditions of history, art history, literary studies, musicology and history of ideas.

³⁰⁴ Alm, 2008, p. 33.

³⁰⁵ Alm, 2010, p. 58.

³⁰⁶ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 12 (attached document: *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Gustaf IV. Adolphs Och Drottning Fredrica Dorotea Wilhelminas Kröning Wid Riksdagen i Norrköping År 1800*); *Ceremonial Wid Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Höga Kröning*, 1772; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21 (attached document: *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Carl XIII:s Och Drottning Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Kröning och Konungens Hyllning Wid Riksdagen I Stockholm År 1809*); Rangström, 2006, p. 49.

³⁰⁷ Ulrica Wachtmeister-Klingenstierna wrote in a memorandum (in an entry with a date corresponding to the day after the coronation) ‘in the morning we visited to Royal Stable to see the coronation horse. It was very beautiful, entirely white except for the nose which was pink [...] it is said he is washed everyday with soap.’³⁰⁷ Steyern, 1960, p. 78. (original quotation: ‘Idag på morgonen ha vi varit i kungliga stallen för att

not used in the procession (which Alm also emphasises). Hauswolff remarked that the horseshoes of silver were, in accordance with tradition, tossed by the Court Stable Master to the general public, but unlike what was observed at the coronation in 1800 the tossing of the shoes did not occur as customary during the procession. Instead, in 1818 the horse shoes were tossed when the king and crown prince proceeded on horseback to Kungsträdgården where several military corpses solemnly lined up after the coronation procedure had ended. Charles XIV John's Orderly Officer and later *aide-de-camp*, Berndt von Schinkel, wrote in his chronicles: 'after the coronation the King mounted one of his former warhorses (as the coronation horse had not been trained to his liking and was therefore rejected)'.³⁰⁸ What makes the picture equivocal is a memorandum written by Ulrica Wachtmeister-Klingenstierna. In passing she mentioned that he king 'wore the crown of a crown prince when he rode to the church' but at the same time, watching the procession from a window, she wrote 'the king was almost entirely concealed by those carrying the canopy'.³⁰⁹

Clearly the sources are conflicting. The credibility of Wachtmeister's testimony is somewhat problematic to assess without access to the primary source material which is preserved in a private collection. The advised journal is made up of excerpts edited and translated from French to Swedish by Maud von Steyern, thus making the original wording uncertain. Without the opportunity to examine the original text one cannot eliminate the possibility that Wachtmeister expressed herself in a more ambiguous manner. In its capacity of being a secondary source, the printed edition can be deemed less reliable than the advised primary sources. Furthermore, when examining the translated statement itself an inherent contradiction emerges: the king was barely visible, yet Wachtmeister claims she was able to discern which crown he wore when he allegedly rode in the procession. Nevertheless, generally her recollections otherwise concur with the ceremonial (for example the depiction of the procession order). Märta Helena Reenstierna, who wrote in her diary that she was walking behind the procession as a spectator, somewhat supports the notion that the king was walking on foot although her account is not conclusive. She claimed that the king came 'riding in his dress of silver fabric on a white horse, which was adorned with four aigrette feathers and gold embellishments and purple velvet' when he, in accordance with Hauswolff's account, inspected the military corpses.³¹⁰ She did not give a description of the coronation procession but since she wrote about the horse in indefinite terms – and did not compare it to a horse which in that case would have been used in the procession – her testimony suggests the king rode on a white horse only after the coronation procession was completed. Nevertheless, one cannot dismiss the possibility that Reenstierna was unable to see the king, covered beneath the canopy, when she allegedly walked behind the procession.

se Kröningshästen. Den var bra vacker, helt och hållit vit utom nosen, som var skär [...] det påstås, att man tvättar honom alla dagar med tvål').

³⁰⁸ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, pp. 101–102; Concerning the practice of the coronation horse's shoes, see Alm & Vahlne, 2010, p. 327; 'Bengt (Berndt) Schinkel, von', urn:sbl:6381, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (article by Gustaf Jonasson), accessed 11 April 2017; von Schinkel, vol. X, 1868, p. 12 (original quotation: 'Efter kröningen satte konungens sig på en af sina fordna stridshästar (ty kröningshästen hade ej blifvit inritten efter hans tycke och blef derföre förkastad)').

³⁰⁹ Steyern, 1960, p. 77 (original quotation 'Kungen skymdes nästan aldeles av dem som buro tronhimmelen. Han bar kronprinskronan, när han red till kyrkan').

³¹⁰ Reenstierna, vol. II, 1993, p. 171 (original quotation: 'ridandes uti sin Silfertygs Klädnad på en hvit Häst, som var prydd med 4 reijer fjedrar, mycket guldprydnader och purpursammet').

It would not be improbable that Charles XIV John deviated from the ceremonial display such as it was staged by Gustav III and Gustav IV Adolph. This became clear at the ceremonial closing of the *Riksdag* on 21 July 1818, a couple of days after the coronation. Neither Charles XIV John nor Crown Prince Oscar wore the royal crown or mantle in the procession to the church but were dressed in uniform, which Hauswolff remarked he had never seen a king wear before on such a solemn occasion.³¹¹ In conclusion, one cannot without further investigation of the sources dismiss the possibility that the king rode on the coronation horse to the church, found it improperly trained and chose a different horse once he set out to Kungsträdgården. However, the circumstances surrounding the late tossing of the horse shoes and the printed ceremonials which ought to have given specific instructions if a horse was used, viewed together with the contradiction in Wachtmeister's account, imply Alm's assertion is convincing.

Riding on horseback as Gustav IV Adolf and his father had done was furthermore not a tradition without exceptions. The sources indicate quite clearly that Charles XIII walked in his procession and, if one goes further back in history, in 1561 when Erik XIV was inaugurated – the ceremony which would constitute the basic model for coronations until Oscar II's coronation in 1873 – the king walked on foot beneath a canopy.³¹² If Charles XIV John did adopt the technique of walking, which the sources indicate, an additional parallel can be found between the two inaugurations. With the coronation at hand Charles XIV John had the crown of Erik XIV restored and used it as regalia instead of the crown of Maria Eleonora which, despite being a queen's crown, had been the customary regalia since 1751. Charles XIV John's successors followed the practice of being crowned with the slightly adjusted crown of Erik XIV.³¹³ It would however not be until the coronation of Oscar II in 1873 that a king walked in his procession. Due to rainy weather Oscar I rode in a coach and Charles XV rode on horseback dressed in a general's uniform.³¹⁴

The question, following this harangue, is whether it was significant if the king walked or not. Walking on foot, rather than riding on horseback, could have functioned as a strategy to avoid mistakes risking to embarrass the monarchy and diminish royal magnificence, as had been the case in 1800. If so, the Maussian principle of error might have been influential as a form of education. It could also signify an aim to achieve uniformity or have been a practical solution, as was partly the case in 1809. However, in 1809 the decision to walk also bore great political significance. In any respect, understanding ceremony and its techniques of the body as imbued

³¹¹ Hauswolff had seen Gustav III appear at a *plenum plenorum* wearing the Swedish national dress without mantle but with a crown. Gustav IV Adolph had appeared in the uniform of the Gentlemen-at-arms but with mantle and crown. Not wearing the royal robes or the crown, but appearing only in the uniform of a major-general as Crown Prince Oscar did or in the usual blue, embroidered coat as Charles XIV John did was therefore highly irregular. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordnning Wid Riksdagens slut i Stockholm År 1818*).

³¹² In the case of Queen Christina's coronation in 1650, it was discussed whether the procession's participants, including the Queen, should walk on foot, ride on horseback or in coaches. The Queen eventually decided to ride in a lavish coach out of fear the heavy crown and kirtle would make the ride challenging. Grundberg, 2005, p. 82 and 174–176.

³¹³ 'Erik XIV:s krona', *Nationalencyklopedin* (online edition, accessed 11 April 2017).

Queen Christina also chose to wear the crown of Eric XIV rather than the crown of Maria Eleonora at her coronation. Grundberg, 2005, p. 176.

³¹⁴ Martling, 2006, p. 55; Lindorm, 1942, p. 234; *Illustrerade minnesblad från krönings-högtidigheterna 1860. Minnen från Carl XV:s och Drottning Lovisas kröning i Stockholm*, 1860, p. 6.

From a gender perspective it is somewhat interesting a queen's crown was used at the inauguration of kings after 1751. Although Queen Christina had worn the king's crown of Eric XIV the printed ceremonial detailing the Queen Dowager's funeral in 1818 stated no Norwegian crown would be carried in the procession as no queen crown existed (attached document: *Ordnning Wid Högsalig Hennes Kongl. Maj:t Enke-Drottningens Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Begräfning den 16 Julii 1818*).

with political, social and cultural significance means that a practical solution could, deliberately or unintentionally, be of symbolic importance. In this particular case the body technique of walking would constitute the significant means of expression. My Hellsing has drawn parallels between the late eighteenth-century Swedish court practice of walking with that at French absolutist courts. When Duchess Charlotte in the 1790s made her promenades in Stockholm, walking on foot meant that she was approachable in the city's public spaces. Likewise, the French absolutist monarchs on promenades signified approachability.³¹⁵ Emperor Joseph II made strolling through his retreat in Vienna an opportunity to intermingle with the general public.³¹⁶ Walking on foot may therefore have had the potential to mediate an image of approachable monarchy, participation rather than distance, expressing the quality of monarchy being deeply rooted in, or at least connected to, civic society. As demonstrated by Per Sandin, the Bernadotte monarchy would do much to make its appeal more popular, bourgeois and complaisant of civic society.³¹⁷

However, Schinkel's testimony indicates that no intended message or deliberate meaning is to be discerned behind the king's (presumable) body technique of walking. The principle of error might have been the decisive cause and most convincing argument. Yet, Schinkel interestingly recounted an utterance from the king in which he stated:

The coronation of a king neither increases his obligations or his precedence, but as it puts a more sacred stamp on the bond, that unites him with the people, it gives the opportunity for a free nation to solemnly honour him, who she has attired with a lawful power to maintain and protect the rights of every citizen.³¹⁸

Clearly, Charles XIV John and his sympathisers generally wanted to mediate an image of a citizen king. Allegedly, at one point Charles XIV John even expressed his wish to embody '*le spectacle d'un Roi vraiment citoyen*'.³¹⁹ As opposed to Gustav IV Adolf, Charles XIV John adopted a communicative strategy in his endeavour to gain discursive authority. Rather than silencing the decisive discursive concepts of the time (such as *citizen* and *liberty*) he appealed to them and strove to embody them.³²⁰

CONTINUITY AND DISCONTINUITY

The king's approach to the coronation ceremony might be seen as corresponding to the regulation of monarchical power set in the constitutional reforms of 1809. These were influenced, as was Charles XIV John, by the French revolution and its ideas of equality and sovereignty of citizens. However, scholarship on Charles XIV John has also stressed the king's difficulties in reconciling with the idea of restricted monarchical authority. His so called

³¹⁵ Hellsing, 2015, p. 50.

³¹⁶ Fichtner, 2014, p. 143.

³¹⁷ Such as in the shaping of the kings' and queens' courts and palaces, their engagement in the city's various associations and design of the crown princes' education. Sandin, 2011.

³¹⁸ von Schinkel, vol. X, 1868, p. 9 (original quotation: 'En konungs lröning ökar hvarken dess förbindelser eller dess företrädesrätt; men då den trycker en heligare stämpel på de band, som honom med folket förena, lemnar den tillfälle åt en fri nation att högtidligen hylla den, som hon beklädt med en laglig makt att upprätthålla och skydda hvarje medborgares rättigheter').

³¹⁹ Ekedahl, 2010, p. 11 (translation of the quotation: 'the sight of a true citizen king').

³²⁰ For a discussion of the repressive strategy in Gustav IV Adolf's language and discourse, see Alm, 2002, pp. 294–296, 327–328 and 394.

sängkammarregemente (bedchamber regiment) has been emphasised and during the last fifteen years of his reign power became more closely tied to the king's personal rule.³²¹ In recent decades the predominate understanding of Charles XIV John and his reign among historians has been the comprehension of a king who in the autumn of his life betrayed the republican ideals of his initial years.³²²

While not riding on horseback in 1809 or 1818 may indicate a discontinuity, perhaps mediating a demarcation from Gustavian despotism, one should not be too quick to conclude that the monarchical body expressed a radically new approach towards civic society. The image of a connection between court society and civic society was cultivated by Gustav III as well.³²³ In 1771 Johan Benedict Busser, the royalist author of the aforementioned chapbook containing a fictive conversation between a priest and a peasant, also had another chapbook in circulation entitled *Conversation between a burgher from Eksjö and a peasant from Säby concerning contemporary times*. In this imagined encounter the image of an approachable monarch was forged by the claim of the peasant:

[I] have gladly heard it being mentioned, how the King has everyone's best interest at heart and wants to see that law and justice is done, wherefore he gives to all his subjects equal admission, to humbly present his business, which my neighbour Per Larsson mentioned, who himself recently had the fortune, to speak with the King, and our vicar, who heard this, said that this seldom had occurred since Gustav I's and Gustavus Adolphus's time, that peasants so freely were permitted to speak with the King and so mercifully be heard.³²⁴

The pamphlet and its conversation reflected ongoing circumstances concerning the regulation of the king's public audiences. In the beginning of June 1771 the periodical *Posttidningar* published an announcement informing the general public that the king intended to give the subjects access and the opportunity to be heard on a regular basis, three days every week.³²⁵

So, throughout the long nineteenth century the monarchy strove to mediate and build a myth around its foundation in civic society. Nevertheless, the separation of powers and the shift of monarchical prerogatives established in the reform of 1809 became most tangible in the coronation of Charles XIV John. In the new constitution the legislative functions had been divided in a dualistic conception between the monarch and the *Riksdag*. The monarch was

³²¹ Hedenborg & Kvarnström, 2015, p. 166; Weibull, 1971, pp. 36–37.

³²² Ekedahl, 2010, p. 10.

As a parenthesis, a similarity can perhaps be discerned between Charles XIV John and Louis XV, although the latter's reign ended forty-four years before the former's began. Thomas E. Kaiser has demonstrated the grave consequences arising when Louis XV assumed the title of *bien-aimé* and began presenting himself as a 'citizen king'. This rhetoric undermined the absolute rule of monarchy by introducing sovereignty as something reminiscent of popular rule, which clashed with the social and political reality and made the monarchical institution vulnerable to criticism. Charles XIV John was also severely criticised by the end of his regime, and the lacking correspondence between his propagation of himself and his policies caused a troublesome dissonance. His almost autocratic way of decision-making was attacked by the liberal opposition demanding reforms of the representative assembly. Kaiser, 1998, pp. 157–158; Ekedahl, 2010, pp. 30–34.

³²³ See Alm, 2002.

³²⁴ LUB, *Samtal, Emellan en Eksjö Borgare Och En Bonde ifrån Säby, Om Närvarande Tider*, 1771, unnumbered pages (original quotation: "[jag] har med glädje hört omtala, huru kungen wil alla wäl, och at Lagen skal owäldugt skipas; hwarföre han lämnar alla sina undersåtare lika tillträde, at i underdåighet andraga sitt ålliggande, hwilket min Granne Per Larsson omtalte, som sielf nyligen haft den lyckan, at tala med Kungen, och vår Kyrkherre, som hörde detta, sade sådant sällan hafwa händt sedan Gustaf den Förstes och Gustaf Adolfs tid, att Bönder så fritt fått tala med Kungen och så nädigt blifwa hörde"). This practice of accessibility would be called into question since the Council and Queen Dowager feared for the King's safety. Their views are presented by the burgher in the fictive conversation who expresses a concern that this favour may be abused by instigators.

³²⁵ Sandin, 2011, p. 112.

placed as the main executive body and the independence of judiciary corpuses was further stressed, for example through the establishment of the Parliamentary Ombudsman.³²⁶ This regulation left its mark in the dynastic ceremonial. Hauswolff was rather perplexed when he, in the printed ceremonial regarding the Swedish coronation procession, commented:

How the Parliamentary Ombudsman received a place here, I do not know. He is not one of the King's officials, and has no position in the Cabinet and the Baron Lars August Mannerheim should have been walking with the Estate to which he rightly belongs, or among the Commanders decorated with the grand cross of the Order of Wasa, which he is part of.³²⁷

Contrary to what was deemed customary and appropriate by the Grand Master of Ceremonies, the Parliamentary Ombudsman, so important in ensuring the new constitutional order, was given precedence and walked with ministers of the cabinet and officials of state rather than with the knights of the Royal Order of Vasa. Furthermore, when the celebration ceremony was arranged a couple of days after the coronation, the ceremonial was changed so that the Estates were included in the royal procession.³²⁸ In the previous celebration ceremonies the Estates did not participate in the procession. Their inclusion signified a remarkable disruption of tradition, mediating not only Charles XIV John's status as an elected king but also the distribution of power.³²⁹

The idea of a necessity for monarchy to mediate its foundation in civic society and an image of bolstering popular support had been prevalent in the image-making of kingship for a long time but constitutional monarchies of the nineteenth century faced challenges in finding a proper balance. Popular appeal became even more important with the rise of new bourgeois society but royal glorification needed to be maintained in order not to completely undermine the monarchical institution. The issue emerged as pressing to most monarchical regimes in Europe and ceremony has been pointed out as a key component in this endeavour. Ceremonies became important means for legitimisation. They allowed the monarchy to signal and publicly embody what the institution stood for and what role it was supposed to play in a society where power was distributed between several bodies of state.³³⁰

So, while the body of the monarch from 1818 and onwards appear to have signalled the adoption of a court with new characteristics and attitudes, one cannot overlook the persisting elements of mediating superiority and grandeur. Mikael Alm has pointed out the need to acknowledge not only the bourgeois characteristics but also the ceremonial constituents in the reign of Charles XIV John.³³¹ Parallels can be drawn with the circumstances surrounding monarchy

³²⁶ Karlblom 1964, p. 213; 'Regeringsformen', Riksarkivet, <https://riksarkivet.se/regeringsformen> (last updated 14 March 2017, accessed 9 April 2017).

³²⁷ Lars August Mannerheim was the first Parliamentary Ombudsman, holding the title from 1810 until 1823. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIV Johans Kröning och hyllning wid Riksdagen i Stockholm år 1818*) (original quotation: 'Huru Riksens Ständers Ombudsman kunde här få plats, kjänner jag intet. Han är ej Konungens ämbetsman, och har ej i statsrådet något att befatta sig med och hade Friherre Lars August Mannerheim bordt gå med Ståndet dit han rättelig hörde, eller bland Commendeurer med stora korset af Wasa orden, som han är'); 'Lars August Mannerheim', urn:sbl:9042, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (article by Erik Fahlbeck), accessed 9 April 2017.

³²⁸ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIV Johans Kröning och hyllning wid Riksdagen i Stockholm år 1818*).

³²⁹ See Alm, 2010, pp. 61–62.

³³⁰ Craig, 2003, pp. 167–185; Kuhn, 1987, pp. 133–162; Cannadine, 1992a.

³³¹ Alm, 2008, p. 24.

throughout the nineteenth century in a greater European context. Thomas Kohut has argued, regarding Wilhelm II at the end of the nineteenth century, that ‘in private and in public the Kaiser sought the “reconciliation” of the “traditional” and the “modern”’ as necessary means of sustaining the institution’s continuous existence.³³² This reconciliation was crucial at the beginning of the century as well, and the question thus becomes how the traditional, or the myth of magnificence and superiority, was maintained in the dynastic ceremonial of Charles XIV John. The degree of effectiveness concerning the myth-making of bourgeois characteristics must also be taken into account. Märta Helena Reenstierna, who wrote about her experiences from the day of the coronation, stated: ‘My eyes were dazzled by the coronation’s many precious curios, the brilliant sight of the military and the sunshine throughout the entire day, and everything I witnessed would be too comprehensive to put in writing – it is enough to say I have never on a single day seen so much splendour.’³³³ Evidently, the most striking myth which was mediated and perceived by Reenstierna was that of royal magnificence.

Mikael Alm has demonstrated the Gustavian characteristics persisting in Charles XIV John’s coronation, for example the costumes. Furthermore, the officiating personages sitting and standing round the king were as devoted to the ‘making’ of Charles XIV John as they had been to the ‘making’ of Gustav IV Adolf in 1800.³³⁴ The anointment was also an enduring component. In the Swedish coronation the anointing was performed by Archbishop Jacob Lindblom. His frail condition is often brought up as a matter of curiosity, but in the public theatre of monarchy Hauswolff’s comments concerning the archbishop’s condition suggest an interesting tension in regard to the body. In the capacity of speaker of the First Estate, the archbishop was supposed to have led the clergy in the procession and then, with the anointing horn in hands, received the king upon his entry to the church. However, since Lindblom was too weak to walk in the procession, or even hold the anointing horn when the king arrived at the church doors, the archbishop was carried in a *porte-chaise* from his house into the church where two court clerics received him and led him to an armchair. Hauswolff remarked he was so overcome with lassitude that he ‘looked as if he was dying and had to be invigorated with aroma. It was a pitiful sight’. Throughout the service the archbishop was in constant need of assistance from the court clerics and when anointing the king his hands were shaking so that he could not spread out the red ointment in the shape of a cross. Hauswolff noted that the archbishop was weaker than most he had seen of older age but added: ‘In any case, the Archbishop’s frailty increased the poignancy of the entire ceremony.’³³⁵ In Hauswolff’s opinion, Lindblom’s weak condition was on the one hand rather pathetic but on the other hand it also contributed in making the ceremony quite touching.

³³² Referenced in Smith, 2000, p. 258.

Similarly, in the 1860s, Walter Bagehot wrote about the British monarchy that ‘Its mystery is its life. We must not let in daylight upon magic’ while at the same time having quite a clear comprehension as to the dissolution of the monarchy’s sovereignty and prerogatives. Kuhn, 1993, p. 645 (quote); Craig, 2003, pp. 168–169.

³³³ Reenstierna, vol II, 1993, pp. 171–172 (original quotation: ‘Mina ögon förblindades af Kröningens myckna prétiosa och den lysande Militairens åskådande och Solskenet hela dagen, och allt hvad jag såg vor för vidlyftigt att anteckna – nog af, jag har aldrig på en dag sett mera prakt’).

³³⁴ Alm, 2008, pp. 32–36.

³³⁵ Hauswolff’s original wording of the latter translation was somewhat ambiguous and the quotation would perhaps be better understood as ‘the Archbishop’s frailty made the ceremony more touching’. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordnning Wid Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIV Johans Kröning och hyllning wid Riksdagen i Stockholm år 1818*) (original quotations: ‘han war af mattighet så betagen att han såg döende ut och man nödgades med luktwatten wedeqwecka honom. Det war en ömklig syn’ and ‘I alla fall ökade Årchebiskopens skröplighet det rörande af hela Ceremonien’).

In the capacity of speaker of the First Estate, Lindblom had signed the constitutional reform of 1809. He had officiated in the coronation of Charles XIII and Queen Charlotte and furthermore been present when Charles John was received upon his arrival in Sweden as crown prince in 1810. In addition, Lindblom was favourably inclined to reform in matters of the church.³³⁶ Having Lindblom officiating in the ceremony despite his frail condition thus imply the important notions carried by his physical presence: the archbishop embodied the myths of dynasty, stability, tradition, reform and modernity. Furthermore, as had been the case in the coronation of 1809 in regard to Charles XIII's impairment when he walked in the procession, a weak body could (although it was a great risk since the Archbishop also could be the subject of ridicule) enhance the charged atmosphere.

In addition to the anointment, the practice or technique of kissing the king's hand persisted in the Swedish coronation ceremony. Significantly however, it was omitted in the ceremonial detailing Charles XIV John's Norwegian coronation in Trondheim. In the 1820s, Count Anders Fredrik Skjöldebrand recounted in his memories a *lever* of Gustav III and wrote that those of a certain high rank 'received the not to all pleasing favour, that our present king never wanted to grant his subjects (let alone at one or another grand occasion, such as the celebration ceremony, required by the etiquette) [...] namely that of kissing a gentleman's hand'.³³⁷ To Charles XIV John the gesture of kissing a monarch's hand was closely associated with the *Ancien Régime* and he regarded it as demeaning to free people. Its use was limited to the most solemn ceremonial occasions and otherwise he adopted the more egalitarian favour of a handshake or an embrace.³³⁸ In the Swedish coronation of 1818 an ambiguity can therefore be discerned in relation to the kissing of the king's hand. Hauswolff remarked in the printed ceremonial that 'at the coronation in 1809 it was only excellencies who kissed the hand of the King but in those days the cabinet ministers did not take the oath together with them'.³³⁹ On the one hand, including the cabinet ministers in the technique of kissing the king's hand could be seen as signalling their subjection to the monarch's superiority. On the other hand, with the knowledge of Charles XIV John's dislike of the practice, including them in the oath-taking and hand-kissing procedure along with the excellencies can also be read as a mediation of their ascribed significance. The ambiguity vanished when Charles XIV John was inaugurated in Trondheim and the printed ceremonial did not prescribe the kissing of the king's hand. The oath-taking was accomplished merely through the holding up of three fingers.³⁴⁰ The reason why the hand-kissing procedure was retained in the Swedish coronation ceremony but omitted from the Norwegian can probably be explained by requirements of tradition and etiquette (as expressed in Skjöldebrand's testimony). A proper coronation had not been performed in Norway since

³³⁶ 'Jacob Lindblom', urn:nbn:se:ri:10473, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (article by Henrik Gladh), accessed 16 April 2017; RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 21, unnumbered pages (attached document *Ceremonial Wid Deras Majestäters Konung Carl XIII:s Och Drottning Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Kröning Och Konungens Hyllning Wid Riksdagen i Stockholm År 1809*); von Malmborg, 2010, p. 13.

³³⁷ Skjöldebrand, vol. I, 1903, pp. 56–57 (original quotation: 'fingo den icke för alla behagliga näden, som vår nuvarande konung aldrig velat bevilja sina undersåtar (om ej vid ett eller annat stort tillfälle, såsom vid hyllningen, tvungen af etiketten) [...] nämligen att kyssa en karls hand').

³³⁸ Sandin, 2011, pp. 89–90.

³³⁹ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIV Johans Kröning och hyllning wid Riksdagen i Stockholm år 1818*) (original quotation: 'Wid 1809 års Kröning woro endast deras Excellencer som kysste Konungens hand men då gjorde ej Stats Rådet med dem ed').

³⁴⁰ *Ceremoniel ved Hans Kongelige Majestæt Kong Carl XIV. Johans Kroning i Trondhjem Aar 1818* attached in RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30.

1514.³⁴¹ The restrictions generated by tradition were presumably much weaker in Norway and allowed for a certain degree of freedom when the Norwegian ceremonial was composed. It might also be added as an argument supporting the critique against Elias's claim of the main function of royal and court ceremony: it was not merely an instrument in the monarch's domestication of elites, creating a gilded cage for the aristocracy, but also dependant on expectation and tradition which could burden, rather than empower, the sovereign.³⁴²

Except for the removal of the hand-kissing, the Norwegian ceremonial was largely fashioned in accordance with Swedish procedures although the ceremony was performed on a less grand scale. Despite the king being crowned in both Sweden and Norway, the respective ceremonies signalled how the realms were unified by the monarchy. In the Swedish coronation procession places were given to Norwegian deputies and cabinet ministers and the Minister for Norwegian Affairs, Peder Anker, walked beside the king. In the Norwegian coronation procession places were equally given to deputies from the Swedish Estates and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Lars von Engeström, walked next to the king (while Peder Anker carried the royal crown). Interestingly however, the printed ceremonials only mention one banner being carried in the respective coronation ceremonies as opposed to what was observed at Charles XIII's funeral when a Norwegian and a Swedish banner was carried.³⁴³ By not using the two banners simultaneously it is possible Charles XIV John intended to mediate the image of the realms united in a personal union tied directly to his own person, thereby expressing the degree of independence that the Norwegian realm possessed.

As indicated by the king's presumable coronation walk or attitude towards hand-kissing, the court of Charles XIV John would be characterised by greater informality which extended to the body. In the Grand Master of Ceremonies' journals this becomes particularly evident in regard to dress at ceremonial occasions. With distaste Hauswolff remarked on the many breaches of etiquette regarding dress. In the coronation ceremony for example, the commanders of the Order of the Sword had been permitted not to wear the order's dress but to appear in uniforms.³⁴⁴ The development in early nineteenth-century Sweden thus corresponded to the general European development described by Philip Mansel. Changes in court costume mirrored greater societal changes. Various circumstances to the wearing of *habit habillé*, uniform and frac reflected the increasing militarisation of the state, the appeal of monarchical and state service which symbolised the end of independent aristocrats, the blurring of distinctions within the elite and the wearers' identification with, or distancing from, the monarchy. Above all, however, changes in dress signalled changes in etiquette, indicating a transition towards more humble court display.³⁴⁵

³⁴¹ T:son Höjer, 1960, pp. 18–19.

³⁴² See for example Duindam, 2002, p. 84 suggesting that conflict over precedence in regard to which courtier rightfully should hand Louis XIV his coat makes a poor example of a calculating monarch who is ever-successful in manipulating subjects through etiquette.

³⁴³ See RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIV Johans Kröning och hyllning wid Riksdagen i Stockholm år 1818*); RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Högsalig Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIII:s Begräfning I Riddareholms Kyrkan 20 Martii 1818*).

³⁴⁴ Even the King himself deviated from custom when he at ceremonial occasions appeared in his usual blue coat, signalling the breach of etiquette was acceptable in regard to the use of the orders' dress. RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, p. 119 and attached document *Ordning Wid Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIV Johans Kröning och hyllning wid Riksdagen i Stockholm år 1818*.

³⁴⁵ Regarding the relaxation of dress etiquette see also RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, pp. 56–57 and 63 and 99.

While modifications of ceremonial dress and bodies can be related to greater societal contexts it might be relevant to point out Mansel's argument that although these changes mirrored transformations in society they in particular reflected different attitudes towards etiquette. As emphasised by Mikael Alm and Bo Vahlne, the militarisation of Swedish court culture was already instigated in the Gustavian era. Hauswolff's remark that King Gustav IV Adolf in a ceremonial procession at the *Riksdag* in 1800 had worn 'the princely crown and mantle, and underneath the uniform of the Gentlemen-at-arms with boots and spurs' is commented on by Alm & Vahlne, stating that this might very well have been the first time the Estates were presented with a king in military uniform.³⁴⁶ It is possible that the costume, in the king's public theatre, was supposed to function as an embodiment of Gustav IV Adolf's *konungaförsäkran* (repeating words originally articulated by Gustav III). The royal declarations and assurances which Gustav IV Adolf were required to sign in 1796 and 1800 stated that the king swore to renounce the 'odious royal absolutism' and eternally regard it as his 'greatest honour, to be the first citizen among an honest and free people'.³⁴⁷ For the king to dress in uniform, something Gustav III according to Hauswolff never had done, but keeping the mantle and crown could have been an attempt to express, through the body, continuity as well as discontinuity, tradition as well as modernity.³⁴⁸ The language and rhetoric of the body and assurance would also be reflected in Gustav IV Adolf's device 'God and the people' which expressed the king's wish not to present himself as a despot.³⁴⁹ Display of militarised characteristics was a strategy of image-making adopted by several European monarchies, but the case of Gustav IV Adolf's bodily appearance and discursive image was not so much a continuously applied and communicative strategy but rather exceptions provoked by specific circumstances.³⁵⁰

It is quite obvious that the trend of informality in dress and body techniques reached new heights in the reign of Charles XIV John, a time period in which etiquette was significantly reformed. The court's ceremonial nature was maintained but manners and customs deemed out of keeping with the time were slowly but steadily undermined.³⁵¹ Militarisation of court culture also increased in the reign of Charles XIV John and was expressed in dynastic ceremonial. Although military corpses had been present in the ceremonies throughout the scrutinised time period, in 1818 the war commanders and the military received specific places of their own in the royal procession. Furthermore, the fact that the king and crown prince immediately after the coronation ceremony rode to Kungsträdgården in order to see a military parade is quite revealing.³⁵² Richard S. Wortman has pointed out the 'Prussomania' sweeping through eighteenth-century Europe, making military parades a vital symbol for power and military organisation. Wortman contends however that military parades in Russia were quite distinct. Paul I, Alexander I and Nicholas I turned military discipline and parades into a 'paramount

³⁴⁶ Alm & Vahlne, 2010, pp. 324–326.

³⁴⁷ RA, 25.2 Statsrättsliga handlingar 1569–1957, vol. 64, Stockholms slott 1 November 1796; RA, 25.2 Statsrättsliga handlingar 1569–1957, vol. 65, Norrköping 3 April 1800 (original quotation: 'afläggande Oss hämedhet förhateliga Konungliga Enväldet, eller then så kallade Souverainiteten, och anseendes städse för Wår största ära, at vara then förste Medborgaren ibland ett rättskaffen Fritt Folk').

³⁴⁸ See RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Riksdagens slut i Stockholm År 1818*).

³⁴⁹ Carlsson, 1946, pp. 76–77 (the motto in Swedish: 'Gud och folket').

³⁵⁰ See Mansel, 1988, p. 57; Ditchfield, 2015, pp. 194–198; Alm, 2002, pp. 280–281 and 327–328.

³⁵¹ Persson, 2010, pp. 55–66.

³⁵² RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, unnumbered pages (attached document: *Ordning Wid Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Konung Carl XIV Johans Kröning och hyllning wid Riksdagen i Stockholm år 1818*).

ceremonial demonstration of imperial rule' emphasising the emperor's authority and control by underlining the victories in the Napoleonic wars and the imperial conquests.³⁵³ However, as allied with the Russians, Charles XIV John had rendered success in his foreign policy and stood amongst the victorious when Napoleon was defeated. Although the annexation of Norway into the Swedish realm failed, the union itself, which ultimately came about through military intervention, cast Charles XIV John in the light of a successful marshal and war hero.³⁵⁴ Parallels therefore exist between Sweden and Russia in regard to the making of military parades into ceremony but, as Wortman points out, the intended messages behind military ceremonies somewhat differed. Per Sandin asserts the changes in etiquette and the development towards a more prominent military image were steps taken by the Bernadottes towards a civic approach and a modernisation of court and monarchy.³⁵⁵

THE PUBLIC AND THE PRIVATE

Overarching political, social and cultural transformations left their mark in the coronation ceremonies of 1818. A remarkable deviation from the previous ceremonies was Charles XIV John's decision to cancel the public dining, or *le festin royal*, traditionally taking place in Rikssalen after the coronation. Instead, the newly inaugurated king arranged a table reserved only for the royal family and a very few select courtiers in the apartments of the queen dowager. Similarly, following the Norwegian coronation in Trondheim the king dined alone with the crown prince.³⁵⁶

The cancellation of the coronation feast may have reflected the king's personal disposition and dislike for public dining. However, if one considers the practices of Charles XIV John in a wider perspective, the circumstances become rather more complicated. On the one hand, the king constructed a small-scale living practice through spatial demarcations and measures of seclusion, but on the other hand lavish forms of public dining were arranged at numerous occasions.³⁵⁷ The case of *le festin royal* might therefore have had a significance beyond the king's personal taste in that it might be seen as an attempt to embody contemporary society where bourgeois ideals surrounding the private sphere, domesticity and family were becoming more prevalent. According to Court Marshal Johan Otto Nauckhoff, the king's wish to dine in select company the years following his coronation signified that he lived 'as a rich private person' rather than a king.³⁵⁸ In an international perspective, a quasi-bourgeois and semi-private lifestyle was also adopted by Maria Theresa and her successors at the imperial court of Vienna whose formality and strict ceremonial constituents were notorious.³⁵⁹ Nicholas I adopted a strategy in which monarchy publicly was presented as a realization of bourgeois ideals and family values. The Tsar undertook the task of mediating a monarchy with a hard-working ruler

³⁵³ Wortman, 2013, p. 86.

³⁵⁴ Ekedahl, 2010, pp. 24–29.

³⁵⁵ Sandin, 2011, p. 127.

³⁵⁶ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, p. 103; *Bihang till Inrikes-tidningar* no. 106, Stockholm den 16 September 1818, attached in RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30; von Engeström, vol. II, 1876, pp. 282–283.

³⁵⁷ See Persson, 2010, p. 56; Johansson, 2008, pp. 68–76; Sandin, 2010, p. 51.

³⁵⁸ Johansson, 2008, p. 68.

³⁵⁹ Fichtner, 2014, p. 132; Duindam, 2007, p. 197.

at its core who also enjoyed the benefits rendered by the private sphere's domesticity, privacy and family life.³⁶⁰ Similarly, George III and his consort Charlotte managed to enhance the reputation of Hanoverian monarchy through an embodiment of 'moral rectitude and domestic portrayal of the royal family'.³⁶¹ As emphasised by Isabel Burdiel, the ability of nineteenth-century monarchies to publicly embody and represent the ideals and virtues associated with the private sphere were imperative for their maintaining of popular support.³⁶²

The case of Charles XIV John's more secluded banquet arrangement furthermore demonstrates the interaction between space and body. Eating in public may be deemed a technique of the body (encompassing the sociological, physiological and psychological) but the more private or domestic nature of the dining was achieved through spatial demarcation. However, the notions of private and public were not clear-cut. After the birth of Prince Gustav in 1827 a lavish feast, the anti-thesis of privacy, was arranged at Rosendal Palace, the royal family's summer residence. Though 1827 lies outside the scope of this analysis, contextualisation is imperative to nuancedly present the inherent tensions in nineteenth-century monarchy. Grand displays with the king dining were held at regular intervals and the number of bystanders at the feast in 1827 were innumerable. Yet, these events did not mediate the monarch as superior but rather as a 'king of the people' since the king and Crown Prince Oscar were said to have walked around freely among the spectators.³⁶³ The staging of the private on the one hand and the public on the other may seem contradictory, but it can also be interpreted as corresponding to the need for monarchs to find a balance between old and new, 'tradition' and 'modernity'.³⁶⁴ An equivalence can be found at the court of Napoleon I, who often ate his meal in private but also satisfied the love for splendour by dining in public a few times every year.³⁶⁵ Furthermore, celebrating the birth of a prince might have been especially suitable as it, albeit in the most public and extravagant manner, had a streak of domesticity in its propagandistic core.

Moreover, the cancellation of the public dining was fairly compensated by the many festivities arranged on the days following the coronation with *fêtes* and balls.³⁶⁶ Throughout the nineteenth century balls would emerge and function as important social arenas for the encounter between monarchy and civic, bourgeois society.³⁶⁷ Balls and *divertissements* had been prominent at the court of Gustav III but these spectacles were predominantly closed and characterised by exclusivity. During the minority of Gustav IV Adolf, the President of the Administrative Courts of Appeal, Baron Reuterholm, drastically reduced court spending and directed state resources on military coverage at the expense of entertainment. Furthermore, the aging court at the beginning of the nineteenth century meant that balls and diversions were sparse. The arrival of

³⁶⁰ Wortman, 2013, pp. 122 and 166.

³⁶¹ Schaich, 2015, p. 2.

³⁶² Queen Victoria's success in creating a public image in which she conformed to bourgeois family values and gender roles of female domesticity was crucial in increasing her popularity. In comparison, Queen Isabel II of Spain's incapability of managing and manipulating the public coverage of her private persona ultimately contributed to her downfall. Burdiel, 2004, pp 301–319; See also Craig, 2003, pp. 173–174.

³⁶³ Sandin, 2011, p. 51.

³⁶⁴ Queen Victoria also wrestled with the reconciliation of the private and the public. While her submitting to the former functioned as an asset in demonstrating conformity to bourgeois womanhood it also made her vulnerable to critique that she did not meet the requirements of queenship. Opinions about reductions in the civil list thus arose. Finding a proper balance was a pressing issue. Kuhn, 1993.

Incidentally, Rosendal Palace somewhat reflected a balance of lavishness and restrain, public and private, in its architectural design, the exterior of the palace being quite humble and the interior lavishly decorated and furnished in the Empire style. See Lundström, 2010, p. 89.

³⁶⁵ Mansel, 1988, p. 67.

³⁶⁶ RA, CÖR, vol. I, no. 30, pp. 109–136.

³⁶⁷ Persson, 2011; Hellsing, 2015.

the new dynasty brought with it the return of court amusements.³⁶⁸ Balls arranged by the bourgeoisie at the beginning of the nineteenth century, for example those held at the Stock Exchange to celebrate New Year's day, were of great significance. At these events the royal personages sometimes deviated from the principle only to dance with nobles and took on dance partners from the middle classes.³⁶⁹ Practices of the body thus functioned as means of including the bourgeoisie in the monarchical sphere, and were significant in the royal myth-making.

The in many ways contradictory approach to ceremony adopted in the reign of Charles XIV John demonstrates the inherent contradictions in the monarchical institution and its aims to accommodate the conflicting themes of tradition and modernity, of distance and participation and of private and public. The myths of its superiority as well as of its foundation in civic society needed to be displayed and asserted. Similar to the French courts of Louis XVIII and Charles X, Charles XIV John strove to achieve a synthesis, satisfying demands of humbleness and simplicity as well as lavishness, vanity and the love of splendour.³⁷⁰

³⁶⁸ Ulvros, 2014, unnumbered pages (e-publication, see the chapter 'Svensk danskultur under 1700- och 1800-talen').

As a parenthesis, the General Lieutenant Carl Akrell mentioned in his memoirs a ball arranged by Gustav IV Adolf in 1803. The anecdote is an interesting story of a body technique, being however less relevant to this particular study. The day after the ball Akrell's colonel approached him saying he had to fight with Count Taube, a *Place Major* in the queen's regiment. According to the colonel, Taube accused Akrell of neglecting him at the ball. Allegedly, Akrell had disregarded Taube on purpose by turning his back at him during the dance and by not greeting a regiment officer in a military manner. The matter turned out to be an unfounded fabrication, but the story in itself is interesting from a discursive perspective, demonstrating the importance ascribed to body techniques in peoples' imagination. Akrell, 1884-1885, pp. 23-24.

³⁶⁹ The Royal Palace would be reconstructed in the nineteenth century so that its ball rooms could house an increasing number of guests. In time the royal balls, rather than those arranged by the bourgeoisie, would thus establish themselves as the more important meeting places between monarchy and civic society. Persson, 2011, pp. 123-137.

³⁷⁰ Mansel, 1988, pp. 187-190.

SUMMARY: DYNASTIC CEREMONIES IN THE POST-GUSTAVIAN ERA

When comparing the employment of bodies in dynastic ceremonies of the Gustavian era to those performed in post-Gustavian society, the continuities are most striking. The ceremonial body in the public theatre of monarchy was used in the same manner as it had been before 1809. Consequently, the fundamental constituents of bodies and ceremonies pointed out by Marcel Mauss (i.e., the triple viewpoint and education) and Jeroen Duindam (i.e., glorification of the monarch, affirming connections to the commonwealth and presence of state representatives, observance of rank and publicity) remained pertinent. Ceremonial bodies remained crucial components in the royal myth-making and in the endeavour to balance various societal currents, thus making them significant in the enhancement of the monarchical institution. In general, the same themes persisted throughout the scrutinised time period. Emphasis was put on the magnificence, glorification and superiority of monarchy as well as on dynasty. Establishing the ties to the commonwealth was also prevalent by demonstrating the division of power. Noticeable differences related not so much to the fundamental employment of bodies as to the specific political, social and cultural circumstances and transformations of the time. Indeed, the balance was somewhat shifted and change is discernible. The myth and attempt of a reconciliation between the contradictions of tradition and modernity became more prominent in the public theatre. The many inconsistencies could be reconciled and contained in physical bodies. The frail body of the archbishop officiating at Charles XIV John's Swedish coronation ceremony simultaneously balanced the various myths of dynasty, elevation and superiority, constitutional regulation and reform. In general, the ceremonial bodies aimed at mediating a relaxation of etiquette in court society and a greater inclusion of political agents. The myth of royal magnificence and superiority was nevertheless persisting and perhaps the most effective.

Bodies and techniques of the body were related to political circumstances and 'propaganda'. Reducing the lavishness of coronations by walking was in part a practical decision, in which error played a part, but it was also politically motivated. However, since the body was not the sole component in the royal public theatre, the endeavour to mediate a restrained monarchy through techniques of the body was not in all instances successful. Material splendour and decorations impressed audiences and had the potential to dampen humble expressions of the body. However, actual bodies of royal personages were significant in so far as the general public appreciated seeing their monarchs and ceremonial arrangers were acutely aware of this.

Political developments were mediated and displayed through the presence of officiating bodies belonging to the state machinery. Giving precedence to newly instituted offices crucial in ensuring political reforms and involving the Estates more comprehensively signified and embodied the new system of constitutional monarchy. Additionally, in 1818 the ceremonies embodied the personal union between Sweden and Norway.

Even so, the dynastic ceremonies largely complied with tradition and precedents continued to act as education of bodies. However, error was also acting as an agent of change and practical limitations engendered necessary deviations. Furthermore, overarching cultural developments

signified that knowledge and adherence of precedent was not the only capital available to courtiers. New fashions, such as the use of uniforms, made accessible a capital which allowed courtiers to express, through their bodies, that they were in keeping with the time. Charles XIII and Charles XIV John contributed to this development by sanctioning the relaxation of etiquette in regard to ceremonial dress. Conflicts between educational systems were thus prevalent. The uniform also signified an increasing degree of militarisation of court culture and ceremonial display, corresponding with greater European trends, which somewhat blurred distinctions within the elite. Slight deviations in dress were thus applied to manifest identities and relations.

In regard to gender, the clash between old and new norm systems appear to have materialised in the bodily expression of grief. Passionately expressing grief through the body appears to have become less acceptable. From the 1770s, indications of women's ascribed passivity and place in the private sphere are noticeable and in the 1790s the need for men to control their bodily expression of sorrow was pointed out when they adhered to specific norms of grief predominant in the pre-nineteenth century. The private sphere of domesticity as a place destined for royal females was furthermore emphasised in the funeral of Queen Dowager Sofia Magdalena. The presence of Gustav III's artificial or represented body in the form of a statue underlined her role as an unpolitical consort. Representations of bodies, i.e. statues and portraits were significant, not least in demonstrating dynastic connections and distributing the imagery of monarchical myths to a wider audience.

The public characteristic of monarchy made the notion of private-public oppositions somewhat ambiguous. The female royal body was at times excluded from the public sphere but in the ceremonial procession of Queen Dowager Charlotte's funeral her public engagement in civic society and charities was stressed by the physical presence of an association she had acted as a patron for. The complexities between public and private became especially palpable in the reign of Charles XIV John, demonstrating the complex entanglement between practices of space and body and the difficulty in making monarchy compatible with bourgeois ideals as well as tradition. The reign and ceremonies of Charles XIV John were thus characterised by contradictions, arising when the monarch attempted to accommodate continuities as well as discontinuities, striving to embody political, social and cultural tradition as well as modernity.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The aim of this thesis has been to study royal ceremonies from the perspective of the corporeal turn, analysing the significance of and the meanings ascribed to bodies in dynastic ceremonies and court society. The argument that bodies constituted a fundamental construct in royal ceremonials has been emphatically proposed through the analysis of a selection of ceremonies in the turbulent time of the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. In the ceremonial and public theatre of monarchy the regulation of bodies was a major concern. In accordance with Marcel Mauss's conception that bodies both inform the social order and are imperative for individuals' experiencing and transforming of the world, it is contended that the myths of monarchy needed not only to be displayed through lavish magnificence or expressed in utterances, but felt and experienced through the body. In order to turn various, often conflicting, myths – of magnificence, elevation, superiority and power, of a personal bond and mutuality, of equality, division of power and popular support – into reality, they needed to be inhabited in a ceremonial body.

However, as was pointed out in the introduction of this thesis, a rigid focus on partiality and eclectic discourse is not an unproblematic enterprise. There has been a demand within historiography for an integration between the 'soft' themes of cultural history and the 'hard' themes of political history. This thesis has endeavoured to discern the political implications of bodies – their techniques, expressions and, to some extent, discourses – in dynastic ceremonies. Throughout the scrutinised time period, mourning attire strove to establish and reproduce a parental logic determining the bond between monarchs and subjects. In 1809 the decision to walk in the coronation procession rather than ride in splendid coaches was an informed adjustment to ensure popular support in an era of upheaval. In the Norwegian coronation of 1818, removing the act of kissing the king's hand expressed an egalitarian view influenced by French revolutionary thought. The place in which the Parliamentary Ombudsman walked in the coronation procession of 1818 mirrored political reforms of society and monarchy. These examples indicate that the bodies of royal personages and subjects cannot be neglected in the study of royal courts and ceremonies. The ceremonial body related to political, social and cultural circumstances of specific times. Nevertheless, criticism against the inclination to study eclectic discourse and wrestle with concepts has a valid point. Indeed, this thesis suffers from a major weakness in that the predominant emphasis on the meaning of bodies obscures the complex interactions which require profound explorations in further research.

Bodies were of great significance but far from the only preoccupation within the public theatre. Material splendour – which in many instances appears to have been the most effective means of communication when regarding the views held by spectators of ceremonies – and space were also employed in the myth-making of kingship. In a brief discussion of scholarship by Janet Dickinson and William Roosen, the notion of bodies was emphasised as an imperative concept besides that of space. However, body and space simultaneously acted as crucial categories for the actual and mental structuring of court society, and the relation between the two was most intricate. Entanglements of space and body were palpable in dynastic ceremonies. Precedence, degrees of favour and identities of courtiers were expressed, experienced and constructed

through the walking in a ceremonial procession which was at once a bodily and spatial practice, an inhabitation of body and of space. It is perhaps emblematic that the corporeal turn as well as the spatial turn can be placed within the wider cultural turn. The historiographic endeavours therefore share some prominent features, such as the emphasis on inscriptions of meaning and produced or constructed dimensions of physical, yet dynamic, materiality.³⁷¹ In fact, the body may even be interpreted in terms of place, i.e. a bodily space charged with ascribed meaning.³⁷² Henri Lefebvre has claimed there is ‘an immediate relationship between the body and its spaces, between the body’s deployment in space and its occupation of space’ which highlights the suggestive potential of merging the perspective of space in court studies with that of bodies more incessantly.³⁷³ Neither space nor body was without preconditions, and the constructs were interdependently connected to each other.

So, while the body cannot be neglected, the sole focus on bodies is an equally deceptive endeavour as disregarding it. If bodies affected the perception of audiences in the public theatre of monarchy, so too did the materialisation of magnificence, perhaps in many instances to an even greater extent. The ‘new research on monarchy’ has grasped and addressed these issues in the study of monarchical cultures of representation but inserting the notion of bodies – physiological as well as sociological and psychological – into the equation more elaborately would make the scholarly enterprise even more comprehensive. As suggested by Robert Bucholz, analysing the corporeal presence in monarchical representation and attribution sheds light on wider societal contexts.³⁷⁴ This thesis proposes a similar argument. However, the notion is not limited to the study of royal ceremonies. Body, space and material culture transgress borders of palaces, courts and monarchy. From society to society these concepts constitute fundamental categories for the experience, production and reproduction of the world. The inclination to wrestle with concepts rather than data might therefore not necessarily signify a cul-de-sac so far as the multitude of discourses are integrated into an entirety, the study of *l’homme total*. It is true that the plural of anecdote is not data, but an understanding of the past might very well require a conceptual wrestling-match in addition to data.

As for future prospects of the particular subject in this thesis, the scope can be widened. According to Jeroen Duindam, ceremony was an extreme, albeit on the same continuum as everyday life, in court society.³⁷⁵ Dynastic ceremony was perhaps an extreme of the extremes, and dissecting the ceremonial body only touches upon a fragment of bodies’ significances in court society. Gustavian ceremonies have rendered a great deal of attention but everyday life has not been the subject of extensive research.³⁷⁶ Understanding the true significance of bodies in court society demands an additional gaze, beyond dynastic ceremonials towards everyday life experience. This would however require a thesis, or perhaps a dissertation, of its own.

³⁷¹ See for example Withers, 2009, pp. 645–645; Cronqvist, 2008.

³⁷² See Cresswell, 2004, p. 10; Johannison, 2013, pp. 120–121; See also the discussion of Duden in Lock & Farquhar, 2007, p. 437.

³⁷³ Lefebvre, 1991, p. 170.

Kirsten Simonsen has argued few scholars prone to the study of human bodies have incorporated Lefebvre in their analyses although Lefebvre’s apprehension of space can be seen as ‘recalling a spatialized version of Bourdieu’ through his discussion of the body’s gestural systems (i.e. codified social gestures, inscribed with meaning, constituted by signs, signals and symbols, whose accomplishment reflect affiliations of groups and activities) at once performed in space and generating space by and for themselves. Simonsen, 2005, pp. 6–7.

³⁷⁴ Bucholz, 2015, pp. 147–148.

³⁷⁵ Duindam, 2007, p. 187.

³⁷⁶ Hellsing, 2015, p. 44.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

Lund

LUNDS UNIVERSITETS BIBLIOTEK (HANDSKRIFTS AVDELNINGEN)

Hauswolff, Leonhard von. Efterlämnade papper 5. Dagboksanteckningar 1.

Hauswolff, Leonhard von. Fortsättning af Baron Rosenhanes [förteckning] på de till En af Rikets Herrar kallade sedan 1793.

Stockholm

RIKSARKIVET

1423 Ceremonimästaren/Överceremonimästaren. Rikshäroldämbetet 1697–1825.

1443 Ceremonialia 1537–1830.

1444 Ministrar 1600t-1700t, Utländska ministrar i Sverige.

25.2 Statsrättsliga handlingar 1569–1957.

KUNGLIGA BIBLIOTEKET

Brev till Lars von Engeström.

PRINTED SOURCES

af Petersens, Carl & Clason, Sam. *För hundra år sen. Skildringar och breffrån revolutionsåren 1809-1810.* Stockholm: Hugo Gebers Förlag, 1909.

Aftonbladet, 19 April 1844.

Akrell, Carl. *Minnen från Carl XIV:s, Oscar I:s och Carl XV:s dagar av Generallöjtnant Carl Akrell och Landshöfding S. G. von Troil. Första delen.* Stockholm: Oscar L. Lamms Förlag, 1884-1885.

Alm, Mikael, & Vahlne, Bo. *Överkammarherrens journal 1778-1826. Ett gustavianskt tidsdokument.* Stockholm, 2010.

Bihang till Inrikes-Tdningen no. 106, Stockholm den 16 September 1818.

Ceremonial Wid Hans Kongl. Maj:ts Höga Kröning. Tryckt hos Henr. Fought, 1772.

Ehrensvärd, Gustaf Johan. *Dagboksanteckningar förda vid Gustaf III:s hof af Friherre Gustaf Johan Ehrensvärd, utgifna af Dr. E. V. Montan. Första delen, journal för åren 1776, 1779 samt berättelse om svenska teaterns uppkomst.* Stockholm: P.A Norstedt & Söners förlag, 1877.

Ekeblad, Clas Julius. *Gustaf III och hans gunstlingar skildrade af Grefve C. J. Ekeblad till Stola, Generalmajor, Landshöfding, R.O.K af K.M.O.* Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner (Kongl. Boktryckare), 1871.

Fredrik Axel von Fersen. *Riksrådet coh färstmarskalken m.m. Fredrik Axel von Fersens historiska skrifter utgifna af R. M. Klinckowström öfverste. Femte delen.* Stockholm, 1870.

- Gustav III:s och Lovisa Ulrikas brevväxling utgiven av Henrik Schück. Första delen.*
 Stockholm: Norstedt, 1919.
- Hamilton, Adolf Ludvig. *Anekdoter till Svenska historien under Gustaf III:s regering af Adolf Ludvig Hamilton utgifna af Oscar Levertin*, hardbound in Svenska memoarer och bref 3-4. Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag, 1901.
- Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta. *Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas dagbok översatt och utgifven af Carl Carlsson Bonde. Första delen, 1775-1782*. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner, 1902.
- Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta. *Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas dagbok översatt och utgifven af Carl Carlsson Bonde. Tedje Delen 1789-1792*. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner, 1907.
- Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta. *Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas dagbok, vol. V, 1795-1796*. Översatt och redigerad av Cecilia af Klercker född Lewenhaupt. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner, 1923.
- Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta. *Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas dagbok, vol. VII, 1800-1806*. Översatt och redigerad av Cecilia af Klercker född Lewenhaupt. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner, 1936.
- Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotta. *Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas dagbok, vol. VIII, 1807-1811*. Översatt och redigerad av Cecilia af Klercker född Lewenhaupt. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner, 1939.
- Hedvif Elisabeth Charlotta. *Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas dagbok, vol. IX, 1812-1817*. Översatt och redigerad av Cecilia af Klercker född Lewenhaupt. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner, 1942.
- Hennings, Beth. *Ögonvittnen om Gustav III. Redigering: Beth Hennings*. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand, 1960.
- I Anledning Af Kongl. Begräfningen, Ett Märkwärdigt Samtal Emellan En Präst och en Bonde; Om orsaken til Hänen Maj:ts Änke-Drottningens frånvaro därvid, Jämte Kort och tydlig Beskrifning Om Riddareholms Kyrkans förträffliga prydnader vid detta sorgeliga tillfälle, Samt Om anledningen til Likprädikans hållande af Biskopen I Linköping Och Kongringningens uphörande öfwer hela Riket m.m. Wennberg och Nordström*, 1771.
- Illustrerade Minnesblad från Krönings-Högtidigheterna År 1860. Minnen från Kung Carl XV:s och Drottning Lovisas kröning i Stockholm i Maj 1860*. Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag, 1860.
- Inrikestidningar*, no. 64, 8 June 1809.
- Inrikes Tidningar*, no. 75, 6 July 1809.
- Inrikes Tidningar*, no. 118, 12 October 1813.
- Posttidningar*, no. 23, 23 February 1818.
- Protocoll, Hållt på Stockholms Slott den 22 Junii 1818 vid Högsalig Enke-Drottningens Hedvig Elisabeth Charlottas Liköppning*. Stockholm, 1818.
- Reenstierna, Märta Helena. *Årstadagboken. Journaler från åren 1793-1839 utgivna genom Sigurd Erixon, Arvid Stålhane & Sigurd Wallin. Urväl och förklaringar av Gunnar Broman. Del I 1793-1812*. Stockholm: Norstedt, 1993

- Reenstierna, Märta Helena. *Årstadagboken. Journaler från åren 1793-1839 utgivna genom Sigurd Erixon, Arvid Stålhane & Sigurd Wallin. Urval och förklaringar av Gunnar Broman. Del II 1813-1825.* Stockholm: Norstedt, 1993.
- Rothlieb, Carl Fr. *Samling af Kongl. Författningsar angående Rang af Carl Fr. Rothlieb. Andra tiöcta och förbättrade Uplagan.* Stockholm: 1828.
- Samtal, Emellan En Eksjö Borgare Och En Bonde ifrån Säby, Om Närvarande Tider.* Wennberg och Nordström, 1771.
- Skjöldebrand, Anders Fredrik. *Excellensen grefve A. F. Skjöldebrands memoarer. Utgifna af Henrik Schück, första delen.* Stockholm: Hugo Gebers Förlag, 1903.
- Spencer, Sarah. *The Correspondence of Sarah Spencer Lady Lyttelton 1787-1879. Edited by her Great-Granddaughter, the Hon. Mrs. Hugh Wyndham.* London: J. Murray, 1912.
- Svenska memoarer och bref, vol. I-2. Öfverste Brelins anteckningar 1809-1818.* J. G. Oxenstiernas mitt minne. *Uno von Troils självbiografi och reseanteckningar. Utgifna af Henrik Schück.* Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag, 1900.
- von Engeström, Lars. *Minnen och anteckningar af Lars von Engeström. Utgifna efter handskrifter och samlingar, tillhöriga Grefve L. S. von Engeström och Svenska Riksbiblioteket af Elof Tegnér. Första bandet.* Stockholm, 1876.
- von Schinkel, Berndt. *Minnen ur Sveriges nyare historia samlade af B. von Schinkel, Öfverste f.d. Adjutant hos Konung Carl XIV Johan. Fjerde delen. Gustav IV Adolf (1796-1809). Författad och utgifven af C. W. Bergman.* Stockholm: P.A. Norstedt & Söner, 1854.
- von Schinkel, Berndt. *Minnen ur Sveriges nyare historia samlade af B. von Schinkel, Öfverste f.d. Adjutant hos Konung Carl XIV Johan. Tionde delen. Carl Johan och hans tid (1817-1822). Författad och utgifven af J. A. O. Hellstenius, docent vid Uppsala Universitet.* Stockholm: Samson & Wallin, 1868.
- von Steyern, Maud. *Herrgårdsliv i Sörmland.* Stockholm: Bokförlaget natur och kultur, 1960.
- Wid Högst Salig Hennes Kongl. Majts Enke-Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Begräfning, Then 31 Julii 1782, I akt tages följande Ordning.* Kongl. Tryckeriet, 1782.
- Wid Högstsalig Hennes Kongl. Majestäts Enke-Drottningens, Sophia Magdalenas Begräfning, I Kongl. Riddarholms-Kyrkan Den 30 Sept. 1813, Predikan Af Jacob Ax. Lindblom, Erke-Biskop.* Tryckt hos Carl Delén, 1813.
- Wid Inflytningen Af Högstsal. Hennes Kongl. Maj:ts Enke-Drottningens Lovisa Ulricas Lik, Ifrån Svartsjö Slott Til Kongl. Slottet i Stockholm Then 25 Julii 1782, I akt tages följande Ordning,* Kongl. Tryckeriet, 1782.

LITERATURE

- Adamson, John. ‘Introduction. The Making of the Ancien-Regime Court 1500–1700’ in *The Princely Courts of Europe. Ritual, Politics and Culture Under the Ancien Régime 1500–1700*, John Adamson (ed.). London: Seven Dials, Cassell & Co, 2000.
- Alm, Mikael. *Kungsord i elfte timmen. Språk och självbild i det gustavianska envälдets legitimitetskamp, 1772–1809.* Stockholm: Atlantis, 2002.

- Alm, Mikael. 'Dynasty in the Making. A New King and His "Old" Men in Royal Ceremonies 1810–1844' in *Scripts of Kingship. Essays on Bernadotte and Dynastic Formation in an Age of Revolution*, Mikael Alm & Britt-Inger Johansson (eds.). Uppsala, 2008.
- Alm, Mikael. 'Riter och ceremonier kring Karl XIV Johan' in *En dynasti blir till. Medier, myter och makt kring Karl XIV Johan och familjen Bernadotte*, Nils Ekedahl (ed.). Stockholm: Norstedts, 2010.
- Archer, Ian W. 'City and Court Connected: The Material Dimensions of Royal Ceremonial, ca 1480-1625' in *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 71, no. 1 (2008), pp. 157–179.
- Bergman, Eva. *Nationella dräkten. En studie kring Gustaf III:s dräktreform 1778*. Stockholm: Nordiska museet, 1938.
- Bergström, Carin. *Sophia Albertina, 1753–1829. Självständig prinsessa*. Stockholm: Atlantis, 2011.
- Bloch, Maurice. 'The Ritual of the Royal Bath in Madagascar: The Dissolution of Death, Birth and Fertility Into Authority' in *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremony in Traditional Societies*, David Cannadine & Simon Price (eds.), Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Bloch, Marc. *The Royal Touch: Sacred Monarchy and Scrofula in England and France*, 2015.
- Bodensten, Erik. *Politikens drivfjäder. Frihetstidens partiberättelser och den moralpolitiska logiken*. Lunds universitet, 2016.
- Bucholz, Robert. '"Every Inch Not a King": The Bodies of the (Frist Two) Hanoverians' in *The Hanoverian Succession. Dynastic Politics and Monarchical Culture*, Andreas Gestrich & Michael Schaich (eds.). Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2015.
- Burdiel, Isabel. 'The Queen, the Woman and the Middle Class. The Symbolic Failure of Isabel II of Spain' in *Social Hstory*, vol. 29, no. 3 (2004), pp. 301–319.
- Burke, Peter. *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*. Yale University Press, 1992.
- Burke, Peter. 'State-Making, King-Making and Image-Making from Renaissance to Baroque: Scandinavia in a European Perspective' in *Scandinavian Journal of History*, vol. 22, no. 1, (1997), pp. 1–8.
- Cannadine, David. 'Introduction' in *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, David Cannadine & Simon Price (eds.). Cambridge University Press, 1992a.
- Cannadine, 'The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition' c. 1820–1977' in *The Invention of Tradition*, Eric Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger (eds.). Cambridge University Press, 1992b.
- Carlsson, Sten. *Gustaf IV Adolf. En biografi*. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand, 1946.
- Cooter, Roger. 'The Turn of the Body: History and the Politics of the Corporeal' in *Arbor: Ciencia, Pensamiento y Cultura*, vol. 186, no. 743, (2010), pp. 393–405.
- Corteguera, Luis R. 'King as Father in Early Modern Spain' in *Memoria y Civilizacion*, vol. 12, (2009), pp. 49–69.
- Craig, David M. 'The Crowned Republic? Monarchy and Anti-Monarchy in Britain 1790–1901' in *The Historical Journal*, vol. 46, no. 1, (2003), pp. 167–185.
- Crane, Diana. *Fashion and its Social Agendas. Class, Gender, and Identity in Clothing*. University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Cresswell, Tim. *Place. A Short Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

- Cronqvist, Marie. 'Spatialisera alltid! Rummets återkomst i de historiska vetenskaperna' in *Scandia*, vol. 74, no. 2 (2008), pp. 9–14.
- Crossley, Nick. 'Researching Embodiment by way of "Body Technique"' in *Sociological Review Monograph*, vol. 55, no. 1 (2007), pp. 80–94.
- Dahlgren, Stellan. 'Metoder i historisk forskning' in *Fråga det förflutna: En introduktion till modern historieforskning*, Stellan Dahlgren & Anders Florén (eds.). Lund: Studentlitteratur AB, 1996.
- Dickinson, Janet. *Court Politics and the Earl of Essex, 1589–1601*. Albingdon: Routledge, 2016.
- Dillon, Janette. *The Language of Space in Court Performances, 1400–1625*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Ditchfield, G. M. 'Visions of Kingship in Britain under George III and George IV' in *The Hanoverian Succession. Dynastic Politics and Monarchical Culture*, Andreas Gestrich & Michael Shaich (eds.). Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2015.
- Duden, Barbara. *The Woman Beneath the Skin. A Doctor's Patients in Eighteenth-Century Germany*. Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Duindam, Jeroen. 'Rival Courts in Dynastic Europe: Vienna and Versailles 1550–1790' in *The Court Historian*, vol. 7, no. 2 (2002), pp. 75–92.
- Duindam, Jeroen. *Vienna and Versailles. The Courts of Europe's Dynastic Rivals, 1550–1780*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Edie, Carolyn A. 'The Public Face of Royal Ritual: Sermons, Medals, and Civic Ceremony in Later Stuart Coronations', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 53, no. 4, (1990), pp. 311–336.
- Ekedahl, Nils. 'En dynasti blir till' in *En dynasti blir till. Medier, myter och makt kring Karl XIV Johan och familjen Bernadotte*, Nils Ekedahl (ed.). Stockholm: Norstedts, 2010.
- Elias, Norbert. *The Court Society*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- Elias, Norbert. *Civilisationsteori: D.I, Sedernas historia*, Stockholm: Atlantis, 1989.
- Englund, Peter. *Förflutenhetens landskap. Historiska essäer*. Stockholm: Atlantis, 1993.
- Fairclough, Norman. 'Discourse and Text: Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis within Discourse Analysis' in *Discourse and Society*, vol. 3, no. 2, (1992), pp. 193–217.
- Fichtner, Paula Sutter. *The Habsburgs. Dynasty, Culture and Politics*. London: Reaktion Books, 2014.
- Fähræus, Edvard. *Administrativ och statistisk handbook såsom bihang till Sveriges Statskalender. Tredje upplagan, utgiven med ändringar och tillägg af Ol. Im. Fähræus*. Stockholm, 1872.
- Griffey, Erin. *On Display: Henrietta Maria and the Materials of Magnificence at the Stuart Court*. Yale University Press, 2015.
- Grundberg, Malin. *Ceremoniernas makt. Maktöverföring och genus i Vasatidens kungliga ceremonier*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2005.
- Hedenborg, Susanna & Kvarnström, Lars. *Det svenska samhället 1720–2014. Böndernas och arbetarnas tid*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2015.
- Hellsing, My. *Hovpolitik. Hedvig Elisabeth Charlotte som politisk aktör vid det gustavianska hovet*. Örebro universitet, 2013.

- Hellsing, My. 'Court and Public in Late Eighteenth-Century Stockholm. The Royal Urban Life of Duchess Charlotte, c. 1790' in *The Court Historian*, vol. 20, no. 1, (2015), pp. 43–60.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. 'Introduction' in *The Invention of Tradition*, Eric Hobsbawm & Terence Ranger (eds.). Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Hunt, Lynn. 'Freedom of Dress in Revolutionary France' in *From the Royal to the Republican Body. Incorporating the Political in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century France*, Sara E. Melzer & Kathryn Norberg (eds.). University of California Press, 1998.
- Hurd, Madeleine. 'Klädd till gatustrid. Uniform, kropp och kläder hos nazisternas stormtrupper' in *Iklädd identitet. Historiska studier av kropp och kläder*, Madeleine Hurd, Tom Olsson & Lisa Öberg (eds.). Stockholm: Carlssons bokförlag, 2005.
- Hurd, Madeleine & Olsson, Tom. 'Identitet och mode' in *Iklädd identitet. Historiska studier av kropp och kläder*, Madeleine Hurd & Tom Olsson (eds.). Stockholm: Carlssons bokförlag, 2005.
- Johannesson, Karin. *Den mörka kontinenten. Kvinnan, medicinen och fin-de-siècle*. Stockholm: Norstedt Publit, 2013.
- Johannsen, Birgitte Bøggild. 'Kongebegravelsernes ideologi og kultur. Problemer og perspektiver' in *Döden som katharsis. Nordiska perspektiv på dödens kultur- och mentalitetshistoria*. Rapport till det 25:e Nordiska Historikermötet I Stockholm, 2–4 augusti, 2004.
- Johannsen, Birgitte Bøggild & Ottenhey, Conrad (eds.). *Beyond Scylla and Charybdis: European Courts and Court Recidencies Outside Habsburg and Valois/Bourbon Territories 1500–1700: Papers from the PALATIUM Conference in Copenhagen and Hillerød 30 April to 2 May 2012*. Copenhagen: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2015.
- Johansson, Britt-Inger. 'Housing a Dynasty. Tradition and Innovation within the Walls of the Stockholm Royal Palace' in *Scripts of Kingship. Essays on Bernadotte and Dynastic Formation in an Age of Revolution*, Mikael Alm & Inger-Britt Johansson (eds.). Uppsala, 2008.
- Järvinen, Margaretha. 'Foucault-a-go-go. Om konstruktivistisk könsforskning' in *Seklernas sex. Bidrag till sexualitetens historia*, Åsa Bergenheim & Lena Lennerhed (eds.), pp. 54–70. Stockholm: Carlsson Bokförlag, 1997.
- Kaiser, Thomas E. 'Louis le Bien-Aimé and the Rhetoric of the Royal Body' in *From the Royal to the Republican Body. Incorporating the Political in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century France*, Sara E. Melzer & Kathryn Norberg (eds.). University of California Press, 1998.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*, 1997.
- Karlblom, Rolf. *Bakgrunden till 1809 års regeringsform. Studier i svensk konstitutionell opinionsbildning 1790-1809*. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1964.
- Koenigsberger, H. G. 'Monarchies and Parliaments in Early Modern Europe. Dominium Regale or Dominium Politicum et Regale' in *Theory and Society*, vol. 5, no. 2, (1978), pp. 191–217.
- Kuhn, William M. 'Ceremony and Politics: The British Monarchy, 1871–1872' in *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 26, no. 2, (1987), pp. 133–162.

- Kuhn, William M. 'Queen Victoria's Civil List. What Did She Do With It?' in *The Historical Journal*, vol. 36, no. 3, (1993), pp. 645–665.
- Landes, Joan B. *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution*. Cornell University, 1988.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 'Introduction a l'œuvre de Marcel Mauss' in *Sociologie et anthropologie par Marcel Maus, précédé d'une introduction a l'œuvre de Marcel Mauss par Cl. Lévi-Strauss*. Presses universitaires de France, 1950.
- Lévi-Strauss. *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss*. Translated by Felicity Baker. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Lindorm, Erik. *Carl XIV Johan – Carl XV och deras tid. En bokfilm*. Stockholm, 1942.
- Lindstedt Cronberg, Marie. *Med våldsam hand. Hustrumisshandel i 1800-talets Sverige. En studie av rättsliga, kyrkliga och politiska sammanhang*. Lunds universitet, 2009.
- Lock, Margareth & Farquhar, Judith. 'Introduction' in *Beyond the Body Proper: Reading the Anthropology of Material Life*, Margaret Lock & Judith Farquhar (eds.), Duke University Press, 2007.
- Lundström, Bo. 'Praktiskt och ändamålsenligt, klassicistiskt och nygotiskt – ur Karl Johanstidens arkitekturhistoria' in *Familjen Bernadotte. Kungligheter och människor*, Ingvar von Malmberg (ed.). Stockholm: Riksarkivet, 2010.
- Lönnroth, Erik. *Den stora rollen. Kung Gustaf III spelad av honom själv*. Stockholm: Atlantis, 2008.
- Mansel, Philip. 'Monarchy, Uniform and the Rise of the Frac 1760–1830' in *Past & Present*, no. 96, (1982), pp. 103–132.
- Mansel, Philip. *The Court of France, 1789–1830*. Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Mansel, Philip. *Dressed to Rule. Royal and Court Costume from Louis XIV to Elizabeth II*. Yale University Press, 2005.
- Marshall, George J. *A Guide to Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology of Perception*. Marquette University Press, 2008
- Martling, Carl Henrik. 'Den sista kröningen – Oscar II' in *Det hände i Storkyrkan. Minnen ur Sveriges historia*, Caroline Krook (ed.). Stockholm: Prisma, 2006.
- Mauss, Marcel. 'Les techniques du corps' in *Sociologie et anthropologie par Marcel Maus, précédé d'une introduction a l'œuvre de Marcel Mauss par Cl. Lévi-Strauss*. Presses universitaires de France, 1950.
- Mauss, Marcel. 'Techniques of the body' in *Economy and Society*, vol. 2, no. 1, (1973), pp. 70–88.
- Melzer, Sara E., & Norberg, Kathryn. 'Introduction' in *From the Royal to the Republican Body. Incorporating the Political in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century France*, Sara E. Melzer & Kathryn Norberg (eds.). University of California Press, 1998.
- Nilsson, Roddy. 'Foucault, historien och historikern. Receptionen av Foucault inom svensk historisk forskning' in *Lychnos*, 2008, pp. 121–144.
- Nordin, Jonas. *Frihetstidens monarki. Kungamakt och offentlighet i 1700-talets Sverige*. Stockholm. Atlantis, 2009.

- Oberlin, Amy B. "'Share with me in my Grief and Affliction': Royal Sorrow and Public Mourning in Early Eighteenth-Century England" in *Parergon*, vol. 31, no. 2, (2014), pp. 99–120.
- Olausson, Magnus & Skuncke, Marie-Christine. "Hovliv i fest och vardag" in *Kina slott*, Göran Alm (ed.), pp. 328–345. Stockholm: Byggförl./Kultur, 2002.
- Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy. The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Persson, Fabian. *Servants of Fortune: The Swedish Court Between 1598 and 1721*. Lund 1999.
- Persson, Fabian. 'Min Gud, tocket hov! Det svenska hovet mellan Napoleon och Louis Philippe' in *Familjen Bernadotte: Kungligheter och mäniskor*, Ingvar von Malmborg (ed.). Stockholm, 2010.
- Persson, Fabian. 'En bal på slottet: Hovbalernas sociala funktion i ett föränderligt 1800-tal' in *Arkiven sjunger: Nedslag i svensk musikhistoria*, Pontus Reimer (ed.). Stockholm: Riksarkivet, 2011.
- Persson, Fabian. 'Äktenskap i döden. Maria Eleonora och Hedvig Eleonora som änkor' in *Politik och passion. Svenska kungliga äktenskap under 600 år*, Henric Bagerius & Louise Berglund (eds.). Stockholm: Natur och Kultur, 2015.
- Price, Munro. 'Versaille Revisited. New Work on the Old Regime' in *The Historical Journal*, vol. 46, no. 2, (2003), pp. 437–447.
- Raeymaekers, Dries. *One Foot in the Palace: The Habsburg Court of Brussels and the Politics of Access in the Reign of Albert and Isabella, 1598-1621*. Leuven University Press, 2013.
- Raeymaekers, Dries & Derkx, Sebastiaan (eds.) *The Key to Power? The Culture of Access in Princely Courts, 1400-1750*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Rangsröm, Lena. *Kläder för tid och evighet. Gustaf III sedd genom sina dräkter*. Stockholm: Livrustkammaren, 1997.
- Rangström, Lena. 'Kröningsstät för Gustav III och Sophia Magdalena' in *Det hände i Storkyrkan. Minnen ur Sveriges historia*, Caroline Krook (ed.). Stockholm: Prisma, 2006.
- Rangström, Lena. *Dödens Teater: Kungliga svenska begravningar genom fem århundraden*. Stockholm: Atlantis, 2015.
- Roosen, William. 'Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial: A Systems Approach' in *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 52, no. 3, (1980), pp. 452–476.
- Sandin, Per. 'Monarken möter medborgarna' in *En dynasti blir till. Medier, myter och makt kring Karl XIV Johan och familjen Bernadotte*, Nils Ekedahl (ed.). Stockholm: Norstedts, 2010.
- Sandin, Per. *Ett kungahus i tiden. Den bernadotteska dynastins möte med medborgarsamhället, c:a. 1810–1860*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 2011.
- Schaich, Michael. 'Introduction' in *The Hanoverian Succession. Dynastic Politics and Monarchical Culture*, Andreas Gestrich & Michael Schaich (eds.). Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2015.

- Simonsen, Kirsten. ‘Bodies, Sensations, Space and Time. The Contribution from Henri Lefebvre’ in *Geografiska Annaler, Series B, Human Geography*, vol. 87, no. 1, (2005), pp. 1–14.
- Smith, Jay M. ‘‘Our Sovereign’s Gaze’’. Kings and Nobles and State Formation in Seventeenth-Century France’ in *French Historical Studies*, vol. 18, no. 2, (1993), pp. 396–415.
- Smith, Jeffrey R. ‘The Monarchy Versus the Nation. The “Festive Year” 1913 in Wilhelmine Germany’ in *German Studies Review*, vol. 23, no. 2, (2000), pp. 257–274.
- Smith, Philip & Riley, Alexander. ‘The Body in Cultural Theory’ in *Cultural Theory: An Introduction*, Philip Smith & Alexander Riley (eds.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2009.
- Stollberger-Rilinger, Barbara. *The Emperor’s Old Clothes: Constitutional History and the Symbolic Language of the Holy Roman Empire*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2015.
- Tandefelt, Henrika. *Konsten att härskä. Gustaf III inför sina undersåtar*. Helsingfors, 2008.
- Tandefelt, Henrika. ‘The Image of Kingship in Sweden, 1772–1809’ in *Scandinavia in the Age of Revolution. Nordic Political Cultures, 1740–1820*, Pasi Ihalainen, Michael Bregnsbo, Karin Sennefelt & Patrik Winton (eds.). Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.
- Tandefelt, Henrika. ‘‘Enlightened Monarchy’’ in Practice. Reforms, Ceremonies, Self-Fashioning and the Entanglement of Ideas and Values in Late Eighteenth-Century Sweden’ in *Collegium*, vol. 16, (2014), pp. 6–33.
- T:son Höjer, Torvald. *Carl XIV Johan. Konungatiden*. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner, 1960.
- Ulvros, Eva Helen. *Fruar och mamseller. Kvinnor inom sydsvensk borgerlighet, 1790-1870*. Lund: Lunds Universitet, 1996.
- Ulvros, Eva Helen. *Oscar I: En biografi*. Historiska media, 2012 (e-publication).
- Ulvros, Eva Helen. *Dansens historia: Dans och lek i Sverige*. Lund: Historiska media, 2014 (e-publication).
- Vincent, Susan. *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England*. Oxford, 2003.
- von Malmborg, Ingvar. ‘Ingen har fyllt en bana liknande min’ in *Familjen Bernadotte: Kungligheter och människor*, Ingvar von Malmborg (ed.). Stockholm, 2010.
- Weibull, Jörgen. *Carl Johan och Norge 1810-1814. Unionsplanerna och dess förverkligande*. Lund, 1957.
- Weibull, Jörgen. *Bernadotterna på Sveriges tron*. Stockholm: Bonnier, 1971.
- Withers, Charles W. J. ‘Place and the ‘Spatial Turn’ in Geography and in History’ in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 70, no. 4, (2009), pp. 837–658.
- Woodward, Jennifer. *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England, 1570-1625*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997.
- Wortman, Richard S. *Scenarios of Power. Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy from Peter the Great to the Abdication of Nicholas II*. Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Önnerfors, Andreas. ‘Inledning’ in *Mystiskt brödraskap – mäktigt nätverk. Studier i det svenska 1700-talsfrimureriet*, Andreas Önnerfors, Henrik Bogdan & Anders Simonsson (eds.). Lunds universitet, 2006.

INTERNET RESOURCES

- 'adelsuniform' in *Nationalencyklopedin*, <http://www.ne.se.proxy.lnu.se/uppslagsverk/encyklopedi/lång/adelsuniform> (accessed 3 May 2017)
- 'Adolf Frederick' in *Britannica Academic, Encyclopædia Britannica*, [academic.eb.com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/levels/collegiate/article/Adolf-Frederick/3769](http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/levels/collegiate/article/Adolf-Frederick/3769) (last updated 3 February 2017, accessed 13 April 2017).
- Alving, Hj. 'Johan Benedict Busser', urn:sbl:17201, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (online edition accessed 21 March 2017).
- Baillie, Hugh Murray. 'L'étiquette et la distribution des appartements officiels dans les palais baroques' in *Bulletin du Centre de recherché du château de Versailles* [Online], Articles et études. Online since 22 December 2014, <http://crcv.revues.org/12137> (accessed 8 March 2017).
- 'Bedoire, släkt' in *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon*, <https://sok.riksarkivet.se/sbl/artikel/18400>, (accessed 15 February 2017)
- Brusewitz, A. 'Georg Adlersparre', urn:sbl:5563, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (online edition, accessed 13 April 2017).
- 'Erik XIV:s krona' in *Nationalencyklopedin*, <http://www.ne.se.proxy.lnu.se/uppslagsverk/encyklopedi/lång/erik-xivs-krona> (accessed 11 April 2017).
- Fahlbeck, Erik. 'Lars August Mannerheim', urn:sbl:9042, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (online edition, accessed 9 April 2017).
- Gladh, Henrik. 'Jacob Lindblom', urn:sbl:10473, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (online edition, accessed 16 April 2017).
- Jonasson, Gustaf. 'Bengt (Berndt) Schinkel, von', urn:sbl:6381, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (online edition, accessed 11 April 2017).
- 'Justititestatsminister' in *Nordisk Familjebok* (digitalised version of *Nordisk familjebok*, vol. XIII, T. H. Westind (ed.), 1910), <http://runeberg.org/nfbm/0184.html> (accessed 9 May 2017)
- Jägerskiöld, Olof. 'Karl XIII', urn:sbl:12358, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (online edition, accessed 7 May 2017).
- Jägerskiöld, Olof. 'Lovisa Ulrika', urn:sbl:9719, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (online edition, accessed 13 April 2017).
- 'Konungens troman' in *Förvaltningshistorisk ordbok*, Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, <http://fho.sls.fi/kalla/240/virka-arvot-ja-arvonimet-suomessa-ennen-itsenaisyyden-aikaa-i-historiallinen-arkisto-54/> (accessed 10 April 2017).
- Naselli, Mara. "Duc de Saint Simon and Courtly Bodies" in *3 Quarks Daily*, 9 June 2014. <http://www.3quarksdaily.com/3quarksdaily/2014/06/duc-de-saint-simon-and-courtly-bodies.html> (accessed 4 February 2017).
- 'Regeringsformen', *Riksarkivet*, <https://riksarkivet.se/regeringsformen> (last updated 14 March 2017, accessed 9 April 2017).
- 'Rikets allmänna ärendes beredning' in *Nordisk Familjebok* (digitalised version of *Nordisk Familjebok*, vol. XIII, 1899), <http://runeberg.org/nfam/0568.html> (accessed 6 March 2017)

- Stavenow, L. 'Adolf Fredrik', urn:sbl:5574, *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (online edition, accessed 13 April 2017).
- Thomasson, Carl-Gustav. 'Gustaf III:s död ur Leonhard von Huasswolffs liv och memoarer' in *Svensk Tidskrift* (1944), digitized edition: <http://www.svensktidskrift.se/arkiv100/1944/5%20Gustav%20III%20död.pdf> (accessed 23 February 2017).
- 'troman' in *Svenska akademiens ordbok*, http://www.saob.se/artikel/?unik=T_2555-0003.5V63&pz=3#U_T2555_27653 (published 2008, accessed 10 April 2017).
- Simon Zoltan Boldizsar, 'Method and Perspective' in *Journal of Microhistory* (2009), online periodical: http://www.microhistory.org/?e=37&w=journal-of-microhistory-2008_1#body-anchor (accessed 23 February 2017).