

CHAPTER 9

Billeted Soldiers and Local Civilians in 1750s Helsinki

Sofia Gustafsson

The year 1748 saw the beginning of one of the biggest construction projects that took place in the early modern Swedish Realm – the building of the sea fortress Sveaborg (later renamed Suomenlinna in Finnish) outside Helsinki. The Russo-Swedish War of 1741–1743 had once more pushed the eastern border westwards and the old defence line was lost. A new central fortress along the southern coast of Finland had to be constructed. After much debate, the plan to fortify Helsinki and the island outside the town was finally approved by the Diet in 1747.

During the following years, all Finnish soldiers and several Swedish regiments were sent to Helsinki for the construction works, alongside plenty of craftsmen and experts. The small town of Helsinki, with around 1,300 inhabitants in 1747, grew

How to cite this book chapter:

Gustafsson, Sofia (2021). Billeted soldiers and local civilians in 1750s Helsinki.

In Petri Talvitie & Juha-Matti Granqvist (Eds.), *Civilians and military supply in early modern Finland* (pp. 259–289). Helsinki University Press.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33134/HUP-10-9>

rapidly.¹ The military population soon outnumbered the local civilians. According to the original plan, the fortress should have been ready within five years, but it was never fully completed despite the construction works lasting for nearly 60 years. However, the most intense phase of the construction works was over by 1756, when most of the islands were in defendable condition.

The fortress construction brought two different kinds of soldiers to Helsinki: allotted regiments commanded for construction work, and enlisted regiments commanded for garrison duties. Most of the former stayed in the town only temporarily, since the construction works mainly took place between May and September, whereas the latter settled permanently in Sveaborg. All the soldiers had to be accommodated somewhere, but, as building barracks was a slow process, the crown had to resort in large scale to the billeting system.

The lack of military infrastructure had already, during the medieval period, created a system where the locals had to accommodate and transport both military and civil staff on behalf of the state. Burghers had already been obliged to billet soldiers in their homes in the 16th century, when the system was used, for example, in Stockholm and Helsinki.² The accommodation and transportation duties often resulted in complaints from the local inhabitants, and on several occasions the state sought to regulate the system.³

The allotment system, where soldiers of provincial regiments were provided with a piece of land, was introduced in the Swedish Realm from the late 17th century onwards. The system turned soldiers to crofters taking care of their own subsistence, making it possible for the state to sustain a standing army in peacetime. However, this system did not remove the problem of how to sustain the enlisted garrison troops in urban areas, and the state

¹ Turpeinen 1977, p. 125.

² Gidlöf 1976, p. 721; Jansson 1991, p. 209; Aalto 2012, pp. 89–94, 135–144, 214–216, 220–224.

³ Holm 2009, pp. 66–69.

continued to use the billeting system in towns if garrisons were not available. Especially for temporary needs, the billeting system was cheaper, faster and more flexible.

In the 17th century, when the Swedish Realm was at its biggest, the garrison cities were mainly in the Baltic states and far in the east, but after the Great Northern War (1700–1721) garrisons reappeared in Finnish towns. In the 1720s, billeting was used in the towns of Hamina and Lappeenranta, which were fortified to defend the new eastern border.⁴ After these two towns had been lost in the Russo-Swedish War of 1741–1743, new fortresses were built in Helsinki and Loviisa, and along came also the billeting system.⁵

The billeting question was hotly debated at the Diet in the 1760s. The burghers wanted the option to pay for accommodation in cash, while the nobility still wanted it to be the right to a living space. In 1766, when a new regulation was finally passed, the burghers got the right to perform their duty in money, while other house-owners in the cities also became obliged to participate. However, houseowners belonging to the nobility or the clergy remained exempted from the accommodation duty.⁶

The question of accommodating soldiers was by no means just a Swedish problem. All over Europe, early modern states were dealing with the same issue: how to sustain permanent armies without making costly investments in infrastructure. A very similar system was in force for example in 17th- and 18th-century Denmark, where soldiers were billeted among the civilians.⁷ And, in France and the Netherlands, billeting soldiers was the last resort if garrisons were not available.⁸

⁴ Ahonen 1991, pp. 34–42.

⁵ Lappalainen 1993, pp. 11–12.

⁶ Gidlöf 1976, p. 723.

⁷ Bjerg 1994, p. 51.

⁸ Guignet 2006, pp. 10–11; Kappelhof 2006, pp. 295; Lamarre 2006, pp. 309–310; Vermeesch 2006, pp. 277–280.

The billeting of soldiers in the Swedish Realm has been studied, for the main part, as it relates to its biggest cities, Stockholm and Gothenburg, which were most deeply and chronically affected by it. In his article about the Svea Life Guards in Stockholm, Leif Gidlöf (1976) focuses not only on the accommodation but also on the soldiers' economic activities. Pär Frohnert (1985) has also written about the soldiers' accommodation in Stockholm, mainly about the debate in the 1760s. The enlisted soldiers' involvement in crafts and their work in manufacturing in western Sweden have been studied by Thomas Magnusson (2005), and Gothenburg has also been studied by Bertil Andersson (1997). Also, the soldiers' wives' economic activities have been studied, e.g. by AnnaSara Hammar (2017) and Marie Lennerstrand (2017). In Finland, the 18th-century garrison cities have been studied by, e.g., Voitto Ahonen (1991), Ulla-Riitta Kauppi (1993) and Jussi T. Lappalainen (1993). For Helsinki, the soldiers' craft works have been studied by Juha-Matti Granqvist (2018) and the soldiers' criminality by Petri Talvitie (2014).

In the 1750s, Helsinki was turned into a huge military camp. The billeting also lasted for years, not week or months, and caused long-lasting tension between the military and the local civil authorities. How did the accommodation of the soldiers and other military staff take place? How did the billeting system work in a small town under these extreme circumstances? What were the relations between the army staff and the civilians? How and in which ways did they interact economically and socially?

The main sources used for this study are Helsinki Town Council protocols and court records from the local treasurer's court, the inferior town court that dealt with minor offences but also conducted a first examination of more serious crimes. I have also used different church records from both civil and military congregations in southern Finland, mainly in the form of the genealogists' database for church records called Historiakirjat (HisKi).

The Billeting System in Helsinki in the 1750s

Officially, the burghers' obligation to billet soldiers applied only to the enlisted regiments doing garrison duty, and not to the allotted

regiments used as construction workforce. However, there was a large grey area. Enlisted regiments were occasionally sent for construction works, and the burghers had to negotiate with the army about their lodging arrangements.⁹ Another question was whether the civilian craftsmen and experts working for the army were entitled to accommodation or not.

The first troops to be billeted in Helsinki arrived already before the fortress construction started. The enlisted Finnish Artillery Battalion, which had retreated to Stockholm during the Russo-Swedish War of 1741–1743, began returning to Finland after the war with reinforcements. The first artillerist arrived at Helsinki in 1744, and, by the time the construction of Sveaborg began in 1748, the town had four artillery companies.¹⁰

At the beginning of the 1750s, enlisted infantry troops from Sweden commanded for garrison duty in the fortress came to town. In 1751 approximately 450 men from the Lantingshausen Regiment and approximately 450 men from the Hamilton Regiment arrived, which meant half of both these regiments. In 1753, more units from these two regiments arrived.¹¹ For a short period, eight companies from also a third enlisted regiment, the Crown Prince's Regiment, stayed in

⁹ Jansson 1991, p. 210.

¹⁰ Hedberg 1964, pp. 29–31.

¹¹ Hirn 1970, p. 13; Screen 2010, pp. 14–15. The regiments were usually named after their commander and, when the commander changed, the regiment's name was changed too. One and the same regiments was known as Lantingshausen's Regiment 1749–1752, Cronhielm's Regiment 1752–1762, Björnberg's Regiment 1762–1772, von Saltza's Regiment 1773, Skytte's Regiment 1773–1777, Fleming's Regiment 1777–1788, Stackelberg's Regiment 1788–1801 and finally Jägerhorn's Regiment 1801–1808 (Hirn 1970, p. 30). In 1759, Hamilton's Regiment turned into Liljesvärd's Regiment, in 1761 to von Liewen's Regiment, in 1762 to Prince Fredrik Adolf's Regiment, in 1771 to Manteuffel's Regiment and finally in 1772 to the Queen Dowager's Life Regiment (Screen 2010, pp. 13–17).

Helsinki.¹² However, they left in summer 1753 for garrison duty in Loviisa instead.¹³

It is impossible to determine exactly how many soldiers the burghers had to accommodate in their homes and for how long, as the town council protocols mention exact numbers only occasionally. One of these occasions happened in May 1751, when the first Swedish enlisted troops started to arrive in Helsinki. According to the town council, in total one general, one colonel, two lieutenant colonels, one major, one artillery scribe, 11 captains, 32 lieutenants and ensigns, 35 NCOs and 522 common soldiers were billeted in Helsinki at the moment. The general, the colonel, four captains and 10 other officers belonged to the Swedish regiments; a lieutenant colonel, one captain and three other officers belonged to the fortification; and four lower officers belonged to Finnish infantry regiments. All the other 24 officers were artilleryists, as were all the common soldiers.¹⁴ The numbers only include the soldiers, and nothing was said about their families.

The cost of the accommodation was estimated to be nearly 40,000 copper dalers. However, this estimate was based on the sums the burghers would have had to pay in cash to the officers in the event they did not accommodate them in their homes. Thus, it had nothing to do with the burghers' real costs for the accommodation, or with their losses for the alternative use of their living spaces.¹⁵

Fortunately, not all the soldiers in garrison duty had to be billeted by the burghers. When the artilleryists had started to arrive in 1744, the burghers and the crown had constructed together the so-called Gyllenborg's Barrack, named after the local governor, with room for 200 soldiers.¹⁶ In 1748, constructions works for

¹² KA, Läänintilit, Uudenmaan ja Hämeen läänin tilejä, Henkikirjat 1751–1756, Helsingin kaupungin henkikirjat 1751–1756.

¹³ Roos 1960, p. 13.

¹⁴ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:55, Helsingin maistraatin talousasioiden pöytäkirja 25.5.1751; Hornborg 1950, p. 297.

¹⁵ Hornborg 1950, p. 297.

¹⁶ Hedberg 1964, p. 72.

another two large barracks to the outskirts of the town was initiated, and yet another smaller barrack was built in 1766. According to Jonas Hedberg's calculations, these four barracks were able to house 1,300 soldiers.¹⁷ As the construction works of Fortress Sveaborg proceeded, more and more living quarters for officers and soldiers were also completed on the fortress islands.

At least Cronhielm's Regiment (formerly known as Lantingshausen's Regiment) was mainly lodging in barracks, either in the town or on the fortress islands.¹⁸ Likely the same applied to Hamilton's Regiment, since the town council protocols are mainly talking about artillerists. As the construction of Sveaborg proceeded, the townspeople eventually got rid of even some of the artillery companies, for in 1754 at least two companies had already moved out to the fortress islands. But still, in June 1755, Councilman Nils Larsson Burtz complained that the soldiers' families were still living in Helsinki.¹⁹

The workforce on the construction site mainly consisted of soldiers from allotted regiments. The first of them arrived in town in autumn 1747 and winter 1748. In the beginning, the workforce was quite small, since only preparational work could be made in wintertime, and the real construction season only started in May. The first regiments to arrive also came from neighbouring areas, and the soldiers could walk home during leaves. During the following years, the numbers of soldiers increased rapidly, involving regiments from more and more remote areas. However, the local burghers were not obliged to accommodate any other than the garrison troops if it could be avoided, and they were very persistent in interpreting their billeting duty as narrowly as possible. In only two known occasions, the governor of Uusimaa and Häme Province, Gustaf Samuel Gyllenborg, requested the burghers to accommodate allotted soldiers.

¹⁷ Hedberg 1964, p. 73.

¹⁸ Hirn 1970, p. 160.

¹⁹ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:61, Helsingin maistraatin pöytäkirja 26.9.1755.

In March 1755, the governor asked for quarters for 280 soldiers from the Häme Regiment on their way to Sveaborg. Since there was not immediately available living space for them on the fortress, the governor asked the burghers to accommodate the soldiers for two weeks. The local authorities claimed that it was impossible to accommodate more than 180 soldiers, since the weather was far too cold so early in spring and soldiers therefore could not sleep in outhouses.²⁰ But the town council still agreed to the governor's request, likely because it simply was impossible to transport the soldiers to the fortress, as the ice was too thin for walking and too strong for boating.

In May during the same year, a new request arrived about lodgements for the same regiment for two or three weeks. This time the town council did not consider the burghers able to accommodate the soldiers comfortably, since they were already burdened with the artillerists. The councilmen asked for an exemption from the accommodation and hoped that the soldiers could be transported elsewhere to be accommodated in barracks and tents.²¹ Unfortunately the protocols provide no answer to whether their request was granted or not.

The remark about accommodating soldiers in outhouses tells that the burghers' persistence was not only a matter of principle. Since parts of the artillery already were accommodated in the homes of the townspeople, their houses were quite crowded. Colonel Augustin Ehrensvärd, head of the Finnish fortification works, commented in as early as 1748 that soldiers had to be accommodated in saunas, sheds and other outhouses, and it was nearly impossible to provide even one more soldier with a roof over his head, let alone getting him any bedclothes.²²

²⁰ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:61, Helsingin maistraatin pöytäkirja 27.3.1755.

²¹ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:61, Helsingin maistraatin pöytäkirja 25.5.1755.

²² Ericsson 1937–1939, p. 146.

Even disregarding the lack of space, it was not in the army's interest to accommodate allotted soldiers in the town. The fortress construction site was on the islands outside the town, and the preparational works such as logging timber took place outside town. This meant plenty of time wasted on marches and boat rides, as soldiers were transported to and from their workplaces.²³ Time and transport possibilities being scarce, the most reasonable thing was to accommodate the soldiers as close to their working post as possible. In 1748, before the work on the fortress walls had even started, Augustin Ehrensvärd had already initiated the work on building makeshift wooden barracks both on the islands and on the mainland. It is also likely that the army used tent accommodation in summertime.²⁴ Unfortunately, the locals still had to accommodate some of the officers from the allotted regiments, a heavy burden since they were entitled to more space than the common soldiers.²⁵

The accommodation duty was definitely a considerable social and economic problem, but the burghers' complaints should still be taken with a grain of salt, as other hidden motivations were often in play. In 1753, the crown transferred the town of Helsinki to a higher category on the taxation scale, which meant that the burghers' tax burden increased. The local taxation board protested wildly, and among other arguments referred to the townsmen's heavy burden of accommodation. In a letter to the king in 1755 the burghers complained of the difficult accommodation, claiming it cost them several thousand silver dalers every year. The aim of the complaint was to obtain concessions and considerable tax reliefs for Helsinki.

From 1749 onwards, the National Population Statistics Bureau (Sw. Tabellverket) obliged priests to compile yearly population statistics from their congregations. The statistics from 1750s Helsinki are not a complete series, but some years have been preserved.

²³ Ericsson 1937–1939, p. 147.

²⁴ Nikula 2010, p. 110; Ericsson 1937–1939, p. 147.

²⁵ Hornborg 1950, p. 298.

Table 9.1: Civil population and civil households in Helsinki 1750–1757.

Year	Civil inhabitants	Number of households ^a
1750	1,520	249
1751	1,648	256
1754	1,887	336
1757	2,072	348

^a Excluding poor and precarious households exempt from taxes.

Source: KA, Helsingin ruotsalais-suomalainen seurakunta, II Dc: 1 Väkilukutaulukot, Väkilukutaulukot 1750–1801. Table by the author.

They provide insight in the size of the civil population in Helsinki (the number also includes children) and, more importantly, the number of households. The latter is not complete, since poor and precarious households were excluded. However, the poorest households were also excluded from the billeting of soldiers since the accommodation was distributed according to the tax records.

The military population is much more difficult to calculate since no similar statistics have been preserved. It also must be remembered that only part of the soldiers lived in the town, with the rest lodging out on the fortress islands or in the neighbouring parishes. However, with so many regiments in town, the military population likely outnumbered the civil population by far. If we divide the number of billeted soldiers from 1751 by the number of households at the same year, we get 2.37 billeted soldiers per household. With the arrival of more enlisted regiments from Sweden later the same year, this number might have risen substantially. And these numbers include only the soldiers itself, not the servants of the officers, nor the wives and children that might have following the soldiers.

The burghers were not the only ones burdened with accommodation, although certainly the ones who complained about it the most loudly. Peasants on the surrounding countryside were burdened at least as much. Many soldiers from allotted regiments worked in the neighbouring parishes, cutting timber or chopping wood for the brickworks and lime burning. The lime quarry was

also situated outside town, but barracks were swiftly constructed there. But, for the mobile forest works, taking place on different places every year, barracks could not be constructed. These soldiers could in summertime be accommodated in tents, but during the winter months they had to be accommodated in the homes of the local peasants.

During the first years, the workforce was composed of Finnish allotted soldiers, who could be sent home for the winter. But, when allotted regiments from central Sweden were sent to construction works in 1751–1754, it became necessary to arrange winter quarters for them in the countryside around Helsinki.²⁶ The winter accommodation started in October or November and lasted until April or May; for sick soldiers it could even last over the summer. The sources often state just that the soldiers were lodging in ‘the countryside’, without mentioning the parishes. However, we know that soldiers were accommodated in peasant homes at least in the parishes of Espoo, Sipoo, Porvoo, Kirkkonummi and Helsinge. At least at the beginning of the 1750s, enlisted soldiers on garrison duty were also sometimes accommodated in winter-time in the countryside.²⁷

²⁶ Hornborg 1950, p. 208. KrA, Helsingfors fästningsarkiv, vol. 18, Kassakontrarulla vid fortifikationskassan i Helsingfors 1752; KrA, Helsingfors fästningsarkiv, vol. 3, Månadskontroller över fortifikationsarbetsmanskapat i Helsingfors 1751; KrA, Helsingfors fästningsarkiv, vol. 4, Månadskontroller över fortifikationsarbetsmanskapat i Helsingfors 1752; KrA, Helsingfors fästningsarkiv, vol. 19, Kassakontrarulla vid fortifikationskassan i Helsingfors 1753; KrA, Helsingfors fästningsarkiv, vol. 4, Månadskontroller över fortifikationsarbetsmanskapat i Helsingfors 1752; KrA, Helsingfors fästningsarkiv, vol. 5, Månadskontroller över fortifikationsarbetsmanskapat i Helsingfors 1753; KrA, Helsingfors fästningsarkiv, vol. 20, Kassakontrarulla vid fortifikationskassan i Helsingfors 1754; KrA, Helsingfors fästningsarkiv, vol. 5, Månadskontroller över fortifikationsarbetsmanskapat i Helsingfors 1753; KrA, Helsingfors fästningsarkiv, vol. 6, Månadskontroller över fortifikationsarbetsmanskapat i Helsingfors 1754.

²⁷ Hirn 1970, p. 158; Screen 2010, p. 15.

The burden of accommodating soldiers gradually diminished in the later part of the 1750s. In September 1757, Governor Gustaf Samuel Gyllenberg promised that the billeting in Helsinki would stop as soon as all soldiers could be lodged in barracks. This proved to be a slow process, and it is uncertain when the last soldiers really moved out from the local burghers' homes. Nevertheless, during the following decades, the crown used large-scale billeting of soldiers in Helsinki only temporarily for shorter periods, e.g. when troops returned after the Pomeranian War (1757–1762) and after a fire in the Siltavuori barracks in 1771.²⁸ However, the problem re-emerged in the 1790s during and after the Russo-Swedish War of 1788–1790.²⁹

The Practices for Billeting Soldiers

The burghers could provide accommodation for the soldiers either in living space or in cash. Each burgher received an officer or some soldiers as houseguests and had to provide them lodgings.³⁰ The alternative was to pay them an agreed sum of money, which they then used to rent lodgings on their own and thus became normal tenants in the townsmen's houses. The burghers could not choose which method to use, as the army had the right to decide whether the accommodation could be paid in cash or not.³¹ But, if it was impossible to accommodate officers properly, the army likely accepted the cash.

According to the accommodation prescript of 1720, as it was interpreted in Helsinki, a general or a colonel was entitled to one large and one smaller room, a kitchen, a cellar, a room for his servants, a stable for four horses, one good and two poorer beds. For lieutenant colonels and majors, the requirements were one big and one smaller room, a kitchen, one good bed and one poorer

²⁸ Hornborg 1950, p. 301.

²⁹ Hornborg 1950, pp. 408–410.

³⁰ Frohnert 1985, p. 21.

³¹ Magnusson 2005, p. 198.

bed, lodgements for the servants, and a stable for two horses. Captains were entitled to one room, one good bed and one poorer bed, and lodgings for one male servant; lieutenants and ensigns got the same, albeit with a smaller room than the captains. NCOs had to be content with a bed lodging with their hosts. All these gentlemen were also entitled to receive firewood and light. For simple soldiers, a bed and heat with the host was enough.³²

However, it is highly unlikely that these requirements were always met in the crowded town. Several complaints from the 1750s show that it was not always easy for the soldiers to get the kind of lodgings they were entitled to. As the chronic lack of space was common knowledge, most of the complaints regarded other things than the number of rooms. Officers complained often that they did not receive enough light or firewood, while the common soldiers lacked bedclothes.³³ There were also problems fulfilling the standards during the Russo-Swedish War of 1788–1790, and the town council had to allow several officers to be accommodated in the same room, even though they should have been entitled to a room of their own.³⁴

In the 1750s, organising the billeting system was the responsibility of Councilman Carl Hasselgren. He likely got help from the municipal officials, but it was still a tremendous task for one man to handle. During the war of 1788–1790 the town council opted for a different solution. In autumn 1789, the council appointed an official Billeting Board, consisting of four merchants, five craftsmen, five petty-burghers, and one representative for the artillery. Later it was also joined by two representatives for homeowners in the town without burghers' rights.³⁵

³² HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:55, Helsingin maistraatin talousasioiden pöytäkirja 25.5.1751.

³³ See for example Helsingin maistraatin pöytäkirjat 9.6.1750, 25.6.1750 and 15.9.1750, Ca:53, HSA.

³⁴ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:95, Helsingin maistraatin pöytäkirja 16.11.1789.

³⁵ Hornborg 1950, pp. 455–456.

The accommodation was distributed among the burghers in proportion to their taxation. The more tax a burgher paid, the more soldiers he had to take in. The taxation was not progressive in a strict meaning of the word, but every year a local taxation board decided how to distribute the town's tax burden between the locals. They had good knowledge of everyone's capability of paying and tried to adjust the shares fairly. However, to decide what was fair was not always easy. Merchant Anders Lindberg complained in 1753 to Governor Gyllenborg that he had been burdened with too heavy an accommodation requirement, but the town council quickly replied that the billeting had been done in proportion to the general taxation. It was not wise to complain. In Lindberg's case, the town council eventually discovered that he should have been receiving one soldier more.³⁶

Until 1766 only the burghers were obliged by law to billet soldiers, but after that all homeowners in garrison towns had to participate.³⁷ However, the statutes of 1720 had already given the town council a loophole, as in extraordinary situations, when there were more soldiers than usual to billet, it could ask all homeowners in the town to participate.³⁸ It is possible that the local authorities in Helsinki used this option, although it is often difficult to say if soldiers were billeted to a household or simply lived there as paying lodgers. For example, in March 1750, Ensign Kyhl handed in a bill to the town for accommodating officers in his house. This seems to indicate that the ensign was not obliged to billet soldiers, but, on the other hand, having to accommodate two high-ranking officers for months was huge task, and it is possible that Kyhl was paid compensation.³⁹

³⁶ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:59, Helsingin maistraatin talousasioiden pöytäkirja 27.10.1753.

³⁷ Magnusson 2005, p. 169.

³⁸ Utdrag utur alle ifrån den 7. Decemb. 1718 utkomne Publique Handlingar, Placater, Förordningar, Resolutioner och Publicationer ... 1742, p. 255.

³⁹ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:53, Helsingin maistraatin pöytäkirja 3.3.1750.

The local authorities were fully aware of the fact that it was impossible to distribute accommodation completely evenly and fairly. Some burghers simply did not have enough space in their homes for the accommodation that they, according to the taxes they paid, should have been obliged to arrange. Other burghers had to help out more than they should have because they happened to live in larger houses.⁴⁰

The town council protocol of 1 August 1753 notes that Commander of the Artillery Fredrik Ehrensvärd will be moving from the fortress to the town. He was billeted to Councilman Carl Telleqvist. However, Councilman Jakob Johan Tesche, who was at the time not burdened with any accommodation at all, was ordered to pay Telleqvist a compensation of 15 copper dalers. Accommodating such a high-ranking officer was a big expense, and it was thought not to be fair for Telleqvist to cover all on his own.⁴¹ A monetary payment was a more practical solution than to force a high-ranking officer to move around all the time just to distribute the burden evenly between his hosts.

The town council protocols show that the billeting system was not popular among the locals, and that many burghers tried different tricks to escape their duties. An honest way to do so was to rent rooms from somebody else's house for the soldiers, or to persuade relatives with more space to take them in. No one stated that the burgher had to accommodate the soldiers in his own house; he just had to arrange the accommodation at his own expense.⁴² Passive resistance was also popular. In October 1750, Jöran Wervelin was accused in town court of not repairing his house, which was seen as an attempt to avoid billeting duties.⁴³ Wervelin was not a

⁴⁰ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:55, Helsingin maistraatin talousasioiden pöytäkirja 25.5.1751.

⁴¹ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:59, Helsingin maistraatin talousasioiden pöytäkirja 1.8.1753.

⁴² See e.g. HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:53, Helsingin maistraatin pöytäkirja 15.1.1750 and 30.6.1750.

⁴³ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:53, Helsingin maistraatin talousasioiden pöytäkirja 19.10.1750.

burgher but a low-ranking civil servant, which indicates that the town council had to include also non-burgher townspeople to the billeting system.

Sometimes the reluctance to billet an officer could take a quite humoristic turn, as Colonel Cronhielm experienced upon his arrival in Helsinki. As the commander of a garrison regiment, he should have been entitled to accommodation in town. However, in August 1753, Cronhielm complained to the town council that he had not been received quarters. The council refused to accommodate the commander, with the explanation that he was also the acting commandant of the Sveaborg fortress. No commandant had ever been billeted in Helsinki, and therefore it was necessary to first ask for instructions from the authorities in Stockholm. Cronhielm replied that in such a case he was obliged to use his powers as commandant and find himself quarters where it best suited him.⁴⁴

The army was aware how reluctantly the townspeople accommodated soldiers, and in 1750 they came up with a system that granted a bonus for all who fulfilled their billeting duties without complaints. Lieutenant Ribbing from the Artillery suggested that the accommodated soldiers should be relocated between the burghers, so that good hosts would get the good-natured and modest soldiers, while burghers failing to follow the rules would get the troublemakers. The town council had no objections to this plan, as long as no one would get more soldiers than before to accommodate.⁴⁵ It is doubtful if this plan was ever implemented, but maybe just the threat was enough to scare disobedient burghers.

The billeting system did not apply only to soldiers but also to some civilians working for the army. At least master smith Anders Wikström, employed by the Fortification, demanded accommodation in 1753 and seems to have got his will, although the town

⁴⁴ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:59, Helsingin maistraatin talousasioiden pöytäkirja 18.8.1753.

⁴⁵ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:53, Helsingin maistraatin pöytäkirja 4.6.1750.

council protocol does not give details about the arrangement.⁴⁶ But not all craftsmen were entitled to accommodation in the burghers' houses, as the fortress accounts note several cases where craftsmen were reimbursed for paid rents.⁴⁷

The duty to accommodate officers and soldiers also included their wives and children. Even if the soldiers were temporarily commanded elsewhere, the families had the right to stay. Leave for private reasons did not automatically deprive the soldier of his right to accommodation, and he still had the right to quarters for himself and his family.⁴⁸ This right could also extend to after the soldier himself had moved into an army barrack. After the artillery regiment moved from the town to the fortress islands in 1754, many families stayed behind in town and in June 1755 Councilman Nils Larsson Burtz complained that the soldiers' families were still living in Helsinki.⁴⁹

For the common soldiers' wives, it might have been more convenient to stay in town. Most of them had to work and gain an income, since the enlisted soldiers' salary was far too low to sustain the family. The town might have offered more economic opportunities for the women, who usually earned money by washing, sewing, nursing and cooking. Many of them also sold food and beverages, either in small stands or circulating on the streets.⁵⁰

Both the allotted and the enlisted soldiers in the Swedish Realm were often married – not only the officers but also the common soldiers. The enlisted soldiers' wives often followed their husbands to the deployment, while the allotted soldiers' wives usually stayed

⁴⁶ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:59, Helsingin maistraatin talousasioiden pöytäkirja 27.10.1753.

⁴⁷ KrA, Helsingfors fästningsarkiv, vol. 18, Kassakontrarulla vid fortifikationskassan i Helsingfors 1752, KrA.

⁴⁸ Magnusson 2005, p. 200.

⁴⁹ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:61, Helsingin maistraatin pöytäkirja 26.9.1755.

⁵⁰ Lennersand et al. 2017, pp. 187–192; Lennersand 2017, pp. 165–169; Hammar 2017, pp. 145–146. About the situation in Europe see for example Hearl-Eamon 2008.

at home, taking care of the croft. However, this was not always the case, as occasionally wives of allotted soldiers could also follow their husbands to Helsinki, and sometimes they also visited their husbands or fiancés during deployments.⁵¹

The facts that civilians could also be accommodated, and that soldiers could live on rent if they received accommodation in cash, blurs the limits of the billeting system. All these factors make it difficult to say if individual soldiers staying with the civilians were billeted or just tenants. But in both cases the results were the same: the soldiers lived close to the civilians and formed social and economic relations with them. They were not staying in closed barrack areas out on the fortress island but constantly interacting with the local society.

Social Interaction between Soldiers and Locals

Helsinki was crowded and it was difficult and expensive to find somewhere to live. Many houses, buildings and even rooms were shared by different social groups, and military staff and civilians mingled extensively. All local households probably encountered the army staff, voluntarily or involuntarily, as it would have been extremely difficult to avoid the soldiers and their families, and these encounters resulted in different kinds of social or economic relations. This mixture of different population groups in their shared living space is difficult to detect in the sources, but sometimes court records can reveal details of the different ways of living.

It would be interesting to know exactly which soldier stayed with which burgher, but no lists have been preserved, and there are not many descriptions in the town council protocols about the actual living arrangements in the crowded town. Complaints were common, but expensive paper was not wasted on details. However, some exceptions can be found. In a murder case from 1761, the living arrangements of the accused soldier Martin Gutatis were described in detail. Gutatis was an enlisted soldier,

⁵¹ Gustafsson 2018, p. 186.

currently on leave, which was nothing unusual for enlisted soldiers. He had been lodging with Anna Catharina Björklund, the wife of an artillery employee. Anna Catharina Björklund, in her turn, was a tenant of Walborg Henriksdotter Hallberg; she was a married woman, but there is no mention of her husband. All three had been living in one and the same room, until Walborg Henriksdotter had evicted the others because it was too crowded. Walborg Henriksdotter also ran a tavern, but it is not mentioned if she ran her business in the same room or somewhere else.⁵²

A later court case from 1789 features a detailed description of the local living arrangements during the Russo-Swedish War of 1788–1790. The situation during the war closely resembled the 1750s, as soldiers in too large numbers had again to be accommodated in the burghers' homes in Helsinki. In November 1789, merchant Carl Etholén complained about the improper behaviour of two captains and the damage they had caused to his house, and at the same time also complained about the number of soldiers he had to accommodate.

Before the two captains arrived, Etholén had already been assigned to billet two other officers with their servants, as well as three NCOs. His house was not big. On the ground floor was his shop, a room for his bookkeeper and apprentices, and a small chamber he used himself. The upper floor consisted of a drawing room – impossible to keep warm in wintertime – and two small chambers occupied by his wife, children, sister-in-law and female servants. Since his family already filled up the house, Etholén had rented a room from his uncle's widow's house for the two officers. The officer's servants and the three NCOs lived in Etholén's servant's quarters in his outhouse.

Despite this, the two captains had been billeted to his upper floor and they were determined to get in there. While the family had been away to a wedding, the captains had broken the door and carried their belongings in. Later at night, while the household was sound asleep, they arrived themselves, forcing the Etholén

⁵² KA, Renovoidut tuomiokirjat, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 4.6.1761.

family to escape from their own home to their neighbours. The town council agreed that Etholén could not possibly accommodate any more officers, and that the captains would have to stay in the vicarage until other quarters could be found. The captains also had to pay Etholén for the damage they had caused to his doors.⁵³

The use of court records as sources easily gives the impression that the relations between the soldier and the civilians were bad. However, usually the soldiers did not cause this much destruction. Cases where civilians sued soldiers for threats, violence, or damages to property are quite rare in Helsinki in the 1750s.⁵⁴ In 1753, innkeeper Gustaf Wetter accused Lieutenant Stjernvall and NCO Schiönström for arriving to his house in the middle of the night, shouting, yelling, and kicking his door when they required accommodation. The material damages were insignificant, and the burgher was mainly upset about the disturbance of his sleep.⁵⁵

In 1757 another case of intruding officers can be found, where two NCOs were accused of having forced a lock and broken a door to get in merchant Aron Peron's shop. This case, however, did not relate to billeting, but to another common problem, namely debts. Merchant Peron owed the soldiers money, but he was unfortunately bankrupt and could not pay. Therefore, the NCOs were planning to take goods from his shop instead of payment. However, they changed their mind after entering and did not take anything.⁵⁶

The only known case from Helsinki where soldiers systematically and constantly pestered a local civilian is from 1755, when the poor brickwork owner Anders Ernst Mosberg claimed that soldiers were defaming him, singing nasty songs about him, shouting at him, threatening him, and throwing stones at his house. The court never really got to the bottom of this story, but

⁵³ HKA, Helsingin maistraatti, Ca:95 Helsingin maistraatin pöytäkirja 23.11.1789.

⁵⁴ Talvitie 2014.

⁵⁵ KA, Renovoidut tuomiokirjat, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 3.4.1753.

⁵⁶ KA, Renovoidut tuomiokirjat, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 19.3.1757.

Mosberg also accused his neighbour, merchant Erik Grönberg, for having something to do with all this.⁵⁷ Mosberg had also been litigating against his former business partner, Johan Lillgren, in court for years. Lillgren ran a tavern in Mosberg's neighbourhood, where the soldiers usually were sitting drinking, which might have been a coincidence or not. Mosberg died in December 1755, which probably explains why the case was never resolved and just disappeared suddenly from the court records. In Mosberg's case the soldier's animosity might very well have been fuelled by local civilians and originated in old conflicts between neighbours.

The court records reveal that civilians ended up in court for attacking soldiers more often than the other way around. Between 1752 and 1755, the town court handled seven cases where soldiers or their wives accused civilians for manhandling them and only three cases where civilians accused soldiers.⁵⁸ The local butcher Gudmund Methers often got himself into trouble, sometimes also with the army staff. In May 1756 he was accused of beating soldier's wife Anna Maria Sjöberg. She and her husband had been billeted to Methers' house together with their children. When one of the children had cried, the mother had tried to silence him with threats of corporal punishment. Methers had tried to calm her down, but she had slandered the butcher, who had retorted by hitting her.⁵⁹

Different behavioural and cultural codes could sometimes lead to conflicts, and women could get violent too. In 1754, carrier's wife Annika Carlsdotter Palin was accused of slandering and beating NCO Jacob Drossel's lover, Madame Holthausen, who had been baking bread at Palin's home.⁶⁰ Men could also fall victim to local civilians' anger, as did the enlisted soldier Jacob

⁵⁷ KA, Renovoidut tuomiokirjat, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 3.10; 10.10; 14.10; 17.10; 21.10; 25.10; 31.10. and 5.11.1755.

⁵⁸ KA, Renovoidut tuomiokirjat, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 1752–1755.

⁵⁹ KA, Renovoidut tuomiokirjat, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 11.5 and 12.5.1756.

⁶⁰ KA, Renovoidut tuomiokirjat, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 22.4 and 5.5.1755.

Östman, who in 1755 accused a local custom inspector and his wife of attacking him both verbally and physically.⁶¹

Considering the size of the military population, including women and children, the few court cases of violence represent a minuscule part of the encounters between the army and the civil population. It can of course be argued that the soldiers' possible attacks upon civilians might not have been dealt with in the town court but instead in courts martial. The complex court system in Helsinki has been thoroughly described by Petri Talvitie (2014) in his study of soldiers' criminality.⁶² However, Talvitie's research does not indicate that the soldiers were violent, as he found only two fights between soldiers and civilians in the military court records. There are also very few cases where soldiers attacked each other, and in the 1750s not a single homicide involving the military population has been found. Talvitie's conclusion is that the townspeople were more inclined to violence than the military staff.⁶³

The court records also reveal that trade and other economic interaction went on to a large extent between the civil and military populations. In the period 1752–1755, nearly 36% of all civil court cases where army staff or their families acted as plaintiffs or accused concerned debts or other economic transactions.⁶⁴ The soldiers could act as both debtors and creditors, buyers and sellers, or employers and employees. For example, in 1754, soldier Henrik Nymalm demanded payment for a cow from butcher Gabriel Wikström,⁶⁵ while soldier Johan Hortenius was arguing with carrier Palin about the sale of a horse.⁶⁶ The court records also show that the soldiers did all sorts of works for the locals, who sometimes refused to pay up. For example, in 1755, enlisted

⁶¹ KA, *Renovoidut tuomiokirjat*, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 9.5.1755.

⁶² Talvitie 2014, pp. 49–52.

⁶³ Talvitie 2014, pp. 56–57.

⁶⁴ KA, *Renovoidut tuomiokirjat*, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 1752–1755.

⁶⁵ KA, *Renovoidut tuomiokirjat*, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 14.6.1754.

⁶⁶ KA, *Renovoidut tuomiokirjat*, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 2.5.1754, 14.6.1754 and 2.8.1754.

soldier Anders Selling complained that he had not received his salary from one of the highest-ranking civil servants in town, Provincial Treasurer Anders Hellenius, who had employed the soldier to paint his house red.⁶⁷

A common type of court case where the soldiers were mentioned, but usually not accused, was trials of single mothers who had given birth out of wedlock. In the years 1752–1755, the records of the Helsinki town court contain 30 trials regarding pre-marital sexual relations involving soldiers. Pre-marital sex, or sex between any persons not being married, was a criminal offence and punishable by 18th-century Swedish law. The courts of Helsinki, however, quite often seem to have taken these trials quite lightly, as the processes were formulaic and the penalties not too harsh.

The Helsinki town court did not deal with the fathers, only with the mothers, since they did not have jurisdiction over the soldiers. In some cases, the fathers were also claimed to be ‘unknown soldiers’. This might have been true in some cases, but blaming deceased or departed soldiers and sailors was also a way to protect local married men. In one case this became evident: in 1752, maidservant Anna Jacobsdotter claimed that her former master, merchant Fredrik Myhrberg, had paid soldier Christopher Bruce to accept the paternity of her child, although the real father was the merchant himself.⁶⁸

It would be easy to assume that soldiers who had sexual relations with local women left them in trouble after an unwanted pregnancy. However, by contrast with the situation in many other European countries, the Swedish army actively encouraged soldiers to marry, so they often did marry their local sweethearts.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ KA, *Renovoidut tuomiokirjat*, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 29.8.1755 and 5.9.1755.

⁶⁸ KA, *Renovoidut tuomiokirjat*, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 17.11.1752.

⁶⁹ About Swedish soldiers’ marriages in general and also their marriages with local women, see e.g. Lennersand et al. 2017, pp. 188–191.

Marrying a local woman provided the soldiers not only with economic support but also with local social networks.⁷⁰

Many soldiers were already married upon arrival, but between the arrival of Hamilton's Regiment to Helsinki in 1751 and the end of 1757 there were 36 soldiers from the regiment getting married according to the regiment's church records. In only eight cases are there indications of the bride's origin. Three of them were mentioned to have been from Helsinki, and one from Fortress Sveaborg. In addition, two brides came from countryside parishes near Helsinki, Kirkkonummi and Inkoo. However, in three more cases a profession and an employer are mentioned, showing that these women had prior to their marriage been working as servants in town. In one case the father of the bride is mentioned, showing that also this woman was of local origin.⁷¹

However, not all soldiers' marriages were registered in the regimental church records. Many soldiers married women from neighbouring civil parishes, and their marriages were inscribed in the civil parish records.⁷² One unusual case went to court in Helsinki in 1754: enlisted soldier Johan Lilliegren accused his former fiancée, maidservant Johanna Eliedotter, of breaking her promise to marry him without any reason. Men could also be abandoned by their sweethearts, but they rarely decided to bring the matter to court.⁷³

Soldiers from allotted Swedish regiments also married local women during their deployment in Finland. At least three soldiers from the Calmar Regiment got married in Inkoo and Siuntio, rural parishes near Helsinki, in 1753–1754. It is likely they had been billeted over the winter among the local farmsteads there. Also, one soldier from Närke Regiment married in Vihti in 1753. In addition to common soldiers, officers, NCOs and other

⁷⁰ Lennersand 2017, pp. 160–169.

⁷¹ HisKi, Sotilasseurakunnat, Hamiltonin rykmentti, vihityt 1751–1757.

⁷² HisKi, Uusimaa, vihityt 1751–1757.

⁷³ KA, Renovoidut tuomiokirjat, Helsingin kämnärioikeus 14.6, 3.9.1754 and 23.9.1754.

military staff from enlisted regiments also sometimes married local women.⁷⁴

Another way of mapping the relations between civilians and soldiers is looking at the godparents of children born in the Helsinki town congregation in 1750–1757.⁷⁵ The results are inconclusive, as godparents often lack titles, and women are often called just ‘wife’. However, common soldiers very rarely appeared as godfathers for common townsmen’s children in the 1750s. For the higher social groups, the situation is different: wealthy merchants, high-ranking civil servants and other members of the local elite could sometimes include high-ranking officers and important army staff among the godparents for their children. In some cases, it is clear that the father of the child had ample business transactions with the army. For example, the local pharmacist Johan Magnus Tingelund often sold medicaments, colours and ink to the army, and it is hardly surprising that many of his children had military staff among their godparents. Also, many of the local merchants that were big suppliers of materiel to the army, e.g. Johan Sederholm, strengthened his bonds with the army by including officers among his children’s godparents.

In the 1750s, many locals might still have regarded the soldiers as temporary visitors in their hometown, and thus felt no need to form long-lasting social bonds and commitment to the army. But, as the garrison regiments during the following decades became permanent residents in town, the military and civil society started to merge to a larger extent, especially among the social elites. In the late 18th century, marriages between soldiers and civil women became much more common, many daughters of wealthy merchants started to marry officers, and their sons might even marry daughters of officers. Not only was this phenomenon due to closer and more long-lasting relations between military staff and

⁷⁴ HisKi, Uusimaa, vihityt 1751–1757.

⁷⁵ KA, Helsingin ruotsalais-suomalainen seurakunta, I C:2 Syntyneiden ja kastettujen luettelot 1750–1764.

civilians but it also reflects a profound social transformation in Sweden, where a new middle class started to emerge.

Conclusions

The burden of billeting soldiers among local inhabitants peaked in Helsinki in the early and mid-1750s owing to the construction works of the sea fortress Sveaborg and the arrival of garrison regiments. The accommodation of thousands and thousands of soldiers for months or years was a tremendous task. The town council tried to distribute the billeted soldiers fairly among the burghers, but that was an impossible task. Complaints were inevitable, but the tensions and complaints rarely resulted in violent rows, although they sometimes did end up in the local court.

Helsinki appears strangely calm and the local inhabitants obviously quite easily adapted to the military invasion of their living spaces. The reason for the Helsinkians' quite relaxed approach under these extreme circumstances might be found in the town's history. The early modern Swedish Realm was a highly militarised society, and Helsinki, owing to its strategic situation and excellent harbour, had always had importance for the military. The inhabitants had likely got used to having soldiers around, and after two Russian occupations during the previous 50 years they might also have felt more secure with so many Swedish soldiers in town. Many of the local inhabitants were refugees from areas that had been conquered by Russia in the Great Northern War or in the Russo-Swedish War of 1741–1743.

The court records also show frequent economic interaction between the army staff and civilians. Many civilians did their best to gain profit from the soldiers. Helsinki had suffered economically from the wars and occupations during the first half of the 18th century, and the fortress and the soldiers offered a wide range of economic opportunities, both for merchants selling construction materials and petty-burghers and poor widows (and rich merchants) selling beer and spirit. For most local inhabitants there was the possibility to profit economically from the army

in one way or the other – the more soldiers, the more clients.⁷⁶ Local historian Henrik Forsius warned that in 1757 the town was already getting economically dependent on the soldiers, and that too many locals were engaged in the lucrative tavern business and neglected their own livelihoods.⁷⁷ Many locals thus had a strong economic incitement to stay on friendly terms with the army.

Peaceful social interaction is always much more difficult to detect than quarrels, since only problems and fights end up in the court records. However, the church records offer proof of sexual relations and marriages between soldiers and civil women. However, only the absolute socio-economic elite in Helsinki included high-ranking officers among their children's godparents in the 1750s. At that time, the soldiers might still have been perceived as temporary guests, and the locals were not so keen in forming life-long relations with them, as they were mainly interested in short-term business relations. Maybe the local civilians' calm and collected approach to the army's invasion of their homes could best be summarised in the old proverb: do not bite the hand that feeds you.

Bibliography and Sources

Archival sources

Helsingin kaupunginarkisto [Helsinki City Archive], Helsinki (HKA)

Helsingin maistraatin pöytäkirjat

Kansallisarkisto [National Archives of Finland], Helsinki (KA)

Helsingin ruotsalais-suomalainen seurakunta

Läänintilit

Uudenmaan ja Hämeen läänin tilejä

Renovoidut tuomiokirjat

Helsingin kämnärioikeuden pöytäkirjat

Krigsarkivet [Military Archives of Sweden], Stockholm (KrA)

Helsingfors fästningsarkiv

⁷⁶ Aalto, Gustafsson & Granqvist 2020, passim.

⁷⁷ Forsius 1906, pp. 116–117.

Printed primary sources

- Utdrag utur alle ifrån den 7. Decemb. 1718 utkomne Publique Handlingar, Placater, Förordningar, Resolutioner och Publicationer...* Först delen till år 1730, Stockholm, Lorentz Ludewig Grefing, 1742.
- Forsius, Henrik 1906. H. Forsii akademiska afhandling om Helsingfors, förra delen öfversättning från latinska originalupplagan af år 1755, senare delen af år 1757. Published in Petrus Nordmann (ed.), *Bidrag till Helsingfors stads historia II*. Skrifter utgifna av Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland LXXII. Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland.

Electronic sources

- HisKi (Historiakirjat)*. Helsinki: Suomen sukututkimusseura. Online database. Available: <http://hiski.genealogia.fi/historia> (accessed 27 August 2020).

Literature

- Aalto, Seppo (2012). *Sotakaupunki: Helsingin Vanhankaupungin historia 1550–1639*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Aalto, Seppo (2015). *Kruununkaupunki: Vironniemen Helsinki 1640–1721*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Aalto, Seppo, Gustafsson, Sofia, & Granqvist, Juha-Matti (2020). *Linnointuskaupunki. Helsingin ja Viaporin historia 1721–1808*. Helsinki: Minerva.
- Ahonen, Voitto (1991). Garnisonernas uppkomst och deras betydelse i Finland 1721–1740. *Historiallinen Arkisto* 98 (pp. 7–71). Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura.
- Andersson, Bertil (1997). Att leva med och i en garnison i det gamla Sverige. Borgare och soldater i Göteborg under 1700-talet. In Gunnar Artéus (ed.), *Nordens garnionsstäder* (pp. 157–169), Slutrapport från ett forskningsprojekt, Försvarshögskolans Acta B 4. Stockholm: Probus.
- Bjerg, Hans Christian (1994). Hvorfore byer bliver garnionsbyer. Samspillet mellem staten og lokalsamfundet. In Sven Hällström & Kari Selén (eds), *Garnionsstaden. Uppkomst och avveckling* (pp. 49–59). *Historiallinen Arkisto* 104. Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura.
- Ericsson, Ernst (1937–1939). *Kungliga Fortifikationens historia IV:3. Rikets fasta försvar 1720–1811, det fasta försvaret i Finland 1741–1772*. Stockholm.

- Frohnert, Pär (1985). Borgare, husägare och soldater. Inkvarteringsfrågan i Stockholm 1757–1766. In *1700-tals studier tillägnade Birgitta Ericsson* (pp. 19–38), Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis Stockholm Studies in History 34, Stockholm.
- Gidlöf, Leif (1976). Inkvartering och hantverksutövning under 1700-talet. In *Kungl. Svea Livgardes historia 1719–1976* (pp. 721–736). Stockholm.
- Granqvist, Juha-Matti (2019). ‘Nämä ovat komppanian säärystimiä!’ Sotilaskäsityö ja sotilaskäsityöoikeudenkäynnit 1700-luvun lopun Helsinki-Viaporissa, *Genos*, 90(1), pp. 2–14.
- Guignet, Philippe (2006). L’armée dans la ville, ville et société militaire: des rencontres aux multiples configurations. In Philippe Bragard, Jean-François Chanet, Catherine Denys & Philippe Guignet (eds), *L’armée et la ville dans l’Europe du Nord et du Nord-Ouest du XVIe siècle à nos jours* (pp. 5–17). Temps & Espaces No 7. Louvain-la-Neuve: Bruylant-Academia.
- Gustafsson, Sofia (2015). *Leverantörer och profitörer: Olika geografiska områdens och sociala grupperns handel med fästningsbygget Sveaborg under den första byggnadsperioden 1748–1756*. Helsinki: Suomen Tiedeseura.
- Gustafsson, Sofia (2018). Ruotusotilaiden vaimot ja lesket 1721–1808. In Riikka Miettinen & Ella Viitaniemi (eds), *Reunamailla: Tilattomat Länsi-Suomen maaseudulla 1600–1800* (pp. 165–204). Historiallisia Tutkimuksia 278. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hammar, AnnaSara (2017). Att klara livhanken i en främmande stad. Båtsmansfamiljer i 1670-talets Stockholm. In Anna Götlind & Marko Lamberg (eds), *Tillfälliga stockholmare. Människor och möten under 600 år* (pp. 133–154). Stockholm: Stockholmia Förlag.
- Hedberg, Jonas (1964). *Kungliga finska artilleriregementet*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland 404. Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Hirn, Hans (1970). *Från Lantingshausen till Jägerhorn: ett värvat regemente i Finland 1751–1808*. Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Holm, Johan (2009). Gästning och skjutsning. Politik och infrastruktur i tidigmodern tid. In Maria Sjöberg (ed.), *Sammanflätat. Civilt och militärt i det tidigmoderna Sverige* (pp. 65–84). Opuscula Historica Upsaliensia 40. Uppsala.
- Hornborg, Eirik (1950). *Helsingin kaupungin historia II*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupunki.

- Hurl-Eamon, Jennine (2008). The fiction of female dependence and the makeshift economy of soldiers, sailors, and their wives in eighteenth-century London. *Labor History*, 49(4), pp. 481–501.
- Jansson, Arne (1991). *Bördor och bärkraft. Borgare och kronotjänare i Stockholm 1644–1672*. Stockholmsmonografier, Vol. 103. Stockholm.
- Kappelhof, A. C. M. (2006). Les dépenses pour la défense dans les cites frontrière de la République des Provinces-Unis entre 1680 et 1750. Bilan provisoire des conséquences économiques. In Philippe Bragard, Jean-François Chanet, Catherine Denys & Philippe Guignet (eds), *L'armée et la ville dans l'Europe du Nord et du Nord-Ouest du XVe siècle à nos jours* (pp. 291–303). Temps & Espaces No 7. Louvain-la-Neuve: Bruylant-Academia.
- Kauppi, Ulla-Riitta (1993). Kymenlaakson linnoitustyöt taloudellisena vaikuttajana 1700–1800 lukujen taitteessa. In Jussi T. Lappalainen (ed.), *Kasarmin aidan kahden puolen. Kaksisataa vuotta suomalaista varuskuntayhteisöä* (pp. 49–70). Historiallinen arkisto 101. Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura.
- Lamarre, Christine (2006). L'armée et la petite ville: l'exemple d'Auxonne. In Philippe Bragard, Jean-François Chanet, Catherine Denys & Philippe Guignet (eds), *L'armée et la ville dans l'Europe du Nord et du Nord-Ouest du XVe siècle à nos jours* (pp. 305–320). Temps & Espaces No 7. Louvain-la-Neuve: Bruylant-Academia.
- Lappalainen, Jussi T (1993). Suomalainen varuskuntayhteisö – taustaa ja ongelmia. In Jussi T. Lappalainen (ed.), *Kasarmin aidan kahden puolen. Kaksisataa vuotta suomalaista varuskuntayhteisöä* (pp. 9–26). Historiallinen arkisto 101, Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura.
- Lennersand, Marie (2017). I väntan på nästa krig. Livgardets soldater i Stockholm under 1680- och 1690-talet. In Anna Götlind & Marko Lamberg (eds), *Tillfälliga stockholmare. Människor och möten under 600 år* (pp. 157–177). Stockholm: Stockholmia Förlag.
- Lennersand, Marie, Mispelaere, Jan, Pihl, Christopher, & Ågren, Maria (2017). Gender, work, and the fiscal-military state. In Maria Ågren (ed.), *Making a living, making a difference* (pp. 178–203). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Magnusson, Thomas (2005). *Det militära proletariatet*. Avhandlingar från Historiska institutionen i Göteborg 48. Revised electronic edition. Available: <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/710> (accessed 27 August 2020).
- Nikula, Oscar (2010). *Augustin Ehrensvärd*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland nr 380. 2nd ed. Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland.

- Roos, John E. (1960). Garnisonsregementena på Sveaborg under svenska tiden. In *Piirteitä Suomenlinnan historiasta/Bidrag till Sveaborgs historia V* (pp. 8–22). Helsinki.
- Screen, J. E. O. (2010). *The Queen Dowager's Life Regiment in Finland 1772–1808*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Talvitie, Petri (2014). Black markets and desertion: Soldiers' criminality in Helsinki 1748–1757. *Sjuttonhundratalet, Nordic Yearbook for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 11, pp. 45–68.
- Turpeinen, Oiva (1977). De finländska städernas folkmängd 1727–1810. *Historisk tidskrift för Finland*, 62(2), pp. 109–127.
- Vermeesch, Griet (2006). Organisation stratégique et bénéfiques économiques. Les garnisons à Gorinchem et Doesburg pendant la révolte des Pays-Bas (1572–1648). In Philippe Bragard, Jean-François Chanet, Catherine Denys & Philippe Guignet (eds), *L'armée et la ville dans l'Europe du Nord et du Nord-Ouest du XVe siècle à nos jours* (pp. 275–290). Temps & Espaces No 7. Louvain-la-Neuve: Bruylant-Academia.