

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN



3 1151 02718 8204

Library



Johns Hopkins University  
of the









Sumptuary Law in Nürnberg  
A Study in Paternal Government

by  
Kent Roberts Greenfield

A Dissertation  
submitted to the Board of University Studies of Johns  
Hopkins University in conformity with the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

1915





## Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter I. Government of Nürnberg	13
"    II. Wedding Regulations	39
"    III. The Hochzeits-büchlein of 1485	62
"    IV. Wedding Regulations and the Reformation	93
"    V. The Reformation and Moral Legislation	125
"    VI. Regulation of Christenings	143
"    VII. Regulation of Funerals	149
"    VIII. Regulation of Clothing	156
"    IX. Problems of Sumptuary Legislation	189
Vita	



## Introduction

Sumptuary regulation prevailed throughout Europe, in the legislation of all varieties of sovereign authority, from a very early date in the Middle Ages until the opening of the nineteenth century. Laws of the English parliament, ordinances of the French kings, decrees of the emperors and diets of Germany were issued from time to time with the intention of restricting the different classes of the population in their indulgence of what was thought to be luxury. But sumptuary legislation manifested itself in some of its most interesting forms in the little governments of the free cities of the mediaeval Roman Empire, particularly in Germany and Italy.

In the weakness of the national power, the German cities at an early date shook themselves free from the larger political units in which they were situated, and were able to establish a practical independence which extended to the management of their internal affairs, and beyond this, to many of their relationships with the outer world. Within the contracted circles fixed by their ponderous walls, homogeneous communities of a peculiar type developed. They were not so populous but that the burghers were thrown into more or less intimate relationships with each other in their crafts and trades,



as well as in the frequent social encounters of a small society.<sup>1</sup> The mere physical nearness of the authority which had jurisdiction over them brought to pass an intimacy of control which corresponded to its literally personal familiarity with their lives and interests. The city councils early attained a position of power in their communities which made it possible for them to exercise the most intensive supervision. As champions of the burghers in their struggles to break away from external authority, they firmly grounded their own, while they multiplied their functions until these included the whole compass of dominion, from mustering an army to fixing the price of bread. Such conditions, social and political, favored a development of the paternalism of which the sumptuary regulations are a pronounced expression.

The sumptuary ordinances have an important incidental value as furnishing an interior view of mediaeval life.

---

1 It is easy to get an exaggerated notion of the size of the mediaeval communities. At the end of the Middle Ages only the fewest of the German cities had a population of 20 000. Strassburg and Nürnberg, the largest, slightly exceeded this figure. Not a great many could count over 10 000. The majority of the imperial free cities numbered between 5 000 and 10 000. The greatest proportion of all did not reach the 5 000 mark. See Inama-Sternegg, *Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, vol. III, part 1, pp. 25-26.



In restricting luxury, they reveal in the act of enumeration the customs, the dress, the furnishings, of the age. They enable one to look directly into the private doings of the men and women, and catch them in attitudes and engagements, which escaped record because they were too familiar, but which to the later world are both picturesque and significant. They make the people seem more human, and help us to visualize the life which at best is too remote.

Studies of sumptuary legislation are not without precedent, but the historians have been interested in the subject chiefly for its sidelights upon manners. They have displayed a certain curiosity for the picturesque and the antique. Careful enumerations have sometimes been made,<sup>2</sup> but too often these laws have been treated as a phenomenon of interest because odd. Consequently the task of relating carefully this legislation to the total scheme of mediaeval law-making yet remains to be done. For sumptuary law was not an excrescence. It claims the serious interest of the student of jurisprudence and of civilization because it registers the extreme limits of the mediaeval spirit of government, that pa-

---

2 For instance, Bodenmeyer, H., Die Hannoverschen Luxus- und Sitten-gesetze; Schwarten, Verordnungen gegen Luxus und Kleiderpracht in Hamburg (Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte, 6.); Liebe, Die Kleiderordnungen des Erzstifts Magdeburg; etc.





ternalism which the authorities openly avowed as their "väterliche Fürsorge" for the governed. It carries to ultimate expression the idea of the Middle Ages that the state was responsible not only for "the enforcement of thrift in industry", but for the economy and moral order of the family life of every person in its care.

Sumptuary regulation was of one piece with the whole design of mediaeval municipal law-giving. We have learned to accept as normal to that period the minute regulation of prices; the strict supervision of purchase and sale; the fixation of wages; the prescription of the quality of goods and the conditions of production. It is only a step from these to that regulation of personal expenditure which is the typical feature of the sumptuary legislation. In the sumptuary ordinance we may see reflected at its clearest the paternal attitude of the legislators, and measure most conveniently the sense of responsibility which they felt for the whole round of the citizen's activities from economic to moral. They required him not only to transact his business in accordance with standards of equity which they undertook to determine, but also to adjust his personal economy, and to dress, and curtail his luxuries, after their ideas of propriety. When the government undertook to dictate what he should spend on his clothes, his



wedding, his feasts, the christening of his baby, the burial of his relative, it laid its hand directly on some of the liveliest of human desires. These laws therefore serve to illustrate the relationship of citizen and state on a plane of most intimate contact.

The sumptuary legislation prior to the Reformation has an interest of its own, which has been heightened by a popular misconception. It has been the custom to associate close governmental supervision of personal conduct with a sharpening of conscience that followed the Reformation. When we think historically of Blue Laws, our thoughts at once run to Geneva and the Puritans. But, as Professor Vincent pointed out some years ago,<sup>3</sup> laws of the same type as the regulations of Protestant Geneva or of the Puritans were part of the normal program of legislation in the free cities of Europe, long before the day of Calvin or Cromwell, and while Catholic faith still enjoyed its monopoly. Professor Vincent's later studies in Basel and Zürich have supported this conclusion with fresh evidence. The enactments of the reformed cities, which have seized attention by their strictness, were by no means unique,

-----

3 Vincent, J.M., "European Blue Laws", in Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1897, pp. 355-373.



however their rigor and particularity may have been stimulated by fervid religious impulses. They were of one piece with legislation that had prevailed throughout Europe since the thirteenth century. It therefore becomes of especial interest to study the paternal regulative policy as it prevailed in the Middle Ages proper, in order to know to what extent it had been pressed, what motives it discloses, what conception of the duty of the city-state to the citizen in respect of his economies and morals, before the influences of Protestantism began to tell.

The interesting results of the studies in Switzerland suggested the desirability of investigating, upon a similar plan, the sumptuary legislation of communities of the same type in Germany. The range of choice is wide, physically limited only by the accessibility of materials, for the making of sumptuary laws was a widespread phenomenon, and went on actively in cities as distant and as diverse in circumstances as Cologne and Hamburg, Stralsund and Görlitz, Hanover and Ulm. For the selection of Nürnberg as the subject of this preliminary study there were several good reasons. Apart from the fact that the extant sumptuary laws of Nürnberg for the centuries preceding the Reformation are numerous and within reach, the constitution and political position of the city



offered in an unusual degree the conditions of a normal experiment. The stability of the city-government, which with a momentary interruption remained unaltered for some five hundred years,<sup>4</sup> gave its laws the character of a continuous policy, and made it unnecessary, in tracing the course of sumptuary legislation, to allow for disturbances due to shifting authorities. The government itself, monopolized by a few old families, was peculiarly in a position to exercise paternal oversight of the most characteristic sort. Furthermore the life of Nürnberg had a cosmopolitan quality. Its traders were in continual intercourse with the rest of Germany and the world.<sup>5</sup> One has only to read in the Jahrbücher of the fourteenth century, mainly from the pen of a brewer of the city,<sup>6</sup> to recognize the breadth of horizon that lay open to the citizen of Nürnberg. He breathed an atmosphere

---

4 For full account of the Nürnberg government, see below, chapter I.

5 Johann Müller, "Regiomontanus", selected Nürnberg as his residence and the seat of his studies because of its centrality in thought and trade, and its consequent stimulus and convenience for the scholar. See Jannsen, History of the German People, vol. , p.

6 Chroniken der deutschen Städte, Nürnberg, vols. IV and V, pp. 47-706. (Paged continuously).





astir with significant interests. One may therefore expect to find in the Nürnberg laws a minimum of provincialism, or fewer antiquated customs which might survive in more sequestered communities. The place was apparently abreast of the times, and however strange to modern eyes the sumptuary laws may seem, they are characteristic and typical of the period.

In the present study, attention has been directed mainly to the Nürnberg ordinances that appeared before the Reformation. The object has been to determine to what extent paternal interference had been proposed, to what extent the government felt responsible for the conduct of persons in their private capacities, before the Reformation could have had any influence over the authorities, in enlivening their conscience, or modifying their notions of government. We can measure the extent of this intention to interfere only by the particularity of the regulations, and by the signs of alert watchfulness. The endeavor has been to record any indications of either slackening or invigoration of the interest of the city-fathers in their laws; and further, to trace any lines of development in the social theory which they sought to apply. It has also been continually an object to decipher the motives of the council, and to define, as far as they could be inferred, the grounds on which they proceeded against



what seemed to them extravagance or impropriety in conduct. It will transpire that motives and lines of regulative policy that have been attributed to the impulses of the Protestant movement had been operative long before, and in fact originated when mediaeval conceptions of life were still reigning undisturbed.

It would be misleading to leave the impression that the sumptuary laws of Nürnberg are interesting only in relation to the Reformation. They have their primary significance in themselves, and in reference to the age and society from the conceptions of which they sprang. They introduce the student of the Middle Ages directly to a philosophy of government, and of life, which has entirely passed out of our experience; and in this they have their first value. The picturesqueness, which has absorbed so much attention, detracts nothing from their usefulness for this more serious purpose. It gives them a certain appeal to the imagination, and helps one to reconstruct the framework of the social life which they serve to interpret. This is my reason for describing the ordinances in more detail than the main objects of the study seem to require. It is a great aid to appreciation of them always to have this framework in mind. It is a portion of that reconstruction in imagination in which one seeks the ex-



ternal aid of contemporary art, and with all these materials rebuilds the city; the gabled roofs; the shadowed streets; the massive girdle of moat and battlemented wall; the men and women who came and went in costumes which have grown curious and strange in the long lapse of time. It is something more than a pleasant exercise of fancy. It kindles curiosity to know how life appeared to these people, what comforts they enjoyed, what limitations hemmed them in; and what thoughts and ambitions they evidently entertained. One task of this study is to find, if possible, the sentiment of the ordinary citizen toward his city-government, and how far its minute regulation was accepted as natural and proper. Almost every clause in the sumptuary ordinances discloses some legal obstruction, some new reminder of the government, which the citizen was liable to meet in his daily life as a result of the paternal attitude of the council. By the variety and multiplicity of these items one may calculate the points of personal contact with the state.

The present investigation must be regarded as introductory, even in respect to the sumptuary legislation of Nürnberg. It deals only with the ordinances as issued and omits many questions which cannot be answered except by a study of their actual administration. It is important to show first



what the council believed to be its duty in the matter of regulation; and for the determination of theory the statutes have been diligently compared over a considerable period of time. The actual pressure of the laws upon the citizen, and other interesting problems which turn upon their enforcement have been left for further observation.

In the first of the chapters that follow I have undertaken to relate the making of sumptuary ordinances to the general scheme of government in Nürnberg, and to indicate its place in the perspective of the council's other legislative activities. I have then given an analysis of the wedding regulations, because in Nürnberg, previous to the Reformation, these were the fullest of the sumptuary laws, and are best adapted to exhibit their distinguishing characteristics. They are taken up with especial reference to the increase of wealth that came to the city in the fifteenth century. The main object of the chapter is to discover what light they shed on the vigor of the regulative policy, and on the motives that underlay their making. The fact that the comprehensive wedding ordinance of 1485, the Hochzeits-büchlein, as it was called, was still in effect and subjected to a revision in the year after the council had committed itself to Protestantism, made it seem advisable, where it was so convenient, to point out the immedi-





mediate effect of the Reformation on at least this one class of sumptuary law, and to indicate the path of further investigation.

The chapter on "Wedding Regulations and the Reformation" includes a sketch of the Protestant movement in Nürnberg, which assists in explaining the nature of the changes wrought in the paternal ordinances. At this point the argument required a brief indication of the extent to which moral legislation other than sumptuary had been enacted before the Reformation; and this forms the subject of the fifth chapter. The study then returns to a discussion of the capital divisions of the sumptuary ordinances, and takes up in successive chapters those which regulated christenings, funerals, and apparel, one object being to exhibit the many different directions in which the citizen was likely to encounter the paternal restraints of the government. In the last chapter a specimen of clothing regulation of the seventeenth century is taken up, in order that the contrast with those which date from the Middle Ages may set in relief some of the ulterior problems of sumptuary law, to the further illumination of which this study has undertaken to pave the way.



## Chapter I

## Government of Nürnberg

The Council of Nürnberg, its government, was aristocratic always. In some of the cities, as Cologne, Brunswick, Magdeburg, the old families (Geschlechter) were unhorsed in those uprisings of the guilds which took place during the fourteenth century, and whose occurrence in close succession throughout Germany hints of a connection which has never been illuminated. The Nürnberg Geschlechter had a close call in 1348; for an instant the guilds triumphed; but fortune restored the families, and they returned to establish a grip on the government which they were able to render séure and permanently retain.

At some time during the eleventh century the settlement that was to be the city began to cluster about a rocky prominence by the river Pegnitz, which bore aloft a castle and stronghold of the Franconian emperors. Attracted by the shelter of this, and a nearby shrine of St. Sebald, which contained some wonder-working relics of the saint, the town swarmed between the rock and the stream, and traded by virtue of a grant of market rights from the king, and for awhile looked to the castellan (Burgvogt) both to guard it and govern it.<sup>1</sup> We are not

---

<sup>1</sup> Hegel, Karl, in Chroniken der deutschen Städte, Nürnberg, vol. I, pp. xiv-xv.



concerned with the first developments of an independent government, of which one can know nothing except by sidelong glimpses. Suffice it to say that by the middle of the thirteenth century a council had definitely put in its appearance as an organ of the community, and probably had been operative for some time previously; and this, with the Schultheiss, a royal appointee, with important functions as judge and executive, and the jurors (Schöffen), who sat in his court, made up the local administration.<sup>2</sup> The police ordinances of the latter years of the thirteenth century are issued in the name of "Schultheiss und Bürger des Rats";<sup>3</sup> judicial documents on the other hand in the name of Schultheiss and Schöffen.<sup>4</sup>

The jurisdiction of the burggrave, which we saw to have been at first all-inclusive, in time fell into fragments, and shrank to the limits of his castle.<sup>5</sup> The Schultheiss, whose entry as a second royal official on the scene had seriously curtailed the burggrave's power and marked the beginning of the town's independence of him, for awhile played the most conspicuous role in administration. But in time his prominence

---

2 Ibid., pp. xvii-xviii.

3 Hegel, in Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. I, p. xviii, citing Murr's Journal zur literarischen und Kunst-Geschichte, vol. VI, pp. 47-70.

4 Hegel, in Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. I, p. xviii.

5 Ibid., pp. xviii-xix.



too declined, and in the opening of the fourteenth century he is found subordinate to the council.<sup>6</sup> Other authorities decline, and it is the council that grows at their expense. By purchase, by grace of imperial grant, it gathered into its hand the full judicial powers, the imperial tolls, the Schultheiss's office, the residue of the burgrave's rights and perquisites. The process was finished, and the city its own master, or, to be more exact, the council was become full master of government, by the middle of the fifteenth century.<sup>7</sup>

We know something of the forms into which the constitution had settled in the fourteenth century, before the outbreak of the guilds. The jurors of the Schultheiss's court had become amalgamated with the "Bürger des Rats" in the ruling body. Thirteen jurors (Schöffen) and thirteen councilors (consuln) made it up. These were the twenty-six burgomasters of the city, half of them senior burgomasters, half junior burgomasters. Pairs of these, a junior and a senior, in alternation conducted business, under the style of "Frager". Beside this ruling council stood a larger council in a subordinate position. Its members were the "genannten", so called. They were called in for advice and assent only in the most important matters. Such in dry outline was the great organ of the community in the open-

-----  
6 Ibid., p. xxi.

7 Ibid., pp. xxi-xxiii.





ing of the fourteenth century, when, as we noted above, it got the upper hand among the authorities with claims of jurisdiction over Nürnberg.<sup>8</sup>

One cannot interpret a body of statute law with intelligence without knowing what class of the community controlled the making of it; and it is a point of extreme importance in a study of paternal legislation to learn the social make-up of the legislative power. It is ascertainable that at least as early as 1340 the right to sit in the Nürnberg council had been narrowed down to a patriciate, that is, to an inner circle of distinguished families, whose exclusive eligibility was an endowment of birth, and was passed on to their sons. What it was that originally set them above the unprivileged is not certain. They were not "Altbürger", - "descendants of those who came over in the Mayflower": for families which first moved to town during the fourteenth century, and later, were admitted. "As the city proceeded principally from the castle, and as even in the thirteenth century several Nürnberg family names appear among the knights and vassals (Ministerialen), we may pretty safely suppose that the nucleus of the Nürnberg patriciate was formed by Burgmannen of knightly rank, to whom in time other Ministerialen-families from the Franconian imperial district attached themselves." <sup>9</sup>

---

8 Ibid., p. xxiv.

9 Ibid., p. xxiv.



The main instrument of government, then, was in the hands of the patriciate, when the uprising of the guilds and the coup-d'etat of 1348 took place. The upheaval was an incident of the rough weather in the empire that ushered in the rule of Charles IV of Bohemia. The council declared for Charles, whereupon a majority of the crafts-guilds, taking advantage of the faction which split the empire, declared for the Bavarian party; and with the support and leadership of Markgrave Ludwig of Brandenburg, its head, and certain renegade aristocrats, swept the ruling notables out of the city. The insurgents constructed a council from among themselves, and held out till the fall of the next year. Then Charles came to terms with the Bavarian party. Nürnberg, with its deeply committed government, was left high and dry, and had to submit. The old council was reinstated. It punished the heads of the revolt with death or banishment.<sup>10</sup>

But before the end of the century eight craftsmen appear seated among the aristocrats in the council. When they came there, or how, is not ascertainable. It is supposed that they were admitted not long after the restoration of the patriciate, as a concession to the feeling that had been generated and crystallized in the uprising.<sup>11</sup> But other new figures appear be-

---

10 Ibid., pp. xxv. See also Rösler, *Alt-Nürnberg*, pp. 109-119.

11 Hegel, in *Chroniken, Nürnberg*, vol. I, pp. xxv-xxvi.



sides these. "Alte genannten" they were called, and there were eight of them, as there were eight craftsmen. They were taken from the retired burgomasters at first, afterwards from the large council, but in any case they belonged to the old families. Hegel thinks that they were brought in in connection with the addition of the eight representatives of the guilds.<sup>12</sup> At any rate they were a counterpoise for the craftsmen, and operated to annul whatever numerical advantage to the council their admission to the government had given them.

We have a most interesting and satisfactory picture of the council, which had become the exclusive government of Nürnberg, in a letter of the humanist Christoff Scheurl to Johann Staupitz, Luther's friend, and vicar-general of the Augustinian order.<sup>13</sup>

---

12 Ibid., p. xxvi.

13 A most satisfactory text of the letter is to be found in Chroniken der Deutschen Städte, Nürnberg, vol. V, Anhang A, pp. 781-804. Scheurl was a native of Nürnberg, born in 1481. He completed his education at Bologna, where after a course of eight years he obtained the doctorate "beider Rechte". One of his friends at Bologna was Johann Staupitz, and at his recommendation Scheurl was called to take the chair of jurisprudence at the new university of Wittenburg. He taught there till in 1512 he was appointed legal adviser to the Nürnberg council. In this capacity he served until his death in 1542. He was therefore a trained observer, and writing in 1516, was treating of a subject with which his daily business made him thoroughly familiar. The German translation, - the original was in Latin, - was not done by Scheurl, and it lacks the concision of the original, but it is a more valuable historical document because it gives the offices and functions of the council their current German names.



It was written in 1516, when the city had reached the height of its strength; and it portrays not merely the governmental structure, but facts as to its working, and the way in which its offices were regarded by contemporaries, that would not transpire in a constitution.

The craftsmen had even less weight in the decisions of the council than the extent of their representation might lead us to suppose. The passive attitude their deputies had come to take in view of restraints which had made their position almost purely a formal one, is apparent in Scheurl's curt description of them. "There are also in the city eight crafts from each of which one man is elected to the council... These have the liberty, when they wish, of coming to the council and casting a vote; when this does not suit them, of staying at home. They administer no office, acquiesce in what is concluded by the other councilors, and when a question goes around, they agree with those whose vote is regarded as nearest the just thing."<sup>14</sup> "All government of our city and commonwealth", says Scheurl in another place, "rests in the hands of those who are called 'geschlechter', that is, persons whose ancestors and great-ancestors have since long ago also been in the government here and ruled over us. Foreigners who have rooted themselves here, and the common people, have no power"; and the legal the-

---

14 Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. V, p. 796.





orist goes on complacently to justify this fact: "it belongs not to them because all power is from God, and to rule well belongs to few, and only those who are endowed by the Creator of all things and by nature with peculiar wisdom." <sup>15</sup>

Roughly speaking, in Scheurl's time the government of Nürnberg was administered by two councils, a large council of "genannten", and a small council at the top, the "Ehrbar Rat". But Scheurl's analysis reveals within this simple structure an intricate gradation of powers, and wheels within wheels. The broad basis of the government, the college of the "genannten", was by no means popular. Its membership, insofar as it did not consist of members of the old families, who needed only to marry to qualify, was under control of the little council.<sup>16</sup> The "genannten" chosen outside the pale of aristocracy were "persons of an honorable life and vocation, who," says Scheurl, "obtain their living by honorable trades (mit eherlichen dapfern gewerben), and not by despised crafts (verachten hantwerke), except some few craftsmen who have obtained a respectable position and bring tangible good to the common city by their handiwork, more than others." <sup>17</sup> In the curl of the lip with which this enlightened aristocrat refers to the crafts one gains an imme-

---

15 Ibid., p. 791.

16 Rösler, pp. 146-147.

17 Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. V, p. 787.



diate insight into the gaping differences of social rank which occupation made in the Nürnberg of the time. It was an honor to sit in the large council. Its seal was highly valued, and it participated, as we shall see, in the election of the vigorous body that stood over it. But as far as law-making went, its powers were slight. Its "sentence, opinion and vote" were taken only when a tax was imposed, war levied, or "the subjects (underthanen) warned of contingent dangers".<sup>18</sup>

There were forty-two members of the small council that stood at the head of the administration. These were divided and subdivided by lines which marked off ascending grades of power. We have already noticed the eight deputies of the crafts, and remarked on the listless attitude which they assumed towards business.<sup>19</sup> Of the thirty-four aristocrats in the council, eight were the "alte genannten".<sup>20</sup> The rest were known as burgomasters. Thirteen of these twenty-six burgomasters were "Schöbpfen", and sat as jurors in the criminal court.<sup>21</sup> The twenty-six burgomasters were crossed by another division into thirteen senior, and thirteen junior burgomasters. From the inner circle of senior burgomasters were taken a still more in-

---

18 Ibid., p. 787.

19 See above, p. 19.

20 See above, p. 18.

21 Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. V, p. 796.



timate circle of seven elders (eltern herrn), who were the real heart of the government. But still the pyramid ascends. From the seven elders were selected the three headmen (hauptmänner) of the city; and two of these were made the treasurers, and known as "losunger". Finally the losunger distinguished by seniority in office was recognized as formal head of the administration.<sup>22</sup>

These narrowing circles represent distinctions not merely titular. Actual jurisdiction and power were concentrated toward the center and summit. The two losunger as treasurers had more importance than the other Hauptman, who shared with them the custody of the seal, the keys, etc., and the military leadership of the community.<sup>23</sup> The three Hauptmänner, again, had this authority in addition to that attaching to the remainder of the seven elders. The seven elders in turn were sharply distinguished in power from the other senior burgomasters, from whom they were selected. Schneurl's statement is that "all power of the whole Nürnberg administration rests in the hands of the seven 'eltern herrn', for all secret affairs are handled by them, and all grave matters passed upon, before they come to the other councilors, so that the highest authority is in them, and the others have very little knowledge or power in compari-

-----  
22 Ibid., pp. 786-787.

23 Ibid., p. 794.



son with them." <sup>24</sup> Finally, in the outermost and least influential circle stood the eight "alte genannten". They were not burdened with exacting duties. Scheurl compares them with retired veterans. When the vote was taken in full council they cast theirs or not, as it pleased them. It is notable that these eight persons, who seem to be supernumeraries, had sleeping powers just sufficient to balance, and if necessary neutralize, those of the eight craftsmen. Scheurl remarks that the position had declined in esteem. Any three of the "alte genannten", as we shall see, were eligible as electors of the council, and the three selected for this office ranked as senior burgomasters. <sup>25</sup>

Scheurl imparts a fact not seen in the written charters which clothes these gradations with added significance. He tells us that there were degrees of rank among the families to correspond. The inner doors of the council were not open even to all of the patriciate. "Although there are many families in our city from whom the council is composed", he remarks, "still many of them are to be found who cannot rise further than to the grade of senior burgomaster; then the families from whom are taken the seven elders are very few; much fewer are

---

24 Ibid., p. 794.

25 Ibid., p. 795.





those, from whom the headmen are taken; those, however, from whom the treasurers are chosen are the fewest of all." <sup>26</sup>

These arrangements, he goes on to comment, were not required by law, but they were matters of uninterrupted usage. They put the most important powers in the hands of a very small innermost ring of an aristocracy itself highly exclusive. Incidentally they made it almost impossible for discontented persons among the lower orders to break the grip of the families upon authority, - certainly unless they could enlist the aid of a foreign enemy. It was provided, for instance, that in case of disturbance the citizens were to resort to the Hauptmänner to take oath and obtain leadership; and under the existing social hierarchy this meant that the loyal would be directed by the bluest of the aristocrats. <sup>27</sup>

The council was elective, and the election took place yearly, in the spring. The intricate arrangements by which the powers of government were exercised by an ascending scale of aristocrats were safeguarded carefully from being disturbed at this occasion by means of a peculiar method of election. The populace had nothing to do with it, except to call upon God to take care of the process. <sup>28</sup> First of all the large

---

26 Ibid., p. 792.

27 Ibid., p. 794.

28 Ibid., p. 785.



council,- itself aristocratic and seated for life- came together on the third day of Easter week, and selected two electors. Their field of choice in this selection was limited to the small council, and in it to the seven elders or the senior burgomasters. Then the small council itself completed the electoral commission by selecting three of its own number, who had to be "alte genannten". This electoral commission of five, a majority of whom were selected by, and two of whom were selected from<sup>29</sup>, the body of men on whose election they were to pass, proceeded to shut themselves up in a chamber specially guarded,- as it were, made waterproof to outside influences,- and to elect "a whole council except the eight alte genannten". Their task was simple enough, for, as one might expect, they regularly chose again those already in the council. Sometimes an old man would ask to be retired; on rare occasions a councilor would be dropped for misconduct; otherwise only when death interfered did they have to exercise their right of choice. "It is held a great disgrace", wrote Scheurl, "when anyone is removed from the council against his will".<sup>30</sup>

The designation of persons to fill the more important of-

---

29 The two senior burgomasters were the only electors themselves in line for choice by the commission. The other three were members of the small council but they were alte genannten, and these were chosen by the new council itself.

30 Ibid., pp. 788-789.



fices within the small council was not left even to the electoral commission, deeply dyed in aristocracy as it was, but was assumed by the burgomasters themselves, and accomplished by another elaborate electoral process. Thus when a vacancy occurred among the seven elders or the two losunger, the two Hauptmänner selected five from the council, who made four nominations. The nominee who received the highest number of votes was elected. The eight "alte genannten" were also the choice of the small council.<sup>31</sup>

I have traced in detail the mechanism of the Nürnberg government, and the safeguards with which it was encased, to show how free it was of all tangible restraints imposed by the people over whose lives it presided. Its forms were such as to offer freest opportunity for manifestation of paternalism. If in the laws it enacted we find it interposing its hand among the wheels of private life, and undertaking to regulate personal economies and conduct by moral chronometers of its own, we are justified in taking these interferences to be, as far as form of government is concerned, typical. In respect of government Nürnberg offers the qualifications of a perfect experiment. A single class of men, those to whom the citizen would be inclined to look with respect on account of their ancient lineage and station, and with something of patriotic

---

31 Ibid., pp. 792-793.



pride, at least in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, because they were leaders in the enterprises that made the city wealthy and famous,- this single class, with the solidarity of a common pride and a responsibility long supported, had gathered into its hands all the political power of the growing city. They had succeeded in dissipating the force of a concession made under constraint to the guilds, and had removed their power from the disturbing touch of hostile interests, by means of a series of internal adjustments that have all the appearance of clever contrivance, and by a mystery of election that was in no wise calculated to jeopardize their position. They were safely entrenched in authority, and they remained so until the beginning of the nineteenth century. They were in a position to exercise over the lives of the citizens a paternalism of the most typical sort.

This is no place to discuss the character of the Nürnberg patriciate; but the statements of a recent book on the Reformation <sup>32</sup> make it of interest to notice that the most of them were merchants, and thoroughly identified with the bur-

---

32 Vedder, Henry C., The Reformation in Germany. New York. 1914.





gher class.<sup>33</sup> As an explanation of the prompt adhesion to Luther of the free cities, - such a critical factor in his success, - it has been asserted that the burghers disliked the Roman church because of the support it gave to the sumptuary laws, which discriminated against them in favor of the knights, and thus compromised their social standing.<sup>34</sup> But in Nürnberg, at least, any sumptuary laws which bound the rising commercial class, - covetous of high station, and as sumptuous in display as the gentry, - were of the merchants' own making. If the wives and daughters of the burghers could not shine in as handsome velvet, diamonds and ermine as their perhaps less wealthy sisters who happened to have knights and ladies for parents, it was not because they were forbidden by some distant body composed of the husbands of the envied, but it was by reason of the decrees of their own husbands and fathers. It is undoubtedly true that the church had a considerable influence in securing the passage of sumptuary laws (see below,

-----  
 33 Rösel, p. 139. Such prominent families as those of Ebner, Behaim, Pfinzing, Gross, Praun, Tucher, Paumgärtner, Kress, Grundherr, Rummel, Muffel, Nützel, Schürstab, Imhoff, - names always appearing in the records of the council, - early attained distinction in commerce; and "even industry did not remain foreign to the Nürnberg 'Geschlechter'." See also p. 142.

34 Vedder, pp. xxxv-xxxvi.



p. 162, for an example of directly traceable influence); but it is not to be supposed for a moment that a free-handed council like that of Nürnberg would submit to laws dictated by the clergy, and so framed as to discriminate against the burgher class, and deprive them of the insignia of a social rank upon which they had set their hearts. Certainly this influence would not bind them so sharply as to drive them to break with the church to be rid of it, or even as to be a serious consideration when they were meditating the advantages of going over to the Protestant camp.

As regards the courts of the city, we are chiefly interested to note their complete subordination to the council. In 1459, when it received from emperor Frederick III a perpetual grant of criminal jurisdiction, the council had gathered into its hand the last of the rights necessary to complete its judicial supremacy; and the constitution of the courts shows how jealously it wielded them. Penal cases were heard by such of the seven elders as were also jurors (Schöpfen); and cases that involved capital punishment were tried by the thirteen Schöpfen, who were incorporate members of the council. Even they were required to follow in their verdict the vote on the case of the council in full session.<sup>35</sup> The civil court was

---

35 Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. V, p. 796.



constituted in the same manner as the criminal till 1497<sup>36</sup>; after that it was separated from the council and composed of eight of the "genannten", who had independent means and could give their whole time to it. Still two members of the council sat in it as assessors; the learned doctors who advised it on points of law were appointees of the council; and appeal could be taken from its decisions to the council. Again, the "Pfänder", the sheriff, was taken from the "genannten", but four members of the council sat with him in cases arising under the laws that regulated the guilds; and they with him had the power to appoint the masters of the crafts. "In short", says Scheurl, "what the gildmasters are elsewhere, the five 'rügsherrn' are with us."<sup>37</sup> All the vital judicial organs were administered either by members of the council, or its appointees under close supervision.

It is difficult to discover in the terms of the sumptuary laws the court by which they were applied, but what evidence we have points to the "fünfergericht".<sup>38</sup> It was a court composed of five members of the council. "Among these are always the two whose term as burgomasters ended in the previous month, and the two whose term as burgomasters has just begun this present month." The fifth was appointed in rotation from

---

36 Hegel, in Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. I, p. xxviii.

37 Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. V, p. 799.

38 See below, p. 186.



the whole number of the council, the two losunger excepted. The court was therefore renewed every month in its personnel. They sat three times a week, namely, on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, in the afternoon, in three-hour sessions. "Before them all cases of slander and injuries are adjudicated, and those who have disobeyed the laws punished. In all cases brought before them they proceed despatchfully and briefly, without discursion and the red tape of courts. They accept no written plaint and permit no party attorney or advocate. They seldom hear witnesses, but for the most part decide the causes on oath. No one may take an appeal from their verdict. Nevertheless when a case is grave they carry it to the honorable council." Scheurl stops to eulogise this as a very salutary practice.<sup>39</sup> It is important to note that this was a purely secular court, and in no sense a consistory; and furthermore, that it came together, not as there was business to despatch, but in appointed and regular sessions. This means that the body which initiated the sumptuary regulations applied them itself in the person of five of its members; and that the court which had cognizance of infractions of them was never

---

39 Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. V, pp. 796-797.





closed, as it was in some cities, from lack of interest in their enforcement.

Merely to name over the instrumentalities of the Nürnberg government is to realize in some measure what a multitude and what a variety of duties the council had to discharge. As we have seen, it discharged the most of them in person. It had come to possess, and it wielded with its own hand, powers sufficient to meet the multifarious needs of a mediaeval free city, -legislative, judicial, executive, political. In thinking of these it is difficult not to let one's conceptions be colored by the nature of the modern municipal government, and to think of the mediaeval city council in terms of the city council of today. Really it was a very different thing. It is true that the council of Nürnberg had the same range of local duties to cover as its modern namesake. It was responsible for policing the streets and for good order. It made building regulations<sup>40</sup>, and had a special officer to look after them. (Baumeister) It made provisions for keeping the streets clean, -after its ideas of cleanliness.<sup>41</sup> It issued ordinances that looked to the prevention and extinc-

---

40 Baader, Nürnberger Polizeiordnungen, p. 285ff.

41 Ibid., p. 275ff.



tion of fires.<sup>42</sup> It levied taxes and administered the finances. It looked after the poor.<sup>43</sup> But beyond these and the like domestic duties the parallel stops, and in two directions a wide field of activities opens which today is occupied by superior authorities, or barred against all governments whatsoever.

First of all the Nürnberg council had the trades to regulate; and they felt called upon to control a multitude of economic relationships which we think best to leave to the automatic adjustment of interest and honor. Through their agent, the constable (Pfänder), they saw to it that bread, meat, and other necessaries were brought to market in proper quantity to feed the city, and sold at a just price.<sup>44</sup> When famine prices set in, they baked bread.<sup>45</sup> They watched narrowly the craftsmen and small traders, and brought them to book when they caught the tradesmen buying or selling in violation of the laws which they laid down from time to time for business,<sup>46</sup> or the craftsmen turning out work that was fraud-

---

42 Ibid., p. 294ff.

43 Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. IV, pp. 378-379, where in the Jahrbuch for 1486, Deichsler the chronicler tells of his appointment as Bettelherr, and the measures he took when in office.

44 Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. V, p. 799.

45 See Jahrbücher, passim, in Chroniken, Nürnberg, vols. IV and V.

46 For examples see Baader, p. 122ff., and p. 191ff.



ulent or scamped.<sup>47</sup> One has only to glance at such a collection as that of Baader's<sup>48</sup>, and note the complex of regulations that falls under such heads as Handelspolizei, Gewerbspolizei, Victualenpolizei, to appreciate to what degree law-making in the economic sphere engaged the attention and energies of the council; and to realize what a familiarity with the busy economic hive of the city was required, a familiarity to be had only by close contact and incessant attention, in order to make these laws, and to give them effect. The council further had a considerable measure of responsibility for the ecclesiastical bodies within the walls. Even before the Reformation it appointed the provosts of the city parishes.<sup>49</sup> It deputed a councilman to have oversight of the city's relations with each of the religious institutions of the city.<sup>50</sup> After the Reformation the council appointed the clergy, fixed their stipends and paid them, prescribed the ritual; and, in short, was "bishop of Nürnberg".<sup>51</sup>

On the other hand an entirely different class of duties fell upon the same men by virtue of the fact that the ci-

47 Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. V, p. 799.

48 Baader, Nürnberger Polizeiordnungen.

49 Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. V, p. 781. Jahrbücher, Tucher'sche Fortsetzung, 1477.

50 Ibid., p. 800. Scheurl's letter to Staupitz.

51 Rüssel, pp. 460-461.



ty was a state. The ring of masonry that was the shelter of their independence in a land of turmoil and lawless enmities was in itself a care and expense, and is a visible index of the posture of defense in which the rulers of the city were always obliged to stand. To command respect in the foreign relations into which the city's far-flung commercial enterprises drew it, and give it a weight in the empire commensurate with its wealth and interests, the council had to prepare a military force, and keep it in readiness. But these offices were but preparatory to the far more difficult one of steering the city, a powerful free factor, in the treacherous waters of imperial politics. The councilors had to be much more than village statesmen to measure up to the task. The council makes its very first appearance in the act of joining the Rhine Confederation of cities in 1256.<sup>52</sup> To take at random another instance of its foreign activities, a delegation from its number are to be found conferring with the representatives of other cities at Speyer in the spring of 1523, how best to thwart the plan of the estates to lay a tax on trade; and Scheurl, the "Ratsconsulent", was despatched as the council's plenipotentiary, along with the delegates of Augsburg, Metz and Strassburg, to interview the emperor in

---

52 Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. I, p. xviii.





Spain, and bring him around to their way of thinking.<sup>53</sup> Delegates of their number sat in the imperial diets.<sup>54</sup> They waged war; entered into leagues and alliances; negotiated treaties with other powers. It was one of the appointed functions of the senior Frager to "receive foreign legates and messengers."<sup>55</sup> This important station in imperial politics was not of a sort to let their minds stagnate in local concerns. They were continually called upon to exercise judgment on affairs that looked beyond the city-walls, and to shape the policies of a little state by considerations that were of interest to the whole empire, often to the whole of Europe. The point that strikes one as curious and interesting is that these same men, without feeling that they were doing anything exceptional, could turn in the natural course of the day's business "to deliberate how the extravagance ( in dressing) children during Holy Week might be prevented"<sup>56</sup>; or

---

53 Rösel, pp. 444-445.

54 Their deputation to the diet of Worms in 1521 consisted of Kaspar Nützel, Leonard Groland, and Lazarus Spengler. Rösel, p. 436.

55 Chroniken, Nürnberg, p. 790.

56 Rats-Manual, 1499, April; quoted in editor's note, number 5, in Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. V, p. 607.



to despatch a letter to the Bishop of Bamberg to say that in compliance with his request they had ordered the cobblers "on pain of a definite penalty, henceforth to make no more peaks on the shoes."<sup>57</sup>

It has seemed to take us somewhat afield to describe the council and its activities, and yet the description is entirely germane to our study. The fact that such was the character of the council, and that such was the extensive compass of its duties, adds greatly to the significance of the paternal laws. They would have little or no interest if issued by some parochial body. It is the fact that a busy, capable and important authority like the Nürnberg council should for centuries feel it a grave duty daily to turn from interests of state to look into the wardrobe and personal account-book of the citizen, to see to it that he did not indulge in vanity or extravagance or improprieties, - it is this that makes the paternal regulation peculiarly significant as reflecting a theory of government, and of life, no longer within our experience. One has to be always reminding oneself that it is not some consistory, some board of clergymen, with consciences professionally tender to the shortcomings of others, that

---

57 Briefbuch, number 23, folio 259; quoted by editor in Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. IV, p. 197, note 1.



makes these regulations, but a body of men in the thick of affairs, whose daily business was of an importance and breadth to school them in sagacity and cultivate them in the broadest practical intelligence. The sumptuary laws were not the expression of sectaries or radicals or of men in an eddy, but of representative public minds.



## Chapter II

### Wedding Regulation

One of the major passages of life in which the citizen encountered the paternal action of the council was at his marriage. Weddings are much the same in all ages; and the exchange of gifts, the feasting, wine and music, the festive attire, and the lavish hand, expected as befitting the joyousness and freedom of the occasion, offered a temptation almost impossible to resist; and the city fathers were engaged from an early time in seeking to curb what they felt to be extravagance in these matters. In Nürnberg, legislation on the subject of weddings is the most complete of the varieties of sumptuary law previous to the Reformation. A review of it will serve to exhibit the nature of the sumptuary ordinances in general, at the same time that it tells its own story of the course of regulation in one important field.

The earliest regulations of weddings that have come to us are little more than miscellaneous fragments. There is nothing by which to determine their dates except within very wide limits; and it is almost impossible to know anything even of the order in which they appeared. Indeed the form in which they survive makes it difficult to reach any conclusions whatever as to the conditions of their making, unless it be this: that, although they appear on the records in sequence,





as if articles of one ordinance, they are plainly the products of a diversity of circumstances, and were made at different times.<sup>1</sup> We shall see that their piecemeal character is in

-----

1 The manner in which Siebenkees, in his *Materialien zur Nürnbergischen Geschichte*, vol. I, pp. 395-402, edits a large group of early wedding-regulations is misleading. He calls them the "älteste", and dates them "ums Jahr 1340". This date is assigned without explanation, and upon scrutiny seems to be open to criticism. There is nothing on the face of the regulations to support the opinion that they originated at any one time, or within a few years. They are a miscellaneous series of articles, not classified, and sometimes contradictory in their prescriptions. They would seem to represent an accretion of provisions put in force at various times and thrown together for convenience of reference in the statute book. A number of the same regulations are printed by Baader (*Nürnbergischer Polizeiordnungen*) among ordinances of the "XIII and XIV centuries"; and he leaves the reader to infer that they ranged in date over a long period of time. He found them in a codex which was begun in the thirteenth century and continued in the fourteenth. The earlier entries, forming the body of the volume, extended no further than 1330. Additions, however, in the form of amendments, or of fresh enactments, were made which date from 1325 to 1350. These, Baader tells us in his preface (p.2), he has indicated by putting them in parentheses. "Those ordinances", he says, "or amendments which, to judge by the writing, might come from the time between 1325 and 1350 I have enclosed in round brackets". "The most of those which are not enclosed in round brackets belong to the latter half of the thirteenth century." (*Ibid.*, p.3) Now only one of the articles dated by



itself of some significance. It sets them in interesting contrast with the comprehensive ordinance from the close of the Middle Ages, the Hochzeits-büchlein of 1485, which we shall take as a sample of later wedding regulation. The absence of dates leaves the order of discussion of little consequence, but the haphazard and apparently "occasional" nature of the early laws would not be exhibited as clearly if they were arranged for description under topics. I have therefore taken them as they come in the records.<sup>2</sup> The detail which might be tedious in describing other kinds of law is lent a saving interest by its disclosure, in glimpses, of the social life of that old time. The picture is fitful and swims in obscurity; to many of its meanings the key is lost; but it presents to the imagination a hint of the forms in which some of the most intimate and lively of human experiences clothed themselves for the man and woman who lived in a mediaeval town.

-----  
 Siebenkees "ums Jahr 1340" is bracketed by Baader. The remainder, according to Baader's notation, may have arisen at any time during the last half of the thirteenth century or the first quarter of the fourteenth. It is not even necessary to suppose that they were entered continuously on the pages of the original statute-book. Baader says of the provisions generally of this codex that "nowhere is a systematic order observed" (p. 2). "This", he says, "can only be established by the several indications scattered through the whole volume."

2 Certain exceptions will be necessary as noted.



One of these early regulations, like so many of those which were to follow, is concerned with the attendance at the wedding. It limits the number of guests to twelve, six men and six women. A party of this same number might attend the bridal party to the church. If more were present, each was liable to a fine of ten pounds haller<sup>3</sup>, and the host to the

-----

3 A note on coinage, to elucidate the terms that occur in the text, is likely to muddle the more a confused and confusing subject. A word or two of the most general sort may be of help. It is well to keep in mind Charlemagne's system, for it was the foundation of European numismatics, and offers a clue in the labyrinth of mediaeval currency. Its basis was a silver pound. 20 solidi (schillinge) made a pound; 12 denarii (pfennige) made a solidus. These proportions hold in the currency of England today; and for a long time they obtained in the reckoning of Germany, amid infinite fluctuations of value. The denarius or pfennig was for a great while the most frequent coin. The pound, and for the most part the schilling, were simply coins of account, -that is, not actual, but imaginary coins, used in reckoning values. In the eleventh century the mark began to take its place beside the <sup>pound.</sup> A Cologne mark contained 12 schillinge and 144 pfennige. The mark, in general, must be understood as a measure of weight, out of which at different times various numbers of pennies were struck. At the same time the pound remained constant, that is, it always consisted of the same number of pennies.

The denarius or pfennig circulated in Germany in various disguises of form and name. Half-pfennige, or even smaller fractions of the pfennig were called Heller, after Halle, which









same penalty.<sup>4</sup>

A second regulation is aimed at the extravagance of

-----  
 was the "numismatic capital" of southern and Western Germany. These are the "heller" of the text. They were adaptable little coins, and were used as a subdivision of the Florentine, and later of the Rhenish gulden.

The heller and penny and the "Pfund pfennige", which at first a measure by weight (pound of pennies) gradually became a standard of value, or "coin of account", all steadily depreciated, and it is more than difficult to ascertain their value at any given time and place. For instance, in the fourteenth century, it took 960, a century later, 1200 pfennige, to make up the value of a mark of silver.

Since Charlemagne the silver standard had prevailed in Europe, but with the spread of trade in the age of the crusades, and as a result of the depreciation of the silver media, gold coins came into demand. In 1252 Florence coined its Goldgulden or Florin; in 1280 Venice its ducat; and they won their way through Europe by their purity and their constancy of value. From 1325 onwards gulden began to be minted in Germany. From the time of the Rhenish Münzverein of 1386, the German goldgulden were called Rhenish gulden in contradistinction to the silver gulden of Cologne, a coin of account. The German gulden suffered debasement, despite efforts to prevent it. Its ratio to foreign silver coins remained fairly constant however because of the high value of gold in the fifteenth century due to its scarcity. The equivalent of the gulden in pfennige or heller varied as a result both of its own fluctuations and of theirs. See Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften, vol. VI, pp. 839-847, s.v. Münzwesen (Mittelalterliches); Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th. edition, vol. XIX, p. 897, s.v. Numismatics; Engel and Serrure, *Traité de Numismatique du moyen âge*, vol. II, p. 524, and passim.

4 Siebenkees, vol. I, p. 396; Baader, p. 62.



promiscuous interchange of gifts. All presents in advance of the wedding<sup>5</sup> to friends are forbidden, except in the case of the mother and father on both sides, and the bride and bridegroom.

The remaining phrases of this provision furnish a glimpse of a method which the council was using at this time to catch persons who were breaking sumptuary laws. Anyone who learned that gifts were being passed, against the law, was enjoined, whether he was under oath or not, - that is, even if not a sworn officer of the city, - to tell on the transgressors to the Frager.<sup>6</sup> The specification that "no one on that account shall bear enmity" is probably intended to give an immunity bath from the odium which tattling was apt to incur.<sup>7</sup>

---

5 This is the meaning of "santunge, die man vor ze den hochzeiten tet". Santunge is old high German for Sendung. See Schade, *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch*, s.v. santunga.

6 The title of the two executive burgomasters of the month. See above, p. 15.

7 Siebenkees, vol. I, p. 397; Baader, p. 59. The fine for breaking the prohibition of pre-nuptial gifts is 5 pounds haller. This fine is not large relatively to those assessed for similar offenses. One might argue from the moderate fine that the offense was not extraordinary, surely not such as to require resort to unusual inquisition; and therefore that private informing was contemplated as one of the regular methods of trapping offenders. The specific mention and endorsement may have been given it in this law because it had fallen into disrepute, and needed a coat



Having bath-parties, -that is, going to the public baths in companies for a good time, -is forbidden in another of these early laws, except to the bride with two friends, and the groom with two of his friends. If more than these went, a pound haller would be exacted of each, and five pounds of the person who was having the wedding.<sup>8</sup>

The night on which the bridegroom took the bride to himself no one was to sit down to a feast with them except immediate relatives, "fathers, mothers, fathers- and mothers-in-law, brothers and sisters, brothers- and sisters-in-law". The morning afterwards the person who was having the wedding might provide a becoming (erleichen, ehrlich) meal. No servants, nurses or maids were to take part in either occasion. If these rules of the council were violated, the person whose the wedding was incurred a penalty of ten pounds haller, and every guest -----  
of legal whitewash.

In Siebenkees's text this provision is dated 1352. Some uncertainty is cast on this dating by the fact that Baader includes the article among the first, which are presumably the earliest, of the provisions which he prints, and that he does not enclose it in round brackets, which we are to infer that it originated at some time before 1325. (See above, note 1.)

<sup>8</sup> Siebenkees, vol. I, p. 397. This section bears a trace of separate enactment in its beginning: "My lords the burghers of the council have decreed, etc.-", instead of plunging straight into the matter with the usual "item".



who came in spite of the law one pound. Out-of-town were as usual excepted.<sup>9</sup>

Another regulation forbids giving or sending anything to musicians who were not residents of the city. The "varnde man", as he is styled here, was an important functionary in the medieval wedding, and he figures in the ordinances to the last. He led off the procession to the church with his tunes. He gave the measures to the wedding dances. His fiddling or piping was heard on the streets in the serenades rendered before the houses of the wedding party. In the ordinance before us the council forbids people to encourage out-of-town players probably in order to save the city from being overrun with strollers. Violations are to be visited with a fine of five pounds haller per minstrel.<sup>10</sup>

A further section with regard to bath-parties appears. It is at the same time less severe and more attentive to details

---

9 Siebenkees, vol, I, pp. 397-398; Baader, p. 61. This provision also starts off with a formula of its own: "Our lords, the Schultheiss and the burghers in common of the council, -" Baader's text has besides: "-mit willen und wort der genannten der stadt Nürnberg". This formula, including the name of the Schultheiss in the title of the legislative power, indicates the very early origin of the law. (See above, p. 15.) The inclusion of the genannten, the large council, is also of interest as indicating its participation in this kind of law-giving.

10 Siebenkees, vol. I, pp. 398-399.





than the provision cited above.<sup>11</sup> It allows the bride to take four companions to the bath with her, instead of two. But they were not to do any dancing, before or after.<sup>12</sup> The guests at one of these bath-parties, men or women, were not to be asked home afterwards, or celebrate the party with feasting, drinking or dancing. If these limitations were transgressed, the person responsible for the entertainment was subject to a fine of ten pounds haller, and one pound was exacted for each guest present in excess of the number permitted.<sup>13</sup> If a lady wished to give a party or a bath-party in honor of a wedding, she was subject to the same limitations. She might not entertain more than four women with the bride without risking a mulct of five pounds haller.<sup>14</sup>

If anyone wished to have his daughter married at home ("Swer sein tochter haim ze haus führen wil..."), not more than six women were to go with her.<sup>15</sup>

---

11 Page 45.

12 "rayen", reihen. Lexicographers think this to have been a special sort of dance in which the dancers joined hands. See Grimm, Deutsches Wörterbuch, s.v. reihen. Tanzen is also used later in the provision: "rayet oder tantzte".

13 Siebenkees, vol. I, pp. 399-400; Baader, p. 62.

14 Siebenkees, vol. I, p. 400; Baader, p. 62.

15 Siebenkees, vol. I, p. 400.



We have already met with a restriction of giving before the wedding season.<sup>16</sup> Another section relates to gifts at the marriage. It is a prohibition. The council forbids giving or sending presents at a wedding or a baptism<sup>17</sup>, jewelry, money or anything else. Both giver and recipient exposed themselves to a fine of five pounds. If it was a woman who offended, her husband was held responsible for paying the penalty.<sup>18</sup>

These regulations are framed to prevent involuntary expense, as well as wilful extravagance. Two articles regarding servants-in-waiting seem to be intended to keep down attendance at weddings. No woman might take with her more than one maid, unless she had with her a daughter who was her host's friend. She was liable for a fine of 60 haller for each maid additional.<sup>19</sup> The other article is more severe, and prohibits taking maids and men-servants to weddings.<sup>20</sup>

In one of these early regulations a view to maintaining social distinctions may be traced. It forbids serving-maids

16 See above, p. 44.

17 In the text is here inserted in brackets, as if an amendment: "nor to a monk or nun before or after".

18 Siebenkees, vol. I, p. 401.

19 Siebenkees, vol. I, pp. 401-402; Baader, p. 60.

20 Baader, p. 60.



to take part in the "raien" or "tantz"<sup>21</sup> of the burgher ladies.<sup>22</sup>

Another enactment on musicians amplifies the one described above. It extends the law to the number of them that might be employed, and forbids giving to more than six players at a wedding, or "senden varnde man und frawen mit einander"; finally, patronizing minstrels from out of town.<sup>23</sup>

There are a couple of provisions with regard to wedding presents, which, it will be recalled, were wholly forbidden in a section which we have already encountered.<sup>24</sup> It would be of interest to know whether that or these were earlier, but there is no clue to the date. (1) It is forbidden father-in-law or mother-in-law to give their son-in-law a silver girdle. By the terms of an ordinance which is to be reviewed presently, a silver girdle was the gift which the bridegroom was permitted to receive on the bridal morning. (2) Persons intending a gift were not to present the bride, in linen-clothing, more than a jacket (rockelein) and a "mursnitz". Chemises one might give her to his heart's content.<sup>25</sup>

---

21 See above, note 12.

22 Siebenkees, vol. I, pp. 401-402; Baader, p. 60.

23 Baader, pp. 59-60. Whether put in effect earlier or later, this provision shows at least no signs of correlation with that cited above, p. 46, and serves to illustrate the piecemeal character of this early legislation.

24 See above, p. 48.

25 Baader, p. 60. Other sections printed by Baader in this group relate to the dowry. Two are clothes-regulations and will be treated later.



One section, which may be placed with reasonable safety after those on the same subject reviewed above,<sup>26</sup> is to the effect that, first, no one is to have an open wedding. This probably means a celebration at which anyone was free to drop in and satisfy his neighborly curiosity and his appetite. Further, it was made unlawful to feast or dance on the day of the wedding, in the morning or evening. This prohibition was probably intended only for persons not of the family, for an exception is made of out-of-town guests, which would mean nothing unless a celebration of some sort went on. A party might be held, and friends invited to join it, a fortnight after the wedding. If at the time of the wedding anything to eat was given to anyone but the household servants, the host risked the infliction of the comparatively heavy penalty of 100 pounds haller, and each of the unlawful eaters a fine of ten pounds.<sup>27</sup>

In one of the documentary collections a series of wedding regulations is printed which are less disjointed and have more of the appearance of a homogeneous ordinance.<sup>28</sup> There are

---

26 It is enclosed by Baader in round brackets, and is thus indicated to have arisen, in his opinion, somewhere between 1325 and 1350.

27 Siebenkees, vol. I, pp. 395-396; Baader, p. 62.

28 There are certain evidences on the surface of the articles that make it up that they were issued as a single law. (1) That





no points of similarity that link them with the miscellaneous provisions described above. Either they treat of new matters, or of the old in a new way. The only coincidence is in the prohibition of eating and drinking at bath-parties.

-----

of the title, quoted by Siebenkees from the manuscript: "Von Hochzeiten, alz der Rate Schepfen und die genannten gelobt haben." (2) Each of the sections after the first refers to the preceding for the amount of the fine, in the terms: "Under the aforesaid penalty". (3) In the final section, relating to application, the person who wishes to have a wedding is instructed to come and read the "above-written laws".

The fact that the fines and values of this ordinance are assessed in gulden, while those of the regulations reviewed above are expressed in pounds haller, is possibly evidence that it is of later origin than the others. The gulden came into use as a common measure of value long after the pound, which had been the usual silver coin of account from the time of Charlemagne. (See above, note 3.) I have not been able to discover when gulden began to circulate as familiar currency in Nürnberg, but it was probably not until after the German goldgulden were minted, that is, about the middle of the fourteenth century. (See Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaft, vol. VI, pp. 845-846, s.v. Münzwesen.) It is possible of course that this ordinance is a sporadic instance of the use of gulden to measure the fines; one which might have occurred at any time during the period of the regulations noted above; but the chances of this are less in proportion to the space of years over which those extended. An example of the use of gulden would be very likely to crop out among them in a long period, if gulden and pounds haller were used indifferently. But not a single example occurs among them. If this criterion is worth anything, the ordinance above belongs to another period, and probably to a later period.



They relate entirely to parties and gifts.

At the outset a flat prohibition is laid on serving anything to eat at a wedding, in the house or out of it. Further, a sort of "closed season" is decreed, to extend two months before and two months after the wedding, in which it is forbidden to send anything to eat out of the house, in the shape of dainties, fish or game, whether raw or cooked. Excepted were the bride's or bridegroom's father and mother, guests who came in from the country with bride or groom, and musicians. When it comes to assessing the penalty, the proportions that hold in the other regulations are reversed, and the host is required to pay one gulden, and the eaters each ten, for transgression.<sup>29</sup> If anyone wished to have a party with maidens present, he was to give them nothing but fruit to eat and wine to drink; the young ladies were not to stay all night for the wedding; and there were not to be more than six of them present.

The authorities seem to have been troubled by the excess of festal celebration that took place, not merely in the nuptial season proper, but afterwards. It had perhaps become the custom and socially obligatory to follow the wed-

---

29 Siebenkees, vol. II, pp. 371-372.



ding with a round of parties which imposed a great deal of expense. This law allows persons who have betrothed or given in marriage their children, and their friends, to have but a single party during the half year after the wedding, and to invite to this ten persons, not more.<sup>30</sup>

The law further provides that "nottgeld" (probably fee or tip) might not be bestowed or received. Exception was made in favor of the household servants. To these one might give moderately. And, in the way of refreshments, no "dresene"<sup>31</sup> or confections might be served without incurring a penalty.<sup>32</sup>

In the part of the ordinance that relates to gifts one may trace the beginnings of the amplified provisions of the later law; or better say, here one may see reflected the same social customs as there. The ordinance starts from a base-level of prohibition. At betrothals and weddings (and note here that the betrothal is for the first time brought under supervision) no gifts might be exchanged. But exceptions

---

30 Ibid., p. 372. Compare with article noticed on p. 50, where permission is given to have a party a fortnight after the wedding.

31 The meaning of the word seems to be lost. It is probably the "Trysanet" of the Hochzeits-büchlein. See below, p.80 .

32 Siebenkees, vol. II, p. 373. These last two articles are the first appearance of regulations that were carried into great detail in the Hochzeits-büchlein promulgated a century later.



were made. When one took a wife, or gave his son in marriage, he might bestow upon the bride a brooch (neftel) worth not more than ten gulden, and a girdle weighing not over three marks. The bridegroom on the other hand might be presented a three-gulden jewel, -nothing more handsome. The morning after the bridal union, the bride might receive two silver bowls, of five marks weight; and the bridegroom, in his turn, a silver girdle of four marks, "with fülle, borders and all". The limitations on the weight of the bride's girdle and upon the value of her brooch are repeated as if for emphasis.<sup>33</sup>

A most interesting feature of this ordinance is the series of provisions for its enforcement. The person who expected to have a wedding in his house, to refresh the requirements in his mind had to go to the Rathaus and read the laws as written, and give his word of honor (sein trew geben) to a burgomaster that he and his wife and all who acted for him would observe them. Failing to do this he was liable to the heavy fine of one hundred gulden.<sup>34</sup> All upon whom the hand of the council was laid in official relations were bound by

-----  
 33 Ibid., pp. 373-374.

34 The words of text run: "der muste geben hundert guldein in an die stat, zu der vorgeschriben puzz, die vor bey den gesetzen steet." It is not clear whether this means a lump sum of 100 gulden in addition to the penalties, or instead of the penalty assessed in each case the greater penalty of 100 gulden.





oath to obedience. "Schepfen, Rate und die genannten"<sup>35</sup>, and after them all head-officials (hawptlewte) and their subalterns (untertan) all have given their word" that in connection with weddings and baptisms, and to persons who are to take religious vows, they will give nothing in jewels, money or the like, except as the law permits. The final section seems to have reference to other regulations besides those of the ordinance with which it here appears. It runs: "And with regard to the above-written mandate concerning christenings and weddings and wine and bread all Rate, Schepfen and all genannten have given their word that they will keep the same, and each of their wives shall also give her word that she too will keep them; and those who are not named, they also shall keep the above-written mandate, under the penalty which is set therein."<sup>36</sup>

Such as we have reviewed them are the points at which one who was married in Nürnberg during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was likely to feel the restraints of the law. They will support few generalizations as to the tendencies of sumptuary regulation during the period over which they extend. Seeking lines of development one is baffled by the absence of dates. As has already been noted in reviewing them, the evi-

-----  
 35 That is, the members of the greater and smaller councils.

36 Ibid., p. 375.



dences of their order of enactment are few and treacherous, and will not safely support inferences as to their evolution. One is confined to noting a few characteristics. These will be reinforced, and gain in interest when we go on to examine later sumptuary legislation.

(1) The very fragmentary character of the early laws which makes them so hard to treat is significant. In lack of detail and comprehensiveness they are in contrast with later enactments. Instead of canvassing thoroughly in one law all the events and usages likely to give offense during the nuptial season, and directing how each shall be, or shall not be carried out, they single out for prohibition or restriction certain practices, which attract displeasure, perhaps as innovations, perhaps as old observances that have run to excess. There is apparently no correlation among the provisions. Until we come to the "gulden"-ordinance, -I have chosen to call the last ordinance reviewed above by this name for convenience of reference, -the legislation seems haphazard; and the form it takes, and surface indications, suggest that it increased piece by piece as abuses called it forth; or as their persistence seemed to require a repetition or modification of the law.

(2) These early regulations are in conspicuous contrast with those of the late fifteenth century and after, in directness and simplicity of statement. None of them has a preamble.



They entirely lack the elaborate explanations that accompany the later ordinances, -the declarations of the motives of the council; the references to excesses and abuses that have provoked new legislation or seemed to call for a sharpening of the old; the frequent invocation of moral and religious sanctions. They restrict or prohibit in bare, matter-of-fact statements, and assign no grounds or reasons. In this, of course, the sumptuary legislation of the time was not peculiar. The same directness shows itself in contemporary law-making in other spheres; and in these, too, as time went on, there was increasing complication and reference to conditions and wherefores.<sup>37</sup>

(3) The motives which, in the absence of explanatory phrases, may be argued from the nature of the regulations themselves are comparatively simple. The council may have had in mind "protection of the home industry" when it forbade the burghers to patronize any but resident musicians, though its main object was probably the simple one of preventing the city from being infested with strolling singers and players. In one of the regulations, - that which forbids serving maids to dance in the dances of the burgher ladies, - there may be a trace of the mo-

---

37 See Baader, Nürnberger Polizeiordnungen, passim, and contrast the laws of the thirteenth and fourteenth with those of the fifteenth century.



tive to become so prominent later, the desire of the council to preserve intact the lines of social stratification. But in the rest the aim appears to be the fundamental one of keeping the expenditures of the burghers and their indulgences within limits which the observant city-fathers considered necessary to the good order and welfare of life. Perhaps these limits were suggested by old usage, which, as departures from it occurred, with the change of times and the increase of wealth, seemed to the council to call for definition and formal instatement by law as the metes and bounds of propriety; but this, in the absence of commentary, can be only a surmise. On their face these early articles are paternal regulations of a clear type. The festal practices which are restrained in them were put in legal hobbles not as a measure of police in the modern sense, not because they threatened public peace and order, but because to the fathers of the council they did not seem good for the burghers whose lives they had in charge, and felt a responsibility to keep from harm.

(4) If the gulden-ordinance may safely be given a later date than the others, certain differences from them which are displayed in it may be taken as shadowing tendencies of development.

The gulden-ordinance covers with somewhat closer particularity the two subjects of which it treats, -wedding parties





and gifts. The fact is not as marked in the section that relates to parties as in that regarding gifts. In one of the regulations prior to this, a party<sup>4</sup> at the house of the wedding after two weeks had been permitted; in another a family-party the night of the wedding, and a moderate feast the next morning.<sup>38</sup> In one article bath-parties had been limited in the number of guests to two men and the groom, and two women and the bride; in another to four women with the bride, with a prohibition of eating and dancing afterwards.<sup>39</sup> This had been the extent of the regulation of parties. The provisions of the gulden-ordinance partly supplement these, partly cross them, and are a little more specific. They forbid serving anything to eat at a wedding, in the house or out of it, and they fix a period, extending from two months before to two months after the wedding, in which it is unlawful to send anything to eat out of the house, in the shape of dainties, fish or game. Friends are permitted to have but one party in honor of the wedding during the half year after it has occurred, and to this they may invite ten guests. Regulation of refreshments that goes into the names of the dishes appears for the first time: it is forbidden to serve "dresene" or confections; and if a party at which maidens are present is held the night pre-

---

38 See above, p. 45.

39 See above, p. 47.



vicious to the wedding, they are to be refreshed with nothing more than fruits and wine.<sup>40</sup>

A greater particularity of regulation is not so hard to trace in the paragraphs that deal with gifts. The law on this point as it stood previously to the gulden-ordinance laid a flat prohibition on giving or sending presents at weddings or christenings, "jewelry, money or anything else", in one article;<sup>41</sup> in a couple of others it laid its hand on fathers- and mothers-in-law desirous of giving their sons-in-law silver girdles, and forbade presenting the bride more in the way of linen-clothing than a jacket and a "mursnitz", while allowing donation of chemises ad libitum.<sup>42</sup> The gulden-ordinance likewise starts out with prohibiting at a sweep all exchange of gifts at betrothals and weddings, but it proceeds to make exceptions much more liberal and specific than the permissions of former laws. It allowed the father-in-law, or a bridegroom to present the bride with a brooch of which it set the price at ten gulden, and a girdle which was permitted to weigh three marks. It privileged the bridegroom to receive a jewel worth three gulden. And on the morning after the bridal pair had been united, the lady might without risk of the law be the re-

-----  
40 See above, p. 52.

41 See above, p. 48.

42 See above, p. 49.



ipient of two silver bowls, of five marks weight, and the groom of a silver girdle of four marks.<sup>43</sup>

The gulden-ordinance differs only a shade from the detached regulations which, on the assumption we are making, preceded it; but the differences which it does present are in the direction (1) of a better coordination of the articles, that is, of comprehensive regulation of a number of points in a single ordinance, instead of occasional and more or less haphazard restrictions; (2) of greater particularity; (3) in the part dealing with gifts at least, of less drastic, though perhaps a more watchful regulation.

---

43 See above, pp. 53-54.



## Chapter III

## The Hochzeits-büchlein of 1485

In the Hochzeits-büchlein of 1485<sup>1</sup>, we are to see the developments of a more advanced stage of sumptuary legislation. From the completeness of the ordinance, and from the fact that several of the previous provisions of which we have record are to be found imbedded in it, the Hochzeits-büchlein would seem to be a codification, perhaps with amendments, rather than an entirely fresh piece of law. Such is the more likely to be the case that at this particular time overhauling the law was the order of the day at Nürnberg. Just in the year before, the council, with the help of jurists, finished treating the whole body of the civil law and legal procedure of the city to what was called a "Reformation", and had codified it.<sup>2</sup>

Whatever the circumstances under which it originated, the Hochzeits-büchlein of 1485 is a striking contrast to the

-----

1 The Hochzeits-büchlein, literally the "Wedding-booklet", of 1485, is printed in Baader, pp. 71-85, and in Siebenkees, vol. I, pp. 449-485. The texts are somewhat differently arranged, but are substantially the same. I have referred only to Siebenkees in the following chapter.

2 Waldmann, D., "Nürnberg Rechts-'Reformation' von 1484", in Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg, vol. XVIII, (1908), pp. 1-98.





regulations of earlier date in completeness. It is a series of articles, arranged by chapters, which, instead of merely selecting certain abuses for correction, visit with restriction apparently every form of expenditure, every sort of festivity, that could arise in connection with a wedding. From the celebration of the engagement to the tips and doles of wine lawful to give to the servants and attendants, nothing, it would seem, is exempted from surveillance. The ordinance was apparently intended to serve as a complete manual of the law with respect to weddings, revised and brought up to date.

There is other evidence that this was its purpose in the fact that it remained the staple and basis of legislation on the subject as late as 1557, perhaps longer. Subsequent enactments, as we shall see, were incorporated in it, and serve to brace it at weak points or to repeal provisions with which improper liberties had been taken. It "was renewed, bettered and changed the 7 Feb. 1526", according to the title which it bears in Siebenkees's text. It seems still to have been in effect and subject to another revision in 1557.<sup>3</sup> In an entry in the "Ältermanual", - the journal of the seven elders, - of December 13, 1599, the lords of the council detailed

---

<sup>3</sup> Siebenkees, vol. I, p. 460, where the editor refers to a clause as "inserted in the revision of 1557".



for the purpose are instructed, in the course of making a stricter application of the new "hoffarts-ordnung" to "proceed with the wedding ordinance and cause certain honorable ladies to see a copy of the same".<sup>4</sup> Whether this is our Hochzeits-büchlein still in operation or not, the passage sufficiently indicates that the law with regard to weddings continued after this to be in the form of a single comprehensive ordinance, and had not relapsed into the straggling regulations that seem to have been the rule before the Hochzeits-büchlein of 1485.

A much greater variety of matters are brought under regulation in the Hochzeits-büchlein than in previous laws; but this cannot be taken as due entirely to a stricter paternalism, a closer attention to the details of conduct, on the part of the council. Another cause must be taken into account, in the case of this as of all the sumptuary legislation. The interval between this ordinance and those described in the previous chapter was a period in which wealth had been increasing in Nürnberg at an unprecedented pace. The city had shared with Augsburg, Ulm, Regensburg, Frankfort and Strassburg, the famous southern circle of towns standing on the highways that led

---

4 In Mitteilungen, vol. VII, (19 ), p. 274.



across the Alps to Italy, the profits of the commerce with Genoa, Venice and Milan, and through them with the rich Orient; and in the fifteenth century they were at the summit of their prosperity.<sup>5</sup>

Nürnberg had very rapidly risen in commercial importance by reason of its location. It was a<sup>t</sup>one of the cross-roads of Europe. It stood between the two great streams that floated the bulk of German commerce, the Rhine and the Danube; and it was also on the route from North to South, and mediated the traffic between the Mediterranean and the Baltic. In the fourteenth century it had already developed substantial trade connections with the Rhine valley and the Netherlands on the one hand, and with Bohemia, Hungary and Poland on the other, and was dealing in the spices of the Orient which came up from Venice, and distributing to the Slavic borders and to Italy the linen and cloths of Flanders and the furs of the North. But it was in the fifteenth century that the commerce of Nürnberg rose to its climax, and the wealth in which it issued accumulated in great fortunes. It was then that the merchant princes built the houses which, "with their spacious courts encircled with columned galleries, and with their richly pan-

---

5 Lamprecht, Deutsche Geschichte, vol. V, part 1, p. 62.



elled chambers and their ornate oriels and turrets", caused Aeneas Sylvius, visiting the city about the middle of the century, to exclaim that "the kings of Scotland would consider themselves fortunate if they could live like a simple citizen of Nürnberg.<sup>6</sup> The council, who were themselves the leading merchants, and had a great stake in the matter of commerce, were able to secure advantageous terms of intercourse with the principal cities and powers of the empire. A lively exchange developed with the Hansa cities of the North. Old relations with the Rhine and the Low Countries were cultivated vigorously and multiplied. Nürnberg had its permanent depots, under the superintendence of members of the families of Ebner, Tucher, and Scheurl, even in Lyon and Paris; and the enterprise of its merchants had planted commercial houses in far-off Lisbon, at the portal of the great trade to open with the undiscovered West.<sup>7</sup>

Furthermore, the group of southern cities to which Nürnberg belonged, in contrast to the purely commercial Hansa cities of the North, began in the fifteenth century to be centers of industry as well as marts of trade. As early as this their manufactures had reached a phase of development in which the distinction between day-wages and piece-wages was

---

6 Rösler, *Alt-Nürnberg*, p. 299.

7 *Ibid.*, pp. 290-303.





familiar, and the division of labor had gone on to quite a considerable degree. It was a time when the merchants, as we have seen, were amassing great fortunes; but not only they were benefiting by the multiplication of wealth. If we are to believe Lamprecht, after the turn of the fifteenth century the artisan had been able increasingly to set aside a surplus above his working capital, had been increasingly better off; a fact witnessed by the epidemic of small dealers, trading on their own capital, which broke out early in the fifteenth century.<sup>8</sup>

Men of all classes, it would seem, were better off. They were coming into possession of means to satisfy the elastic range of appetites that stretches beyond the demands of necessity, which to meet had formerly absorbed all their energies; and we cannot be surprised to hear that they adventured freely in their new pleasures. As the century wore on, a departure was noted in many quarters from the simplicity and frugality of the old times. What seemed to the conservative reckless luxury and extravagance broke out in the life of the cities; and the years just previous to the Reformation were stigmatized by such humanistic critics of manners as Wimpfeling,

---

8 Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. V, part 1, pp. 68-72.



Erasmus, Sebastian Brandt, and Geiler von Kaisersberg, as the most luxurious and self-indulgent epoch that had till then occurred in German history.<sup>9</sup> Whatever we may say of the power of the change to corrupt, which was the aspect of it that concerned our informers, it was a change certain to involve a departure from the style of living of more frugal times, and to introduce a life of multiplied tastes and wants, and of multiplied enjoyments. One turns from the earlier regulations to the Hochzeits-büchlein of 1485 to see at once this greater complexity of life reflected in the law. The numbers present at the parties, even as permitted by the law, was much larger; the gifts that may be given are more costly and numerous; and there is an accumulation of ways of celebrating the nuptial season noticed and regulated, the appearance of which in the statute cannot, in view of the change of the times, be charged up entirely to a closer supervision, and a more diligent paternalism on the part of the council.

In the preamble of the Hochzeits-büchlein the council declares that its object in framing the statute is to reach with the wedding laws the lower ranks of the population. It had passed laws and set penalties to restrain extravagance in connection with betrothals and weddings before, but these had

---

<sup>9</sup> Jannsen, History of the German People, vol. II, pp. 62-67, for pertinent quotations from the critics and satirists of the prevailing luxury.



been "operative only against the well-to-do".<sup>10</sup> "The common man had been exempted in them"; the result was that " manifold injury and mischief" had come to him "in the interruption of his work with processions to church feasts gifts donations and other display". To avoid this and secure "a just uniformity among their subjects", the council enacted the provisions of the ordinance to be observed without distinction.<sup>11</sup> It is very interesting to find that up until this late hour only the upper classes, perhaps only the "ratsfähige Geschlechter", the families eligible to the council, had been subject to the wedding regulations. The reason that the "common man" had been left unregulated may well be that he had not had the means to offend. At the eve of the Reformation it is the merchants who figure in the eyes of the humanist-preachers as the chief sinners against the old simplicity. It is the costly and ostentatious apparel, the luxurious tables, the sumptuous living of the merchant class that draw their shafts of sarcasm and rebuke.<sup>12</sup> It was inevitable that the lower classes should imitate them, as soon as they had the means. It seems to have taken a good while for the snow of wealth to filter down to the lower strata of society; or else the taste for the new enjoyments put within reach was slow to awaken among the artisans;

-----  
 10 "statthaftig", -in mhd. "wohlhabend"; in some parts, "ratsfähig".

11 Siebenkees, vol. I, pp. 449-450.

12 See quotations in Jannsen cited above, note 9.



for Wimpeling could write in the last days of the fifteenth century that "the least affected by the growing spirit of luxury are the working class and the peasants, who continue to live in the simple style of their fathers." <sup>13</sup>

But the ferment struck down at last; and early in the new century the moralists and the civil authorities begin to deplore with increasing frequency the obliteration of social distinctions in dress and manners, the affectation by the lower classes of clothes and usages proper to their superiors; and we shall find in the sumptuary laws increasing attention paid to maintaining the lines of classification. Just when the infection of luxury began to manifest itself among the artisan class in different cities would be hard to determine; but it was probably in view of the early symptoms of it in Nürnberg that in 1485 the wedding regulations were extended to include "the common man". The council had become aware of a change, and had realized that henceforth not only the well-to-do burgher would have to be curbed, as of old, but that now the artisan as well, for the first time financially in a position to do so, was overstepping the limits of a due moderation; and would henceforth require the same restraints as his wealthier fellow-citizens. It is important to note that the change

---

13 Jannsen, History of the German People, vol. II, p. 62, quoted from the close of "De arte impressoria".





was as yet apparently in its incipient stages: the council sees fit to bind him with the same restraints, and not yet, as it would later, to discriminate between him and his social superiors, and forge for him the more stringent limitations.

For convenience of analysis, we may break the Hochzeits-büchlein into three parts. (1) The regulations of the betrothal, and the events and observances that took place up until the wedding. (2) The prescriptions with regard to the wedding proper, and the parties, dances, gifts, employment of helpers and musicians, etc., that attended and followed it. (3) Miscellaneous. In reviewing each of these parts into which we have roughly divided the law, our interest will be occupied in observing: (a) the treatment of matters not handled in the earlier statutes, and the possible reasons why they are now taken up; (b) the reappearance of the old provisions and the tendency, if any, of the modifications in them. Certain sections of the ordinance represent changes made in it after it was put into effect. These will be reserved for consideration in the discussion of the ordinance in its relations with the Reformation, where they become especially significant.<sup>14</sup>

The public announcement of the betrothal, the "laut-

-----

14 See below, chapter IV.



merung", as it was called, was almost as important an event as the wedding, and a variety of festal practices had gathered about it which are first revealed in the terms of this ordinance of 1485. Upper limits are set upon the number of guests to be admitted, and even the kinds of refreshment to be served, at a series of parties accompanying the celebration. A formal ceremony of some kind seems to have been observed first. The law requires that this take place at home or at the Rathaus, and forbids its being performed in a monastery. It might be witnessed by a company of men and women which the law limits exactly to thirty-two, and divides into halves, -sixteen for the bride-to-be, sixteen for the man. When this rite was over, the groom might gather a band of his friends, the number of which the law fixed at seventeen, and go to wish the bride happiness, -"zw der preut gen und Ir glücks wünschen". The statute declares with singular liberality that anyone who fell in with the party on the way without an invitation was not to be punishable. The bride was permitted to show her appreciation of these attentions by regaling her visitors with native or Rhenish wine, or other of the same grade, -with this and nothing else. The council would seem to be careful to provide against the possible dulness of a party all of men in its permission to the bride to have in a couple of girl friends; or if she should



be a widow, two matrons, to meet her betrothed and his comrades.<sup>15</sup>

The particularity of the law is evident in the completeness of the picture it yields. After the "glückwünschen" of the men, the bride-to-be and her two friends might be visited for further congratulation by women to the number of twenty-four, -half of them on the part of the bridegroom, half on the part of the bride. Those who came on the groom's behalf might bring the lady-betrothed gifts, provided these observed the limits of the articles on gifts. The company of women visitors, like the men, were to be refreshed with nothing but inexpensive wine.<sup>16</sup> Even with this reception the round of festivities regulated by the law was incomplete. On the evening of the announcement, the bride-to-be might have her betrothed and two friends of his for dinner, and with them, two female friends of hers, to pair off, it is to be presumed, with the extra gentlemen. The menu was to include nothing more than what was permissible at the wedding dinner; and the law intrudes this further restriction on this little dinner party that the lady-guests were not to stay all night. The law seems liberal in all its provisions, at least when compared with the older regulations of parties;<sup>17</sup> and its pressure is further relaxed by the clause which declares that brothers and sisters

-----  
 16 Siebenkees, vol. I, p. 452.

17 See above, pp. 58-59.



of the betrothed couple, and husbands and wives of these, are not to be counted in the number of guests made legitimate. The penalty is moderate, -five gulden for breaking any article.<sup>18</sup>

In the regulation of serenading on the night of the betrothal-announcement we come upon the first provision avowedly made to reduce to the normal a new situation. In its foreword the council complains of "a new unnecessary extravagance that has arisen". Fellows go about the streets serenading their friends with the "City-pipers", in honor of the betrothal and the bride, and costly things to eat and drink are passed out to them. The council orders this refreshment of musicians stopped. The serenading is allowed to go on under certain conditions. The person who is arranging it "may bestow a moderate tip but not more than a Rhenish gulden".<sup>19</sup> As for refreshments, he may give the musicians and the persons invited to the serenade fruit, cheese and bread to eat, to be passes around once and not oftener; also native or Rhenish or other wine of the same quality to drink, in discreet measure, and nothing else.<sup>20</sup>

There were gifts at the "lautmerung" as well as at the marriage, and restrictions upon them similar to those of the gulden-ordinance are imposed in the Hochzeits-büchlein.

---

18 Siebenkees, vol. I, pp. 452-453.

19 See above, chapter II, note 3.

20 Siebenkees, vol. I, pp. 453-455.





In the old prescriptions the gifts permitted to be given at the betrothal had been simple and modest: a brooch worth not more than ten gulden, and a girdle weighing not over three marks for the bride, and a three-gulden jewel for the groom.<sup>21</sup>

By the Hochzeits-büchlein, they were to be a silver brooch, and a chain for the bride, -a change instead of a girdle perhaps because of a change of fashion. The values permitted had been scaled up somewhat. The brooch might be worth from fifteen to twenty-five Rhenish gulden, the chain fifteen gulden.<sup>22</sup> Besides these things the law allows that the bride might receive from the hand of her betrothed an engagement ring, "the maidenring, as one calls it"; but even in this matter of sentiment the council interposed its voice and laid down the condition that the ring was not to be worth over ten gulden. So, again, when they went to the church, the bride pair might exchange a wedding ring; but this, with the stone, might not without risk of public penalty cost more than from ten to fifteen Rhenish gulden.<sup>23</sup>

---

21 See above, pp. 53-54.

22 The gulden had depreciated, and the whole difference in value therefore cannot be taken to measure a permission to use costlier jewelry.

23 According to a provision which appears only in Baader, p.73, and which may have been of earlier or later date, the engagement ring was to cost only eight gulden; and the bridegroom was to give his fiancé nothing in addition to this and the brooch and the gold chain, till he led her to the church: then, according to the old custom and tradition, the wedding-ring, customary for the couple to give the one to the other in front of the church.



The provision of the older laws that on the morning after the bridegroom had taken the bride to himself, the bride might receive from him or his friends two silver bowls of five marks weight,<sup>24</sup> stands altered<sup>only</sup> by the qualifier that "other jewels gilded or not" of the same worth might be substituted for these. Her gift to him of a jewel is not mentioned, probably because it was no longer customary. Other customs are reflected, however, in the paragraph which forbids her or her friends, to make presents of any kind of shirt or garland to the friends of the groom, to the bridal-escorts, the inviters, the servants, -to anyone except the groom himself. Him she might present with a shirt, and a bath-suit, and, according to a clause apparently thrown in later, a headdress of prescribed value. Also within the privilege of the law she might bestow upon the bridal-escorts and the dance-bidders a cheap garland apiece, "without ribbons and without other costliness". The fine if she broke these articles was five gulden. That for infraction of the other regulations of gifts was greater, - twenty gulden.<sup>25</sup>

There is a clause with regard to the manner of inviting to the dance interesting only as adding a detail to the

---

24 See above, p. 54.

25 Siebenkees, pp. 455-458.



picture of old manners which shows through this law so distinctly. The Tantzler, the inviters, were each to have not more than three horses, and the "hegelein"<sup>26</sup>, the fool, only one, as they went about giving the invitations. A fine of three gulden was to be inflicted for each horse additional.<sup>27</sup>

The provision with regard to tipping is more particular than the old sweeping prohibition of it except "in moderation" to servants in the house.<sup>28</sup> It prescribes exactly the amounts lawful to bestow. The bride, and anyone acting in her behalf, might not give to anyone who did the bridegroom a service in connection with the betrothal more than fifteen pfennige. When the bride and groom were dined out for the first time in honor of their engagement, they were not to give more than this amount as a tip. But this was a special concession: other persons at such banquets, or at any other, must observe the custom of the city, and give as a fee not more than two pfennige.<sup>29</sup>

Looking back over this first group of regulations,

---

26 The municipal fool was called "hegelein", "hängelein" from the pictures with which his clothes were hung.

27 Siebenkees, vol. I, pp. 458-459.

28 See above, p. 53.

29 Siebenkees, vol. I, p. 459.



one can find little to signify either a greater strictness or a greater leniency of supervision. More points are brought under regulation, to be sure; but when we remember the complication of life and its enjoyments that must have gone on since the earlier legislation, we cannot be certain that the greater particularity means a more inquisitorial attitude of the city-fathers. Perhaps when all discounts have been made, we may take this part of the ordinance as somewhat more liberal than the earlier laws. It is certainly so in letter, if not in spirit; and it is decidedly more comprehensive, more systematic.

When we come to the wedding itself, again the variety of events is greater, and the particularity of regulation such that we obtain a detailed portrayal of what took place. The procession to the church is permitted to be a much more numerous affair than formerly. The spare dozen of the old time are increased to forty-eight, -half, as before, on the part of the bride, and half on the groom's; and the procession might be swelled by any out-of-town persons who had come especially for the wedding.<sup>30</sup>

The feasts of the wedding are subjected to elaborate supervision and restriction. First of all it is sought to repress a practice that had newly arisen. It seems that it had

---

30 Siebenkees, vol. I, p. 460.





become a custom for the bridegroom to take his comrades to have a stag-party at "the cook's" (kochen), or a tavern. The council, without words except to say that the practice is an innovation, orders it abandoned, under a penalty of five gulden.<sup>31</sup> The provision of the older law which forbids inviting anyone to the feasts of the wedding but immediate relatives and out-of-town guests is repeated.<sup>32</sup> It is softened by the qualifying clause, that in the absence of father or mother, or both, other persons may be invited to take their places. The fine for making the feasts anything but family affairs is comparatively heavy, -twenty gulden.<sup>33</sup>

The council deals in particulars and uses the language of the caterer, when it comes to regulate the dishes that might be served. It specifically rules out partridge, hazel-hen, pheasant, "Norhannen", grouse, peacock, capon, either boiled or roasted, venison, and heron, fish and wedding herbs. A roast capon might be served up on a side table, without danger of fine; and if there was anyone present who could not eat meat on the day of the wedding, a dish or two of fish might be specially prepared. The penalty one risked

---

31 Ibid., pp. 460-461.

32 See above, p. 45.

33 Siebenkees, vol. I; pp. 461-462.



in bringing on one's board these unlawful delicacies was twenty gulden.<sup>34</sup>

The two items of the older regulations with regard to giving confections and "notgelt"<sup>35</sup> turn up in this ordinance united, but little modified. No sort of "trisanet" or confection or "ansing geld" is to be bestowed at the wedding, except upon the servants a gulden or less.<sup>36</sup> The prohibition in the old law of sending out of the house anything to eat or drink is reiterated. Perhaps the quarter in which it had been most violated is pointed out by the specification of the organ as a place at which one was to serve nothing to eat and bestow no fee. An exception is made of the warder at the door of the parish church into which the wedding passed: one might give him a measure of native wine. The whole provision is probably intended to save the bridal party the cost and annoyance of having to give tips and doles of food and wine to all the doorkeepers, sextons, janitors, etc., who would put in a claim of service, and make a draft in their own favor on the good-will of the time. The council gives the bridal party a refuge of law in the case of the city's servants, when it prohibits tipping them except when they do a definite service, and then on-

---

34 Ibid., p. 462.

35 See above, p. 53

36 Siebenkees, vol. I, p. 462.



ly to an amount which it prescribes. When there are two of them or more, the fee is not to exceed one gulden; when there is but one, nine heller is the limit.<sup>37</sup>

The ordinance skips from one thing to another somewhat at random. From its excursion into the regulation of tips it returns to the question of refreshments. The menu of viands was visited with a blue pencil; the drinks are regulated by affirmative prescription. The wines are to be Franconian, Rhenish, or others of the same grade, and only such. The fine is the high one, -twenty gulden.<sup>38</sup> There is even exact provision as to "what one may give the dance-bidders to eat and drink", -namely, to them and their attendants at a breakfast one or two boiled chickens and with these wine of the permitted quality.<sup>39</sup> If in any respect this ordinance shows decided advance in particularity, it is in these prescriptions with regard to the eating and drinking.

The guests at the wedding feasts were limited, as we have seen, to the family and out-of-town people. After the feast, however, one might invite in to dance whomever one wished. But the council laid it down as a condition that these guests at the after-dinner party were to be refreshed with nothing but fruit and confection, and wine of the permitted sort.

---

37 Ibid., pp. 463-464.

38 Ibid., pp. 464-465.

39 Ibid., p. 466.



The simple provisions regarding musicians in the old statutes, to the effect that only those resident in the city should be employed, and not more than six of these, appear in the Hochzeits-büchlein considerably amplified. By its terms the only musicians or funmakers one might have were either those who came in from the country with bride or bridegroom, or else those wearing the escutcheon of the city, together with the fool. This fool and the musicians who wore the city coat-of-arms seem to have been regular servants of the municipality, and were kept on hand for state occasions, and for the use of bridal parties, with the other wedding paraphernalia described below: like the livery and colored waiters of a modern catering establishment. Should a prince happen to be in town on the wedding day, the law permitted giving his minstrels refreshments if they visited the wedding. Provision is made for the person who does not desire, or is not able to have the minstrels that wear the city-shield: he is left free to have in their stead one, two or three others.<sup>40</sup>

On the wedding day a "schenck" was permissible. Again the greater size of the wedding-parties is apparent. Thirty-two men might be invited, besides strangers in town for the wedding. The law strictly prescribes the refreshments: fruit,

---

40 Ibid., pp. 455-456.





cheese, and bread, and simple wines to drink, those of native Franconia, Rhenish or others of the same quality. If the host had more in his menu than these, he exposed himself to a fine of ten gulden.<sup>41</sup> If one wished to have a dance in connection with his wedding, and a "schenck" with it, he was not free to choose the scene, but was required to hold it at the Rathaus, in chambers specially set apart for the purpose. The object of this arrangement was probably to make certain of having it where it could be freely visited and observed by the city officials. At the banquet no silver bowls or drinking vessels might be used, or seat-covers, table-cloths or napkins, except those "which the council has set apart for the purpose, and given orders to the steward to use". The refreshments are limited to those enumerated in connection with the "schenck" held on the wedding day. Not more than two measures (virteil) of wine might be given into the hands of the steward. If one did not comply with these terms, one was subject to a fine of ten gulden.<sup>42</sup>

It was forbidden in a provision of the older laws to have a wedding party or feast during the half year after the wedding except on a single occasion.<sup>43</sup> The prohibition is

---

41 Ibid., pp. 466-467.

42 Ibid., pp. 467-468.

43 See above, p. 53.



repeated in the ordinance of 1485, slightly qualified and rendered somewhat more liberal, perhaps by way of allowing what it had been tried in vain to prevent. It is specified that the one party permitted must be held the day after the wedding, and held in the house where the wedding took place. But the strict lines drawn upon the hospitality of the house by the main provision are loosened considerably in the sequel. For one or two mornings a party of twelve might be entertained at breakfast; and in the evening, at a supper, these same persons or others, to the number of seven besides bride and bridegroom. And when the bridal pair had set up housekeeping for themselves, they might give a "wedding-party", and invite seven friends. The penalty for violating the conditions imposed in this permission to entertain is relatively high, -fifty gulden. A heavy fine is threatened probably because the practices at which it is levelled were hard to break up.<sup>44</sup> The restraints imposed by the article as a whole are evidently intended to save the parents and the young couple from the tax of having to keep open house during the bridal season and afterwards; and on the other hand to prevent the rich, who could afford to do it, from setting a pace in lavish entertainment which others could not follow without bankrupting themselves at the

---

44 Siebenkees, vol.: I, pp. 468-469.



outset of their wedded career.

It will be noticed that the parties of the wedding are regulated with greater watchfulness than before, although the more specific limits imposed may be less exacting. For instance, the council extends its control to the parties that might occur in the interval between betrothal and wedding, which in the old regulations received no attention. A friend might entertain bride and groom but once during this period; he must do it at his own house; he might invite not more than six guests, and, to keep the law, he could regale them with nothing but fruit, cheese, bread and simple wines. The same six persons, or six others, it was allowed him to have for the "nachtmall", -but this permission was granted only on condition that he observed strictly the limitations of guests and viands laid down, and only if he was an immediate relative of the bridal couple. If his hospitality stepped off this chalk-line drawn by the council, he was liable to a public fine of three gulden.<sup>45</sup>

We have come to what we arbitrarily chose to call the third division of the Hochzeits-büchlein, the portion made up of provisions that can only be classified as odds

---

45 Ibid., pp. 469-470.



and ends. Two of them, with regard to gifts, are manifestly intended to brace up the fence of the law against evasions. An easy way to dodge the regulation of giving would be to postpone it until after the wedding day. This subterfuge is forestalled by provision that neither party is to give to the other any jewel, money, or money's worth, except as expressly allowed; and no one is to make the bridal couple a present in the two months following their betrothal or marriage. Violation in the first instance was punishable by a fine of twenty gulden; in the other by forfeiture of the value of the gift and five pounds new haller besides.<sup>46</sup>

One section is dated 1436, and its appearance is significant of the heterogeneous character of the whole ordinance, and the impossibility of determining when any of its undated provisions originated. This one is definitely marked as having been proclaimed "1436 A.D. 10 Dezember, Sunday". Even the old preamble, long obsolete, was retained, as it had been read out from the chancel that long-past Sunday morning, and was incorporated in the BÜchlein of 1485. It runs to the effect that a previous law with regard to the matter under correction (costuming at weddings) had failed of its purpose; the council therefore decreed that neither bride nor bridegroom,

---

46 Ibid., pp. 470-471.





nor anyone on their account, at their expense or at his own, is to dress in the bridegroom's color. None but a servant or boy might be dressed in his color. The person who disobeyed would be punished with a fine of ten gulden.<sup>47</sup>

The old provisions as to bath-parties disappear, and their place is taken by a simple one that forbids "treating" to a bath, or paying another's bath-fee, or having refreshments after the bath. One cannot argue from this a relenting toward bath-parties. They were probably no longer the fashionable amusement they once had been, or perhaps had fallen into the disrepute which everywhere came to attach to the public baths as nests of license. The fact that it is the household servants of bride and groom of whom exception is made in this provision indicates the class of people who used them.<sup>48</sup> It would no longer be necessary to forbid the burgners to frequent them in celebration of their weddings.

One other variety of party is brought under regulation, - the "Ayrkuchen", evidently a traditional wedding observance.<sup>49</sup> It was a party for women. The law did not allow over ten to be invited, on the part of each of the couple, in addition to the sisters of bride and groom. The refreshments are restricted to "Eierkuchen", flat cakes or larded cake, and the usual

---

47 Ibid., pp. 471-472.

48 Ibid., p. 473.

49 "Ayrkuchen" is plainly seen to be "Eierkuchen".



wines, "'francken', Rhenish, or others of the same grade."

An interesting provision is made in favor of the bride who came to Nürnberg from the country or from other cities. She was not to be subjected to the sumptuary regulations of her new home for the first three months of her residence in Nürnberg. During this time she might wear what she would. It was probably supposed by the city-fathers that three months would give her time enough to wear out the clothes which she brought with her, or at least to wear them enough to make it less of a hardship for her to give them up or suit them to the terms of the law.<sup>50</sup>

Among these miscellaneous provisions there appears one of a different type, -different in its occasion and in complexion. It does not propose, like the majority of the prescriptions of this ordinance, to set permanent standards of conduct, but attacks a specific abuse, and attacks it on grounds of propriety. It seems that it had become the practice of the ladies of the city, the married as well as the gay and single, to go serenading on the streets by night, upon the occasion of a betrothal. The council brings down upon this innovation a heavy hand of disapproval, because, as it declares in the preamble, such behavior "does not become maiden and matronly modesty". The council proceeds to cut off

---

50 Ibid., p. 476.



social encouragement by forbidding anyone to invite the serenaders to eat or drink; and it forbids these to partake of any refreshment, -a prohibition hardly necessary if the main clause was obeyed and the serenading suspended. The motive of this interference with the merrymaking of the burgher women may have been in part a sense of police duty, or the shock imparted by a new practice to the consistent feeling of the council that what had been always was proper; but the regulation is based on grounds of moral propriety, and to this extent is quite in the manner of Geneva.<sup>51</sup>

The remainder of these scattering provisions are devoted, so to speak, to stopping small leaks. For instance, it was provided that the restrictions of the numbers that might be present at the festivities were not to be eluded by having relatives issue the invitations. Drinks were no longer to be served in front of the houses after the procession to church; the bride must be blessed only at one end of the house; the bridegroom was to thank the persons who went home with him not more than once, namely, in the evening after the dance, -probably because it was expected that his thank-you should be accompanied by something more substantial; bride or bridegroom were not to ask or appoint any man to escort ladies at the wedding,

---

51 Ibid., p. 477.



except sisters and out-of-town guests.<sup>52</sup>

The Hochzeits-büchlein winds up with an injunction to the constables and their deputies, and the "Rüger"<sup>53</sup>, to have a diligent supervision, and bring persons who transgress to justice without sparing, -a formal clause that might attach to any law, and is disappointing in failing to shed light on the administration of the sumptuary regulations.<sup>54</sup>

Looking back over its provisions, it is apparent at once that, compared with the earlier enactments, the Hochzeits-büchlein of 1485 is distinctly fuller and more complex. It embraces a greater variety of details, and treats them with a thoroughness in which the old laws were lacking. It would be hard to demonstrate that it is at bottom different from them in spirit. As was said before, the multiplication of details cannot be taken as conclusively proving that sumptuary legislation was being more vigorously pressed. Times had changed; the enjoyments and expenditures to be regulated had been diversified; and there must always be the question whether the particulars of conduct visited with restriction appear in greater variety and number because the council has made the meshes

---

52 Ibid., pp. 477-478.

53 Probably here means simply informers, although it may refer to the "rügsherrn". See above, p. 30.

54 Siebenkees, vol. I, p. 478.





of its drag-net finer, or because there were more to be caught in the old net. One may safely say however that the policy of governing from the city-hall private expenditure and manners is shown to have been still vigorously in operation, and apparently kept abreast of the times. The very form in which these regulations are published, -a "büchlein", with preface, ostensibly intended to cover every form of expenditure likely to arise in connection with a wedding, -when it is set over against the simple and random prescriptions of the earlier time, indicates that the regulative policy has gained in definiteness and consciousness of purpose, to the point of being distinctly specialized as a branch of municipal law-making.

As regards the temper of the ordinance, none of the provisions, as we have seen, marks it as distinctly more strict than the older laws. None of them, on the other hand, shows any increase of liberality that cannot be charged to the compulsion of changing usage, to which the law had had to yield. In the Hochzeits-büchlein the council descend further into particulars at many points than in their old prescriptions. They define exceptions more frequently and generously. They display the wisdom of experience in seeking to shut up certain loop-holes against escape and evasions. A discount must be made for the effect of a maturer legal experience and devel-



opment. The traits of the statute which have just been noted are nevertheless to be regarded as evidence that the city-fathers were more alert in their interferences with conduct, at weddings at least; that their supervision, if not harsher, was in plan certainly more thorough-going. It may be impossible to determine whether the standards of the council had been stiffened or liberalized; but we may note in such provisions as that described on pages 88 and 89 above that they were applying to the conduct of the burghers a moral spirit-level sensitive not merely to extravagance and over-lavish expenditure, but to improprieties of behavior as well,-such a criterion as it would not surprise us to find in the hands of one of the reformers.



## Chapter IV

### Wedding Regulations and the Reformation

Consideration of the provisions scattered through the Hochzeits-büchlein that were evidently added after 1485, the date of its first publication, has been postponed because their main interest is lent them by the occurrence of the Reformation. One of the most interesting questions about the paternal regulative policy is as to the effect upon it of the Protestant Reformation. The answer should shed light upon the real quality of the Protestant movement, as well as illustrate the development of paternalism. It is generally supposed that the Reformation quickened state supervision of manners. Most of the instances of intensive regulation that pass as typical have been taken from Protestant communities. The whole policy has become familiarly associated with Geneva and the Puritans; and it is a popular notion that it was peculiar to authorities highly charged with Protestant spirit.

Another impression, much more respectable, obtains, that up to the Reformation the civil authorities laid hands on the citizen in the realm of conduct chiefly when his behavior threatened good order, and left all more intimate discipline to the church, as custodian of morals; but that when the



Reformation came, and robbed the ecclesiastical authority of much of its awe, the secular magistrates felt obligated to step into its shoes, and maintain moral discipline. In this role they proceeded to enmesh the private life of the citizen in restraints of law that looked to his moral welfare. The Reformation, after this view, was a point of departure in paternal regulation. Not merely did it sensitize the moral consciousness of those who made law. It cast upon them a burden of responsibility for the behavior of the citizen, his expenditures, his dress, his indulgence of luxuries, his chastity, to which they responded with an elaborate body of ordinances of a new character.

It is true that in some places, as in certain of the Swiss cities, the Reformation gave the regulative policy fresh impetus. The existing statutes were sharpened up. The councils watched for trespasses with renewed interest, and prosecuted them more energetically. But even in these cities laws had long been operative just as inquisitorial in principle. For some centuries the authorities who after the Reformation took the citizen more strictly in hand had felt it part of their function and duty to set him by statute standards of propriety and of decent restraint; and they had undertaken, with more or less show of purpose, to hold him to these by





fear of court and fine. The Reformation stimulated a sense of duty that had been from of old one of their springs of action. It set them forward with new keenness upon lines of policy which they had accepted and followed for centuries, perhaps, as at Geneva bringing forward some zealous leader to give them head and persistency.

The Nürnberg Hochzeits-büchlein of 1485 was overhauled in 1526, the year after the council committed itself to Protestantism; and it contains amendments dated at late as 1557. It will accordingly serve to exhibit whatever effect the Reformation may have had upon the sumptuary policy of the Nürnberg city-fathers in respect of weddings. Evidence which will be discussed later indicates that the statute was not remodeled in 1526 in such a way as to obliterate the form it had when first issued, but was simply revamped with amendments; and it is to the amendments that we must look for the imprint of the Reformation.

Some of the amendments can be assigned to a date. Elaborate regulation of the wages to be paid musicians of various sorts was made in the ordinance; the wages of a new variety were fixed in a provision added on the Sunday after St. Andrews, 1509. If one wished the music of the bell-ringer, with his wife and men, at the wedding or at one of the parties,



one was required to give him and his troupe a half a gulden a day, besides their keep, not more. The duties of the bellman are also marked out by the council. When he was done playing at the wedding, he was required to make music on the streets at night without fee, and give the public the benefit of his talent. If the wedding and the "Eierkuchen"<sup>1</sup> were held on the same day, and he therefore had to do double duty, he was to receive a gulden; if on successive days, a half gulden on each occasion.<sup>2</sup>

Further regulation of the same kind was added in April, 1511. It had been provided that the bidder to the wedding might receive on the wedding day altogether one gulden. The amendment allows the like sum to the "schwennter" for his services, -a trifling alteration, which shows, however, with what trivial points the council was concerning itself.<sup>3</sup>

In the provision regarding the "Statpfeiffer" in its first form, the wage to be paid them for playing at night was set at one gulden, and for this sum they were expected to make music at eight different points. If it was desired of them to play at other places besides, they were to receive for each per-

---

1 See above, p. 87.

2 Siebenkees, vol. I, pp. 474-475.

3 Ibid., p. 475.



formance a gulden. This prescript was modified later by an inscription in the margin declaring the pipers "to be bound to play only in front of the houses of the bride and of both of her maids; and before more than these three houses they shall not play previously to the wedding or afterwards, under penalty of five gulden". Finally on December 23, 1522, a further amendment was written in, which relaxed the grip of the former. It provided that in future "music should be played before the houses of the parents of bride and groom, and of the bridesmaids."<sup>4</sup>

In the revision of 1557 the prohibition of the bridegroom's having a public stag-party<sup>5</sup> is qualified in its terms so as to cover all places where it might be celebrated, and in particular certain public resorts, - "weder bey denn wirten auff meiner herm trinckstube, Im Schiesgraben".<sup>6</sup>

Such are the amendments to which a date can be affixed. There are a number of others that may have been added at any time during the period in which the statute was operative. Nothing about them gives a clue to their date. It is entirely possible that they were written in at the revision of

4 Siebenkees, vol. I, pp. 475-476.

5 See above, pp. 78-79.

6 Siebenkees, vol. i, p. 460.



1526, and represent the mind of the city-fathers under the inspiration of their new Protestantism.

Some of these undated amendments soften the terms of the law. One is inserted in the section regarding gifts, and permits the bridegroom to bestow on his bride a "maidenring" worth ten gulden.<sup>7</sup> In another the bride is forbidden to give out garlands except to the bridegroom, dance-bidders, bridal escorts, musicians and out-of-town guests.<sup>8</sup> To all of these but the bridegroom she was prohibited from giving in the earlier provision.<sup>9</sup>

One clause, apparently also an amendment, is presumably designed to repair the net of the law at a point where frequent evasion had revealed a flaw. It is attached to the section in which the gifts are described that might be exchanged on the morning of the wedding. It forbids bride and groom to borrow the articles named as legitimate presents; or, in order to avoid the penalty of the law, to borrow from one another things costlier than the law permitted, and retain them. One can see through these terms the clever practice aimed at. High-priced presents were given, and when the officers or some "cat-

---

7 Siebenkees, vol. i, p. 455.

8 Ibid., p. 472.

9 See above, p. 76.





ty neighbor" spied them, it was easy to answer embarrassing questions by saying that the forbidden objects were simply borrowed. The council were trying to put a stop to this subterfuge by making borrowing also an offense.<sup>10</sup>

Another amendment renders the original provision more explicit and less easy to evade. It fixes definitely the cost of the bride's gifts to the groom, which were required at first simply to be inexpensive.<sup>11</sup> Under its terms the bathsuit which she might give him must cost not over five gulden, the shirt not over ten; and furthermore it was not to be worked with gold or silver. The amendment takes a liberal turn at the end. An additional gift is allowed, -which the original provision is modified to cover, -a headgear (hawben), to cost not more than ten gulden.<sup>12</sup>

Certain of these amendments that are not dated tighten the bands of restraint imposed by the ordinance in its first form. It may be recalled that in the original provision regarding serenades it was permitted to pass out light refreshments and a discreet measure of certain not too costly wines to the thirsty musicians and invited guests. But the practice came to

---

10 Siebenkees, vol. i, p. 456.

11 See above, p. 76.

12 Siebenkees, vol. i, pp. 457-458.



seem extravagant to the council, and by an amendment "the extravagance with the wine, which is served the city-pipers at serenades" was ordered abolished, under penalty of five gulden.<sup>13</sup> In another amendment the council repealed its previous permission that at weddings, etc., a measure of wine (a "viertal") or a less quantity might be served to those who came in on account of the wedding, on the ground of its having led many people into notable extravagance. Thereafter no wine at all was to be dispensed, on pain of a fine of ten pounds.<sup>14</sup> It will be noted that in neither of these instances are moral grounds advanced for the closer restriction, but simply the expense in which the permission of the law had involved persons inclined to good cheer who had taken advantage of it.

On the same ground, -the burden of superfluous expense imposed on the entertainer, -another amendment aims at a practice that had arisen and perhaps was growing socially obligatory, of inviting people in after the lawful feasts to dance and have refreshments. The amendment has a little preamble of its own, in which its reasons are set forth. "Although already definite and well-adapted laws have gone forth and been proclaimed under the authority of the honorable council, for the

---

13 Siebenkees, vol. i, p. 455.

14 Ibid., p. 478-479.



avoidance of needless and superfluous cost in betrothal-announcements, weddings, etc.,...nevertheless a special innovation has recently arisen besides", namely, of inviting, on the day or evening of the wedding-betrothal, many women and maidens, in addition to the persons allowed, to eat and dance. This "is not only an expense but much trouble and overtax". The council orders the practice discontinued and the law obeyed, but not without a reservation. If the bride and bridegroom have brothers and sisters or nieces and nephews, they may invite these in to dance after the feast on the evening of the betrothal-announcement, but they may invite them thus at none of the other wedding-feasts or parties. The amendment is nailed down with a penalty of ten gulden.

The paragraph that follows this in the text of the law throws some light on the structure of the ordinance, besides itself bracing it. "If any other or additional persons", it runs, "besides those who are permitted and allowed to be invited according to the tenor of the Hochzeits-büchlein and the law just read", (the reference evidently being to the section above as a later addition to the Hochzeits-büchlein), -if any such additional persons come bidden or unbidden to any of the parties or celebrations connected with the betrothal, they shall each pay a fine of three gulden, "which shall be exacted



without sparing of each and all".<sup>15</sup>

The last of this congeries of sections that permit of being identified as amendments is not a specific addition to the requirements of the law, but a kind of enforcing clause, perhaps added at some moment when the council resolved to screw down the ordinance with a new vigor. "And since", runs its foreword of explanation, "and since in the Hochzeits-büchlein it is declared in specific laws, who and what persons bridegroom and bride may invite home after the betrothal announcement and before the wedding", the council commands that no other persons shall come invited or not invited to feast or dance, except as those laws allow. Whoever invites others, or whoever attends uninvited, contrary to the statute, each shall pay the fine which the law imposes.<sup>16</sup>

Such are the provisions that can be distinguished as amendments to the Hochzeits-büchlein. Ranging in date from 1485 to 1557, they cover, with ample margins, the period of the Reformation. We are looking for marks of the Reformation, and may discard at once the amendments which by their own confession, antedate it, namely, those of 1509, 1511 and 1522.<sup>17</sup> This leaves a limited number that might have been added under

---

15 Baader, Polizeiordnungen, p. 75.

16 Ibid., p. 75.

17 See above, pp. 95-97.





the reforming impulse. It is by no means an inevitable conclusion that these undated additions were actually all written into the ordinance at one time, and at the dictation of the Protestant spirit. In fact the probabilities are against such a conclusion. It is easily possible that some of them were inserted before 1525. There is nothing in the statements, or in the temper of any of them to show that they were not. But one must admit, in the absence of positive testimony to the contrary, that they all may possibly have been drafted after the conversion of the council, and may reflect its mind under Protestant influences.

It is apparent from rehearsing them that taken altogether these amendments do not radically alter the statute. They show hardly more than a tinkering with it at minor points. One stops a way of evasion. Another is more definite than the original about the value of gifts, and therefore harder to elude, but it is softened at the end by permission of an extra present. Several articles set the screws a little closer, - three meeting an extravagance that had unexpectedly arisen and extending the law to cover it<sup>18</sup>; another extending the penalties of the provisions as to the number of guests to the guests as well as the hosts (a device in use for centuries);<sup>19</sup>

---

18 See above, pp. 99-100.

19 See above, pp. 45, 46, 50, etc.



finally, one which has a somewhat more positive look, declaring that the rules and penalties as to guests will be strictly enforced. These represent scarcely deeper alterations of the law than the amendments dated 1509, 1511, and 1522. If we had no other means of knowing that a Reformation occurred, we should not detect it here. It is hardly to be imagined that the citizen about to get married felt that these amendments suddenly straitened his prospects, and warned him that he would now have to do with a council that had suffered a revolution of heart, and would frown with a new puritanical disfavor upon his pleasures. The council may have given the laws on Hochzeits-luxus a more vigorous execution as a result of their conversion on 1525; but a change of policy, if it occurred, exhibits itself but faintly in the terms of the law. The fact has already been noted that the sharpening of the law which may have taken place as its result does not proceed on moral grounds. Simply the extravagance of the customs forbidden is cited; and no new motives are professed, or need to be called in, to account for the changes made. In fine, if we knew nothing about the Reformation, we might very well take this patching of the wedding code as a mild response to the exhortations of the orthodox diet of the empire of 1524. Meeting in Nürnberg, that Catholic body of notables had strongly complained of the new



extravagance breaking out everywhere, and it had declared that "with regard to burghers, artisans, and peasants, new sumptuary dress laws must be made", and extraordinary measures taken to enforce them.<sup>20</sup> If the amendments to the Hochzeits-büchlein were made under the influence of the Lutheran movement, they were not such in character as might not have been made in the spirit of this utterance, and under the conditions of the old regime.

But my assumption with regard to the evidence is open to the question whether possibly the whole ordinance, as well as these undated amendments, is not a product of the converted council. It is entitled the "Nürnberg Hochzeitsbüchlein of the year 1485, which was renewed, bettered, and changed the 7 Feb. 1526."<sup>21</sup> This title lends strength to the suggestion that we have the statute as it issued from the revision that took place in 1526. If such is the case, one is confronted with the possibility that at this revision a milder draft framed in 1485 was swallowed up, and the convenient opportunity which the Hochzeits-büchlein seemed to offer for comparison of the law just before the Reformation and just afterwards,

---

20 Expressions of the diet quoted in Jannsen, History, vol. iv, pp. 145-146.

21 Siebenkees, vol. i, p. 449.



destroyed. To put the question in another form, we are called upon to consider whether we have before us the ordinance as it was framed in 1485, with the revisions of 1526 in the form of amendments; or whether this is the ordinance as it was published in 1526, after the council had gone Protestant.

There is certain internal evidence to show that we have the ordinance substantially as it was framed in 1485, with the revisions of 1526 in the form of amendments. First, a number of the amendments attached have dates prior to 1526.<sup>22</sup> The fact that these survived intact in 1526 indicates that attempt was not made at the revision of that year to draft a law uniformly new, or to weld the provisions already on the books, and the amendments that had gathered, into a fresh and compact statute. It would not be surprising therefore if whatever changes the council saw fit to make in 1526 should be found likewise tacked on in the shape of amendments.

It is true that it is extremely hard to distinguish the provisions of the ordinance that may be amendments. Those recounted above are manifestly such, but many provisions may also be, which wear on their fronts none of the signs. The possibility of this is raised to probability by an accidental

---

<sup>22</sup> See above, pp. 95-97.





revelation in the terms of one provision which otherwise would pass unquestioned as a piece of the original law. It is in the section on forbidden meats.<sup>23</sup> Partridge, hazel-hen, and other game fowl are forbidden, as are capon and fish. The law goes on, however, to permit serving a roast capon on a side table, and further to grant that if there should be anyone present who could not eat meat on the day of the wedding, a dish or two of fish might be specially prepared for his benefit. Now an exception in favor of those who might have scruples about eating meat on set days would mean nothing except as issued after the Reformation. This clause although not dated was certainly added after 1485, and there may be others like it which cannot be distinguished.

But the considerations of structure noted above support one with a fair degree of probability in taking the main provisions, except where there is evidence, perhaps in the preamble, of enactment to meet some particular emergency,<sup>24</sup> as the ordinance of 1485; and the amendments, when not otherwise labelled, as possibly the work of the reformed council in 1526, and if so, probably the sum total of its work in changing

---

23 See above, p. 79.

24 For examples, see above, p. 79 and p. 88. The dates of these "occasional" provisions is usually problematic. They are a common feature of sumptuary laws, and not peculiar to the Reformation period.



this variety of sumptuary law.

But suppose that the ordinance has indeed come down to us as published in 1526, with the features of the ordinance of 1485 indistinguishably plastered over by the alterations of that year. This alternative does not force us, in the lack of a comparative standard, to give the law up as showing nothing of the effect of the Reformation on the local sumptuary policy. First of all, we have a comparative standard of a sort in the articles imbedded in the statute that are specifically dated earlier than the Reformation, - one of them from the year 1436; others from 1509, 1511, and 1522. They seem to be of about the same severity as the surrounding provisions, which do not strike one as utterances in a temper decidedly more rigorous. It must be admitted however that these few dated sections are scarcely sufficient criteria. They are samples not wide enough to show the pattern. If then we give up all nearby standards as impossible to establish with sufficient definiteness, we may still make good use of the distant enactments of previous centuries.<sup>25</sup> When one compares this whole ordinance with them, as is done above in detail,<sup>26</sup> one sees that the Hochzeits-büch-

---

25 See above, Chapter II.

26 See above, Chapter III.



lein is only more elaborate, and not more stringent; that, if different at all, it is more liberal than these.

If therefore we must take the Hochzeits-büchlein in the form in which we have studied it as representing the council's mind under the influences of 1526, and must say that we cannot know whether or not it is a sharpening of the laws on the subject in force just previously, it is still to be seen that it represents no wide departure from the curve which the policy had been describing for centuries. And this, though short of all that we should like to know, is after all the significant point. Whatever its effects in the long run, the Reformation did not immediately shunt this species of sumptuary legislation off its ancient track, but gave it whatever acceleration it may have imparted, along lines projected from the past.

It is impossible to reach a fully intelligent understanding of the effects of the conversion of the council of Nürnberg on their sumptuary policy, without inquiring into the conditions of the Lutheran movement there, and the nature of that conversion. A study that wanders somewhat from our main line is involved, but it justifies itself in the light which it sheds on the motives of the council in adopting Protestantism, and consequently upon the spirit that was to be ex-



pected to animate them in their acts of reform.<sup>27</sup>

The soil was prepared for a friendly reception of Luther's teachings in Nürnberg by the personal popularity of Johann Staupitz, the Vicar-General of the Augustinian Order. Staupitz had been heard by overflowing crowds at the time of his visitations in 1512 and 1516, and a number of prominent men of the town, attracted to his person, formed a club, which held meetings at pleasure in the refectory of the convent of the Augustinians, and called themselves the Sodalitas Staupitziana. Among them were the men who later pressed the Reformation most vigorously in Nürnberg, -Jerome Ebner, Kaspar Nützel, Lazarus Spengler, Dr. Christoff Scheurl, the council's legal adviser, Jerome Holzschuher, Andrew and Martin Tucher, Jacob Welser, the provost of St. Sebald's parish, George Behaim, -all sons of the old ruling families of the city; these, besides such famous names as Albrecht Dürer and Willibald Pirckheimer. The attitude and sympathies of such men were apt to have a considerable influence, at least in setting the fashion of thought. The feeling of the Staupitz club toward Luther just before the

---

27 I have followed the narrative, without always making use of the inferences of Rösel, in his *Alt-Nürnberg*, pp. 424-461. Rösel approves the Reformation, and may be trusted, in doubtful passages, to set forth fairly all that is creditable to the Protestant side.





Diet of Worms is reflected in pamphlets published at the time by two of its members. One was a "Schutzschrift für der Lehre Luthers", by Lazarus Spengler, clerk of the council,<sup>28</sup> a controversial tract in which it was seriously attempted to demonstrate the accord of Luther's teachings with scripture and reason. The other was the noted satire, published anonymously under the title "Eccius Dedolatus" (Eck planed down), the work of Willibald Pirkheimer. The result was that Eck had the names of Spengler and Pirkheimer thrown into the bull which was directed against Luther; and the two Nürnbergers got off only by the intercession of the council with the Duke of Bavaria and the bishop of Bamberg, and by seeking absolution from Eck. That the standing of Spengler in the community was not damaged by

---

28 He seems to have been one of its dominant personalities. Lazarus Spengler "nominally only a scribe or a clerk, was in reality the author and director of all the decisions of the council." Camerarius, Life of Melancthon, quoted in Jannsen, History, vol. IV, p. 62. Speaking of Spengler and Osiander, Pirkheimer says: "A conceited scrivener without any sense of propriety and a presumptuous priest...are forsooth to rule despotically over such a worthy town as Nürnberg, and to alter and reform everything according to their wisdom; whatever they want must be right, and must be done." Quoted in Ibid., pp. 62-63.



his championship of Luther is indicated in the fact that he was one of the three deputies of Nürnberg at the Diet of Worms.

The test of the Edict of Worms showed the council orthodox, but not eager in its orthodoxy. It delayed to publish the decree until October. Its long hesitation seems to have been due to uncertainty as to what effect an attempt to enforce it might have; and may therefore be taken to measure roughly a pro-Lutheran sentiment gathering head among the populace. When at last it determined to act, it spoke decisively, and declared an intention to enforce the edict to the letter.

In 1521 a factor was injected into the local situation which, it seems not unlikely, prevented the Reformation in Nürnberg from taking the course to be expected amid so many favoring circumstances. Nürnberg was made the seat of the new experiment in imperial administration, and the Reichsregiment and Reichskammergericht were installed in a chamber of the Rathaus, where they were separated only by partitions from the deliberations of the council. This proximity was certain to have its effect. The new regime might be weak in influence, but it would nowhere be more impressive than in the town which must daily live in its presence, - particularly when its residence among them was a favor and privilege which the burghers, if only with an eye to business, did not desire to lose. Whatever



the reason, while the imperial authorities remained, the council gave no unequivocal grounds for complaint respecting its orthodoxy or its loyalty to the emperor's policy in religious matters.

In 1523 division of opinion over religion had gone so far as to lead to discord and ruptures in the monasteries. Among the Dominican brothers, one Gallus Korn, a son of Nürnberg, began to use the conventual pulpit to inveigh against monkery. When the prior threatened him with the dungeon, he took refuge with the Augustinians, where a radical spirit seems to have been present from the first. A Carthusian, Franz Kolb, found the same asylum under similar circumstances. The council refused to interfere in these cases, not necessarily because it looked indulgently on the Protestant malcontents,<sup>29</sup> but very likely because it regarded these quarrels as outside of its jurisdiction; for as soon as the monastic squabbling took a political turn, and a Barefoot friar, one Kettenbach, began to ventilate his Lutheranism in animadversions upon the emperor, the pope, and Henry VIII of England, the council promptly put its foot on him, and stopped the sale of his writings. And

---

29 As Rössel implies.



its coolness for too violent breaks with the established order was further exhibited when four monks escaped from the Carmelite Convent and it banished them from the city.

There was apparently a strong anti-Romanist ferment at work among the populace. One may not feel justified in taking the demonstrations of the noisy and vulgar, -the "Katzenmusiken" heard on the streets in the evening, the window-breaking, the ribald catches sung before the nunneries, -as tokens of a universal popular sentiment in favor of Protestantism.<sup>30</sup> But there is other and safer evidence that such a sentiment was making, in the many pamphlets that began to pass around, despite rescripts from the council, and the vigilance of the police; and in the quarrelsome discussions which are described as continually going on in taverns and at the baths. In 1523 Hans Sach's "Wittenberger Nachtigall" was produced, and became immensely popular.

The evidences of heresy at last grew so obnoxious to the papal nuntio and the imperial viceroy that each entered complaint with the council. The vicegerent summoned the city-fathers to him on the eleventh of December, and took them to task for the trade in Luther's books that was being driven, in

---

30 Rössel makes much of these expressions.





contempt of the edict. The result of the conference was the issuance of a sharp reprimand to the book-dealers. Presently the legate appeared to demand the arrest of the fugitive monks, and of the four preachers of the city, who apparently had for some time been preaching Luther's doctrines. A sample of the high pitch of their sermons is furnished the day after the legate's complaint, when they freely attacked the pope, as willing to subvert the teaching of Christ with lies, and admonished the people not to put up with it.

One can gauge the height to which popular antipathy for the Roman clergy had run in 1523 by the circumstances of the legate Campeggio's entry into the city on his commission to the diet. Instead of approaching with calvacade and pomp of ceremonial, upon the advice of princes who met him beyond the suburbs, he came in as a private citizen, to attract as little attention as possible, and went to his lodgings without even visiting the churches. His presence seems only to have excited the preachers to rasher utterances. Osiander cried to his hearers: "And though the pope should add to his three crowns yet a fourth, he would not turn me aside one inch." Thomas Murner, coming to the diet from the bishop of Strassburg to lodge complaint against the Strassburg council



was hooted and dogged through the streets by gamin bawling: "Murrnarr", "Katzenkopf". Even the bishop of Bamberg, the ecclesiastical superior of Nürnberg, was bespattered with mockery and satirical songs.

At several points the old ecclesiastical regime was visibly crumbling into decay, and the intention of the council to stay and restore it was plainly growing weaker. At first they are little breaches that appear,-for instance, negligence of the lenten fasts, which the council sought at once to correct by forbidding the burghers to eat, and the butchers to sell, meat on fast-days. But a lesion destined to be much more serious had threatened the year before, when the congregations of the churches had petitioned the provosts to administer the Eucharist in both kinds. Although we are not given the means to know with what unanimity, it is clear that the populace were taking critical steps of reform for themselves. The provosts referred to the council; but no one in authority seemed to relish assuming responsibility. The council referred to the bishop of Bamberg; and he to the ecumenical council expected to be called. But the Augustinians refused to depend upon such an uncertainty, and the prior went on to administer the supper in both kinds to his monks and a number of the burghers. In Holy Week of 1524 no fewer than



three thousand persons partook of the communion at his convent under the Lutheran forms.

His bold initiative hewed away the lingering scruples of the provosts in the two great parishes of St. Sebald's and St. Laurence's. They stopped at nothing now, but changed the mass, abolished confession and Latin hymn-singing, mass-sayings and anniversaries for the dead, set feast days, and had the gospel and epistles read in the German tongue. The council did what it could to recall them from these headlong measures of reform, but had to confess, in a letter of self-exculpation to the archduke Ferdinand and the bishop of Bamberg, that it was unfortunate but true that the magistrates could not proceed against the innovations without provoking a storm which they dared not face.

Events now approached their crisis. Probably stirred to action by the sequel of the Regensburg convention, the bishop of Bamberg at last made up his mind to deal summarily with the insubordinate provosts of Nürnberg. They answered his citation, but took high ground and refused to accept his judgment on the plea that he was an interested party to the action. When they appealed to the expected council, to which before he himself had referred them, he excommunicated them. But neither the Nürnberg council nor his own deputy in the city would as-



sist in giving effect to the ban.

The council had evidently been pursuing a policy of expediency. Whatever the religious convictions of its members, it had been looking out first for the public interests of Nürnberg, and had steered a middle course, growing more and more difficult, between the Protestant sympathies of the populace, and the orthodoxy expected of it by those with whom it had to do in its imperial relations. When the Reichsregiment had finally proved itself a phantom, and neither to be wooed nor feared, and when the cities had united at Speyer and Ulm in 1524 openly to deprecate persecution of "the good teachings of Luther", the chief reasons for holding out against popular sentiment and personal inclination were removed.

At the same time the inducements at home for the council to turn Lutheran were strengthening, and its cupidity began to marshal it in the way of its Protestant inclinations. The factions, wordy and violent, which had shattered the ancient quiet of the cloisters, offered a tempting excuse to the council to step in as arbiter, and with a good show of equity, to lay a hand upon the rich monastic properties for the benefit of the city. In December, 1524, the Augustinians discarded their cowls, and deeded over their convent to the council. Whether or not their action bred in the city-fathers a bad sug-





gestion, it is easy to believe that it sharpened an appetite which asserted itself plainly in their dealing shortly afterwards with the Carthusians. A faction of the Carthusians, headed by prior Blasius Steckel, purposed to follow the example of the Augustinians, whereupon brother Martin and the remainder of the friars stood up in opposition. But the council were loath to see such good purposes fall to the ground. They packed off brother Martin into exile, as a disturber of the peace, then essayed to bring his recalcitrant comrades to terms by making them listen to the sermons of reformed preachers. The council had overcome now the hesitancy of the first step; and they went on to deny the Barefoot monks and the Dominicans their exercise of the cure of souls in the two nunneries.

In the spring of 1525, in March, after going through the formality of hearing a public discussion of the religious question, the council committed itself to the work of introducing the Reformation. Its policy was directed by the two losunger, at the head of the administration, Jerome Ebner and Kaspar Nützel. They were vigorously seconded by the clerk of the council, Lazarus Spengler, of "Schutzschrift" fame; and by Osiander, the hot-headed, radical young preacher of the St. Laurence parish. The council now made laws embodying the reforms which the ecclesiastics had undertaken at their own per-



il. They permitted eating meat on fast-days; they abolished the whole series of "popish holidays", and put the monasteries under regulations informed by Lutheran teachings.

It was not long before they laid hands on the monastic properties. Even Protestant writers admit that the motives of the council were not unmixed;<sup>31</sup> and that they probably looked upon the monastic houses with a more indignant and zealous eye because these contained a wealth which they coveted. As the summer of 1525 wore on, one after another of the convents was coaxed or pressed to the point of surrender:-the Carmelites in May, after their prior had been removed by banishment; the Carthusians in July as the result of long and painful negotiations; in the same month the wealthy Schottenkloster. The Barefoot friars and the Dominicans contested stoutly the dissolution of their retreats; and the council had to content itself with instituting a siege. It took an inventory of the property; forbade the monks the cure of souls; and refused to permit admission of new members. The Dominicans held out until they were reduced to five; the Barefoot monks until, a half century later, death removed the last of them.

The fate of the nunneries is a long and interesting

---

31 Rössel, p. 455.



story, but for our purposes needless to follow. The council adopted the same policy as in the case of the monasteries. The resistance of the sisters was much more stubborn; and it provoked the reformers to acts of force, which have been hard for their apologists to defend, and which go far to justify such animadversions as Jannsen's.<sup>32</sup> The nuns clung to their convents to the end. It is significant of the attitude of the council in their reforms that they did not confiscate these outright, and suffered them to remain in possession of the sisters as long as they refused to give them over. The house at Engelthal fell to the city in 1565, while the prioress, Anna Tucher, and one sister were still living. But the fathers of the council secured possession of the cloister at Pillenreuth and the Clara-Convent in the city only when in 1591 the sole survivor in each died; and of the Dominican nunnery of St. Katherine, whose inmates obtained favor because of their activity as copyists, not until the year 1596 put out the solitary candle of the last sister.

The council had extended its jurisdiction to cover a reform of the church with no authorization but the acquiescence of the burghers. It constituted itself bishop of Nürnberg, and it formed no consistory to suggest or second its policies. A tenth of the property sequestered it devoted to the support of

-----

32 Jannsen, History, vol. iv, pp. 64-84.



the church; a portion it invested in charitable institutions; the rest it pocketed for the city. The costly instruments of worship were melted into money, or inventoried and taken into safekeeping. The monks were given the choice of entering the parish service, or, with the nuns, of receiving a pension, on condition they married. All ecclesiastics in the new church were put on a salary, but they lost their immunity from taxation, and they had to qualify regularly as citizens.

Such was the Reformation in Nürnberg. It had passed through its initial stage without uproar. Manifestly it was a popular movement. From 1522 onwards Lutheran sympathies were thriving apace among the mass of the populace, and they spread until by 1524 it would seem that only the monasteries were left as distinct islets of fidelity to the old belief. The council lagged behind public feeling, at least in its avowed policy, and steered a course of prudence. The cardinal alterations in the forms of worship in the city churches were accomplished without its consent. When at last the council committed itself to the Reformation, it would seem to have made up its mind as a result of a balance of advantages, rather than from a change of heart. However vigorous in its reforms when once committed, it had not been the aggressor. It had not set the pace. It must be remembered, as perhaps in part explaining this, that there was no big, emphatic min-





ority in Nürnberg to contest the advances of Protestantism, and force consolidation on its friends; and the council could well afford to bide its time, and reap all the advantages of an orthodox front, in the certainty of what the event would be.

This apparent calculation, and the large part ulterior motives seem to have played, scarcely prepare one to expect a thorough-going moral zealotry in reform. Not that much violence to private beliefs was not likely to be done, and a new attention and interest turned upon moral questions as a result of the stirring of the waters of religion; but even in the dealings with the convents, where the incitements to it were sharpest, with all the disgraceful cajolery and vexation,<sup>33</sup> there is an absence of extreme fanaticism, an absence of pressure of blood, so to speak; and the rights of the religious orders in their coveted property were treated, if all things are taken into account, with a considerable degree of restraint. A certain leniency in the sumptuary policy which this character of the Reformation in Nürnberg may help to explain is illustrated by the amendment to the Hochzeits-büchlein noted above, in which even the scruples of Catholics about eating meat on

---

33 Janssen, History, vol. iv, pp. 64-84; Rösel, pp. 456-460.



certain days is respected, although one of the acts of reform had been to refuse public recognition to the set days of the church. Perhaps we may find in the presence of mixed motives, and in the council's qualified intolerance, -and I speak of its attitude as tolerant in any sense only in comparison with the systematic radicalism of such cities as Geneva and Zürich, -one reason why we found the Reformation effecting no abrupt accentuation in the policy of controlling manners, certainly at least as far as that policy is reflected in the Hochzeits-büchlein and its amendments.



## Chapter V

## The Reformation and Moral Legislation

One of the modern historians of Nürnberg, when he has described the Reformation, points to the sumptuary laws for proof that the conscience of the city-fathers was quickened by Protestantism.<sup>1</sup> They set to work to clean up their house, at the impulse "of the stricter views regarding public life which came to prevail through the teaching of Luther". Their other reforming activities, their dissolution of all the wealthy convents within reach, might have had a mixed motive, but he cites as indubitably wholesome fruits of the local reformation the attempts to rectify morals in the city, - in particular, the prohibitions and limitations laid upon "gambling, with cards and dice, and at bowls"; the interdiction of ribald singing in the streets; the extension of a close supervision to the vice of tippling; the restriction of carnival abuses; the sharper lines drawn upon the excessive luxury indulged in at weddings; the subjection of marriage relations to severer public scrutiny and discipline. It has already been attempted to show that the sumptuary wedding-laws fail to support this

---

1 Rösel, Alt-Nürnberg, p. 461.



contention. The sumptuary wedding-code, drafted a generation before, was revised just after the council's conversion; but it took no severer tone than previously; in fact, bears no marks of the reforming wave that can be identified except doubtfully and by aid of external evidence. Unfortunately nothing is said in the narrative that has been cited to prevent us from receiving the impression that the public discipline of manners described,-the repression of gambling, boisterous singing, drinking, carnival revelry, extravagance at weddings,-was a new departure in the city; that, if it had been on the statute books before, it now received an emphasis only to be accounted for by the inoculation of the council with Lutheran ideas.

The recommendations of the orthodox diet of 1524<sup>2</sup> are sufficient to signify that Luther in fact pronounced no stricter views of public moral policy than men whom he did not inspire; and that as distinct a sharpening of sumptuary legislation might well have occurred at Nürnberg in 1526 in obedience to Catholic authorities, had Luther never preached. And there are Nürnberg ordinances of earlier date extant to show that the council had long felt it to be their duty to

-----

2 See above, pp. 104-105.





restrain manners in points at which they have been represented as introducing reforms under an access of Protestant zeal. We have laws in which they sought to control gambling and tippling, for instance, that date from the fourteenth century. Laws which evince a still more intimate concern for the uprightness and restraint of private manners had been appearing repeatedly for two centuries before the Reformation; and these had by no means ceased, or been allowed to grow obsolete, in the period that preceded Luther's outbreak. Enactments that renew them when slipping into neglect, amendments which indicate the vigilance of the council in the matter, and an intention to keep the policy of restriction abreast of new abuses bred of new conditions, are at hand in plenty dating from the latter years of the fifteenth century and the opening years of the sixteenth. Many of these, as will appear, have a moral cast, and profess motives in their explanatory passages, which, after such a view as that cited above, would cause us, in fault of an express date, to stamp them as products of the Reformation. The spirit of the Reformation may indeed have excited the city-fathers of Nürnberg to apply the sumptuary laws with a new energy; but examination of earlier enactments shows that it did not lead them to make radical departures in the character of the laws.



Tippling is cited as one of the matters of conduct "taken under strict supervision" as a result of the Reformation.<sup>3</sup> But the council had for many generations been taking measures that looked to hedging the liberties of the citizen in his cups. In the fourteenth century it gave notice that the person who should give to drink in his house or before his door after the curfew, would be subject to a fine of one pound haller, and the person who imbibed the drink sixty haller; and, -with the taverns and public bars in view, -the tapster sixty pfennige.<sup>4</sup> This law was repeated in the fifteenth century with higher penalties. The penalty upon the host had been raised to five pounds of new haller, and the fine of the person found drinking after the curfew to two pounds.<sup>5</sup> Later the law was renewed, with its net mended to catch certain offenders who pled, when arraigned, that they had been dining at the inn.<sup>6</sup> Another ordinance forbade anyone to have a drinking saloon without the permission of the council.<sup>7</sup>

These measures do not look strange to us because we

---

3 Rüssel, p. 461.

4 Baader, Polizeiordnungen, pp. 63-64.

5 Baader, p. 254.

6 Baader, pp. 254-255.

7 Baader, p. 115.



still keep the sale and consumption of liquor under close municipal supervision; and indeed it would be hard to show that the laws cited are not merely police regulations, made in the interest of public order and safety. Drink-laws appear in the fifteenth century which may be classified less doubtfully as paternal legislation. In one of them the city-fathers ordered drinking places of all sorts to close their doors on specified holy-days, viz: Christmas day, Easter, Whitsunday, "Oberstag", Corpus-Christi day, Ascension Day, on all the days of our dear Lady, on the days of the Twelve Apostles, and during Passion Week. The council here again may have had the peace foremost in mind, for on the days of the church the working-people had their liberty in the Middle Ages, and idleness was apt to end in drunkenness and excess. But the prohibition extended to the homes of private citizens, and anyone, man or woman, who gave to another to drink, or allowed games to be played for money, in his house on Christmas, Easter, or Whitsuntide, was liable to a fine of five pounds.<sup>8</sup>

Just at the close of the fifteenth century, and in the generation of the Reformation-outbreak, the council had been provoked to enact a law against treating whose basis of paternal and moral purpose is manifest. The council had

---

8 Baader, p. 255.



been informed, they declared in the preamble, and could see for themselves, that "punishable, disorderly treating has broken out in the city", a practice from which proceed "much sinfulness and blasphemy, also strife, anger, injury, and murder"; therefore "to the praise of Almighty God, also to prevent and abolish this abuse, with which much frivolity is connected", the council, in pointed terms, forbid it.<sup>9</sup> This profession of motives, with its almost puritanical twang, makes it hard to accept any attempt at the Reformation by supervision of drinking "to stamp upon the public mind a more serious character" as a new thing, or as peculiarly the expression of the Protestant impulse.

"Gambling with cards, dice and bowls was partly prohibited, partly limited", -such was another of the reforms which the Nürnberg council has been represented as introducing to put in effect "the stricter views of public life, which came to prevail through the teaching of Luther".<sup>10</sup> Again a glance back over the regulations of gambling which the council had been enacting from the time of the earliest of its decrees that survive, shows that actually this was no innovation, and might have occurred without the Reformation. From

---

9 Baader, p. 115. The year of this ordinance was 1496.

10 Rösel, Alt-Nürnberg, p.: 461.





the beginnings of the fourteenth century, perhaps from a date even behind this, comes a law which limits to sixty haller the stakes a burgher might set upon his game, on pain of the winner's forfeiting to the city the excess, and there was besides a fine of five pounds upon him and the loser alike. The third person, who backed a wager in excess of sixty haller, risked the same penalty. The law was to cover all "'hande spil', bowling, disk-throwing, dice and other games," with the exception of running. A person caught playing, whether winner or loser, and unable to pay the fine, was required to leave the city until he could pay it.<sup>11</sup>

In the latter half of the fourteenth century ordinances with the same general provisions, but with heightened penalties, and with the elaboration of much more careful safeguards of the limitation upon stakes, appear on the law-books.<sup>12</sup> The council did not stop short of total suppression, when it saw fit, in this early time. In the fourteenth century it summarily ordered all gambling places in the city rooted out, and armed the constables with authority to confiscate their property, and put whomever they caught breaking the law in the stocks, at the discretion of the council. Again it flatly prohibited

---

11 Baader, p. 63.

12 Ibid., pp. 63-65.



"weltzeln", -probably a game played with balls, -under penalty of forfeiting the winnings, and sixty haller; and, in default of the haller, of sitting in the stocks at the pleasure of the council.<sup>13</sup> The keeper's punishment was to sit in the stocks for eight days, and be banished a year from the city.<sup>14</sup>

In a series of restrictions and prohibitions which appeared at the time of the Hochzeits-büchlein, in 1485, the city-fathers sought to regulate gambling with still greater particularity. The intention of the law seems to have been to drive the practice into the light. In general a fine of five pounds haller is suspended over everyone, man or woman, who engages in a game for money. The host in whose house the playing takes place is liable to a mulct of two pounds, "if at the time he is serving his liquors with his sign out, and his saloon open", but to one five times as great, "if he is not serving liquors at the time in the aforesaid manner, and has not his bar at the time open to the public."<sup>15</sup> To ferret out playing in secret where a censor could not get at it to

13 Baader, p. 65.

14 Ibid., p. 65. A final clause of this ordinance forbids pitching pennies. "Also it is decreed that no one shall with haller or pfennige shoot in a ring, under the same penalty.

15 Ibid., p. 87.



see that the law was observed, the council decreed that when anyone heard of such illicit gaming, he should report it, and the proprietor of the establishment in which it was going on should be haled before the council and bound by oath to disclose and designate who has been playing at his house during a stated period previous, say a quarter-year. These persons informed upon should then be summoned and likewise be bound to name anyone whom they knew to have played. The law was drastic not only in its publicity-clauses. When anyone lent to a friend to play and he lost, the ordinance authorized the lender to demand the sum of the winner, and if necessary, to bring suit for it, while the winner did not acquire legal title to his ill-gotten gain even in default of suit. If the parties interested failed to enter suit within a quarter of a year, then the burgomaster might claim it. He was to devote half of it as a fine to the common city, and, it is to be presumed, keep the rest for his pains. Certain games played for limited stakes were exempted from the frown of the law: "cards, draughts, bowling, for a pfennig" or for drinks, or a small purse; "chess, running, and shooting".<sup>16</sup>

This law seems not to have worked effectively, at least

---

16 Baader, pp. 87-88.



not to suit the conscience of the council. Later, but still before the Reformation, they revised and sharpened it. In the preamble they refer to the former enactments regarding the matter. These are in force, and they "have repeatedly punished transgressors of the same". But they saw them still violated in contempt of the consequences, and much excessive gambling practised, especially certain "suspicious playing for lucre at cards and dice, into which and the like transactions it befits the council to look and protect their community from damage and mischief". The former laws, they ordain, shall remain in force. But no one hereafter must play "schanntzen, passen, faren, or the like, with dice; or at cards the game called "puckenmendlens", or any sort of costly game for gulden, in whatever form. They expose themselves at each offense to a fine of ten gulden, and one half of the winnings.<sup>17</sup>

In its deliberations of July 18, 1503, the council decided to prohibit "card-playing and dice upon the 'Schutt und hallerwiesen", but to suffer playing at bowls and shooting, this however not on feast-days before singing and preaching, or on work-days."<sup>18</sup> These last pieces of law-giving are especially

---

<sup>17</sup> Baader, pp. 88-89.

<sup>18</sup> Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg, vol. viii, p. 244.





significant as indicating that the council did not need the prick of a religious impulse to waken it to the harmfulness of gambling in the city. Before the Reformation it had the matter on its conscience, as one in which it was in duty bound to interfere; and these cases in which it tightened the restraints of the law show that it was likely at any time, of its own accord, and with only the stimulus of the menace offered to public peace and morals, to draw in the rein on excess.

One might point to the old regulations of the carnival-revelries, restriction of which again has been cited as a manifestation of the reforming spirit, to show that these too had long been under the watchful restraint of the council.<sup>19</sup> But our object is something beyond tilting against the errors of one writer. It is rather, by the test of their legal pronouncements, to measure the extent to which the fathers of the council felt a responsibility for the moral welfare of the burghers, for their private conduct and for a scale of living, regarded from the city-hall as proper and decent. Perhaps this sense of duty was intensified, certainly it was not engendered, by the Reformation, by injection of the Protestant spirit. The laws already cited in correction of the state-

---

19 See the elaborate regulation of mumming and masquerades on Fastnacht and at other times, dating from the fifteenth century, in Baader, pp. 92-94.



ments of a previous writer. serve our broader purpose. There are others arising in the pre-Reformation period which support it still more pointedly.

Take, for instance, the laws with regard to dancing. Here is a matter which the council would regulate only in view of its moral incidents. The earliest rule may have been prompted by mixed considerations. It forbade artisans, apprentices and menial servants to go about the streets dancing, accompanied by fiddlers and fifers, except on the three days before Ash Wednesday, the day of the great gild-carnival. If the offender could not pay a pound haller, he must cool his heels for an hour in the pillory.<sup>20</sup> This prohibition dates from the fourteenth century. Another, of the same time, is more inquisitorial, and has a moral tinge. The fathers forbade anyone to dance after seven o'clock in the evening, unless he got express permission from them. They would fine the person in whose house the dancing occurred twenty pounds and each of the dancers two gulden. They threaten to inflict corresponding fines of half these amounts upon men or women who danced "longer than between the two meals", and did not stop when they heard the vespers sounded.<sup>21</sup>

---

20 Siebenkees, vol. i, pp. 676-677.

21 Ibid., p. 677.



In its deliberations on the eighteenth of July, 1503, - the Reformation was still a quarter of a century away, - the Council among its other business of the day concluded to put a stop to "the dancing which takes place on Sunday and other holy-days upon the streets", and directed that an ordinance to this effect be proclaimed on the next Sunday.<sup>22</sup>

A specimen of dance-regulation, interesting for the motives professed in it, as well as for the curious picture disclosed, comes to us from the fifteenth century. It runs: "Since it has definitely come to the knowledge of the honorable council, that many unwonted shameful immodest and novel dances are daily encouraged and practiced, which is not only a sin and without doubt displeasing to Almighty God, but also may produce much dishonorable light-mindedness and scandal besides, among men and women, the same to prevent, our lords of the council earnestly and strictly command, that henceforth no player or minstrel shall pipe, play or cause any but the customary dances which have come down from of old; also no one whoever it be, woman or man, shall dance the same, and in dancing shall not take by the neck or embrace one another."<sup>23</sup>

-----  
 22 Mitteilungen, Nürnberg, vol. viii, p. 244. The minute continues: "...also to add to the proclamation that no one shall shoot the knobs off the towers."

23 Baader, pp. 91-92.



Set beside this ordinance one of the same kind from the late sixteenth century, when the Reformation had had ample time to work in the blood of the council. For the sake of a complete comparison I quote freely also from this one, which like the other opens with an elaborate announcement of motives. "Inasmuch as it has not only been definitely made known to the Honorable Council but also is manifest to the eye and in plain sight of day in what measure at weddings and other dances here an altogether unseemly and immodest abuse prevails, in that women and maidens are excessively whirled and swung around by those who dance with them, wherefrom no small mischief and scandal proceeds, with the result that it is not improperly displeasing to all modest, honor-loving persons to behold it; Therefore the Honorable Council recognizing themselves responsible by virtue of their bearing office to plant and to further whatever is conducive to modesty and honor, but on the contrary to prevent and extirpate all that is opposed to this, they our Lords have resolved to longer to look upon this unbecoming abuse", but herewith command "that everyone, of whatsoever rank, at all dances which shall be held... in the gardens and other places about the city" and suburbs, "in and outside the houses, shall wholly refrain from all immodest dancing, besides all swingings round and whirlings, likewise from





dancing in breeches and jacket only, without any garment put on over them." Penalty, two gulden. If the accused makes light of the matter, the council may lay the fine on thicker at discretion.<sup>24</sup>

Comparing these two parallel ordinances, it is hard to find in the second any differences to be attributed to the Reformation. To all appearances they are two expressions of a continuous policy. In the ordinance of the fifteenth century the city-fathers used fewer words, but they ran their probe in as deep as in that of the sixteenth. The sixteenth century law attacks an abuse which the other did not encounter, the dancing that looked to the council to be *en dishabille*; but it proceeded on the same grounds,-the immodesty of the dances, the scandal they were likely to breed; and its tone is no more puritanical. The sense of obligation is the same in both cases. "Recognizing themselves", they say, "by virtue of their bearing office responsible to plant and to further whatever is conducive to modesty and honor, but on the contrary to prevent and extirpate all that is opposed to this",- they are prompted to make these laws, and, in fact, to utter all the sumptuary and paternal laws of the period. It is an

---

24 Siebenkees, vol. i, pp. 172-174.



excellent conscious expression of the relation in which they believed they stood to the community, a relation which in fact had underlain the paternal legislation from the beginning of the story. At least in this expression of its basis, the policy had not suffered any change that is traceable to the Reformation.

The regulations of profanity furnish another interesting test of the council's attitude toward the moral state of the citizens. In an ordinance apparently from the early part of the fourteenth century, the council decreed, "in order to increase all blessedness and to the praise of God, that all loose usage with words shall be done away with, and especially they will not that anyone henceforth shall swear by God's corpse, His head, His heart, His blood, and also by his other members, and by other creatures, [in connection with] which God is named in dishonor, nor with the new oaths, which now are many in the world". To get at the offenders, they charged the officers and magistrates of the city by virtue of their oaths of office to censure any swearing that came to their ears; others by the oath which they took in connection with the taxes. They might hold the person caught in his blasphemy for six haller, half of which they must make over to the council as a fine, the other half to go to the informer.



Anyone who resisted the constable made himself liable to banishment for eight days; and if he made light of the punishment, it assumed terrifying proportions, and from a trifling fine mounted into a liability to have his eyes gouged out, his ears lopped off, and other heavier punishments inflicted, -not, however, without legal process.<sup>25</sup>

The guilty party felt in his flesh the inflictions for blasphemy under the terms of an ordinance of the next century. "To the praise of Almighty God our lords of the council decree and command that no one shall swear wickedly or grievously, as by God, or our dear Lady, or the like, or use any unseemly blasphemy." The council would set the offender in the stocks, or have him whipped through the city; and if the profanity was serious enough, at its discretion inflict capital punishment, according to the form of the offense.<sup>26</sup>

These utterances, this tenderness of ears to blasphemy and sense of a duty to lay hands on it, would not be surprising in a Puritan town-meeting of the eighteenth century or the consistory of Geneva. As a matter of fact, they are taken from the lips of a group of men entirely secular,

---

25 Baader, p. 68.

26 Ibid., p. 114.



busy with administering the multiplied affairs, at home and abroad, of a great commercial city, long before Luther or Protestantism had seen the light, or even the forces that brought them to birth had broken the full circle of Mediaevalism.





## Chapter VI

## The Regulation of Christening

Given the theory that control of personal extravagance is a duty of the government, the need of regulating weddings and clothes explains itself. To understand the reason for ordinances regarding christenings, one must have in mind contemporary usages. At the birth of a baby the mother was visited for congratulation by companies of women, whom she was expected to provide with refreshments. These visits were made while she was still confined to her bed, and before the baptism; and the burden and expense of the social duties involved provoked the interference of the council as guardian of the regularity of the citizen's life. If the distinction is kept in view between these parties at the bed of the mother and the events of the baptism proper, the social observances with which the arrival of a baby was celebrated in the Middle Ages are explained with sufficient clearness by the terms of the ordinances regulating them.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 One is aided by contemporary art in visualizing the event that required the most regulation, the party which the women of the neighborhood had around the bed of the mother. Dürer's picture of St. Anne in the "Life of Mary" series may be taken



The regulations of baptisms which the council of Nürnberg enacted in the fourteenth century are, like the early wedding-regulations, direct and simple rules. By one, a party of more than twelve women at the bed of the mother was forbidden; and friends were to do no dancing in honor of the baby until the mother had taken it to the church for christening. The parents were held responsible for the keeping of these rules, under a penalty of ten pounds; and each person who broke them by taking part in the forbidden festivities was liable to be fined one gulden. Again only twelve women were allowed to be invited to the baptism. If more attended, without invitation, each exposed herself to a fine of a gulden. Furthermore, the council signified its displeasure with drinking-parties at the time of the baptism by attaching a

-----  
 as representing a typical party of this kind in the Nürnberg of the artist's day. St. Anne lies in her high canopied bed; and about a dozen neighborly women are in the room, chatting and enjoying the refreshments, or ministering to the saint. At the opposite side of the bed two of them are serving her with a beverage. The artist has sketched a stout woman sitting in the foreground, with head thrown back and face buried up to the eyes in a pitcher. The baby, over in a corner, and apparently receiving little attention, is about to have its bath.



penalty of three gulden to attending them.

Overdressing the baby was another extravagance incident to christenings which led the council to interfere. They ordered that no one should "carry a child to the church in a baptismal garment of silk, or in a dress that has been bordered or sewed with silk, gold, silver or pearls." They found it needful also to set limits upon the number of godfathers, probably in view of the involuntary taxation, in the shape of gifts, which standing as godfather involved. A rule of the fourteenth century made it an offense subject to a fine of five pounds for anyone to have more than one godfather for his child.<sup>2</sup> In the next century the council exactly fixed the maximum of the gift which the godfather might bestow at thirty-two pfennige.<sup>3</sup>

Ordinances of the fifteenth century again fix the number of women who might be invited to a christening at twelve.<sup>4</sup> It was a women's event: the only men whom the law permitted to attend were the father and godfather.<sup>5</sup> One article permits neighborly women to visit the mother on condition that they

---

2 Siebenkees, vol. i, pp. 47-48.

3 Baader, p. 70.

4 Ibid., p. 69.

5 Ibid., p. 70.



give neither children nor nurses, on one day, more than four pfennige.

An ordinance that regulated closely the entertaining which was expected to accompany a birth was issued in the fifteenth century. It was designed, the preamble states, "to abolish and avoid unnecessary and superfluous expense". Having any sort of party in connection with the birth of a baby or its baptism, or during the two months that followed, was forbidden. The entertainer risked a fine of five pounds, and everyone who had anything to do with the party a fine of two pounds. But the prohibitions was not unconditional, and certain guarded exceptions were allowed. For instance, one might serve the women who came home with the baby from the christening, -themselves and their maids, with a sweet-cooky and some inexpensive wine. The mother might also on one occasion invite in after dinner her female relatives, provided that she gave them nothing more and nothing else to eat or drink than "in moderation one dish of unforbidden food", and besides this, small cakes, raw fruit, cheese and bread, and ordinary wine. If any friends dropped in during the time that the mother was confined to her bed, she might serve them the same light refreshments. If she added anything, she risked a fine.<sup>6</sup>

---

6 Baader, pp. 70-71.





An ordinance which was promulgated in the latter half of the following century repeated these provisions almost word for word. The Reformation left no visible traces on the sumptuary regulation of christenings. The law of the fifteenth century, fitted with a new preamble, answered the requirements of the council in the sixteenth, after it had become Protestant. In the altered foreword the city-fathers complained that their "several honorable, sensible and good ordinances", enacted "to avoid extravagance and mischief" have been "in manifold ways overlooked and transgressed, wherefrom harm and ruin have come and issued".<sup>7</sup> The rules limiting the men who might be present at the baptism to father and godfather, and fixing the gift which visitors might bestow on children or the nurse to a small sum, are also repeated. A new clause is added which looks to effective enforcement of the statute. Midwives that make assistance at births their business are enjoined to warn mothers in childbed of the terms of the laws affecting baptism, visiting, and entertainment. If they fail to do this, and assist in violations or are privy to them without protest, they shall be held accountable equally with the mother, and be punished

---

<sup>7</sup> Siebenkees, vol. i, p. 174.



by infliction of the proper penalties.<sup>8</sup>

The christening laws disclose a new range of points in daily life at which the citizen felt the paternal hand of the council. The motive prominent in the wedding-regulations, an apparent sense of duty both to make possible and to enforce regularity in the citizen's domestic economy, recurs; and an attention to intimate and petty details is manifested, that indicates a careful oversight. The failure of the Reformation to leave any marks of its effect on the christening ordinances confirms the observations of the foregoing chapters as to the influence of the Protestant movement on the sumptuary policy.

---

8 Siebenkees, vol. i, p. 176.



## Chapter VII

## The Regulation of Burials

The council which arranged the circumstances of a man's entry into the world followed him in his departure, and laid its paternal hand upon the demonstrations of grief over his death, and the monuments by which it was sought to perpetuate his memory. The rites of the church for the dead offered a temptation to a rivalry of display, which could not but make for extravagance, and the setting of standards that imposed a severe involuntary tax upon persons who were not well off; and as early as the thirteenth and fourteenth century the Nürnberg council is to be found making such rules as this: "It is forbidden that anyone expend on a corpse more than twenty-five pounds of wax;" and: "One shall also not make more than twelve candles; that each candle have not over two pounds of wax"; and again, that no one should place candles on the grave except on the set funeral anniversaries, the "siebente", the "dreizigste", and the "jahrzeit"; and that one should not have singing at the grave except when one laid away the corpse.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 Baader, p. 67.



The law was interposed to regulate the burgher even in the masses which he might have said for the deceased. On the memorial days he might lawfully offer one mass or sacrifice in the convents, and not more than two in the two parish churches, St. Sebald's and St. Laurence's. If anyone wished to offer more for his dead,<sup>2</sup> he was now not restricted in the sum of money to be expended, but required by this early law to make it not less than a groschen or a schilling heller.<sup>3</sup> By other articles, one was to give the priest in person but a schilling or less for the anointing oil; and prohibition was laid upon offering sacrifice or requiem mass in the convents at more than one altar.<sup>4</sup>

The paternal interference of the council with the last rites of the dead had an additional motive in a burial ordinance which dates from the fifteenth century. It is set forth in a preamble in which complaint is raised of "the great assemblings of men" that had become customary at the mourning for a dead person, "whereby comes much waste of time in their trades and occupations to the persons repairing to such gatherings." In the desire to prevent this interruption of business the council forbade the attendance of anyone but the im-

---

2 "Swer Dar uber mer opphern oder messe frumen will".

3 Siebenkees, vol. i, pp. 203-204.

4 Ibid., p. 205.





mediate male relatives and the household servants of the dead.<sup>5</sup> Likewise on the funeral anniversaries only the men and women who were closely related to the deceased might take part in the memorial observances. The secret of the crowds which the council found it necessary to limit is revealed in another section in which the council forbade invitation of friends to eat, or their eating without invitation, at the mourning.<sup>6</sup>

It is extravagance again which leads the council to regulate in the same ordinance the ceremonial incidents of death. "Our lords of the council have considered and observed the notable extravagance, pride and superfluity, which are yet unbecoming to the same, which are practiced and take place to no good use in the burial of deceased persons", - in the "seelwein", the tapers, the nuns employed to offer prayers; and they accordingly lay down several rules, as that there might not be more than two of the "seelschwester" with each corpse; that these were to receive for wages, meat and drink not over twelve pfennige, and on the memorial days, eight pfennige; that they were not to sit by the graves between the burial and the "siebente", the first day of memorial rites; and fur-

---

5 Baader, pp. 109-110.

6 Ibid., pp. 109-111.



thermore, if anyone asked, paid, or permitted the "seelschwester" to sit by the grave between the "siebente" and the "dreißigste", he should forfeit to the city one pound haller for each day.<sup>7</sup>

A considerable portion of this fifteenth century ordinance is devoted to regulating the pall. First, the pall was forbidden to be spread except in the week between the interment and the close of the "siebente"; and again on the "dreißigste". Use of it at other times exposed the person responsible to a fine of a pound haller a day. Further, no one was allowed to have a pall of his own; but anyone might hire those of the parish, according to his rank. The terms on which the palls might be hired were fixed in the law. If a person used a first-class pall<sup>8</sup>, and would have it spread at all the occasions when it was permissible, he must pay the church four pounds for it; if he employed it only at the burial, sixty pfennige. The corresponding charges for a middle-class pall were sixty pfennige and thirty pfennige; for the third-class, twenty pfennige and ten pfennige. "In all this are excepted the palls which are presented and designed beforehand for the

---

7 Baader, p. 111.

8 "vorder leychtuch". The others were the "mittelleychtuch" and the "geringsten leychtücher".



corpse 'um gottes willen'; also those which the crafts have for themselves." Even the hire of the woman who laid out the dead was stipulated in the ordinance. This "ausrichter-in der todten" was to have not more than thirty pfennige for her services at the funeral, and ten pfennige at the "siebente" and "dreizigste", and otherwise through the year for her trouble sixty pfennige.<sup>9</sup>

Memorials for the dead offered a field in which there were many inducements to costly display; and in the fifteenth century elaborate regulations "von den Leichschilden, Grabsteinen, und Gemälden" were issued. The council in one ordinance forbade erecting or hanging up a memorial shield or tablet costing over three gulden, taking this action, it declared in the preamble, "for particular and important reasons thereto moving it, and before all, for the suppression of vanity, extravagance and waste". If a tablet more costly was already in place, it was to be at once removed, and a fine of ten gulden paid to the city; and the workman who fashioned the tablet, or put it up, was subject to the same penalty. Another regulation, which seems to be a revision of the foregoing, is more particular. The council gives its reasons in a diffuse

---

<sup>9</sup> Baader, pp. 111-112.



preamble. "Inasmuch as hitherto manifold superfluity in the matter of hanging memorial shields in the churches of great size and costliness" has been practiced, the honorable council, to the praise of God, and for the common good, "in consideration of the vanity of such waste, also in anxiety as to the falling of such shields, obstruction of the light, and other reasons", forbids anyone to set up in a church or convent of the city a shield for the dead greater in size and weight than is ordered and prescribed by the council, and fixed in the measurements given to the churchmasters at St. Laurence's and St. Sebald's. The law goes on to prescribe that the figure of the arms of the dead is to be painted on ordinary planed wood, and not carved or in relief, and with a plain inscription, that meets the approval of the council and the warden of the church.<sup>10</sup>

The burial ordinances show the state operating upon the life of the individual to restrict his choices in a new series of relationships. They show distinctly what is evident also in the other kinds of regulation, that the object of the government was both to curb the extravagant leadings of his own desires, and on the other hand to protect him a-

---

<sup>10</sup> Baader, pp. 113-114.





gainst extravagance into which he was thrust because it was socially expected of him. It offered a refuge of law from the petty tyranny of social usage and criticism. As in the other sumptuary legislation, a careful supervision that descends into minutiae is displayed. A fresh aspect of the council's paternalism is brought to light in the law in which attendance at funerals is limited because of the interruption occasioned to business. Here the council stands forth as not merely the guardian of personal economies, but as taskmaster of the city; and evidently acts upon a sense of responsibility to limit a man's personal action when it took a form, not of vital importance, which injured his productiveness as a unit of the industrial community. The influence of the same conception of duty is traceable in the preamble of the Hochzeits-büchlein, when the council declared that it felt obliged to extend the wedding-regulations to the "common man" because of the injury that resulted from "the interruption of his work with processions to church, etc."<sup>11</sup> The motive that evidently rules in the burial-ordinances, as in the other sumptuary laws of this period, is the opposition to extravagance, to excessive display, as wasteful and manifesting only an unworthy pride. A respect for class distinctions, not strongly pressed, appears in the rules with respect to the pall.

---

<sup>11</sup> See above, p. 69.



## Chapter VIII

## The Regulation of Clothing

Apparel was everywhere a principal subject of sumptuary regulation; and the council of Nürnberg did not fail to extend its surveillance to clothes and adornment of person. Ordinances appear from early times which govern in great detail the dress of the citizens, men and women, in literal truth from the part in their hair to the sole of their shoes. The reason for the prominence of clothes in the sumptuary laws is obvious. If the city-fathers were out to bridle extravagance, they were sure to find it here. The tempting chance for display offered by the necessity of wearing clothes has always been too much for frail humanity; and the rare and expensive fabrics, the costly finery, the fantastic cuts and colors, the changes of fashion, involving needless expense, and unsettling the customary which seemed also the safe, continually exercised the city-fathers, to whom these things appeared to threaten that moral and decent composure of life which they felt called upon to maintain.

The clothing-ordinances seem curious to us now. It is a thing outside our experience, and strikes us as odd, that a sovereign government should pass in the natural course of



its business from making treaties, raising an army, regulating trade, to the grave matter of prescribing the pattern of coats and breeches, the quality of silk or velvet, the cost of the trinkets, the length of the trains, which the men and women of its jurisdiction might put on. At present railways may be debateable as a subject of governmental regulation, but not clothes. This very look of oddity, this quaintness of the ordinances, throws into more striking relief the theory of government of which they are manifestations, and which we are seeking to understand.

A clothing-ordinance probably from the latter years of the fourteenth century <sup>1</sup> is comparatively simple. It covers with broad provisions certain styles, certain varieties of apparel and ornament, certain stuffs, which men and women might not wear, or only within certain limits of value. The object of keeping things as they had been seems to be foremost. The Nürnbergers, the mercantile element at least, were beginning, even in the fourteenth century, to realize the profits of the city's expanding commerce in the possession of more to spend on luxuries. Changes that seemed dangerous were evident-

---

<sup>1</sup> Schultz, who makes use of this ordinance in *Deutsches Leben*, dates it by a reference to slashed sleeves, which he thinks sufficient indication that "the statute has in view the fashions prevailing about 1400". See *Deutsches Leben im XIV und XV Jahrhundert*, vol. I, p. 304.



ly taking place in dress and ornament. The influence of the free intercourse with Italy is reflected in the ban laid upon "Roman jackets", upon "silver Italian knives", and upon wearing "silver cloth from Venice". The city was beginning to look out upon the world, and was giving signs of departure from domestic simplicity and plainness.

In this early ordinance young and old were forbidden to wear certain ornaments evidently regarded as extravagant or dandified, -as silver girdles worth more than a half a mark; silver bags; silver knives from Italy, perhaps disapproved of as a foreign affectation; fine pearls; slashed shoes, or slashed coats, -coats "slashed under and on the sleeves";<sup>2</sup> or any sort of paternoster worth more than twelve heller. The anxious conservatism of the city-fathers is displayed in the further provision that the wearer "shall not hang them over the backside; he shall wear it in front at one side, as has been done from of old".<sup>3</sup>

The council turns its attention to certain modes that seemed to require curbing, whether for their cost or simply their freakishness is not declared. Men and women alike were

---

2 "In order that the undergarments of brighter color or precious material might show." Schultz, Deutsches Leben, vol. i, p. 304, note.

3 Baader, Polizeiordnungen, p. 66.





to refrain from wearing any sort of clasps or rings or buttons on their sleeves higher than the elbow, on pain of forfeiting one poun haller a day. Lady-burghers, married, unmarried or widows, must not put on veils or a headdress that have in them more than a certain measure of material, and are not worn in such a way "that the ends in front lie upon the head." If they wished to put on more veil or headdress on account of sickness or cold, they might do it provided that they put "it on over 'twerch', and shall not pile two or more one upon the other".<sup>4</sup>

The remainder of the law, as far as it applies to women, attacks the use of expensive goods in dress and personal adornment. Women are classified in the terms of the ordinance as "married women, maidens, and widows". To the matrons and widows it is forbidden to wear any "reisen"<sup>5</sup> except of a cheap grade, which is white or red, "as they have done from of old". The husband is held responsible for the payment of the fine of five pounds haller; or if he is dead, the widow or the person "whose bread she eats". To all women, -matrons,

---

4 Baader, p. 66.

5 Schultz, in Deutsches Leben, vol. i, p. 304, calls "die Reise" "a kind of Haube", that is, headdress. Baader, p. 66, note, explains it to be a "kind of woven stuff".



widows or maids, -is prohibited wearing any garment of silk, or Roman jackets, or garments trimmed with zendal (a light silken fabric), or with gold or silver, or bordered with these last; and they might have only two garments wholly of fur.<sup>6</sup> They must smother their longings for ermine, fur-coats and coats of "Spalt", or pay a fine of ten pounds haller; and on pain of the same penalty they must abjure the vanity of ear-ornaments "which are made with beaten gold, or with silver, with fine pearls or precious stones."<sup>7</sup>

The council dismisses the men with the broadest restrictions in the two brief paragraphs which it devotes to them. Its regulation of them is in the interest of propriety, it would seem. If they had passed the mark of fifty years, they must stop wearing red buckram, conceived perhaps as not becoming advancing age. And "no burgher, young or old, shall wear his hair parted; they shall wear the hair in tufts as it has been worn from of old." Offense against either prohibition invited a fine of five pounds haller. Finally, no burgher, young or old, was thereafter to "wear any silver cloth from Venice".<sup>8</sup>

---

6 Baader, p. 66.

7 Ibid., p. 67.

8 Ibid., p. 67.



A clothing-ordinance that has come to us from the next century, probably from its last quarter, is more elaborate. It repeats in this difference the history of the wedding-laws.<sup>9</sup> As was pointed out with reference to them, a more complex regulation was to be expected in the fifteenth century, even though the regulative policy should be more vigorous, because time and such a growth of wealth as meanwhile went on in Nürnberg could not have failed to multiply the points at which regulation seemed needful. The ordinance is headed with a preamble in which the council professes a sense of the grave and solemn bearings of the matter upon which it is legislating, and maintains a religious tone quite in keeping with the solemnities of the pulpit from which it was read. The city-fathers rest their action upon the broadest grounds not only of morality, but of religious faith as well. "Since, as in various ways is manifest", they begin, "the Almighty God from the beginning not only upon earth, but also in heaven and in paradise has hated crime, pride and presumption and heavily punished them, has exalted and rewarded obedience, humility, modesty and honorable good morals, also from pride and disobedience have risen and flowed to many an empire principality and commonwealth (commonen) great injury

-----

9 See above, Chapters II and III.



detriment and loss, as lies evident to the eye in many places, therefore to the praise of Almighty God, in the interest of the common weal, and to the honor of this honorable city of Nürnberg, also to the end, that God with his favor may be pleased so much more graciously to guard, to protect...and keep us and the city in blessed praiseworthy discipline, as we appear humbly with honorable morals before his divine majesty, therefore have we burgomasters and council of the city of Nürnberg, for the avoidance and suppression of pride, folly and superfluous expenditure" have prepared the ordinances which follow.<sup>10</sup>

When all allowance has been made for stereotyped formalities, such a preamble is still significant of the fact that when the council undertook to set bounds to personal indulgence and expenditure, they felt that they were doing something beyond keeping good order. Evidently they felt that they were meeting a responsibility to preserve among the citizens a scale of living and a manner of life that accorded with their standards of morality; that was right and proper, and approved by the sanctions of religion.

It is possible to cite an interesting illustration of the relationship in which the council stood to the church as the disciplinarian of manners. Nürnberg was not an epis-

---

<sup>10</sup> Baader, p. 95.





copal seat. It belonged to a see whose bishop resided at Bamberg. The chronicler notes that in the year 1453 "the long peaks on the shoes began; the vanity came from Schwabia".<sup>11</sup> This invasion of his dominion did not escape the eye of the bishop. His way of meeting it was to write a letter to the council of Nürnberg and ask them to take measures to stamp it out. On July 17 the council replied that in obedience to his request, they had given order to the cobblers "on pain of a definite penalty henceforth to make no more peaks on the shoes".<sup>12</sup> How often the suggestion of sumptuary regulations came from ecclesiastical sources there is no way of ascertaining. But this instance shows how close the sphere which the council assumed in the matter lay to that of the church; how without a difference appearing in the resultant law it might act as the arm of the church or in its secular capacity. The regulation of shoes in the fifteenth century ordinance appears in the last clause, and it reveals the same method of reaching the long peaks as that adopted at the bishop's petition. No man or woman, it ordains, shall wear any sort of shoe longer, in proportion to the size of the foot, than the standard which is given to the cobblers for the purpose, and is also to be found with the city

---

11 Chroniken, Nürnberg, vol. iv, p. 197.

12 Quoted in footnote, in Ibid., p. 197, from Nürnberger Briefbuch, Nr. 23, Bl. 259.



master of measures (Marckmayster). The penalty to be inflicted on the purchaser is three gulden; and, it would appear from the quotation above, that a separate penalty was exacted of the cobblers.<sup>13</sup>

As in the clothing ordinance described above, there are a number of broad provisions in the fifteenth century statute ruling certain materials out of a legitimate wardrobe. Thus it was forbidden women to wear cloth of gold, or of silver, velvet, satin or other silk material, as dress-goods or trimming; sable or martin fur, as material or lining; coats of camel's hair; linings of taffeta or other silk in their mantles; pearls, which, however, maidens might wear in certain set ways by exception; and "scharlach" and "scharlatin".<sup>14</sup> Men were forbidden cloth of gold, or of silver, velvet, and scarlet; ermine, sable, and weasel fur; gold lace, pearls. These materials are evidently condemned on the ground of their high cost.<sup>15</sup>

There are other materials which might be worn only in specified measure, or up to a given value. Thus women might wear the silks and the precious cloths other wise prohibited as a border on the collar and sleeves of their cloaks and coats,

-----

13 Baader, p. 109.

14 Scharlach was "a costly material, -dyed red, brown, blue, -originating with its name in the Orient". Schade, Altdeutsches Wörterbuch, s. v. Scharlach.

15 Baader, pp. 96-105.



but not a jot wider than the standard measure given the tailors, and never so as to use more than a half an ell of goods.<sup>16</sup> Again, women might not have borders of fur on their clothes broader than the measure given the furriers on this account, and they were not to have them at all around the bottom of their coats and undergarments.<sup>17</sup> Exception to the prohibition of taffeta and silks as lining for mantles was made of "zendal, schylher, or taffant"; but these were to be worn in such moderation as not to cost, on any one mantle, over five Rhenish gulden.<sup>18</sup> A woman might have her cloak lined with fur, provided that it did not as a result, with all appurtenances, buttons, covering, clasps and the rest, cost over eighteen gulden; or she might have it lined with buckram or the like, if it should not exceed in cost ten gulden.<sup>19</sup> The council felt the need of putting restrictions on the men too, in the matter of extravagant trimmings. No male person in the city was to have a bordering of "velvet, satin, damask, or other silk", on coat, breeches, cloak or mantle, that contained over a half an ell of goods; and no man was to have any border of silk around

---

16 Baader, p. 96.

17 Ibid., pp. 96-97.

18 Ibid., p. 99.

19 Ibid., p. 99-100.



the bottom of his garment.<sup>20</sup>

Again, certain sorts and styles of apparel are permissible only within given limits of value. Thus "tapharthembden" (wide garments caught in the middle with a girdle), with the cost of making and all appurtenances, must not exceed six gulden; "halshembden"<sup>21</sup> must not exceed two gulden in value; head-shawls (hauben), two gulden.<sup>22</sup> Veils were not lawful that contained over six folds, or with all attachments cost more than six gulden. A "Stewchlein"<sup>23</sup> might be worn worth a Rhenish gulden or less.<sup>24</sup> Again, a maiden might wear pearl fringes, tiaras and fillets, but they must be of such value as not to make her whole headdress cost more than forty gulden.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, the women seemed to the city-fathers to have gone to an extreme with gold and gilded chains. They would have

---

20 Baader, p. 107.

21 "Gamps" I suppose we should call them: they began at the neck and extended over the breast where they were fastened to the corsage. See Grimm, Deutsches Wörterbuch, s.v. Halshemdt.

22 Baader, p. 97.

23 The "Stewchlein" was a substitute for the veil, but had pouches on the sleeves into which to stick the hands.

24 Ibid., p. 98.

25 Ibid., p. 101.





thereafter to content themselves with one, and this, with all pendants, was not to exceed in value fifteen Rhenish gulden.<sup>26</sup> The paternoster again figures in this ordinance as a feature of apparel whose costliness, for display, exceeded the due limit. The council forbade the women to wear them of a value exceeding twenty gulden.<sup>27</sup> The men too were not allowed to select their wardrobe without respect to prices. They could not wear breeches or caps which they paid more than one orts-gulden to have made.<sup>28</sup> And they must cease wearing fancy shirts and breast-cloths. Their shirts, with all the borders, embroideries and trimmings, and with the cost of making, must not be worth more than six pounds, their breast-cloths more than three pounds.<sup>29</sup>

The object of such regulations as these was manifestly to keep in check extravagance; and this motive is frequently professed in the secondary preambles with which many of the sections are headed. Restraint is set on wearing pearls in the hair, in order to bridle a "notable extravagance" in the matter which "has broken out and is practiced among certain 'honor-

---

26 Baader, p. 102.

27 Ibid., p. 103.

28 Ibid., p. 105.

29 Ibid., pp. 105-106.



able' maidens".<sup>30</sup> In regulating the wearing of gold and gilt chains, the council declares that it is seeking "to avoid and repress such useless and uncalled-for costliness".<sup>31</sup> When it orders the men to wear their clothing closed in front, so that the temptation to have a costly fur lining, to show at the openings, may be removed, and allows them only a turned-over fur collar, it declares that it is moved to this because "notable extravagance has risen" among the men of all classes, "namely in the use of marten and other expensive fur-stuffs on cloaks, breeches, coats and mantles; also expensive sable, marten and (other) fur hats and headgear, all which more benefit manifest pride than necessity". It is "to meet such [extravagance], also to avoid needless and excessive expenditure" that the council draws the line.<sup>32</sup> Again, it regulates the wearing of fancy shirts and ornamented breast-cloths because "considerable extravagance has broken out", despite former laws on the matter, enacted "to avoid unnecessary expense", and the shirts and breast-cloths are made over-costly with broidery and borders, "and other needless and senseless contrivances".<sup>33</sup>

---

30 Baader, p. 101.

31 Ibid., p. 102.

32 Ibid., p. 104.

33 Ibid., p. 105.



This is the predominant motive apparent on the face of the ordinance: to curb personal extravagance, with a view, perhaps, to keeping in check the moral disorder of pride (Hof-fart). Another motive, distinctly moral, asserts itself. It did not appear at all in the fourteenth century ordinance, but in this it has a prominent place. It comes to light in the prohibition of certain cuts and styles of dress because they are immodest, because they violate decency, and threaten good morals.

For instance, the council forbids women to wear garments cut too low at the neck. There could be but one reason for such a prohibition. "Too low", in the eyes of the city-fathers, was anything exceeding one finger's breadth below the throat. In the back the collar might lawfully be a half quarter-ell lower. Furthermore, women must not wear their coats and other clothes standing open at the girdle, but have them clasped with catches, or else wholly closed. If they had garments which they could not alter to conform with the law, they might wear them only if they wore underneath a breast-cloth and a closed collar. The reproof of extravagance again comes uppermost in the proviso that this breast-cloth and collar together, and all trimmings and facings on them, must not



cost more than the trifle of half a gulden.<sup>34</sup>

The object of ethical discipline reappear<sup>s</sup> distinctly in the provisions forbidding the men certain patterns stigmatized as indecent. It seems that the garments of men, which at first reached to the ground, had been growing shorter steadily since the change of styles that went over Europe in the fourteenth century, and had seemed to the conservative at each new abbreviation to offer an outrage to propriety. From this ordinance it is evident that in Nürnberg the coat and mantle alike were rapidly dwindling to a jacket; and the city-fathers had been reduced to despair of being able to retain more than a mere rag of decency, so to speak. They confess their inability to enforce the statute which they had made requiring that garments reach at least as far as the arm extended downward. They had not prevailed against the tide. Such long garments as the law approved had become old-fashioned, "nach gemeynem welltlauff dieser zeyt", and they must perforce give in. But there was one requirement on which they would take a last stand: the coats and mantles must, for decency's sake, extend two finger breadths over the fly and the man's shame. And the mantle, short or long, must "not be cut out too deeply,

---

34 Baader, pp. 97-98.





or be left open, in order that everyone's shame may be covered, and he may not be found unchaste therewith." <sup>35</sup>

-----

35 Baader, p. 105. This provision is printed by Baader as an article of the clothes-ordinance; but it seems to have been uttered separately, probably at a different date, and in the same breath with ordinances regulating flagrant immorality. See Siebenkees, vol. ii, pp. 602-604. The enactment regarding unchastity, and that regarding clothes apparently are both covered by the inscription at the close: "Decretum in Concilio feria quinta vigilia Nativitatis Marie virginis in gloriose. Anno ec. lxxx. Proclamatum de pretorio, dominica post Nativitatem Marie virginis Anno domini ec. lxxx." It may throw some light on the character of the article on short clothes to give the substance of the morals-ordinance with which it was linked. This runs: "Since the honorable council has been definitely and credibly informed that day and night, within and without the city, and especially at Gostenhof, also on all sides in and before the forest", many and various sins, especially of unchastity are committed without restraint or shame, tempting the vengeance of God, and likely to bring injury to good people, the council forbids "any woman of the town or other woman" to commit unchastity with a man within a radius of a half a mile of the city, "except in the ground upon the 'Judenpöbel', and besides upon the green and meadows between the 'Wilbolzprunnen' and the 'Staynen Prucken', which has always been called here the 'plerrer', there alone and nowhere else, outside the city, - this the council will suffer for the prevention of greater evil, with the proviso that such practices shall be carried on so as not to be seen from the gardens and garden-houses near the city."



Again the offense to good morals is the evident motive of the provision with regard to the flies of the breeches. The fashion, not confined to Nürnberg, was such as to direct attention to these. The color was often one in conspicuous contrast to that of the breeches, and the flap was "stuffed and artificially enlarged".<sup>36</sup> The council pronounces the fashion "unchaste and shameful", and the practice of wearing the fly "at dances and on other occasions shamelessly bare and uncovered in the presence of honorable women and maidens" "not only against God, but contrary to decency and manly breeding". Henceforth, they ordain, every man in the city "shall wear the fly of his breeches not bare, uncovered, open, or visible, but shall have all of his garments made, and shall wear [them] in such a manner that his shame and the fly of his breeches may be well covered and not seen bare." <sup>37</sup>

Class distinctions, to maintain which was to become later a principal object of the clothing-laws in Nürnberg, did not figure at all in the fourteenth century ordinance described above. In the ordinance of the fifteenth century which we are considering, traces of a regard for social rank appear. For

---

36 Schultz, Deutsches Leben, vol. ii, p. 332; also Tafel XXXI.

37 Baader, p. 105.



instance, when the blanket prohibition is laid upon wearing precious materials, like cloth of gold, certain exceptions are made in favor of "honorable" women and maidens, as that these might have borders of silk on the collars and sleeves of their coats; the "honorable" matrons, droops of velvet on their sleeves.<sup>38</sup> Again, the preamble of one of the sections regarding men's clothes runs: "And since a notable extravagance has arisen among the men, not only the 'honorable', but the common man...etc."<sup>39</sup> It was noted with regard to the wedding-laws that they were extended for the first time in 1485 to the "common man", and that they probably had not taken cognizance of him earlier because he had not had the means to offend.<sup>40</sup> That social classifications appear so faintly in this clothing-ordinance, is possibly due to the same cause, - the absence as yet of a wealth among the lower ranks that would tempt them to trespass. The likelihood of this is at least sufficiently strong to make unnecessary the inference that social distinctions did not exist and were not sharply marked. It will be noticed that no prohibitions are laid upon the "common" man or woman, except implicitly in the spe-

-----

38 Baader, p. 96.

39 Ibid., p. 104.

40 See above, pp. 68-71.



cial permission to "honorable" women to wear silk borders. It was not yet felt necessary to hold the lower classes to their place, by denying them apparel allowed to the ranks above. One need not therefore infer that at this time the artisans and shopkeepers and their wives, were wearing at pleasure, and with the sufferance of the council, the same clothes and the same finery as the great merchants and members of the aristocratic old families. It is much more natural to suppose that the men and women on the lower levels were still wearing the clothes regarded as proper to them because they could afford no others; and that the objection of the council to a violation of class-lines in costume remained as yet latent, only because there was nothing to call it into play.

There is one provision in which respect of class distinctly emerges, but in this it is not the bisection of the community into "honorable" and "common" that figures, but lines which cut across this. "Henceforth no male person," it runs, "citizen or denizen of this city, except doctors (of the law) and knights, shall wear in any part of his garb any strings, borders or lace, which are made wholly or in part of gold." Here one has a foretaste of the elaborate provisions designed to mark off the social orders by the badge of dress that were to come later.<sup>41</sup>

---

41 Baader, p. 105.





Hostility to the new as such, disapprobation of styles because they broke with the familiar past, predominated among the motives expressed or implicit in the terms of the statute of the fourteenth century which was reviewed above.<sup>42</sup> Undoubtedly it mingled with the motives which we have named in determining the cast of the ordinance of the fifteenth century now under notice. Nowhere however in the body of the statute does it come to expression, as in the older law, or show itself definitely enough to be identified, until the end. There in a curious and interesting omnibus clause it proclaims itself emphatically. The council declare themselves against novelty. Having enumerated all of the extravagances, all of the innovations of extravagant tendency, which they can think of, they spread the broad net of this provision to catch any new ones that may arise from beyond their ken. Perhaps it were more correct to say, -any new ones that had already arisen or might arise, for the section reads as if it was tacked on when the insufficiency of the law in the face of unforeseen emergencies of style had become manifest. It is entitled: "Von neuigkeit und sonndern schmytten inn cleydungen, geschmucke und schuhen". "Although an honor-

---

42 See above, pp. 157-160.



able council", runs the preamble, "has adopted now various and manifold laws for the suppression of pride, nevertheless in spite of these the council has considered and remarked...that novel foreign customs have arisen, been adopted and practiced, none of which have been provided against in their laws aforesaid". The council therefore forbids that "any male or female person, inhabitant of this city, shall adopt practice or use any sort of peculiar cut or innovation in clothing, trimming, ornaments, or other material, or decoration of the body, in any manner. Then he on whom such innovation, foreign custom or peculiarity...is found, (if) he being arraigned...therefor, the council or the Five Lords 'am hader' shall recognize it as an innovation or peculiarity", he shall pay the city a penalty of three gulden for each article.<sup>43</sup>

It would seem that this clothing-ordinance, like the Hockzeits-b"uchlein of 1485, was not issued en bloc, but represents an accretion of provisions enacted at different time to meet new conditions as they arose. There is no proof of this on the face of the document or in its terms, but there are certain indications of it. There is, for example, the appearance in the midst of it of a provision known to have been framed and proclaimed in connection with a law of a different

---

43 Baader, pp. 108-109.



kind.<sup>44</sup> The discovery of this foreign clause raises a suspicion of alien nativity against its neighbors. The clause against innovations is evidently a later amendment. One provision, with regard to making gifts of brooches, refers to the Hochzeits-büchlein of 1485, and must therefore be of later origin than the provision with regard to short clothes which appeared in 1480. Again, the ordinance from point to point seems to take a fresh start. It is opened with an ample preamble, sufficient to cover all of its provisions. But several sections have separate preambles, complete in themselves, as if they had originated separately, as we know that one of them did, and had afterwards been added to the main ordinance.

These, however, are slender threads of evidence, and the one important conclusion that might be suspended upon them, -namely, that the ordinance was flexible and constantly molded to new conditions, -is sufficiently supported by the express terms of the regulations themselves. For example, the section with regard to "women's robes" declares that, a former law on the point having failed, it is intended in this, in view of the shifts which the women have adopted to evade, to frame a regulation that will be milder and so secure obed-

---

44 See above, note 36.



as to its relative severity or leniency, even though we lack the ordinances that went before to compare with it. The provision with regard to wearing pearls represents a sharpening of the law on the subject. The preamble is specific: a previous ordinance forbidding men and women, under penalty of three gulden, to wear pearls, except in the form of fillets and hair-bands, had "because of the slightness of the penalty, come to be held in contempt by many persons both of the male and female sex." The council finds in this no reason to relent, but now forbids altogether the appearance of pearls, clustered or single, anywhere on the person, under pain of the more than tripled fine of ten gulden. The single exception is made of maidens, who may wear them on their heads up to a certain value, -forty gulden.<sup>50</sup>

In the article "von frowen schawben", the city-fathers evince an entirely different disposition. "The orderly and good law and commandment" which had previously gone forth, fixing the price of robes permissible to wear, had been violated by all sorts of evasions. The council declare their intention (apparently in order to make the best of the inevitable) to "give to this statute a moderate and tolerable air". They would seem to recognize that, the pressure being so strong,

---

<sup>50</sup> Baader, pp. 100-101.





ience.<sup>45</sup> Again, the section with regard to pearls is declared to be necessary to take the place of an ordinance held in contempt because its penalties were too slight.<sup>46</sup> Again, the council declares in enacting the provision regarding fillets, that it is moved by the "notable extravagance that has broken out".<sup>47</sup> So with the section limiting the display of gold chains: it is enacted in view of the "extravagance that has broken out among women in the matter".<sup>48</sup> The "abuse and disorder that has arisen" calls out a provision against having the face covered on the street.<sup>49</sup> Examples might be multiplied. They demonstrate that a great many of the provisions of the ordinance were "occasional" enactments. They represent the application by the council of its views of good form in dress to new conditions arising which they did not foresee, or to a stubbornness of forbidden practices upon which they had not reckoned.

These repeated preambles make this ordinance peculiarly rich in explanatory matter, in confessions, so to speak, which enable us to form roughly a judgment as to its temper,

-----

45 Baader, p. 99.

46 Ibid., p. 100.

47 Ibid., p. 101.

48 Ibid., p. 102.

49 Ibid., p. 103.



they must make the law less drastic, in order to get it obeyed at all. Accordingly they permit women to wear fur-lined robes, if their hearts are set on it, but they may not have them lined with any of the varieties of fur forbidden,<sup>51</sup> and the worth of the garment, with all its appurtenances, lining, covering, buttons, clasps, etc., must not amount to more than eighteen gulden.<sup>52</sup> The abortive law which this was to supersede is probably to be found in the paragraph that follows in the text of the law. In this it is forbidden to women and maidens to wear a cloak worth more than ten gulden.<sup>53</sup> The substitute is much more liberal, with its permission of a value almost double this.

Again, in the article with regard to short clothes the council recognizes the futility of its previous enactment, and bows to the storm. Fashion has been too much for the law. Despite the requirement that garments extend downward the length of the outstretched arm, they have continued to grow shorter "nach gemeynem welltlawff dieser zeyt". "An honorable council will therefore suffer" (what it cannot prevent, namely,) "that henceforth clothes may be worn shorter than as before decreed and above indicated". They will only in-

---

51 See above, p. 164.

52 Baader, pp. 99-100.

53 Ibid., p. 100.



sist upon a length that will conceal the fly and the man's shame, a requirement of decency.<sup>54</sup>

The article regarding men's shirts and breast-cloths alters the law without making it more or less severe. The change is simply designed to mend a leak. A previous ordinance, the preamble tells us, had forbidden men to wear plaited shirts and breast-cloths. It is not complained that they are wearing these notwithstanding, but that they are making the unplaited ones just "as costly or more costly than the plaited with embroidery, borders, and other needless and senseless contrivances." To cover this development the council broaden their law and forbid the wearing of shirts worth, with all ornamentation, over six pounds, and breast-cloths plaited or not worth over three.<sup>55</sup>

In all four of these points the council acknowledges the failure of its previous laws. It takes different action in view of these failures. In the regulation of pearls it seeks to correct it by making the law more stringent; in the case of fancy shirts and neckwear, by making it more specific. In the other two cases it adopts opposite tactics. It gives in, and agrees to apply requirements less drastic, that acknowledge, in part at least, the victories of fashion. If

---

54 Baader, p. 105.

55 Ibid., pp. 105-106.



the ordinance is of one piece throughout, and expresses the mind of the council at a given time, one might reconcile the apparently inconsistent attitude represented, on the ground of policy. The aim of the council was to get their laws enforced. Where they saw a chance of success, they bound the restraint tighter, as in the case of the pearls and the shirts. But where usage appeared too strong, they lowered the tension of the statute to a point where it seemed enforceable. It is not necessary to suppose that their only incentive in thus watching the success of their laws was the pride of the legislator in seeing his will enforced, though doubtless this played its part. One may safely believe that there also figured largely in their motive the paternal anxiety to keep in wholesome restraint the lives in their charge to the measure of their ability. But we have seen that it is at least not improbable that a number of articles of the ordinance are amendments, and were added at different times; and in that case, each might well have a different pitch, according to the mind of the council at the moment regarding luxury in dress. Unfortunately the articles lack dates, and the other evidence seems not to be obtainable which would enable one to work out the problems presented.

Amid these uncertainties one dares to say little more





than that a certain vigor in the regulative policy is indicated. The council had the restraint of luxury in dress enough at heart not to let its decrees sleep in the statute-books, regardless of new outbreaks, regardless of violations that seemed to require some change in the law. The final test of the vigor of the policy, of course, is to be found in its enforcement in the courts. But in the law itself problems are reflected that would only arise from a more or less active attempt to put it into effect. The value of the law is primarily to reveal the standards sought to be applied, the principles of conduct which the council is shown to have thought desirable to be realized by its intervention in the lives of the burghers; and these ideals of the council we have seen to range from a moderate and definite scale of expenditure on dress, to a regard in one's clothing for decency; and a close adherence in style to the past.

Two interesting features appear in this clothing-ordinance with regard to its enforcement. First, not only the wearers, but the makers, of unlawful garments were held responsible for them. The borders of velvet or silk which ladies were permitted to wear about their collars and sleeves were to be of exactly the width of the measure given to the tailors for the purpose. Borders of fur were to be no wider than the



standard given to the furriers, and also placed in the chancery.<sup>56</sup> Shoes were not to be worn which were any longer, in proportion to the foot, than the standard given to the cobblers, -also to be found with the city master of measures.<sup>57</sup> In the case of the cobblers we know that a fine was exacted of them if they built shoes except by this standard.<sup>58</sup> The person caught wearing pointed shoes was bound by the statute to name the cobbler who had made the forbidden points. Such a method of applying a sumptuary law attacked abuse at the source, and was a good stroke of policy, for, if successful, it robbed the fashion of the great advantage it had over the law when once it was entrenched in leather, or fur, or velvet.

It was perhaps the insufficiency of a reprimand and fine to break the attachment for a garment already possessed that led the council to give itself leave in some instances to confiscate the goods. The language in one of the articles would seem to indicate that it was generally expected that the offender should alter his garment to conform with the law.<sup>59</sup> But in others of them confiscation is expressly

-----  
56 Baader, pp. 96-97.

57 Ibid., p. 109.

58 See above, p. 163.

59 Baader, p. 97. "If a woman has a garment which she cannot alter to conform with the law", she may wear it with a gamp, etc.



threatened. If a woman wears a fur-lined cloak other than allowed, "an honorable council may in addition to the afore-said penalty take such cloaks as transgress the ordinance..."<sup>60</sup> Again, if a maiden decks herself with more than forty gulden-worth of pearls, the council will take them in possession besides the ten-gulden fine.<sup>61</sup> Again, if the council caught a woman wearing a dance or wedding a brooch worth over eighteen gulden, it might in addition to the mulct take the brooch<sup>62</sup> So with all gold chains in excess of one worth fifteen gulden.<sup>63</sup> In every case the council was to make compensation for the garment or finery taken. But this was to be measured, not by the actual value of the articles, but by the value which they should have had under the terms of the law. Thus the council bound itself to pay only forty gulden for the pearls worn unlawfully by maidens, whatever their value; only fifteen gulden for the chains taken worth more than that, etc. The difference between these sums and the value of the finery was in the nature of an elastic fine, which the offender increased by the measure of his offense.

The terms of the provisions regarding confiscation

---

60 Baader, p. 100.

61 Ibid., p. 101.

62 Ibid., p. 102.

63 Ibid., p. 102.



would seem to indicate that the council itself undertook the enforcement of the clothing-ordinance. They run: "An honorable council may take, in addition to the aforesaid fine, etc." Such a style however may be taken to cover the action of the council through its agents. In a clause of the regulation of pointed shoes, a slender hint escapes as to the court in which the sumptuary cases were heard in Nürnberg. According to this it was either the council itself or the "Fünf herrn am hader". "Also each person arraigned (for wearing unlawful shoes) shall be bound to name the cobbler who made such forbidden points, at the discretion of the council or the 'fünf herrn am hader'."<sup>64</sup> This presumably is the tribunal which was known officially as the "fünf herren".<sup>65</sup> Of its jurisdiction Scheurl in his letter to Staupitz speaks with disappointing vagueness, -says that it tried slander cases and punished those who disobeyed the laws. Its procedure was summary and rapid. It did not accept written complaints or allow attorneys; and seldom heard witnesses but for the most part decided the cases on oath. No appeal could be taken from its verdict, but when the case was grave the court voluntarily referred it to the council. Such a court would seem well

---

64 Baader, p. 109. Baader (p. 121, note 1) says that the term "herren am hader" denotes the "so-called fünfergericht".

65 See above, pp. 30-32.





adapted to handle cases arising under the sumptuary laws.

When this ordinance is laid alongside one of the previous century,<sup>66</sup> greater elaborateness is at once apparent. The law reflects the increase of variety and costliness in apparel that must have come with the accumulation of wealth. Regulation is shown to have kept pace, in some measure at least, with luxury. It is noticeable, too, that the garments and styles forbidden are described more carefully than in the old ordinance. It would appear as if the city-fathers were seeking to make it harder for offenders to escape through indefinite terms in the law. Again, there are more explanations. The motives are professed, and the situations described that have provoked the legislation. Too much stress cannot safely be laid on this fulness as indicating that the regulative policy had become more definite, and grown more conscious of its purposes; or that need was felt, as not before, to buttress it with religious sanctions, or to make it appear reasonable. The change is doubtless in some part attributable to advancement in the art of legal phrasing.

One feature of the fifteenth century ordinance not to be found in the other is the appearance of articles called forth by special outbreaks of extravagance. They represent

---

66 See above, p p. 157-160



an effort of the council to head off luxury wherever it showed itself in some new guise. It is true that all the sumptuary laws were aimed at abuses already existent. They all are intended to restore a normal order that has been violated and seems threatened with disruption. These articles, however, which are directed against specific outbreaks, would seem to indicate an early appearance of the council upon the scene of disorder; an action taken promptly before the abuse had got beyond control; and therefore perhaps a certain alertness of attention. In no respect does the later ordinance as compared with the earlier display any relaxation of the fathers in their attempts to enforce by law their ideas of propriety in dress. Whether these ideas were stricter or not, is practically impossible to determine. One can only say of their content that in the older law the council's notions of propriety seem to be informed chiefly by a hostility to extravagance first, and then to innovation and foreign importations. In the later law there is, <sup>revealed</sup> in addition to these the consideration of modesty. There is also a certain respect for class distinctions, not, however, as strongly emphasized as later. The hostility to extravagance and ostentation still predominates; but mere novelty or foreign origin, "outlandishness", and suggestive exposure of person, appear as sufficient grounds for making certain forms of clothing unlawful to wear.



## Chapter IX

## Problems of Sumptuary Legislation

If, anticipating for the moment a more thorough study, we turn from a sumptuary law of the fifteenth century such as the clothing-ordinance described in the foregoing chapter, to a statute of the same variety enacted at the close of the seventeenth century, we find that an interesting change had taken place. The council appears to be no less sensible of a duty to enforce propriety by law, for its regulations in 1693 were of even greater volume than the ordinance of two centuries before, and they were much more particular. But the idea of what propriety was, had developed. To prevent extravagance in dress was yet the object; but the council no longer employed a single standard of judgment for the whole community, but a different standard for each social rank. The rule no longer held that what was permitted to one to wear was permissible to all who could afford it. The respect of social lines of which we noted incipient traces in the ordinance of the fifteenth century is the conspicuous trait of the ordinance of 1693, and asserts itself not only in the professions of the preamble, but in the very structure of the law.



It was natural that this extension of the theory of restriction should take place in a society as sharply stratified as that of Nürnberg as soon as the diffusion of wealth made it possible for the lower ranks to ape their superiors. But although the development was a corollary of the theory traceable in the fifteenth century, it operated to give the paternalism of the council a new object, - the maintenance of social distinctions in dress. The place of importance which this distinct duty had assumed by 1693 in the view of the city-fathers is indicated in the preamble of the statute. Enumerating the reasons for a new ordinance, they name the violation of that of 1654, and "the immoderate costly display" resulting, which must be a matter of grievance to "virtue-loving persons"; and then, the fact that "one can scarcely distinguish one class from the other any longer", so that foreigners riding through the city often confuse persons of high and low degree; and, in fine, the risk that is run of being "plunged by God, the Almighty Creator and Preserver of mankind into destruction".<sup>1</sup>

The dominating influence of the motive of preserving social gradations in the value and manner of dress is indica-

---

1 The document used is a manuscript copy of the original. Further reference will not be necessary.





ted also in the structure of the ordinance. Four ranks are recognized; and the law is divided into four great sections to correspond. The first regulates the apparel, ornaments and equipage, first of the men, then of the women, married and single, of "the old noble families" (des Alten Adelichen Geschlechts)"in the foremost rank". The second section lays down parallel rules for the second class, who are defined as including the "respectable merchants" (Erbarn Kauff- und Handels-Leute), "who have no 'offen' business", but carry on commercial and trading enterprises with their own means, and assume the risks, and whose ancestors have done the like; who also are "Genannten" of the Great Council.<sup>2</sup> The third class are defined in the third division as merchants and traders, and members of the Great Council, who carried on a business which was their own, but which was not as "superior and dignified" as that of the class above them. With these were classified the craftsmen of the small Council. In the fourth class, regulated in the final division, the persons engaged in trade were placed who had been in business at Nürnberg only a few years, and had not yet attained the standing of "Genannten", these with the shopkeepers and craftsmen "who are

---

2 See above, p. 15, and Chapter I, passim.



in the genannten-rank", and the merchants' servants.

The council enumerates in each paragraph of the long section devoted to the first class, first what was allowed them in dress, then what was forbidden. It follows a parallel course with each of the other social grades, but with a decreasing volume of negative provisions, because it is able at a stroke to deny to each succeeding rank all of the things prohibited to the ranks above. Observance of social precedence is required in everything, down to the ribbands on the horse that drew the coach of a bride. In the uppermost class, the horse might have his forelock, mane and tail tied with a colored ribbon; in the second class only his forelock and tail; in the third class nothing but his forelock. A comparison of a few of the parallel rules laid down for the several classes will serve to illustrate the differences in dress which the law required, and at the same time show how meticulous the regulation of this period was.

Take, for example, the rules for the headgear of women. Ladies of the first class might wear velvet caps, not too ample, bordered with sable and marten. These on festal occasions (Ehren- und Fest-Tagen) they were privileged to ornament with rosettes or buckles of gold, and a few pearls, but



no diamonds; and in such measure that the ornamentation should not exceed in value seventy or seventy-five gold-crowns. They might wear little hair-caps all of gold, but without pearls, and not worth above thirty or forty gulden. On the other hand, it was forbidden to them to "set diamonds in the hair-caps, and upon the hat-cords, should such again come into use". Gold, and other precious stones than diamonds, were permissible. The high-class maiden was privileged to wear pearl bands in her hair.

Wives and daughters of the second rank might also wear velvet caps, but they were required to wear them with a difference. They might not have them costing over twenty-four gulden; they might not put gold buckles on them, or gold-lace, but must content themselves with gold mixed with silver. They might wear silk caps within the law, and have narrow gold borders on them; but they must abjure hats with gold and silver buckles, and hair-caps that were all of gold. The maidens of this class might wear a pearl hair-band, but not over twenty-five or thirty gulden in worth. When it came to the maidens and dames of the third rank, they might wear caps of cut or uncut velvet, with rims of dyed marten or jennet; and they might have their headdresses set with silver, but not worth



more than ten gulden. Their summer hats, with silver hat-cord, must observe a narrow limit in value, -three or four gulden. They might wear silk-caps, and have silver or mother-of-pearl bangles on them. The wives and daughters of the fourth rank were forbidden all of the things forbidden to the three upper classes. They might have caps of figured Tripp-velvet, with rims and lining of fur, but not of marten. In case of mourning they might wear crepe veils on their hats not more than four ells long.

The law regulated the handsomeness of a man's equipage both as a source of extravagance, and as an index of social standing. There is an illustration of its particularity in the attention given to the material of the saddle-cloth and the holster, and the pompons on the heads of the coach-horses; and in the permission, for instance, of feathers, and the prohibition of silk or half-silk tassels on the harness. The jealous emphasis laid upon class distinctions in this law is exemplified by the section with respect to sleighs. Persons of the first rank were not to have too much gold on their sleighs; but they had a practical monopoly of sleighing. There were only a limited number "outside of the first rank" who had "from of old been privileged to sleigh"; and these, when they





made use of it, were forbidden by the council to have any gold, and but very little silver on their sleighs; and to use "expensive bells, feathers, silk tassels and other ornamentation" which shall make the whole equipage cost more than a hundred or a hundred and twenty gulden. Furthermore, they were charged to remember that they were expected, according to the old custom, to seek permission of the ruling burgomasters when they wished to go sleighing.<sup>3</sup>

The coaches, chaises and "victorias" of persons of first rank were allowed to be upholstered with silk or brocade, but not to be hung with costly fringes and tassels. Persons of the second rank were forbidden entirely to have pompons on their coach-horses, and gold or silver fringes on the blankets. They might have their coaches upholstered with cloth, but not red or blue; and silk fringes were allowable. People in the third class could not have horses, and coaches, chaises, and victorias at pleasure. They might keep a coach if they needed to drive, on paying fifty Thalers a year for the privilege. But their coach must be a plain vehicle without painting or carving upon it, and lined with sober gray cloth. Their horse might not wear harness of silver or bright metal; and the

---

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 198.



coachmen and servants were not to wear livery, but were to be attired in dark coats of plain gray, without cords or borders.

Picturesque details might be multiplied, but the examples presented are enough to illustrate the two features of the ordinance that stand out prominently in a comparison with earlier laws of the same kind: the great attention paid to preserving class-distinctions in attire; the increased minuteness of regulation. Both represent an advanced stage of tendencies which were observable in the legislation of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It was noted with regard to all the varieties of sumptuary law in Nürnberg that before the close of the Middle Ages they were growing more thorough and systematic. The other tendency, to make social standing a ground for paternal regulation, was as yet in its initial stages, but it was traceable. There are certain foreshadowings of it whose significance is enhanced in the after-light of its later development, as, for example, the extension of the wedding-regulations to the "common man" in the Hochzeitsbüchlein of 1485, which at least reflected the condition that was to make class-regulation of dress seem necessary, - the ability and inclination which increasing wealth gave the lower orders to affect the fashions of their betters. We found regard of rank distinctly present in the fifteenth century



clothing ordinance in the special permission accorded to "honorable" women to wear certain materials. The peremptory need of sumptuary legislation for the express purpose of keeping social station clearly visible in attire was declared by the Diet of Worms of 1521, and was urged upon the imperial free cities.<sup>4</sup>

It rapidly developed as a motive of the paternal action of the Nürnberg council during the century of the Reformation. As we have noted before, it had not led in previous times to specific discrimination against the lower classes. It had only made itself apparent in the extension to them of rules which had formerly been thought needful for the upper classes alone, and in special permissions to persons of high degree which carried an implicit restriction. The definition which it gained in the course of the sixteenth century is shown in the very title of an "Ordinance and prohibition of August 8, 1568 regarding vain display, and what is permissible and proper in clothing and other things for each man according to his rank". The refinements of distinction which were observed in this ordinance <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ exemplified in the final paragraph respecting "the superfluities of serving-maids", where it is

---

4 Resolution of the "kleinen Ausschusses", presented April 17; in Deutsche Reichstagsakten, jüngere Reihe, vol. ii, p. 336, and p. 340.



explained that the rules laid down for servant-girls are meant to apply "only to housemaids and not to shop-girls, or those who serve in the shops"; but that these were to dress as the ladies and maidens of the craftsman-class.<sup>5</sup> In the sixteenth century regulation by rank was applied also in the wedding-ordinance, from which it had been almost entirely absent as late as 1526; and the title of a wedding-regulation of 1598 reads: "Ordinance prescribing how the common Zahl-Hochzeiten shall be celebrated in Nürnberg"; and the title of one of 1603: "Renewed ordinance prescribing how the Erbarn und verlegten Hochzeiten shall be celebrated...".

The lively interest of the council in the enforcement of social prerogatives at this period is manifested in an order which the Seven Elders issued in December, 1599. The special occasion was the sleighing which had begun again with the falling weather of the past few days; and the council were taking measures in order that only those might ride in sleighs whom it befitted. They ordered the constables to make a list of those who went sleighing on that day, December 13; and to lay this before the council that they might take it under advisement "to whom outside of the families such a mode of trav-

---

5 Siebenkees, vol. i, p. 100.





el should be permitted", and to whom it should be forbidden. They proceeded to resolve that "since also vanity is here increasing to such a degree, that one rank can scarcely be distinguished from another, and common shop-keepers and their wives presume to wear almost more than members of the old families, one should instruct the appointed lords (deputierten herren) to press the new Hoffartordnung that such disorder may be prevented betimes."<sup>6</sup>

This brief glance at the sumptuary enactments of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries makes it possible to confirm our observations of earlier laws. It has revealed two respects in which later legislation of this character differed from that of the Middle Ages proper: its greater particularity, and its stronger emphasis upon the propriety of class distinctions. But it has been seen that these were not new developments. Regulation had been growing steadily more meticulous, and regard for differences of rank had appeared in the ordinances, before the close of the Middle Ages. It

---

6 *Altermanual*, December 13, 1599, nr. 14, bl. 202; quoted in *Mitteilungen*, Nürnberg, vol. vii, p. 274. At the same time they were instructed to cause certain "Erbarn" ladies to see a copy of the ordinance on weddings, privily however, in order to refresh their memories. These expressions were not intended for public consumption, and are apt to come nearer to the real mind of the council than the preambles of the ordinances.



may be affirmed, therefore, on the authority of good evidence, that in Nürnberg the essential motives and tendencies of the sumptuary restrictive policy appeared in advance of the Reformation, and had their origin amid the influences of the Middle Ages.

Our review of the statutes showed that as early as the thirteenth, and repeatedly in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Nürnberg council was regulating intimate personal concerns, such as the manner and cost of weddings, funerals, baptisms and clothes, in laws which were not simply police regulations in the modern sense of the word, and did not relate to the processes of economic output or exchange, but evidently proceeded from a sense of paternal responsibility for a moderate and respectable way of life on the part of every man and woman in the community. The main object of endeavor seems to have been to cut off the superfluous, to repress what was regarded as proceeding only from vanity. But examination of ordinances of the fifteenth century regarding tipling, dancing, swearing, weddings and dress, showed that superfluity was not the only ground of regulation; that the council evinced also a sense of duty to discourage the expression of desires that seemed harmful to good character. The manifestation of such a view of its duty revealed the government of Nürnberg to be



standing, at the close of the mediaeval period, in a relation to the individual which the state has often been supposed to have entered only as a result of the Reformation.

It was noticed that the earliest sumptuary regulation was in the form of brief, almost fragmentary rules, apparently uttered one or two at a time, as occasion demanded. Later the ordinances grew more mature in statement; and at the same time they came to regulate with greater thoroughness. By the latter half of the fifteenth century they had become long and complicated; and there is evidence to show that at this time they were not issued at one breath, but that in the form in which they have survived they represent an accumulation of enactments codified. They show the effects of repeated patching, revamping, and alteration, to meet a change of conditions or a difficulty of enforcement. Such frequent readjustment would seem to betoken a continuous interest of the council in their sumptuary policy, and goes to show that the vitality of the impulse to care for the private economic and moral processes of the citizen's life had not abated at the close of the Middle Ages.

Compared over the mediaeval period, the sumptuary laws displayed, if anything, a tendency, as they became more thorough-going, to be less exacting in their denials, and more



liberal in their concessions. It is not necessary to infer from this a decay in the theory of regulation, a decline in the sense of its desirability. It was but natural that the city-fathers' notions of propriety should be liberalized, as, with extension of commercial intercourse, life itself and its manners grew more complex, and the outlook upon the world widened. Means were being multiplied; new tastes were awakened by new objects of imitation; and the most conservative were certain in time to find their standards of criticism revised. The intervals between the surviving laws are too long, and their dates too uncertain to make it possible to trace with accuracy the changing views as reflected in them; but the analogy of other cities, strengthening the evidence of the ordinances which we have, suggests that the authorities yielded to new usages and costlier fashions only when they found it impracticable to make the rules of the past generation operative; that then they lowered the tension of the statute to a point where it seemed enforceable. We saw them in the act of doing this in certain articles of the fifteenth century clothing-ordinance.

The point of interest is that the slackening was not due to failure of a sense that regulation was desirable, but





probably was born of the very attempt to enforce it. If the magistrates found it necessary to retreat before the encroachments of luxury, they at least put up a fight; and the vitality of the theory upon which they were acting is demonstrated. And whatever the necessity under which they were placed to give way before usages once though<sup>+</sup> extravagant that had established a hold, they offered no clemency to new outbreaks, but appeared repeatedly in the Hochzeits-büchlein and the clothing-ordinance seeking to head these off with strong prohibitions. The story of their experience in enforcing the laws, and the degree of determination with which they pressed them, will have to await a study of their judicial administration. Our comparison of the laws themselves lays the necessary foundation of this in giving the history of the conceptions on which they were based; and it shows that the paternal sense of an obligation to keep the men and women of the city within certain bounds of economy and personal uprightness awakened early in the council of Nürnberg, and if somewhat liberalized in content, had not lost its vigor at the end of the Middle Ages, but was operating to hedge private life about with multiplying legal restrictions.

The observations of this study have been directed upon Nürnberg, and insofar as Nürnberg was a typical community they have a general significance. The evidence assembled



has exhibited the sumptuary ordinances as a serious legislative activity of a sovereign body that stood in the main currents of its time. Tracing the laws in their historic growth, it has shown the intimate details of conduct into which such a government would press its control under the sense of paternal responsibility; and has served to illuminate the medieval view of the relation of the state and individual at the points of closest contact. In setting forth the restriction which the city-fathers of Nürnberg proposed, it has paved the way for study of the interesting problem of its enforceability; ~~and~~ equipped us to proceed with a survey of its course in Nürnberg after the Reformation; and furnished a basis for comparative observations of its development in communities differently governed and differently circumstanced.



The principal collections of source material used in the preparation of the foregoing study were:

Nürnbergger Polizeioronungen aus dem XIII bis XV Jahrhundert, herausgegeben von Joseph Baader, which is volume lxiii of the Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart. Stuttgart. 1861.

Materialen zur Nürnbergischen Geschichte, herausgegeben von D. Johann Christian Siebenkees. Nürnberg. 1792-1795. Four volumes in two. Volumes i and ii, and volumes iii and iv are paged continuously, and to avoid confusion have been referred to as volumes i and ii, respectively, as in form, and for all practical purposes they are.

Sufficient reference to other sources and authorities consulted will be found in the footnotes.



## Vita

Kent Roberts Greenfield, the author of this study, was born in Chestertown, Maryland, on July 20, 1893. He matriculated at Washington College in 1905, and at Western Maryland College in 1907. In 1911 he received from Western Maryland College the degree of Bachelor of Arts. He entered the graduate school of the Johns Hopkins University in the fall of 1911, and during the sessions of 1911-1912, 1912-1913, 1913-1914, and 1914-1915, pursued courses in history, political economy, and political science, having history as his major study. During the session of 1914-1915 he was University Fellow in the Department of History.











































