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INTRODUCTION

A powerful triumvirate provided the leadership, organizational structures, and theological formulations at the center of the Lutheran Reformation which swept across Europe in the early decades of the sixteenth century. Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon shared this vital role with a ponderous, affable, bourgeois Pomeranian schoolmaster, Johann Bugenhagen, who arrived in Wittenberg in 1521 and remained a Wittenberg resident until his death in 1558. During these thirty-seven years Bugenhagen served as the pastor of the city church of Wittenberg (1522-1558) as well as Luther's confessor and spiritual adviser; a university professor at Wittenberg and adviser to the northeastern European reformers; organizer of the reform in Braunschweig, Hamburg, Lübeck, Schleswig-Holstein, Denmark, Pomerania, Hildesheim, and Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel as well as providing a Low German translation of the Old and New Testaments for northern Germany; a renowned commentator on the Psalms
and a harmonizer of the four gospels. Bugenhagen presided
over and blessed the marriage of Luther and Catherine
von Bora and preached the eulogy at Luther's funeral. He
also crowned the king and queen of Denmark, consecrated
the first evangelical bishops, refounded the University of
Copenhagen, and refused two bishoprics twice. These
achievements are certainly those of a major figure of the
Reformation Era.

Despite his impressive accomplishments in the
work of the Reformation, Bugenhagen has not received the
attention given to other major figures in the evangelical
movement. Many possible explanations can be tendered
for this neglect, not the least of which must be Bugen-
hagen's unpopular positions near the end of his life.

He accepted the authority of Duke Maurice after Elector
John Frederick's imprisonment and, though with reluctance,
did support Melanchthon's position on the Leipzig Interim.
These two factors brought volleys of critical fire from
the more conservative of Luther's followers, such as
Flaccius Illyricus and Nicholas von Amsdorf. Having
died with charges of being a clandestine papist hanging
over his head, it was probably convenient for the succes-
sive generations of reformers discreetly to ignore him.
There was a surge of interest in Bugenhagen in the nineteenth century with such men as Hermann Hering and C. A. T. Vogt undertaking extensive biographical work as well as editing original tracts and other writings. This waned, however, and only recently, since the four-hundredth anniversary of his death in 1958, has there been any attempt to reassert Bugenhagen's position as a central figure in the events of the sixteenth century. A collection of essays edited by Werner Rautenberg and sketches of the man and his organizational ideas by Ernst Wolfe constituted an important element of this modern interest.

Bugenhagen tended to be a very practical man. It was, therefore, difficult for the historians of ideas to write about or create interest in him. With recent trends toward social and economic history, Bugenhagen has become a mandatory subject of investigation if the social phenomena of the Reformation are to be understood. The purpose of the following study is three-fold. The first is to present the man himself in his historical perspective. Because so few biographical sources are available, there has been a perhaps unusually long biographical study included in this work. Secondly, there is an
attempt to establish the sources of the social values which were the motivation for societal reorganizing by the reformers. Thirdly, the documents of social reform, as exemplified by the systems of poor relief, are studied to see exactly how social reorganization was to be implemented in local communities. The conclusion will be an attempt to use the material produced by Bugenhagen and his contemporaries to determine what Bugenhagen's specific contributions were in matters relating to wealth, poverty, and the poor in the tumultuous world of Reformation Germany.

The objection may be raised, as it was by Pastor Fritz of Württemberg, that, "it is inadequate to base the description of the reformed attitude toward poverty and poor relief on the Church Orders as Riggenbach did. This gives only the ideal."¹ This objection cannot be lightly dismissed as it poses very serious problems. To accept it completely, however, would prohibit any broad work on the subject for all local details would have to be compiled and brought to bear on the whole. What I

¹Wilhelm Liese, Geschichte der Caritas (Freiburg in Breisgau: Caritasverlag, 1922), I, 251.
have attempted to achieve is a study of one man and the superstructures of social reform that he created. This work answers the questions who he was, what he attempted to do, and why he attempted to do it. It hopefully provides necessary background for individual studies aimed at answering the question, what actually happened.

Modern experience has taught us, or should have taught us, that behind every social problem and every attempted solution there exist values that determine the direction curative measures will take. Even apathy results from sets of values or a lack thereof. It becomes imperative, then, to understand these values in order to grasp the full reality of given social situations and imperative also that these values be understood in the context of different times and places. It is on this basis that I would defend the importance of the following study for, unless we can grasp the values upon which Reformation society was constructed, we cannot understand the Reformation or the world which grew out of its convulsive regeneration of western civilization.
CHAPTER I

BUGENHAGEN: FROM CATHOLIC PRIEST TO 
EVANGELICAL PASTOR

Johann Bugenhagen was born on June 24, 1485 in the island town of Wollin in Pomerania. Philip Melanchthon saw his birth date as a sign that, "He was strong of nature as was signified by the meeting of Saturn and Jupiter under the sign of Scorpio."¹ Very little is known of Bugenhagen's early life but tradition affirms that his father, Gerhardt Bugenhagen, was a member of the Wollin City Council.² It appears, therefore, that Johann came from a German bourgeois background. The only evidence contradicting this assumption comes from Liborius Schwichtenberg, a contemporary of Bugenhagen and

²Ibid.
a canon at the Cathedral of Greifswald. Schwichtenberg claimed the family was Slavic, Bugdan, and changed to a German name to conceal early family history.\(^3\) Slavic or German, the family was a town family, reputable and prosperous in 1485.

Melanchthon provides the only reference to Bugenhagen's early education and stated that before his matriculation in the University of Greifswald he had studied "Christian catechesis, along with grammar and music."\(^4\) The schools accessible to Wollin were the local grammar school under the patronage of the Cistercian abbess and the two more advanced schools located in nearby Stettin. It is not known which of these schools he actually did attend as his formal education can only be traced from his inscription at Greifswald as "Joannes Buggenhaen de Wollyn, caminensis dioecesis"\(^5\) at age sixteen on January 24, 1502.


Greifswald had introduced a humanist course of studies by the time Bugenhagen arrived. Duke Bogislav X, duke of Pomerania, was interested in the Greifswald curriculum and had succeeded in bringing Peter of Ravenna and his son Vincent, both outstanding professors of law, to his University.\textsuperscript{6} Hermann von dem Busch was a guest lecturer at Greifswald in 1502. Busch was a well known humanist who had unsuccessfully opposed the conservative forces at Rostock led by Tilemann Heuerling. He apparently only stayed a single term in Greifswald as he was professor at Wittenberg in 1502 after having left Rostock in the summer of the same year.\textsuperscript{7} Busch was an erratic and militant defender of the new learning and had studied under Rudolph von Langen in Münster, Alexander Hegius at Deventer, and Rudolph Agricola at Heidelberg, later spending five years in Italy. He began the study of law in Paris, continued it in Cologne and received his

\textsuperscript{6}Tbid.

bachelors in law from Leipzig in 1503. His enthusiasm for the classics and the new learning was most often expressed in his poetic tributes to the fatherland. It was with Busch that Bugenhagen studied one term of Priscian, Lucan, and Caesar. This is Bugenhagen's single most important formal encounter with the general humanist movement in northern Europe. Melanchthon also records that it was at Greifswald that Bugenhagen "developed his knowledge of Latin, dialectic, and the elements of physics." Greek was also taught and Bugenhagen studied the elements of Greek grammar.

Bugenhagen's formal university studies ended in 1504 when Abbot Heinrich von Baggerow of the Belbuk Premonstratensian Monastery called him to become rector of the city school in the Marienkirche in Treptow.

---

8 Ibid.


10 H. Meinhof, Dr. Pomer Bugenhagen und sein Wirken (Halle: Verein für Reformationsgeschichte, 1890), p. 4.

The abbot of the Belbuk monastery had patronage rights over the school as well as the churches in Treptow and Stolps. His appointments were subject to approval by the Treptow City Council. Abbot Heinrich presented Bugenhagen's name for approval and, as the Council accepted the appointment, the nineteen-year old Greifswald University student became rector of the Treptow city school in the autumn of 1504.

As rector, Bugenhagen began to study Scripture and the Fathers. He had developed his linguistic skills at Greifswald and could easily read the Bible in Latin. Whether he was capable of working with Greek texts is not known. Erasmus' Greek edition was not yet completed and there is no evidence of other Greek editions to be found in Pomerania. Most probably Bugenhagen used the Vulgate as the basis of his scriptural studies. He concentrated on Scripture and the Fathers to the exclusion of scholastic theology. Hermann von Busch had been strongly opposed to scholastic theology thus it could have been either Busch's

position or the lack of courses at Greifswald which determined Bugenhagen's attitude. He did freely admit that he could neither read nor understand Albertus Magnus and Bonaventure. The Bible and Fathers presented theological questions, however, and Bugenhagen sought advice on the problems that arose. With his advanced students at Treptow Bugenhagen studied Paul's Letters to Timothy and the Psalms. His Latin was better than most and his reputation as a teacher of Scripture spread quickly bringing clergymen from the Treptow area to his classes on the Bible.

Bugenhagen, as rector, lived in the clerical community at the Marienkirche. The school provided living quarters for the rector in the church indicating that a clerical life was normative for the school rectors. In 1505 he was registered as a church notary and in 1509 Bugenhagen was ordained a priest by Martin Carith, Bishop of Commin. Abbot Heinrich named him Vicar of the college of canons of the Marienkirche with the title, "Priest and

---

Vicar of Treptow an der Rega.\textsuperscript{14} Attached to this office was the obligation to say Mass for the Premonstratensian nuns in the chapels of the Holy Spirit, St. George, St. Gertrude, and St. Nicholas. As a member of the college of canons he had the obligation of community life. It was here that Bugenhagens' learning and affability exerted great influence over the eastern Reformation. Peter Suave, Joachim Möller, Andreas Knopken, and Jakob Knopken were all students and colleagues of Bugenhagen at the Marienkirche.\textsuperscript{15}

Bugenhagen's circle of students grew as his reputation spread. He continued probing Scripture and encountering problems which he could not solve. Concern for his students' further education gave him cause to address himself to contemporary sources for theological advice. Bugenhagen had an associate at Treptow named Georgius who had studied for a year and a half in Münster under Johannes Murmellius, a humanist from Gelderland and rector of St. Ludiger school in Münster. Georgius spoke so highly

\textsuperscript{14} Gorigk, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{15} Arbusow, p. 71.
of Murmellius that Bugenhagen wrote to Murmellius asking him to accept one of his own students who wished to pursue studies with the renowned humanist. The letter, however, contained much more than this initial request. He told Murmellius of his admiration for the Fathers and asked where he could find a contemporary who could illuminate the theology of Scripture as Jerome, Augustine, and Ambrose had done. Specifically he inquired about the Immaculate Conception and the interpretation of the Psalms.\textsuperscript{16} Murmellius' response recommended Bugenhagen to Pico della Mirandola who had written on various doctrines, Jakob Faber Stapulensis (LeFevre d'Etaples) who had written commentaries on several books of Aristotle, David's Psalms, and the Letters of Paul. He also recommended Carolus Bouillum and Capnion (Reuchlin). Above all, Murmellius urged Bugenhagen to read Erasmus.\textsuperscript{17} Bugenhagen took Murmellius' advice quite seriously with the result that many excerpts of Erasmus' works appeared in the Treptow school in Bugenhagen's own handwriting.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{16}Bugenhagen, \textit{Briefwechsel}, p. 3-4.

\textsuperscript{17}\textit{Ibid}, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{18}C. A. T. Vogt, p. 8.
By 1517 he had read *Praise of Folly* and many of Erasmus' other works. Melanchthon affirmed Bugenhagen's interest in Erasmus when he wrote, "During the evenings he studied Erasmus who dealt with the behavior of monks and the means of adoration induced by ethics. He therefore read the sources and sought for truth." The fruit of his studies was also summarized by Melanchthon. "He knew that God did not wish to cultivate a particular type of external behavior or actions but wished to develop virtues in men." By 1517 Bugenhagen had steeped himself in humanist learning and, except for two years at Greifswald, appears to have been self-educated.

In 1517 the new abbot of Belbuk, Johann Boldewan, established a school at the monastery and appointed Bugenhagen to the position of lecturer. The Premonstratensian patronage in Treptow and Bugenhagen's appointment as lecturer in Belbuk has caused some confusion. Many biographies assumed that he was himself a monk of St. Norbert. This opinion appears erroneous. Nowhere is there a record of Bugenhagen taking monastic vows.

---

20 Ibid., p. 298.
He was and remained a secular priest who had assumed the obligation of communal life in Treptow as a member of the Marienkirche's college of canons. This situation was not at all unusual as many secular priests were better educated that the more isolated regulars and were often called upon to teach in monastic schools.

It was at Belbuk that Bugenhagen published his first work which grew out of his lectures on Scripture. "And it happened that I had to read the Evangelist Matthew in the lecture hall." The study of Matthew's gospel inspired his first book, the *Passional*.

I then came upon the story of the suffering, death, and resurrection of Christ. I undertook the task in the name of God, to bring together, in a small book the history or story of the suffering and glorification of our Lord, Jesus Christ. I took this history from all four of the evangelists."

Bugenhagen's *Passional* was an attempt to produce a harmonization of the Passion from the Synoptics and John. This endeavor enhanced his reputation, bringing students to

---

21 Gorigk, p. 5, footnote 1.


23 Ibid.
him from as far away as Livonia and Westphalia. 24

Very soon after his arrival at Belbuk he received a commission from Duke Bogislav X to undertake the task of producing a comprehensive history of Pomerania. Melanchthon described the situation and the work:

Because he had many young hearers of the knightly class, his friendship was sought by noblemen, particularly by the learned ones. These, along with others of the church often spoke about their native land. He encouraged many of the group to know the history of Pomerania, the premises and mandates of a prince's work. These occurrences were brought to the attention of the princely court of Bogislav, who, when he heard of the learning and virtue of what this man preached, he desired him to make known to himself, his sons, and his counselors the history of Pomerania. Naturally Bogislav was generous; the council approved the project and he ordered that the old annals of the palace were to be examined. He ordered Bugenhagen to search through the writings in the colleges and monasteries for historical information. He instructed Bugenhagen to write prudently of the succession of princes, wars, church charters, and orders. This book was kept in the palace where it was read by the prince and his counselors. 25

Bugenhagen finished this work in May, 1518.

In his Pomerania, Bugenhagen revealed many attitudes toward reform. He openly criticized the conditions of

24 Ibid., p. 29.

some of the clergy and monasteries, accusing them of pagan practices, especially the amount they drank on holidays and the increasing number of holidays they celebrated. At the same time he praised the nobility and the princely house for their concern for religion both morally and in their willingness to endow monastic foundations.²⁶ Ranke perhaps overstates his position in saying that Bugenhagen was convinced of the necessity of a complete change in the body of the clergy.²⁷ Nevertheless Bugenhagen did not spare his criticism of clerical laxity in morals, prayer, and learning. He had read a great deal of Erasmus by 1518 and must have been aware of the current wave of criticism of the clergy. This cannot truly be heralded as a pivotal point of transformation from clerical humanist to Reformer as many others had been more critical and yet never left the Roman Church. There was, at any rate, a great deal of Erasmus' Ratio vorae theologicae in


Bugsenagen's criticisms. 28

Bugsenagen's sermon on the feast of Sts. Peter and Paul (June 29) in 1518 is the first strong indication of his reformed sympathies. He had previously, in his *Passional*, shown a great attraction to the suffering and death of Jesus. This was to be a most important theme in Luther's theology but need not be seen as establishing an early dependence on Luther by Bugsenagen as it had also been very important in Franciscan spirituality for many centuries and was certainly not neglected by the Roman Church in her teachings and piety. Criticism of the abuses of the church was not relegated only to the reformers. Bugsenagen's strong emphasis on God's mercy and his attack on requiem masses in his sermon of June 29, 1518, is generally accepted as the first public sign of his conversion process. At the very beginning of his sermon he stated that he would not praise these saints to the exclusion of God as many preachers did. He denounced sermon books because they allowed the preacher to avoid reading Scripture itself. In reference to confession he denied there was forgiveness without contrition but

exhorted confessors to be kind and merciful to aid the penitent to be sorrowful. He attacked clerical greed, condemning priests who would not perform their duties unless they received money for it. "But you say, how should I live? Believe me, believe Christ even more, when you seek first the kingdom of God and his justice, everything else will be given you." He admitted that in his sermon he had gone beyond the limitations of church teaching by saying, "Much of what I have said would make it possible for me to be called to account, not because it isn't true but because in our damnable times other things are accepted." He ended his sermon with an admonition against prayers for the dead. "Go forth and learn what it means: I am greatly pleased by mercy (charity) and not by sacrifice." Gorisk states very strongly that Buggenhagen's influence at Belbuk turned the monks away from the church and prepared them to accept Luther's teaching.

---

29 Ibid., p. 21.  
30 Ibid., p. 23.  
31 Ibid., p. 25.  
32 Meinhof, p. 5.  
33 Gorisk, pp. 6-7
It cannot be assumed that Bugenhagen was unaware of Luther's activities before reading the *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* in 1520. Duke Bogislav's son, Barnim, was, for instance, sent to Wittenberg to study in 1517 and the story of the indulgence struggle in Wittenberg had certainly reached Pomerania in late 1517. Duke Bogislav, furthermore, attended the Augsburg Diet in 1518. Bugenhagen worked closely with the princely court in the writing of his *Pomerania* which he finished in 1518 making it improbable that news of trouble with one of the Wittenberg monks at Augsburg could have passed unnoticed. Judging from Bugenhagen's reaction to Luther in 1520, he probably had not read any of Luther's writings before *The Babylonian Captivity*. The times were filled with the spirit of dissent and those who were aware of the humanistic literature and were concerned with the condition of the church were part of this spirit. To claim all evangelical thought began with Luther alone is a most improbable position. Bugenhagen's friend and student, Johannes Knipstro had already debated the indulgence question in Leipzig with Tetzel in 1518.⁴ Bugenhagen's close friend

---

⁴ Bugenhagen, *Briefwechsel*, p. 3.
and student, Peter Suave, was studying in Wittenberg in 1518. Bugenhagen's sermon on the feast of Peter and Paul in 1518 had already gone beyond the limits of church teaching in his condemnation of masses for the dead. It is certain that he did not know scholastic theology and was not interested in learning it. His own testimony to this is in 1512. He had turned from pious sources to the Bible shortly after his arrival in Treptow in 1504 and was, in fact, giving lectures on the Bible by 1506. He pursued the search for intellectual solutions to theological problems through reading the works of Erasmus and, if he followed Murmellius' advice, Pico and LeFevre d'Etaples. The conclusion must be that Bugenhagen had been following a course for almost fifteen years which led to his ultimate acceptance of the evangelical faith. Perhaps in a less personally tumultuous way than Luther but no less decisively, Bugenhagen also made the long journey from Catholic cleric to evangelical pastor. Many men had in small but decisive ways prepared themselves

\[35\text{Ibid., p. 6.}\]

\[36\text{Ernst Kähler, "Bugenhagen und Luther," Johann Bugenhagen: Beiträge zu seinem 400. Todestag, ed. by Werner Rautenberg (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958) p. 112.}\]
for the new faith. Luther did not provide answers for those who has not asked questions. Luther and Bugenhagen shared an age and a spirit but were not interdependent before 1520.

The decisive turning point in Bugenhagen's views of reform came in 1520. In October of 1520 the pastor in Treptow, Otto Slutow, received a copy of Luther's Babylonian Captivity of the Church. He had the book read at common table in Belbuk to see what opinion would be concerning the tract.\textsuperscript{37} Bugenhagen was given the book by the rector to comment upon. He read the tract quickly and commented, "There have been many heretics since the death of Christ but never has there been a more destructive heretic than the one who wrote this book."\textsuperscript{38} He kept the book, however, and read it more carefully introducing the subject again at table. This time he had changed his opinion. "What can I say to you? The whole world exists in the outer darkness, only this man sees the truth."\textsuperscript{39} Bugenhagen pursued his conviction and argued his position

\textsuperscript{37}Cramer, III, 43.

\textsuperscript{38}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{39}\textit{Ibid.}
so well that Abbot Boldewan himself became convinced that Luther was right. In 1520 Bugenhagen also read the Freedom of a Christian. Across the cover of the pamphlet he wrote, "not all who believe the Gospel experience faith in their heart." By 1521 Bugenhagen was in Wittenberg.

There is a problem concerning Bugenhagen's motive for going to Wittenberg as well as when he actually arrived. Melanchthon says that Bugenhagen came to Wittenberg to study at the university "a little before Luther faced Emperor Charles V at Worms." This would place the arrival in the early part of April, or in March of 1521. He matriculated as a student at Wittenberg on April 29, 1521. Daniel Cramer's version of the story is quite different. He places Bugenhagen's arrival much later in 1521, after the return to Pomerania of Duke Bogislav from the Diet of Worms. Cramer says that the new bishop of cammin, Erasmus von Manteuffel was pressuring Bogislav to enforce the Edict of Worms especially at the

---

40 Bugenhagen, Briefwechsel, p. 8.
43 Cramer, III, 49.
monasteries of Belbuk, Pieritz, and Stolpe. As a result of this threat of persecution Cramer says, "Johann Bugenhagen also fled to Wittenberg during the time Luther was in his Patmos in the Wartburg Castle near Eisenach." 44 Cramer also said many of Bugenhagen's students went with him and continued to attend his lectures in a small room in Wittenberg. He supports his general description of the unrest in Treptow by explaining that many of them fled, Johannes Kerich to Stralsund, Andreas Knopfe to Riga where he taught Paul's Letter to the Romans. Knopfe used Bugenhagen's, not Luther's commentary. 45 Arbusow maintains that Luther had little direct influence on the progress of the eastern European Reformation. It was spread by Bugenhagen's students using Bugenhagen's writings during the persecutions of bishop Erasmus von Mantenffel. These Pomeranian reformers accepted Lutheranism on counsel from Bugenhagen and wrote him at Wittenberg for advice. Knopfe sent his own commentary on Romans to Bugenhagen for editing and publishing in 1523.

44 Arbusow, p. 242.

45 Hering, pp. 17-18.
There are, then, two conflicting accounts of what brought Bugenhagen to Wittenberg. Hering, using Melanchthon, affirms that Bugenhagen arrived before the Diet of Worms and enrolled as a student at age 35. Melanchthon put him to work immediately lecturing on the Psalms to the Pomeranian students already in Wittenberg.\textsuperscript{46} Cramer’s account, accepted by Wolf,\textsuperscript{47} maintains that Bugenhagen fled Treptow and arrived with his own students while Luther was in the Wartburg and Wittenberg in turmoil\textsuperscript{48} The second account seems more probable but Bugenhagen’s matriculation date in the University on April 29 makes it difficult to accept. A possible solution is that the bishop of Cammin did not wait for Bogislaw to return from the Diet of Worms to begin making it clear he would not tolerate these new ideas in his diocese.

Whatever the circumstances of Bugenhagen’s arrival, there is no disagreement about the fact he began to lecture


\textsuperscript{47}Cramer, III, 49-50.

on the Psalms in 1521. In his preface to his commentary on the Psalms, published in March, 1524, Bugenhagen says that he had not reached the sixteenth psalm before his quarters became too small for all those who came to hear him. Melanchthon responded by obtaining a suitable lecture hall and an official position for Bugenhagen on the university faculty, a position which he held until pastoral and organizational duties forced him away from the academic life. His efforts in the instruction of Pomeranian students and his reputation as a leader of the Pomeranian reformers led to his title of "Dr. Pomeranus." This title became an accepted part of his name as well as a standard form of address even though he did not actually receive his doctor's degree until age 48 in 1533 by the consent of the Wittenberg faculty and a decree of Elector John Frederick.

Bugenhagen's lectures were very popular. When Luther returned from the Wartburg, he insisted that Bugenhagen publish his commentaries on the psalter. In his introduction to the book, Bugenhagen says that Luther has instructed him to publish the work; "Praeceptit hoc

49 Hering, p. 95.
Luther's preface is filled with praise for Bugenhagen's commentary. His enthusiasm was clear in his statement that, "This Pomeranian has earned the title of the world's foremost exegete of the psalter." In fact, Bugenhagen's commentary was so well received and so widely used that his tombstone has a harp carved on a shield; a second David. Cramer points out that this work, published by Adam Petri in Basle and Johannes Petrejus in Nürnberg in March and August of 1524, is the first major published work in the Reformation by a Pomeranian. It became the standard text on the Psalter throughout Pomerania and the areas reformed by Pomeranians.

The friendship between Luther and Bugenhagen grew quickly with Bugenhagen replacing Staupitz as Luther's confidant even though Staupitz and Bugenhagen were very

50 Giesenhof, p. 4.

51 WA, XV, 8.


53 Gisenhof, p. 5.

54 Cramer, III, 59.
different. Staupitz was proper and diplomatic, pursued mystical thoughts, and ended his life as the abbot of St. Peter's Monastery in Salzburg. "Bugenhagen was a townsman full of energy and without many scruples, happy and bourgeois." Not having been subjected to the emotional and spiritual rigors of monastic formation, Bugenhagen was most probably freer of inner scruples and emotional blocks than Luther which made his role as confidant invaluable. Bugenhagen became Luther's spiritual director, confessor, and friend. Although Luther had many trusting and helpful companions, such as Melanchthon, Jonas, and Catherine, Bugenhagen was the most important and most effective. His steadiness and determination helped the emotional and charismatic Luther to carry out his reforms in a consistent and orderly manner. The first storm that Bugenhagen encountered in Wittenberg was Carlstadt's radical innovations during Luther's absence in the Wartburg. Even though the university closed and many students fled the city, Bugenhagen


56 Kähler, p. 116.
continued lecturing, kept his students in Wittenberg, and
publicly denounced the destruction of pictures and
images. 57 It was mostly probably this situation which
first brought the two men together.

Bugenhagen showed quickly that he understood the
implications of Luther's thought and had the will and
determination to live according to the new teaching. When
Luther's disputation on religious vows came to Wittenberg
from the Wartburg, from the Wartburg, Bugenhagen announced
to Melanchthon with whom he was boarding, "These
disputes will bring about changes in the public forum in
things which have remained unchanged before these theses
were taught." 58 He applied the refutation of monastic
vows to his promise of celibacy made at the time of his
ordination to the subdeaconate. Celibacy was a law and
the law could not bind. 59 The consequences of a rejection
of religious vows and clerical celibacy were obvious to
Bugenhagen and he determined to manifest his convictions.

57 Melanchthon, "De Vita Bugenhagii," p. 299.
58 WA, VIII, 317.
59 Geisenhof, p. 212.
On July 20, 1522, Bugenhagen announced his engagement to a young girl in Wittenberg but that girl backed out of the engagement apparently because of the stigma of marrying a priest. 60 Luther said that "Pommer's engagement has not worked out so he's looking for someone else." 61 On October 13, 1522, Bugenhagen did marry a young girl named Walpurga. Some have claimed she was the sister of Dr. Georg Rorer because Dr. Rorer is sometimes referred to as Bugenhagen's brother-in-law, but this was because Dr. Rorer had married Johann's sister, Hanna Bugenhagen. 62 Little is known of Walpurga, including her family name, except that she was a servant girl in the house of Hieromymus Schurf of Wittenberg. 63 The engagement which had previously been cancelled left Bugenhagen open to attacks from his enemies such as Johannes Hoffmeister who used the failure of Bugenhagen's first


61 WA, Br II, 597.

62 Kähler, p. 108.

63 Walter M. Ruccius, John Bugenhagen Pomeranus: A. Biographical Sketch (Philadelphia, Pa.: The United Lutheran Publication House, (no date)), p. 27.
engagement to ridicule him personally and to attack his position on clerical marriage. The marriage made Frederick the Wise sufficiently uneasy that, although he sent Bugenhagen a gold coin as a gift, he gave it to Luther lest he be accused of condoning married priesthood. Despite a fifteen year age difference, the deaths of many of their children, and the economic hardships of the first few years, the Bugenhagens had a fairly happy life together and from this time on Bugenhagen was an implacable foe of celibacy.

Finances were a serious problem for the Bugenhagens. Their income consisted of what the students paid him for his lectures. This changed in 1523 when Simon Heinsius, pastor of the city church of Wittenberg, died. The church was under the patronage of the chapter of the castle church of All Saints which first elected Nicholas Amsdorf as pastor. When he refused, first Luther then Wenceslaus Link were elected and both refused.  

---

65 Hering, pp. 20-22.
The people were getting impatient by the time Luther suggested Bugenhagen's name. There were two problems with his nomination. Bugenhagen still spoke with a heavy Pomeranian accent which might hinder his preaching and he was married. All parties, including Bugenhagen, stalled for time to consider. Without waiting for either Bugenhagen's or the chapter's decision, Luther announced from the pulpit that Bugenhagen was the new pastor. The chapter protested but the matter was settled. Money problems beset the office but Bugenhagen negotiated a new salary and the building of a new parsonage for himself and his family. The controversy over the selection resulted in a new method of choosing the city pastor. Instead of the chapter of the church of All Saints, the city council, ten members of the parish, and the university became the electing body. Bugenhagen held this position until his death in 1558 although he retired from preaching in 1557.

Bugenhagen's life as city pastor of Wittenberg was demanding and diverse. He began an immediate but

---

67 Hering, p. 21.
68 Ibid., p. 22.
conservative reform of the church's liturgy and began writing profusely on the scriptures. His method of exegesis tended toward the allegorical and his commentaries were so practical that they quickly became popular devotional books and were frequently reprinted. His major literary endeavor was a Low German translation of the Bible for the people of Northern Germany and Pomerania. Bugenhagen's translation was not original nor did it rely on the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts available. There had been at least four Low German translations before Bugenhagen's; the Cologne Bible of 1470, the Nürnberg edition in 1477, the Lübeck Bible of 1494, and the Halberstadt Bible of 1522. Bugenhagen's Bible had a number of translators, some being his students from seminars in Wittenberg, with a possibility that most of the actual translation was done by Johannes Hoddersen, one of Luther's students who was later pastor of Hammelworden

69 Bergsma.


in Oldenburg. Bugenhagen was, most probably, the general editor of the project and stated in the preface to the 1524 Wittenberg edition of the New Testament that the translation was made "from the translation of our worthy father Dr. Martin." The source of the Bible was, therefore, Luther's German translation and not the problematic Hebrew masoretic texts or Erasmus' Greek text. The complete bible finally appeared on April 1, 1534, six months before Luther's complete High German edition, under the title, "De Bibel uth der uthlegginge Doctoris Martini Lutheri yn dyth dudesche vlitich uthgesettet mit sundergen underrichtingen, also mën seen mach inn der Kayzerlichen Stadt Lübeck bey Ludowich Dietz gedrucket, 1533." The book became known as the "Bugenhagen Bible" but, despite its enthusiastic reception, the Bugenhagen Bible never rivaled the harmonization of the passion story of the four evangelists, that is, the *Passional*, in popularity. One of the principal pastoral problems facing Bugenhagen as pastor was the attraction which the radical

---

72 Ibid., p. 78.
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74 Ibid., p. 78.
reformation had for the poor and dispossessed. Bugenhagen's stand against the radicals was so adamant that in 1523 he presented a rescript to Elector Frederick justifying the use of force in suppressing "those who have unjust and evil causes." 75 The prince can do this because those who espouse such causes fall under the judgment of the law and "are not under the Gospel." 76 The prince's duty is to uphold the law against those who are judged by it. It was, therefore, very early that Bugenhagen established his position that the "Gospel" not only can, but must be defended by force when necessary. Since he opposed the radicals so vehemently, he appointed Sebastian Froschel to preach to the poor living in public poor houses in an attempt to reduce the radicals' influence in Wittenberg. He also arranged for sermons to be delivered to prisoners about to be executed. 77 Ever since Geiler von Kaisersburg had struggled with the bishop and council of Strassburg to obtain last rites for criminals, it was

76 Ibid.
77 Hering, p. 23
considered a great advance in social justice to obtain spiritual rights for convicted felons. Bugenhagen's involvement in such issues began during the first rumblings of the Peasants' War, a situation which undoubtedly added some urgency to his social concerns. As time passed, Luther trusted Bugenhagen more and more and even referred to him as "Episcopus Ecclesiae Wittenbergensis." 78 When Bugenhagen received a call from the community of St. Nicholas parish in Hamburg in 1524, their friendship was so close that Luther was against his leaving Wittenberg. The issue was resolved when the Hamburg city council rescinded the invitation and Bugenhagen remained in Wittenberg. In 1527 Luther became very ill, suffering one of the most severe physical and spiritual crises of his life. Bugenhagen, also ill with a dangerous and painful ear infection, 79 came to Luther's assistance. He read to him from Scripture and gave him confessional absolution. 80 When the plague came to Wittenberg in the autumn of 1527, the Bugenhagens moved into Luther's home.

78 Bugenhagen, Briefwechsel, p. 106.
79 WA, Br, IV, 200-201.
80 Bugenhagen, Briefwechsel, pp. 68-69.
and stayed several months. Bugenhagen's first child, Johannes, was born in Luther's home on December 31, 1527. 81

The plague year 1527 was also the year in which the elector had instituted the visitation to oversee the working of the church. Without written directives the visitations had been disorganized and unproductive. To remedy this, Melanchthon prepared a visitation order which was submitted to Luther and Bugenhagen for approval in September of 1527. On October 12, Luther sent it to Elector John with the comment, "Our pastor Herr Johann Pomer and I have read over the visitation articles and have changed them very little." 82 The articles were officially issued in March, 1528. Quite unexpectedly, the implementation of these articles by the Elector laid the foundation for Bugenhagen's organizational work throughout northern Germany and Scandinavia. He had organized his own parish and been a consultant on the Visitation Articles of Melanchthon. He was now to have an opportunity to use this background to spread and stabilize the Reformation.

81 WA, Br, IV, 313. 82 Ibid., p. 265.
CHAPTER II

BUGENHAGEN: THE ORGANIZATIONAL WORK
OF THE REFORMATION

When Bugenhagen had been invited to Hamburg in 1525 by St. Nicholas' parish he responded with a lengthy tract, *Van dem Christen louen und recht geden wercken*. This widely publicized statement of beliefs, organizational thought, and apologetics enhanced his reputation and created a demand for his as a reformer. In 1527 he was summoned by the city of Danzig but, when protests were raised in Wittenberg, he refused the invitation. Later in 1527 a call came from the Braunschweig City Council to which Bugenhagen did respond in the affirmative. He and his wife and daughter left for Braunschweig on May 16, 1528, having buried their sons Johannes and Michael in the cemetery in Wittenberg only a month before.¹

¹WA, Br, IV, 462.
The call to Braunschweig was a difficult and potentially dangerous undertaking for Duke Henry of Wolfenbüttel, liege lord of Braunschweig, was an arch-enemy of the Reformation. The city, in religious turmoil, had attempted to introduce reform earlier by calling Heinrich Winckel from Halberstadt but clerical infighting, Duke Henry, and fairly hostile elements within the city council were more than Winckel could cope with.\(^2\) The people were less than knowledgeable about the whole question. When news of Bugenhagen's impending arrival spread, the people were thrilled as they were quite sure that such an important man was bringing greater and more valuable indulgences.\(^3\) To complicate matters, the city was badly divided jurisdictionally. The churches of St. Martin, St. Catherine, and St. Michael were under the patronage of the city council while St. Magnus and St. Ulrich as well as the monasteries of St. Blaise, St. Cyril, St. Giles, and Holy Cross were all subject to the


\(^3\)Ludwig Hanselmann, *Bugenhagens Kirchenordnung für die Stadt Braunschweig* (Wolfenbüttel: Julius Zwisslers Verlag, 1885), p. XXII.
jurisdiction of Duke Henry. Furthermore Albert of Mainz was the Metropolitan of the area.

Reformation ideas, however, were not new to Braunschweig. In the early 1520's, a Benedictine monk, Gotschalk Kruse, began to preach the new teaching from Wittenberg. In 1527 Heinrich Lonze and Johannes Oldendorp were preaching the new teaching regularly in the parish church of St. Magnus. The Diet of Spever of 1526 had allayed the fears of the city council and the men preached freely gaining converts and influencing the council itself. By 1527, it was the city fathers who invited Bugenhagen to come to Braunschweig.

Bugenhagen arrived in Braunschweig on May 20, 1528, the day before the feast of the Ascension. He, Walpurga, and their daughter Sara were given a place to stay with

---


6 Hänseleman, p. 1.

one of the citizens on Neuenstrasse. Bugenhagen immediately called all thirteen evangelical preachers together in the church of St. Andrew. Very significantly, Bugenhagen laid hands on them, confirming their mission to preach God's Word. This seems to be the first time that he ignored Catholic ordination and gave a separate sign that a man was called to preach the gospel.

The next morning Bugenhagen preached on Paul's letter to the Romans and to the Ephesians in the church of the discalced Carmelites. The church was so crowded that he had to preach another sermon outside the church to accommodate those anxious to hear him. His sermons followed the fundamental teachings of Luther. The sermon on Friday reveals the tone of Bugenhagen's preaching to the people of Braunschweig: "Faith is the understanding of Christ and must be given through Christ by God. It cannot be possessed or grasped by any human power as can be seen from the slowness with which the disciples came to believe

---

8H. Meinhof, Dr. Pommer Bugenhagen und sein Wirken (Halle: Verein für Reformationsgeschichte, 1890), p. 16.

9Hering, p. 49.
in the Resurrection. . . ."¹⁰ The divine origin of faith was Bugenhagen's starting point. On Saturday Bugenhagen dealt with justification by faith and the futility of performing good works to obtain merit. This central doctrine permeated his preaching in Braunschweig.

Bugenhagen's organizational abilities were very valuable to him in dealing with Braunschweig. He and his thirteen evangelical preachers preached daily and twice on Sunday. The people were quickly absorbed in the new movement, making it dangerous for Duke Henry or the city council to attempt to control or halt the reform movement within the city. Bugenhagen was, himself, very cautious in his activities and restricted all reform to the central city, that part which was enclosed by the walls. St. Blaise, St. Cyril, and Holy Cross were all outside the wall and were under the patronage Duke Henry so Bugenhagen left these untouched. St. Giles, which was inside the walls and under Duke Henry's patronage, Bugenhagen did

reform. He showed an ability to assess situations and restrain his zeal for the sake of practical gains which helped his first venture into organizational work to prove quite successful.

By September of 1528 Bugenhagen had prepared a church order for Braunschweig entitled, "Der Eharn stadt Brunswig christlike ordeninge to denste dem hilgen evangelio, christlicher leven, tucht, frede, unde eynicheit. Ock darunder vele christlike lere vor de borgere. Dorch Joannem Bugenhagen Pomeren bescreven. 1528." The Order is very important. Ideologically, the Braunschweig Order flows from Bugenhagen's response to St. Nicholas' in Hamburg in 1525, that is, from van dem Christen louen unde rechten queden wercken, and was addressed to three major areas of concern.

Before all else, there are three things which must be considered essential. The first is the establishment of good schools for the children. The next, preachers who will carry the pure word of God to the people and who will teach latin and the interpretation of Holy Scriptures.

---

11 Horst Reller, Vorreformatorische und reformatorische Kirchenverfassung im Fürstentum Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (Göttingen: Bandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1959), p. 95

to the educated. The third is to establish a common chest with church possessions and other gifts in order that various services can be performed for the church and the poor and needy will be provided for.\textsuperscript{13}

Bugenhagen was most thorough in explaining why and how these three objectives were to be implemented.

The order concluded by demanding expulsion from the city of anyone who refused to accept the evangelical teaching. The order is not in any strict sense a legal document or ordinance but is theological and scriptural. The document is quite lengthy as Bugenhagen was repetitious and wordy both in the pulpit and his writings. Luther, as a matter of fact, often joked about how long-winded Dr. Pomer was.\textsuperscript{14} It is as much a theological tract as an organizational plan. Bugenhagen himself was not a law-giver and had to submit his plan to the Braunschweig city council for approval and for any enforcement which it needed for the order became law only insofar as it was

\textsuperscript{13}Hans Lietzmann, ed., \textit{Johannes Bugenhagens Braunschweiger Kirchenordnung 1523} (Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Webeis Verlag, 1912), p. 6.

proclaimed and enforced by the council.\textsuperscript{15} The dependence of the reformers on civil authorities to enact religious reform and to institutionalize the Lutheran movement is very clear in the arrangement between Bugenhagen and the Braunschweig city council and is typical of all the cities reformed and organized by Bugenhagen. Wittenberg, of course, served as the example to the other Protestant cities.

On September 5, 1528, the Braunschweig city council adopted Bugenhagen's Church Order and provided a great municipal celebration. The people of Braunschweig requested the Elector and Luther to allow Bugenhagen to be named general superintendent for life or, if that were impossible, at least for a year.\textsuperscript{16} It is believed that Bugenhagen anticipated this move and asked the Elector not to approve the request while Luther vehemently opposed any delay in Bugenhagen's return to Wittenberg. Martin Görlitz was designated by Bugenhagen as the Braunschweig superintendent with Heinrich Winckel as his coadjutor.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15}Meinhof, p. 16.


\textsuperscript{17}\textit{Ibid.}
A delegation from the Hamburg city council had arrived in Wittenberg in July of 1528 to formally request that Bugenhagen be sent to reform Hamburg. The council was well aware that the Hamburg cathedral chapter would oppose any move in that direction. The reform had taken hold slowly in Hamburg and had been restrained and controlled with much bitterness. The cathedral chapter had driven Ordo Steenmehl from his position as lecturer for the chapter in 1524 because of his evangelical leanings but had allowed a more radical man, Stephan Kempe, a Rostock Franciscan, to replace Steenmehl.\textsuperscript{18} Kempe was young, eloquent, and evangelical and contributed greatly to the rising controversy over the new teaching. The Catholics could not agree among themselves as to what position to take which gave the evangelicals somewhat of an advantage. It was decided that a disputation would be arranged to resolve the confusion. At first the Catholic party was to be given the articles of disputation in order to prepare their answers and a reputable syndic was to be appointed as judge over the dispute but the evangelicals

\footnote{\textsuperscript{18}Wilhelm Jansen, \textit{Das Hamburger Domkapitel und die Reformation} (Hamburg: Friedrich Wittig Verlag, 1961), p. 20.}
pushed for public disputation with the effectiveness of the arguments being the only judge. The city council refused to permit an open debate. The debate concerned the question whether the evangelicals could prove their position with God's Word. The protestants used Bugenhagen's Van dem Christen louen unde rechten guden wercken as the basis of the argumentation. Barthold Moller, Stephan Kempe's theology professor at Rostock, defended the Catholic position and based his argumentation on the authority of the Church's magisterium. Since the Catholics came off badly in the dispute, another disputation was demanded by the chapter and took place on April 28, 1528. Meanwhile the vernacular was introduced into the liturgy, communion was distributed under both species, and, acting upon Bugenhagen's 1525 suggestions, a form of poor chest was established.

The Catholics fared no better in the second disputation so the chapter and pro-catholic members of the


20 Tbid., p. 105.

City Council appealed for help to the Archbishop of Bremen and the Emperor. Some of the Catholic party were forced to leave the city by public demand. The Archbishop, a brother of Duke Henry of Wolfenbüttel, made attempts to interfere but without success. The case was finally presented to the imperial diet at Speyer which began legal processes but was unable to stop the movement completely. During the summer, in July, Bugenhagen had been invited to reform the city by pro evangelicals on the city council and, despite imperial censures, he entered Hamburg on October 9, 1528. He had told the city council in 1524, "The city councilors commit an injustice and an ungodly act if they forbid the Word of God to be heard and read because of a command of the emperor. No one should render to Caesar what belongs to God."\textsuperscript{22} His arrival overcame the presumed injustice of the council five years before.

The people of the city turned out in great numbers to welcome him and his Hamburg escort and presented him with a fattened ox, a forty-gallon cask of wine, and two barrels of Hamburg beer.\textsuperscript{23} He also was given the home of

\textsuperscript{22}Meinhof, p. 13.

\textsuperscript{23}Sillem, p. 124.
Barthold Moller, the exiled instructor of the cathedral chapter for his residence. Moller's brother complained that even though it was Friday they ate meat, roasted and fried venison, beef, and other expensive dishes of meat and fish.\textsuperscript{24} Despite the hospitality, all was not well with the reform in Hamburg. Undercurrents of Catholic dissent were present and there remained resistance from the chapter and some city councillors. Bugenhagen began his work immediately by preaching and meeting with other evangelical preachers. One of the most significant reforms that Bugenhagen introduced was the establishment of a Latin school in St. John's monastery which remains today an outstanding Gymnasium in Hamburg.

On February 19, 1529, Bugenhagen presented his church order to the city council. The order is very similar to the Braunschweig Order. In the section on the poor chest, Bugenhagen acknowledged the order's debt to Braunschweig; "In concerns such as by whom and when gifts should be given, and which upright honest Christians should be deacons, are based on Holy Scripture and is

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., p. 125.
written in the Braunschweig Order.

25 Bugenhagen therefore limited his theological explanation of poor relief and dealt primarily with its practical implementation in Hamburg. The city council was most concerned about Articles 54 and 128, both dealing with the church funds and their supervisors, and with Article 59 which concerned ceremonies. 26 In fact, these are the only three articles of the order which the city council itself published. The order was ratified by the city council and proclaimed from the Chancellory on May 23, 1529, but was not published in full until a 1770 codification of Hamburg law. 27 Bugenhagen himself published parts of the order in 1531 in a tract called Von menigerleie Christlichen saken trostlike lere, genamen uth der Lübecker, Hamborger und der Brunswiker ordeninge. 28

25 Sehling, V, 532.

26 Ibid., p. 483.


Bugenhagen's assessment of the Hamburg situation can be seen in his letters to Luther.

At first I had doubts for a few days. At last God has begun to show me that my labors will not be fruitless in the future. Many people are beginning to love the Gospel and are present at services even on working days. I have nowhere seen such favor shown by the religious, both monks and nuns. All the Franciscans have embraced the Gospel and the Order of Preachers is not resisting. The virgins of a third convent, the Blue Nuns, both young and old have discarded their outer habits and dress as other women, retaining only their tunics, similar to your Augustinians', to protect themselves from haressment by the children. . . ."29

Bugenhagen's success made it necessary for him to request that Luther and the Elector extend his allotted time in Hamburg. In a letter to Luther he wrote,

However, my father, I fear more friction here between the citizenry and the city council than there was at Braunschweig (and there was more than enough there). Why then, may I ask, was I sent here by obedience to the Elector only to be recalled before my work is finished. It would have been better not to have come at all than to leave this place in turmoil rather than in peace. . . I believe that you are the one responsible for my orders to return hastily. It it were in any way possible to return so soon, I would need no urging but it appears I won't finish even if I stay all winter. Therefore please respond to the

29 Bugenhagen, Briefwechsel, p. 77.
urging of the city council and ask the elector to grant a longer stay.  

Bugenhagen was well aware of how important his presence was in the faction-torn city and was quite firm with Luther. Luther was legitimately unhappy about the work loan Bugenhagen had left him for Melanchthon was also gone from Wittenberg. "I am no longer only Luther but Pommer and the Officialis (Melanchthon)."  

The Hamburg City Council supported Bugenhagen's request with a petition of its own to Luther and the Elector and the request was granted.

By late spring of 1529, Bugenhagen felt the situation stable enough to leave the city in the hands of Johannes Aepinus, the author of the Stralsand Order and a Pomeranian, whom he appointed superintendent. On June 9, escorted by Joachim Wullenwever, a brother of the Burgo master of Lübeck, he left Hamburg with Walpurga and Sara.  

During his stay the city council had given him food, drink, lodging and 55 thalers from the court treasury as well as

---

30 Ibid., p. 78.
31 WA, Br, V, 691.
32 Sillem, p. 154.
100 Rehnish florins for himself and 20 gold guldens for Walpurga as a parting gift. These gifts and those he was to receive from other cities, and from the King of Denmark, did not pass unnoticed. His enemies kept a careful account of Bugenhagen's fortunes. This attention clearly shows that he was becoming an international figure and a plague in the sight of Rome. In his chronical of the year 1532, Cardinal Baronius attacked Bugenhagen for a book against those who withheld the cup at Communion and accused him of being self-seeking.

The Church of God fought the pestilence of a book which an adversary wrote against chalice thieves. This book dealt with bishops and priests in an outrageous and insulting manner. Johann Bugenhagen Pomeranus, a defrocked apostate, wrote the book. Bugenhagen has gone forth from Wittenberg to pour the bilge-water of Lutheran impiety into the wealthy Hansa cities of Lübeck, Hamburg, Flensburg, and others. . . He has propogated more than a little of the seditious violence of Lutheranism and has brought back to the herd at Wittenberg great wealth from those who have been ensnared in his errors. He has poured out his ill-gotten gold in private fancies and extravagances.  

Despite the fact that Bugenhagen was ignored in subsequent

33 Ibid., p. 125.

centuries, Baronius shows that his contemporaries were well aware of his importance. The great cities of the north were a bitter loss for Rome, and Bugenhagen was taking them away.

Bugenhagen and his entourage returned to Wittenberg by way of Braunschweig where discord had erupted among the reformers in the city. The preachers of St. Ulrich's Church had turned to Zwinglianism and were calling for the reform of Bugenhagen's church order. Neither Görlich nor Winckel seemed able to reconcile the factions so Bugenhagen met with the city council, gild masters and officials, the supervisors of the common chest, and the preachers. The preachers from St. Ulrich were also present and would not accept Bugenhagen's explanation of the Eucharist. Bugenhagen had them expelled from the city on the basis of disobeying civil law since the church order had been duly promulgated by the city council. He did not accuse them of heresy but of civil disobedience. On June 24, 1529, Bugenhagen returned to Wittenberg in time to free Luther, Melanchthon, and Jonas for their trip to Marburg and a meeting with Zwingli.

---

It was well that Bugenhagen was the one to stay behind in Wittenberg during the Marburg Colloquy as he had earlier tangled with Zwingli in 1525 and had come off badly. Zwingli had published his view of the Lord's Supper in a tract De vera et falsa religione Commentarius.\textsuperscript{36} Luther was busy battling Erasmus and dealing with the peasant revolt so it fell to Bugenhagen to respond. Bugenhagen's \textit{Eyn Sendbrief widder den neuen vrrthumb bey dem Sacrament des leybs and blutts gave glaring testimony to his lack of formal theological and philosophical training. Bugenhagen's response was pedantic, paternalistic, and lacking in solid argumentation that the sacrament was a means of grace.\textsuperscript{37} The articulate and clever Zwingli responded with sarcasm and irony\textsuperscript{38} while Bucer compounded the difficulty by translating Bugenhagen's psalter with overtones of Zwinglian Eucharistic theology in Psalm 111.\textsuperscript{39} To those who


\textsuperscript{37} Geisenhof, p. 200 ff.

\textsuperscript{38} Zwingli, \textit{werke} III, p. 604.

\textsuperscript{39} Hering, pp. 43-44.
followed the controversy, Bugenhagen appeared pompous and clumsy. He immediately withdrew from the controversy and let Luther take over. Certainly Bugenhagen's presence in Marburg would not have contributed to the desired reconciliation between Zwinglian and Lutheran factions. It was, therefore, important for Bugenhagen to return to Wittenberg from Hamburg before the colloquy began.

Pastoral and academic duties were not the only tasks which awaited Bugenhagen in Wittenberg. Charles V had withdrawn the privileges granted the Lutheran territories in the Diet of Speyer of 1526 at the second Diet of Speyer in March, 1529. The problem was clear. Did the Lutheran princes have the right to resist the Emperor with force? Elector John wanted an opinion and sent his Chancellor Bruck to Bugenhagen for advice. ⁴⁰ On the feast of St. Michael, September 29, 1529, Bugenhagen responded to the formal question: "Is it allowed to use the sword in defending the Gospel against the Emperor?". ⁴¹

Bugenhagen's argument was outlined in fourteen points in which he basically defended the use of force


⁴¹Ibid.
against the Emperor because "the Emperor is not the overlord in these matters but God's Word is." He used the passage, "render to Caesar the things that are Caesars," and continued by observing that the Gospel is not Caesar's but God's. All power is from God (Rom. 13) and no power is therefore legitimate which is employed against God's Word. The entire fourteen points followed this basic line of reasoning. The formal argument is closed with a prayer that Charles V will submit to God's will and make the use of force unnecessary. Nevertheless, in his personal conclusion to the letter, Bugenhagen urged Elector John to keep his opinion secret until the advice of others had been sought. He wrote, "Therefore keep this secret until the advice and opinions of other people have been collected." Bugenhagen knew that Luther was not of the same opinion and when Luther, Jonas, Melanchthon, and Bugenhagen cooperated on a similar response on


43Ibid.
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March 6, 1530, the position was reversed. This letter to Elector John, in preparation for the Diet of Augsburg, took the opposite stand and said that princes could no more protect their people by force from the Emperor "then the burgomaster of Torgau could protect the burghers of Torgau from the Prince of Saxony by force." 46 Melanchthon, however, knew Bugenhagen's position and a degree of mistrust developed between the two men.

The conference in Torgau had been called by Elector John to prepare for Augsburg. Bugenhagen's pressing duties in Wittenberg made it impossible for him to stay long in Torgau or to go on to Augsburg with the Elector's entourage. Jonas reported that "The pastor Pomeranus has remained at home so that someone is there to care for the church and the school." 47 Luther, being under the ban, had to stay at the nearby castle of Coburg and could not enter Augsburg thus it fell to Melanchthon to prepare the final draft of the Lutheran position which came to be known as the Augsburg Confession. "This was the

46 ibid., p. 61.

opportunity he had been hoping for when he wrecked the Colloquy of Marburg: now as an Erasmian—encouraged, moreover by letters from the aged Erasmus, who also wrote to the legate and the Catholic organizers of the Diet—he was to attempt to restore the unity of the Church.\textsuperscript{48}

Bugenhagen remained in Wittenberg, anxious for news of the proceedings. News was slow in coming and Bugenhagen was aggravated by the delay. Melanchthon had deliberately kept the Confession from reaching Wittenberg because he was sure Bugenhagen would ignore an imperial decree forbidding its publication.\textsuperscript{49} His suspicions were correct for that very year Bugenhagen published a Low German edition of the Confession.

Bugenhagen's work in Wittenberg was again interrupted. Bugenhagen and Luther were both concerned about the great Hansa city of Lübeck. In February of 1530 Bugenhagen had seen hopeful signs from Lübeck; "In Lubeck, which is a great and powerful city among the Saxons, there are two evangelical sermons preached daily. Before and


\textsuperscript{49}\textit{Hering}, p. 81.
after these sermons they sing our German hymns. Pray for them that violence may be averted."  

The Lübeck city council held tenaciously to the old Church. The people had flirted with heresy during the days of Wycliff and Huss but had always returned to a loyal relationship with Rome.  

The first evangelical preacher in Lübeck, Osenbrugge, spent three years in jail (1524-27) and was exiled from the city when released. In 1514 Pope Leo X sent instructions to the Archbishop of Oslo, Norway, to use the Fugger bank in Lübeck when depositing the Peter's Pence collection from Norway, Sweden, and Iceland.  

The city council of Lübeck exercised caution when dealing with its greatest source of credit, the Fuggers, the papal bankers of the north. In addition to the continued prosperity of Lübeck, the city council also had to protect its private interests. The council was allied with the cathedral chapter which had grown extremely

50 Bugenhagen, Briefwechsel, p. 92.


powerful over the centuries and by 1520 owned twenty-four villages in Holstein, ten villages in Mecklenburg, one in the bishopric of Ratzeburg, and two in Pomerania. In addition it held sufficient patronage rights in Lübeck itself that much of the tithes collected by the bishop went to the chapter as did part of the income from St. John's monastery, and a fourth of the tax placed on the mendicants.\textsuperscript{53} The reform movement appealed to the burghers on the usual religious grounds but also as a means of prying loose Lübeck's wealth from the clerical chapter, papal bankers, and patrician council. The political-religious alliances here were the most clearcut and obvious of any of the northern cities.\textsuperscript{54} It was into this political and economic struggle that Bugenhagen was called in the summer of 1530 for the Council had been forced by the threat of a popular uprising to experiment with reform.\textsuperscript{55}

Luther returned to Wittenberg from Coburg on October 13, 1530. On October 28, 1530, Bugenhagen entered

\textsuperscript{53}Ibid., p. 6.
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Lübeck. He began his organizational work with a sermon in the Marienkirche and was given a committee of eleven men from the Council and burgher movements to assist in the task of preparing a church order. The work was complicated at the beginning by a possessed girl who verbally attacked Bugenhagen and frightened many of his supporters. He reported the incident to Luther, Jonas, and Melanchthon and explained how he had exorcised the demon with prayers.

One of Bugenhagen's first acts was to arrange a dowry of 200 marks to be extracted from the income of the monastery of St. John to make it possible for those nuns who wished to marry to do so. Those who wished to remain in the convent could if they agreed to accept evangelical ceremonies and preaching. There was a great deal of Catholic resistance to the organization of the Reform, so on January 7, 1531, the city council made Catholic teaching, ceremonies, and preaching illegal and punishable.

56 Schreiber, p. 73.
57 Bugenhagen, Briefwechsel, pp. 101-104.
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On May 14, 1531, the new Order was prepared and published by Johannes Balborn under the title, *Der kevzerlichen Stadt Lübeck Christlike Ordeninge tho denste dem hilgen Evangelio, Christliker leve, tucht, frede unde unicheyt, vor de joeget vn eyner guden Scholen tho lerende. Unde de kercken denere und rechten armen Christlick tho vorsorgende. Dorch Jo. Bugen. Pom. Beschreven 1531.* The order relied heavily on the Braunschweig Order but the details of poor relief were altered to fit the particular situations of Lübeck.

Bugenhagen was also busy publishing while in Lübeck. The Low German "Bugenhagen Bible" was sent to the printers in 1532 and appeared in 1533. In 1532 Hans Lufft of Wittenberg published *Widder die Kelch Diebe* (Against the Chalice Thieves). *This pamphlet was particularly vehement, calling all who would not restore the chalice to the laity "nothing but stupid asses," while the bishops who resisted giving the cup could "go to the devil and be damned."* He also again attacked the Zwinglians

---
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for obfuscating the Lutheran position on the Eucharist. It was to this polemical pamphlet that Cardinal Baronius reacted in his Annales Ecclesiastici. Bugenhagen also published a new edition of Athanasius' defense of the Trinity, D. Athanasii libri contra idolatriam gentium and his compendium of the Braunschweig, Hamburg, and Lübeck church orders, Von menigerleie Christliken saken. While in Lübeck he received two pastors from Rostock in Mecklenburg who sought his advice on the direction the reform should take in their city. Bugenhagen wrote to the city council of Rostock urging a conservative reform of ceremonies and the prudent use of confession admonishing against radical ideas such as the Sacramentarians espoused.

During this time Luther was growing impatient and irritable about Bugenhagen's long absences. In November of 1531 Luther addressed a letter to "Dominus Johanni Pomerano, Episcopo Witenbergensi, Legato Lubecensi," in which he outlined the problems that neglect had brought to the church in Wittenberg and said sharply that he could
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wait no longer for Bugenhagen to return. He did, of course, wait six more months for Wittenberg's pastor to take up his parochial duties again.

When Bugenhagen finally left Lübeck, he returned to Wittenberg by way of Braunschweig where the Zwinglian problem remained despite Bugenhagen's use of the civil law to suppress it. Luther had urged Bugenhagen either to write to Braunschweig or stop there on his way home because "the world is the world and the devil is its God. This same devil has sent a Zwinglian wolf to your church in Braunschweig." On April 30, 1532, Bugenhagen again arrived in Wittenberg.

The Wittenberg situation had changed considerably since Bugenhagen's departure in October of 1530. Elector John had died and his son John Friedrich was taking a very dominant role in the reformation movement. In 1533 the Wittenberg Church Order had been promulgated and throughout the order there were strong traces of Bugenhagen's Braunschweig Order. John Friederick appointed
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Bugenhagen and Justus Jonas as official visitors for Saxony and made the pastor of Wittenberg the General Superintendent of Electoral Saxony's territory west of the Elbe River. In March of 1533 Bugenhagen, in his role as visitor and superintendent, visited the officials of Allstedt.

Bugenhagen was surprised by an action of the elector in Jun3 of 1533. The Hamburg superintendent, Johannes Aepinus, and Caspar Cruciger were to receive their doctor's degrees from Wittenberg on June 16. John Frederick wanted Bugenhagen to be presented with the degree of doctor of divinity. Melanchthon quickly prepared theses for disputation. On June 16, 1533, Bugenhagen defended the right of the civil authorities to make administrative laws for the Church because all temporal power belonged to the civil authority. He clearly distinguished the evangelical office of preaching God's Word to the community from the civil authority. This position is consistent with Bugenhagen's activities in

---
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Braunschweig and Hamburg. He seems to have been wedded more closely to the idea of Church government by territorial prince or municipal council than Luther. Sohm's arguments concerning church government by the Princes might have been better applied to Bugenhagen than to Luther.69 John Friederick was pleased with Bugenhagen's defense and Dr. Bugenhagen was admitted to the ranks of full professor at Wittenberg University.

Once again, however, Bugenhagen's stay in Wittenberg was interrupted. This time a call came from Pomerania for help in reforming the territory. It was only reasonable that Dr. Pomeranus should return to organize the Reformation in his home land. There had been many changes in Pomerania since his departure in 1521, Duke Bogislov X, for example, defender of Bishop Erasmus and of the old order, had died in 1523. His two

sons Barnim and Georg had succeeded him. Barnim had been sent to Wittenberg to study in 1518 and in 1519 had taken part in the Leipzig Debate. He had received a copy of "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church" from Luther himself in 1520. Georg had spent two years, 1507-1509, in the household of his uncle, Duke Georg of Saxony, and had been under the direction of Bishop Erasmus von Manteuffel for many years. Barnim was, therefore, favorable toward the Reformation while Georg remained the staunch defender of the old church.

The reform movements had started in Pomerania with the Bugenhagen circle at Treptow before 1521. Johannes Curicke and Christianus Ketelhut had appeared in Stralsund in 1523 and had begun the preaching of the reform. The reaction was strong but social divisions of nobility

---


and clergy against the towns allowed a certain freedom to the new preachers.\textsuperscript{73} The adherence to the old church of the nobles and clergy made the townsmen receptive to the reformers and jealous of their rights to listen to them. The dissatisfaction of the burghers was deeply imbedded in their traditions. As early as 1411 a priest was murdered in Stralsund because of his excessive wealth.\textsuperscript{74} There were frequent instances of violence and turmoil throughout the land. When Prince Georg died suddenly in May of 1531 there was an escalation of conflict between the old church and the reformers. Georg's successor, his son Philip had been raised a Catholic by his uncle Ludwig of Heidelberg but had been led to the evangelical position by his advisor Jobst von Dewitz.\textsuperscript{75} Barnim and Philip had to reach some kind of an understanding for not only was Stralsund becoming reformed but Stolp had come under Ketelhut's influence while another Bugenhagen student, Johannes Knipstro had implanted the
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reformation in Prititz, Stettin, and Stargardt.76

On July 27, 1534, Barnim invited his nephew Philip to a meeting in Cammin to discuss the growing disorder. The two met on August 24, 1534 and decided to convene a diet in Treptow during December of 1534 to which they invited Bugenhagen and the evangelical preachers from Stralsund, Stettin, Greifswald, Stargard, and Stolp.77 Barnim then went to Belbuk to confer with Bishop Erasmus. Their meeting was strained as the Duke warned Erasmus that reform was necessary and would be implemented with or without the Bishop.78

The diet in Treptow opened on December 13, 1534. On December 6 Bugenhagen had met with some of the local evangelical theologians, including Ketelhut and Knipstro, and produced a document consisting of fourteen articles, Anescheit to Treptow gegen den Landtdach. The bishop of Cammin was left in possession of ecclesiastical goods and income, only the most blatant abuses in church ceremonies

77 Heyden, Kirchengeschichte, p. 228.
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were eliminated, convents were to be used as schools for noble children and schools were founded for the townsmen.\textsuperscript{79} Perhaps most significant was the firm establishment of the bishop's properties and income under the patronage of the local nobility and the Dukes.\textsuperscript{80} This particular move broke the old affinity of nobles and clergy by giving the nobles a reason to lean favorably toward the Reformation. Bugenhagen's practicality and diplomatic sense were evident in the document.

The diet itself did not issue any definite proposals concerning reform but decided on a visitation and placed Bugenhagen in charge.\textsuperscript{81} The earliest product of the visitation was the printing of the church order which was completed early in 1535 and was sent to Wittenberg to Franz Schlosser to be printed. Despite the fact it had not yet been officially accepted it bore the title, \textit{Kercken-Ordeninge des ganzen Pamerlandes. Dorch de Hochgebaren Forsten und Heren, Heren Barnym unde Philips, beyde gueedderen up dem landdage tho Treptow, tho eeren}
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Bugenhagen wasted no time in proceeding with the actual visitations. He visited twelve major cities in all parts of Pomerania between January and June. Before leaving Pomerania, he also managed to arrange a marriage between Duke Philip and Maria of Saxony, the stepsister of Elector John Frederick. Bugenhagen continued the marriage negotiations at Wittenberg and eventually blessed the marriage at Torgau on February 25, 1536. He had implemented the reformation in Pomerania and helped to cement the relationship between the Reformation in electoral Saxony and Pomerania by marrying the Protestant Elector's sister to the wavering Catholic Duke of Pomerania. When Bishop Erasmus died in 1544 his bishopric was offered to Bugenhagen. When he refused to accept, Bartholomew Suave was appointed the first evangelical bishop of Cammin in 1545. Although Bishop Erasmus lost
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his battle to keep Pomerania Catholic, he was probably responsible for ensuring a conservative reform with evangelical bishops rather than superintendents and authority residing in the old nobility rather than the more modern townsmen.

Then Bugenhagen returned to Wittenberg he found the University had been moved to Jena because of the plague. Luther was again left alone in Wittenberg and was anxious for Bugenhagen's return for companionship as well as some relief from the work load he carried. During Bugenhagen's absence, Luther had reordered his position on ordination to comply with Bugenhagen's thinking. Previously the pastor of Wittenberg had ceremoniously ordained the new preachers before sending them out to the parishes. Bugenhagen had maintained that ordination should be in conjunction with the assumption of the office of preacher in and for a particular parish which he was to serve. The adoption by Luther and introduction into Wittenberg of this position caused an outburst from the Catholic apologists of the time. Cochlæus wrote that "Emperors,  

kings, princes, and potentates should tremble because they should know the ex-monks Luther and Pomer do not have the power to ordain and that their ordinations are hideous idolatries."\(^{87}\) He admitted their masses were valid but not those of the preachers they ordain.

The issue of ordination was crucial. It signalled to the Catholics the true end of a single church. The question was apostolic succession and whether Bugenhagen and Luther had the authority and power of Catholic bishops to ordain or whether they had broken apostolic succession and were therefore, as Cochläeus maintained, idolaters. When Vergerio, the Papal nuncio, arrived in Wittenberg in 1535 to encourage the reformers to attend a general council, the question of ordination and apostolic succession was brought up immediately. Vergerio was obviously concerned about whether it might not be too late for reconciliation. Bugenhagen and Luther were invited to the nuncio's for breakfast. Luther jokingly called Bugenhagen "God's instrument, the German pope, and Cardinal

\(^{87}\)Johannes Cochläeus, *Corpus Catholicorum*, XVIII 49.
Pomeranus.\textsuperscript{88} When Vergerio questioned them on whether they really had ordained or not, Luther pointed to Bugenhagen and said, "There sits our ordaining bishop".\textsuperscript{89} Vergerio laughed and Bugenhagen responded forcefully about the rights of the Wittenbergers and the German people to choose their preachers.\textsuperscript{90} Luther and Vergerio seemed to enjoy the sparring, Bugenhagen did not, but both agreed to attend a council, even if it were held in a papal city, and defend their positions.\textsuperscript{91}

There was increasing tension also with the south German reformers over the question of ceremonies and doctrine, particularly the Eucharist. Near the end of May, 1536, Bucer, Capito, Musculus, and Wolffhart came to Wittenberg to discuss solutions. Bucer was shocked to find holy pictures, mass vestments, candles, and the elevation of the bread and wine still in use in Wittenberg.
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Bugenhagen defended the retention of the artifacts of Catholicism as simple acts of charity to protect the sensitivities of the weak and unlearned.\textsuperscript{92} He then preached a sermon urging all parties to forego their differences and seek only the truth.\textsuperscript{93} The central issue was the Eucharist. Bucer insisted that Christ's body was not received by a "faithless" recipient, thus endangering Luther's idea of presence. Luther was unyielding and the conference was in danger of collapse when Bugenhagen offered a compromise. He suggested speaking of "unworthy" reception which removed the theological element of faith from discussion and seemed to satisfy all parties concerned simply because each party interpreted "unworthy" as it wished. They celebrated the Lord's Supper together on May 25 and on May 26 signed the Wittenberg Concord.\textsuperscript{94}

Ten days later, June 1, 1536, the papal bull, "Ad Dominici gregis curam," was issued convoking a council
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at Mantua.⁹⁵ All ecclesiastical prelates were ordered to attend and the emperor and princes were encouraged to be present. Neither Luther nor the Saxon court had been entirely satisfied with Melanchthon's Augsburg Confession and wanted to define a position to present to the Council upon which the Protestants might stand firm. The evangelical princes were to meet at Schmalkalden to discuss their position.⁹⁶ Elector John Frederick commissioned Luther to draw up articles which were essential to evangelical teaching.⁹⁷ The result was the Schmalkaldic Articles. Bugenhagen signed the articles and, with Luther and Melanchthon, prepared to go to Schmalkalden.

Melanchthon was prepared for compromise with the Catholics and showed his apparent animosity toward Bugenhagen and the influence he had over Luther and evangelical theology by infering to Philip of Hesse that the strong position on the Eucharist which appeared in the Articles should not be taken as absolute and unable to be compromised since


⁹⁶Leonard, p. 239.

it had been made stronger than the decision of the Wittenberg Concord by "Pomeranus, an irascible man and a boorish Pomeranian." The harmony of the conference was further endangered as Bugenhagen was finding it difficult not to quarrel with Bucer over the Eucharist.

On the return trip from Schmalkalden Luther became very ill at Gotha and sent the others on to Wittenberg asking only Bugenhagen to remain with him. He gave Bugenhagen instructions for the elector and for Catherine, then confessed to him and received absolution in preparation for death. In 1547 Bugenhagen recounted this experience in the forward to Luther's pamphlet on self-defense. He said that one of Luther's prayers was for the elector to be strengthened in evangelical progress.

Despite the work to be done in Wittenberg and Luther's increasing incidences of illness and discouragement, Bugenhagen was again requested for organizational
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purposes, this time outside of Germany itself. Bugenhagen had first met King Frederick I of Denmark in 1529 when he travelled from Hamburg to Flensburg in Schleswig-Holstein to debate with the Anabaptist Melchior Hoffman.\textsuperscript{102} Frederick's son Prince Christian, duke of Schleswig-Holstein, was also present at the disputation. Frederick had been elected King of Denmark to replace his unpopular nephew Christian II. Despite the fact that he was drawn to Lutheranism, his throne was not secure enough to resist the strong political coalition of clergy and nobles. He was unable, therefore, in 1529 to attempt to bring Bugenhagen to Denmark to establish the reformation. When Frederick died in 1533, his son Christian was elected to the throne.\textsuperscript{103} After three years he felt secure enough to begin the suppression of the Catholic ecclesiastical structures in both Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein. He had won the civil war and had entered Copenhagen on

\textsuperscript{102}Hering, pp. 72-75.

August 6, 1536.\textsuperscript{104} When he called a meeting of his army commanders to discuss how to acquire the money necessary to pay his troops, it was agreed that the wealth of the bishops would be siezed. All of Denmark's bishops were, therefore, imprisoned and their property confiscated by Christian.\textsuperscript{105} In October of 1536, Christian summoned the Danish Rigsdag and received its approval for his actions against the bishops. He was also in communication with Elector John Frederick, requesting that Bugenhagen be sent to Denmark to organize the reform. John Frederick refused the first invitation for Bugenhagen because of the impending council at Mantua\textsuperscript{106} but when the request was made again the following year, John Frederick consented, with the stipulation that Bugenhagen would remain no longer than one year. Meanwhile Bugenhagen had already admonished Christian on the proper uses of the money and property he had taken from the bishops urging that these goods should be used for "churches, preachers, students, 
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poor people, the sick and needy church workers and school workers."107

On July 5, 1537 Bugenhagen, Walpurga, their children, and his nephew Johannes Lübbecke arrived in Copenhagen. Bugenhagen immediately began making the corrections in the existing church order that he and Luther had agreed upon before leaving Wittenberg.108 The order was, therefore, not entirely Bugenhagen's although much of his influence is evident both directly in the liturgical reforms, and indirectly through the order's similarity to other northern orders which he had prepared.109

Bugenhagen's most controversial act was the crowning of the Danish King Christian III and his wife, Queen Dorothea on August 12, 1537. Luther referred to the event in a letter to Bucer: "Pomeranus is still in Denmark and that which God does through him is flourishing. He has even crowned the King and Queen like a real bishop."110 Significantly Bugenhagen himself wrote to
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Bucer without mentioning the event at all, probably for fear of criticism. On September 2, 1537, in the Frauenkirche of Copenhagen, Bugenhagen ordained seven superintendents or bishops of the Evangelical church of Denmark.

In the presence of the King and Queen and members of the Rigraad Bugenhagen laid his hands on the heads of the men who had been selected for the office and work of Superintendent . . . up to the period of the Reformation there was no other idea of episcopacy except that of transmission of apostolic commission. That the ministry of the episcopal government could be introduced without such a link was never contemplated until Bugenhagen reconstituted a nominal episcopate in Denmark.\textsuperscript{111}

With Apostolic succession deliberately ignored, Bugenhagen had intentionally created a church for Denmark distinct from and consciously separate from Roman Catholicism.

Bugenhagen also took a major role in the refounding of the University of Copenhagen. He became professor of Theology there and served for a time as the rector of the university. He worked on publishing a Latin translation of the Psalms for those with an inadequate knowledge of German.\textsuperscript{113} During this time Bugenhagen and King Christian
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established a close friendship and a close sense of cooperation in furthering the ideals of the Danish Reformation. Christian issued the New Order for Denmark on September 2, 1537, entitled *Ordinatis Ecclesiastica Regnorum Daniae et Norveigiae et Ducatum Sleswicensis Holtsatiae etc.*, which had been written by Danish theologians, corrected and edited by Bugenhagen.114

On Good Friday, 1539, Bugenhagen left Copenhagen. He traveled to Nyborg Castle where he wrote a tract addressed to the Danish superintendents concerning baptism, doctrine, ceremonies, and schools. Parts of the tract were published in Wittenberg in 1540.115 From Nyborg he attended the Diet of Odense where on June 10, 1539, the Danish church Order was formally proclaimed to be law. There were still difficulties with structure and language in the order that were not resolved until 1542 when the revised order was publicly received in Ripe in Schleswig with Bugenhagen present. At Ripe Bugenhagen ordained Hans Tausen who, as superintendent, became the principal
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leader of the Lutheran Church in Denmark.\textsuperscript{116}

Christian had difficulty imposing his Church order on Schleswig-Holstein because his actions there were subject to the approval of the diet. He made several attempts to have the order established as law but was unsuccessful until the Catholic bishop of Schleswig died in 1541. Bugenhagen was then invited to become bishop of Schleswig\textsuperscript{117} but refused the invitation and Tilemann von Hussen, a professor from Copenhagen, was elected. In January, 1542, Christian asked Bugenhagen to translate the Danish Order into Low German for implementation in Schleswig-Holstein. Bugenhagen's role in the translation and revision of the Order is disputed\textsuperscript{118} but Christian's letters left little doubt as to Bugenhagen's central role in the reform of both Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein.\textsuperscript{119}

By 1542 the League formed at Schmalkalden was on the offensive and attacked Duke Henry of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel. By August Henry was defeated and
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John Frederick sent Bugenhagen to the territory in order that "the cherished Gospel will be established in the entire territory of Braunschweig." Before the formal visitation procedure could begin, Bugenhagen was called to Hildesheim, the seat of the local bishopric. Under pressure from John Frederick and Philip of Hesse, the city council welcomed Bugenhagen and his companions Martin Görlich and Anton Corvinus. The three men instituted evangelical ceremonies in six of the city's churches before issuing the church order for Hildesheim, which was virtually identical with the Order for Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel except that Corvinus wrote the introduction for the Hildesheim Order. Both the Christlike kerken-ordeninge im lande Brunschwig, Wulffenbuttels deles 1543 Wittenberg and Christlike Kerken ordeninge der løsleken Stadt Hildenseem were essentially reproductions of the Braunschweig Order of 1528 except that a
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common chest is established, rather than a separate poor chest and church chest.\textsuperscript{124}

The undertaking was Bugenhagen's last major effort away from Wittenberg for, although he was offered the bishopric of Cammin and of Schleswig, he refused them both saying, "This pastorate (Wittenberg), even though of a lesser title, is truly and episcopal position and one, in these times, of greater importance than the other bishoprics which I have already twice refused."\textsuperscript{125} His refusal of Cammin opened possibilities of armed conflict so he did reconsider on the condition that he could resign at will and name a successor\textsuperscript{126} but when this was unacceptable, Bugenhagen remained in Wittenberg while Bartholomew Suave became bishop of Cammin.\textsuperscript{127}

His life in Wittenberg was no less demanding than his twenty years of travelling had been for aside from the parish, the university, and the duties of general
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superintendent of Electoral Saxony, Bugenhagen also had
to watch over Luther during the last years of his life.
Luther had, for example, left Wittenberg in anger over the
refusal of people to live the Gospel and Bugenhagen was
the only one who could persuade him to return. When
Luther died suddenly in Eisleben on February 18, 1546,
Bugenhagen was not with him as he had been in most of his
crises, but he did preach the eulogy at Luther's funeral.
In his sermon he called Luther "a teacher and prophet,
the reformer sent by God, the angel of the Apocalypse." 128
Later in a letter to Christian of Denmark he called him
"our dear father." 129 The years following Luther's death
were difficult and discouraging years for Bugenhagen.

Seemingly without warning the impending war between
the Schmalkaldic League and the emperor erupted. "In
Wittenberg we knew nothing about this war," wrote Bugen-
hagen in his account of the war years, Wie es uns zu
Wittenberg in der Stadt gegangen ist, in diesem vergangene
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Krieg, bis wir durch Gottes Gnaden erlosen sind.¹³⁰ Threatening rumors spread through Wittenberg such as, "the city will be levelled and Dr. Pomoranus hacked to pieces."¹³¹ While he himself refused to leave Wittenberg, he sent Walpurga and the children to Zerbst for protection. Rumors of atrocities spread through the city and Bugenhagen wrote to King Christian in August of 1546 that "Emperor Charles and the pope had agreed and sent orders to their captains that no one, even children over the age of two years, were to be spared."¹³² His bitterness was obvious when he told Christian that "the devil, with the Pope and Charles, has gained such ascendancy over Christendom that he can go no higher."¹³³ On November 6 Wittenberg University closed as Duke Maurice entered the city. Maurice had to retreat again but after Charles' victory at Mühlberg and the imprisonment of John Frederick on April 24, 1547, Maurice took control of electrol Saxony.

¹³¹ Meinhof, p. 34.
¹³² Bugenhagen, Briefwechsel, p. 371.
¹³³ Ibid., p. 370.
Much to Bugenhagen's surprise the emperor dealt very kindly with Wittenberg. Bugenhagen's vigil during the war had been intense and he wrote that, "I placed myself in danger of death and remain here by my church in the name of God."\(^{134}\) He had expected the worst, had prayed and preached continually, had almost despaired at the news of John Frederick's imprisonment, and was, therefore, totally unprepared for Charles' leniency. As a practical man, however, he made the most of it and to Duke Albert of Prussia he wrote with surprise that Maurice was allowing the university to reopen.\(^{135}\) His rising spirits were squelched for awhile by a rather bad fall that almost cost him his life\(^{136}\) but he recovered from the injuries sufficiently to carry on his work. New troubles, however, were not far away.

The emperor convened a Diet at Augsburg to solve the problems of Germany. The proposed religious solution appeared in the form of a document known as the Augsburg

\(^{134}\)Bergsma, p. 29.

\(^{135}\)Bugenhagen, Briedwechsel, p. 402.

\(^{136}\)Melanchthon, Corpus Reformatorum, VI, 732.
Interim.

Although the basic Catholic doctrines were retained, a few weak concessions to the Protestants were made, such as permission for clerical marriages with papal dispensation, communion in both kinds, a slight restatement of the doctrine of justification by faith, reference to the pope as supreme bishop, and recognition of the need for reforms. 137

"We would rather be killed or hunted throughout the world before we would accept such a thing," wrote Bugenhagen to King Christian. 138

Duke Maurice called for an accord on the Interim. Conferences were held in Meißen, Pegau, Klostercelle (where Bugenhagen was present), and Juterboh. Bugenhagen spoke out so strongly against the sacraments of anointing and ordination as well as the Canon of the Mass that he was not invited to the conference at Juterboh. 139 Melanchthon counseled him to be more moderate and, as before with the Augsburg Confession, thought it prudent to keep his plans for compromise from the militant


138 Bugenhagen, Briefwechsel, p. 420.

139 Hering, p. 151.
Pomeranian. Most probably convinced by Melanchthon to stay behind, Bugenhagen was not present at the Diet in Leipzig. The contents of the resultant Leipzig Interim were probably not known to Bugenhagen until after its publication.\textsuperscript{140} Melanchthon had signed the Interim in the name of the Wittenberg theologians although only his signature was actually on the document.\textsuperscript{141} Bugenhagen publicly denied having sanctioned all of the articles of the Interim but did accept a more conservative view of the adiaphora and welcomed a peaceful compromise. He was, therefore, classed with Melanchthon as a traitor to the evangelical cause by the more radical Flaccius Illyricus and Nicholas von Amsdorf who accused both Bugenhagen and Melanchthon of being clandestine papists.\textsuperscript{142} The southern Germans, who had suffered most from the war, were incensed at the northerners' willingness to compromise while the great cities of Lübeck and Hamburg rejected the Interim which their reformer was defending. To compound problems, many were shocked by the ease with which the city pastor

\textsuperscript{140}\textsuperscript{C. A. T. Vogt, p. 19.}

\textsuperscript{141}\textsuperscript{Ibid., p. 10.}

\textsuperscript{142}\textsuperscript{Meinhof, p. 35.}
of Wittenberg accepted Duke Maurice. They felt Bugenhagen should excommunicate Maurice and demand freedom for John Frederick. If this were not possible, he should at least leave the city rather than submit to the rule of a usurper.\textsuperscript{143}

The political situation subsided after the desertion of Maurice from the imperial camp and the subsequent battle of Sievenhausen. The Peace of Augsburg granted equal rights to the Lutheran as well as Catholic territories and the evangelical life of Wittenberg again flourished. Bugenhagen, however, was no longer a central figure in the postwar years. His reputation had been badly damaged by his compromise on the Interim and Duke Maurice's authority but he did, however, reject the Council of Trent as having no importance for the evangelicals.\textsuperscript{144}

Bugenhagen had long been a friend of Duke Albert of Prussia. Albert had Osiander at his court as preacher and addressed a letter to Bugenhagen espousing Osiander's position on the justification of men by Christ sharing his

\textsuperscript{143}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{144}Bugenhagen, \textit{Briefwechsel}, p. 536.
divine nature with them. Bugenhagen took this as an indication that Albert had rejected the Augsburg Confession. His answer to Albert was sharp and clear, asking what good it did to use eloquent words about Christ while attacking his real glory. Albert answered in a friendly letter but their correspondence ended.

In 1556 Bugenhagen published his *Vermanung an alle Pastoren und Predicanten des Evangelium in Churfurstenthumb zu Sachsen*. It was a gloomy tract concerned with the impending end of the world through war and the Turkish danger. The sad and gloomy apocalyptic tone of the tract came, most probably, from the sadness and rejection he himself had experienced. Not only was disaster predicted for the world but Bugenhagen repeatedly talked about his own impending death.

He continued his domestic responsibilities as well as what public duties he could still manage. His loyalty to Luther showed in his concern for Luther's widow.

---

145 Ibid., p. 516.
146 Ibid., p. 524.
147 Geisenhof, p. 444.
148 Ernst Wolf, *Gestalten der Reformation*, p. 64.
He had written to King Christian asking money for Luther's widow. "She wouldn't be poor if she knew how to take care of what she has, but she doesn't."¹⁴⁹ In 1556 he asked Christian to turn his pension over to his wife Walpurga after his death.¹⁵⁰

"A large number of theologians had rejected him as they had Melanchthon for their roles in the Interim. Old friends deserted him and he no longer exercised great influence. The young generation no longer cared to hear what he had to say."¹⁵¹ In 1557 he gave up preaching but went to church daily, spending long hours in prayer. He had gone blind in one eye and had never fully recovered from his fall in 1547. By April of 1558 he no longer could leave his bed and he died during the night of April 19-20. He was buried in the parish church at Wittenberg where he had worked for thirty-five years. His passing was quiet and his funeral small. Melanchthon preserved his memory

¹⁴⁹ Bugenhagen, Briefwechsel, p. 480.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 565.

in his *De Vita Bugehagii* but he was soon all but forgotten. 152

---

CHAPTER III

THE PROBLEM OF SIXTEENTH CENTURY POOR RELIEF

There is considerable discussion today about the origins of the social institutions and social ethics of the Reformation. Central among the social institutions are the various systems of poor relief established throughout Europe in the early years of the sixteenth century. These systems were devised and implemented by city councils, humanist scholars, clerics, and even the emperor. During the nineteenth century there were great debates concerning the Catholic, evangelical, or humanist origins of these systems. The Jesuit cardinal, Franz Ehrle, strove to show that prudent municipal charity was established by Catholic cities and was in the best tradition of Roman Catholicism. His principal theses was set forth in 1888 in his discussion of the poor relief orders of Nürnberg (1522) and Ypres (1525).¹ Ehrle went

¹Franz Ehrle, S. J., Beiträge zur Geschichte und Reform der Armenpflege, "Stimmen aus Maria-Laach" (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1881).
so far as to claim that the entire idea of justice and
charity for the poor was an exclusive invention of Chris-
tianity and of the Catholic Church as the truest embodiment
of that tradition. He, rather pompously, proclaimed:

The teaching of doing good for our neighbor,
as the saints taught, the Apostles proclaimed,
as is set down in the New Testament was not
only not known to pagans but even to the Jews.
It was a specifically Christian teaching.
Saint Ignatius, without fearing contradiction,
could announce in his letter to the faithful
in Smyrna that, 'Outside Christianity there is
no love, no concern for the orphans and
widows, no help for the downtrodden, no solace
for the prisoners.'

Apparently Cardinal Ehrle had never encountered the Old
Testament fulminations of the prophet Amos against the
oppression of the poor in Israel or the constant gener-
osity and reverence toward the "anawim," the poor of
Israel, expressed also in the Old Testament. At any rate,
according to Otto Winckelmann, Ehrle did not have authen-
tic texts and had based his analysis on documents quite
different from the original poor relief orders of Xpres
and Nürnberg. 3

2Ibid., pp. 7-8.

3Otto Winckelmann, "Über die ältesten Armenordnung
der Reformationszeit (1522-1525)," Historische Viertel-
jahrschrift, XVII (1914), p. 216.
Georg Ratzinger, whose purpose was similar to Ehrle's and who was Ehrle's contemporary, came under similar attack by Winckelmann. Not only did Winckelmann deny the authenticity of Ratzinger's sources, he even questioned the responsible use of these unauthentic documents. Winckelmann was quite convinced that both Ypres and Nürnberg were clearly Protestant creations. In his enthusiasm, he claimed that the Reformation was the first declaration of obligatory care for the community and the first time the poor had a real claim to public assistance. This claim was made despite an overwhelming number of medieval canonical decretales and writings of the Fathers which clearly state that the poor are the true and legal owners of church property and are, in justice, entitled to assistance and support. To have withheld assistance would have been grievously sinful. St. Basil the Great particularly emphasized that all wealth was merely a stewardship and not an ownership. There should

---


be no rich or poor but a community of equals.⁶

Ludwig Feuchtwanger saw the trends in poor relief as one of secularization. He felt that after the property concessions made by Eugene IV to the secular princes during the Council of Basle, the trend in all administrative affairs was toward secular control. He stated that, "The community of citizens became the leading instrument of church administration."⁷ There must be a great deal of caution used in claiming secularization because the term seems to imply a clear distinction between a secular and an ecclesiastical community. In Bugenhagen's church orders there is certainly a de facto secularization of poor relief but there is not a consciousness of a clear distinction between civil and ecclesiastical people. All the people form the Christian community which is the city. To say that the reformers made a clear transference of administrative authority from the church to the secular government is a difficult

---


position to defend, especially having read Bugenhagen's criterion for the election of deacons of the poor and for the recipients of aid. To argue that the reformers secularized poor relief because the end result of Protestant poor relief is the secularization of the whole welfare system, is to be guilty of anachronism. Bugenhagen, for example, did not live to see legal religious pluralism in the cities of Saxony and did not, apparently, grasp the de jure distinction between evangelical community and municipal community. His intention was to shift administrative responsibility within a single community, from ecclesiastical to civil bodies within the evangelical community. This is quite different than shifting administrative responsibilities from the evangelical community to the secular community.

Felix Pischel found two distinctive sources for the many poor relief orders of the early sixteenth century. He found that the orders for Augsburg, Ypres, Nürnberg, Regensburg, Kitzingen, and Zurich were developed from the humanist response of Geiler and Juan Luis Vives to the practical socio-economic problems of sixteenth-century cities. Their intentions were to clearly divorce poor relief from church administration and bestow the
responsibility on the city councils. He clearly, and quite correctly, realized that this humanistic response to practical problems was not the exclusive motivation for the proliferation of poor relief provisions. He saw that the Leisnig Order of Luther and the Wittenberg Order of Carlstadt shared a common source with the poor relief orders of Bugenhagen. The common source was the evangelical theology which these men deduced from Scripture. 8 This is not to infer that there was no relationship between the religious atmosphere of the day and the humanists' thoughts or between the practical social problems and the religious reformers' thoughts. They all lived in the same world and faced similar problems. Humanists and religious reformers were aware of problems and grasped for solutions that might be workable in their time and place. This does not necessarily imply a direct causal relationship between the two groups in their response to the social problem of poverty. One would be hard put, for example, to say that Bugenhagen's poor relief orders were derived from the De subventione pauperum

---

of Juan Luis Vives. This is especially true since Vives’ work on poor relief was first published in Germany in 1532 after Bugenhagen had completed his three major orders. Vives’ plan was presented to the city council of Bruges on January 6, 1526 but was not published in Germany for six years. There is no evidence to show that Bugenhagen had read or knew of the Bruges Ordinance or even any evidence that he read Vives’ work after it was published in 1532.

Albert Emminghaus, an opponent of Ehrle, attempted to show that municipal poor relief was in the oldest European tradition and that the Church of Rome had perverted this tradition. He used the council of Tours of 567 A.D. as an example. His purpose was to show that Protestantism was, in fact, not revolutionary in its response to the problem of poverty but was restoring the best of European tradition. He admitted that Protestantism was forced into this position by diminishing

---


church income but saw this as beneficial to the poor as well as to Protestant society. He reasoned as follows:

The only alternative in the way in which it (poor relief) was conducted arose from the fact that the church had less abundant means at its disposal. This fact alone, however, may be considered a great gain, for abundance of means is the greatest danger of all in the relief of the poor.11

Emminghaus thus found Protestantism in a de facto superior position to Catholicism in meeting the needs of the poor. The standard objection to Catholic poor relief was that it sanctioned indiscriminate giving which encouraged poverty and begging. Emminghaus found a scarcity of charitable revenue to be the beginning of sane poor relief.

All such argumentation seems to have been based partially on the desire of partisan scholars to identify their particular religious and social traditions with the growing industrial state of Bismarck's Germany. The entire debate took place between 1870 and World War I. While industrious scholars accumulated vast amounts of information of great value, they also strove to defend their traditions in the light of their contemporary realities, not at all an ignoble task but one which urges

11Ibid., p. 13.
caution on later generations. R. H. Tawney, Max Weber, and Ernst Troelach also joined the debate, lifting the argumentation to philosophical and sociological levels. Weber's and Tawney's identification of Protestantism with capitalism has been challenged in recent times but remains a viable position and a focal point of debate.

The discussion of poor relief has been taken up again in more recent times. Brian Tierney's *Medieval Poor Law* published in 1959 is a masterful work of scholarship and turns attention to canon law as the proper area of investigation for the ideological and legal foundation of the Catholic system of organized charity. The Catholic Church was torn between the practical matters of increasing demands by the urban poor on the resources of the church and the theoretical communism found in the social teachings of the early church fathers. Canon Law became the vehicle used to synthesize tradition and practicality. Each particular situation would have to be investigated to determine where and to what extent canon law was a successful tool.

Individual studies have also been undertaken in recent years by Brian Pullen, *Rich and Poor in Renaissance*

Mrs. Davis tends toward humanism as the source of sensible municipal relief while Pullen uses the entire socio-economic structure of Venice and the traditional Catholic spirituality which remained a part of this structure.

Jordan's methods and intentions are clearly stated in his first chapter of Philanthropy in England 1480-1660:

It has been our purpose to record every gift and bequest made to charities, quite broadly defined, during the period 1480-1660 in a selected and, it is hoped, representative group of ten English counties, which probably included about one-third of the population and somewhat more than half of the disposable wealth of the entire realm. ... Very broadly, it may be said that this study documents though certainly imperfectly, one of the few great cultural revolutions in western history: the momentous shift from man's primary religious preoccupations to the secular concerns
that have moulded the thought and institutions of the past three centuries.\textsuperscript{12}

In addition to these works, there is an article by Harold J. Grimm in the \textit{Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte} (1970) entitled "Luther's Contributions to Sixteenth Century Organization of Poor Relief." Grimm maintains that there are four major sources of Protestant poor relief, "(1) the theory and practice of charity in the medieval church, (2) the practical experience of German city councils and territorial chanceries, (3) the reform programs of humanists, (4) the Bible."\textsuperscript{13} He seems to feel that Protestant poor relief had, in combining these factors, a unique quality.

There is, then, a rather vast literature on the entire question of poor relief. It is virtually impossible to arrive at a definitive answer to the problem of sources and influences. Pischel asserted that there were two groups of orders, reformed and humanist. He placed


\textsuperscript{13} Harold J. Grimm, "Luther's Contributions to Sixteenth-Century Organization of Poor Relief," \textit{Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, LXI} (1970), 232-233.
Bugenhagen's orders with the reformed but maintained he was most heavily influenced by Ypres in 1525. There were, of course, structural similarities among the orders but this, contrary to Pischel, does not necessarily mean there was any direct causal relationship between them. At least such a relationship cannot be proven. Pischel's thesis that there were at least two distinct groups of orders is valid if it is also admitted that many of these orders are from disputed sources. Nürnberg's ordinance, for example, is considered a humanist ordinance by Pischel, a Protestant ordinance by Winckelmann, and a Catholic ordinance by Ehrle. There would be, therefore, a certain value in studying the structure of the Nürnberg ordinance as well as a clearly humanist order. Such a detailed study will provide a broad basis of comparison for determining the sources and relationship of the evangelical poor relief systems established by Bugenhagen with those of other possible origins and motivations. The De subventione paupcrum of Juan Luis Vives, while not the first of the humanist solutions for poor relief, can be considered representative of the humanist approach. Subsequently two pre-Bugenhagen evangelical orders should also be investigated. These are the Wittenberg Order of 1522 and the
Leisnig Order of 1523.

The Nürnberg Ordinance\textsuperscript{14} of 1522 was entitled, \textit{New Ordenung der betthler halben In der Stadt Nürnberg hoch vonn notthen beschehen. M.D.XXI.}\textsuperscript{15} In the introduction to the order there was a discussion of faith and love as the motivation for alms giving. There seem to be traces of both justification of faith as well as a high regard for good works. Thus there is neither a completely Catholic nor completely evangelical theological basis. Of great interest is the fact that Scripture is never quoted throughout the entire ordinance. The thrust of the ordinance seems to be to eliminate begging and insure the fact that the children of beggars can be integrated into society as constructive and productive citizens. The structure of the relief system was established to achieve that end.

\textsuperscript{14}The Nürnberg Ordinance will be called ordinance rather than order since it was written and promulgated as legislation by the city council. It is civil legislation not an organizational plan for ecclesiastical structures.

\textsuperscript{15}Otto Winckelmann, ed., "Die Armenordnung der Stadt Nürnberg 1522," \textit{Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte}, X (1912), 244.
The city council was to appoint two members of the council and ten local citizens to control the distribution of alms. Two of these ten citizens were to be the actual administrators of the alms while two others were chosen to be substitutes if either of the administrators were to become ill or incapacitated. The rules established by this commission had the force of law and local citizens could be fined for not complying with the regulations.

The two administrators could appoint four helpers to assist in the distribution of alms. These four helpers were to be paid from the money designated for alms and were to record the names of all beggars and keep accounts of the amount of money they collected. The helpers were also to question the beggars and those who knew the beggars to determine if they were upright persons. If they were thieves, prostitutes, or if they worked in teams to deceive donors, they were to be reported to the two administrators who would punish them.

Beggars also had to wear a badge. This was not only to keep track of who the beggars were but also to keep them out of taverns or other frivolous places where they would squander what money they did have. The beggars
were to live and associate with each other. If a beggar went out completely on his own, he was to receive no alms.

The house poor were to be looked after by the four helpers who personally were to give them aid. House poor who were ashamed to wear the beggar's badge and were too old or disabled to work were given special attention. Provisions were made that if a man and wife were in need they were to be assisted. If, however, only one of them was in need then only one wore the beggar's badge and only this same one was to receive alms.

Provisions also were made for the support of poor students. There were five schools and a total of one hundred and sixty students who were allowed to wear the beggar's badge and sing for their livelihood. Forty poor students were in St. Sebald school, forty in St. Lorenz, forty in the Spitalkirche, thirty in St. Aegidian, and ten in the Werde school. This rigid distribution of poor students was intended to eliminate an excess of begging students or a wave of fraudulent students begging under false pretenses.

Poor priests, who were reduced to begging or who had had to forsake their priestly duties in order to earn a livelihood, could be given alms. It was recommended,
however, that they be put in the care of more prosperous priests and be cared for from the benefice or annual income of the more affluent clergymen. This seemed a just way of caring for the destitute clergy and of activating the priestly fraternity in Nürnberg.

Those afflicted with the fever or other illnesses, or women in confinement should receive medical and hygienic services from the helpers. If necessary, alms could be used to purchase medicine from local Nürnberg pharmacists.

The final provision of that part of the ordinance which dealt with the distribution of alms and legality of begging, dealt with transient beggars who arrived in Nürnberg, Gostenhoff, or Werde. These foreign beggars were not permitted to beg in the city of Nürnberg itself after St. Aegidiad, 1522. A proclamation was to be posted to this effect at the city gates and any beggar who violated this proclamation was to be banished from the city by the two administrators. If the needs of these beggars were truly urgent, they could present themselves to the four helpers who, if they judged their petition valid, could give the beggar between twenty and forty "Pfennige." It was necessary to take their names and
record the amount given them. The beggars then had to leave Nürnberg under threat of the imposition of a punishment if they returned. They were forbidden to congregate outside the city gates or in the streets.

The remainder of the ordinance was concerned with the collection of money to be used as alms. The preachers of Nürnberg's two parish churches, St. Sebald and St. Lorenz, were to encourage the local citizenry to be mindful of the need to perform good works and contribute to the funds needed for alms. This was to be done two weeks in advance of the collections. Written announcements were also to be posted previous to the collections. The city council would control this income in an attempt to provide for the needs of the local poor and to regulate begging. It was also important that they have sufficient money to use for relief in case of an outbreak of the plague. The funds were deposited in chests in the parish churches and administered by the representatives of the city council. The local poor, about whom there was special concern, were the infirm and orphans. The maintenance of church buildings also depended on the alms collected by the city council. Those poor who could come to the church to receive alms should, those who were
unable were to be represented by the four helpers. The house poor and the victims of syphilis were not to take money from the alms chests in the church because they were already provided for but if their needs increased beyond their normal support, they could then receive alms.

If the income exceeded the necessary disbursements, the administrators could extend aid to working men and their families to supplement their incomes in cases of accidents or even to help pay taxes. In addition, there were provisions for assistance to war victims and general emergency situations as well as for vocational training for employable men, widows, and unmarried girls. Excess money could be invested in purchasing wheat at opportune times for later distribution to the house poor.

The normal disbursements of poor relief were determined every six days by the two active administrators and the four helpers. An elderly couple received from fifty to sixty Pfennige weekly while a couple with children could receive from seventy-five to ninety Pfennige. Bedridden patients could receive a half guldin a week. Poor people who could work part time but not enough to support themselves could receive anywhere from fifteen to thirty-five Pfennige a week. These general
regulations were flexible and their implementation left to the discretion of the two administrators who were also to screen the beggars, find employment for those who could work, provide relief for local beggars who could not work and expel those who would not work.16

The Nürnberg ordinance was primarily an attempt on the part of the city council to control begging and still provide for the legitimate needs of the city's poor. It was conceived and promulgated by the city's civic officials and was not a theological tract even though its provisions were prefaced by a short discussion of faith as a motivation for good works and good works as an element of faith. The discussion is sufficiently general that it could be interpreted as a Catholic document or a pre-evangelical document. The subsequent tone and the structure of the ordinance leave little doubt that it was created to establish order and fiscal responsibility in the municipal society of Nürnberg. Pischel's argument that it was a civic document produced in response to a socioeconomic situation would seem to be substantiated. Insofar as the Nürnberg city council was humanistically

16 Ibid., pp. 258-279.
oriented, the document reflects humanistic values and the
civic concerns of Renaissance society. The discussion as
to whether this humanistic influence was itself influenced
by evangelical or Catholic thought would involve a
thorough-going discussion of Nürnberg humanism. Judging,
however, from the tone of the preface and from subsequent
directions in Nürnberg municipal policy, it should be
said that the religious influence was transitional, that
is, it was Catholic in the process of becoming Protestant.
Apparently, however, the religious influence was secondary
to the practical civic concern over the need to control
begging.

In an effort to continue defining terms and estab-
lishing a basis for discussing socio-economic, humanistic,
and evangelical systems of poor relief, the work of Juan
Luis Vives must be considered essential. The term
humanism can be vague and the question of who the human-
ists were subject to considerable discussion but there is
no doubt that Juan Luis Vives was a humanist. His tract
De subventione pauperum presented to the mayor and city
council or Bruges on January 6, 1526 is unquestionably a
humanist document.
While Vives seems to have approached the question of poor relief as a humanitarian rather than a religionist, the legal demands of the medieval church were evident in his discussion of charity. Vives contended, "Let us not be deceived. He who distributes not to the poor what he has over and above the necessary demands of nature is a thief." 17 In the mid-fourteenth century Henricus de Bohic, commenting on the Decretum, said: "We are bound to give what is superfluous to our own needs and the needs of our dependents, having regard to our station in life." 18 The Decretum and the Glossa Ordinaria are filled with similar phrases. Tierney cites some of these pronouncements such as:

Feed the poor. If you do not feed them, you kill them. . . . Our superfluities belong to the poor. . . . Whatever you have beyond what suffices for your needs belong to others. . . . A man who keeps for himself more than he needs is guilty of theft. 19

Vives is therefore not approaching the basic question of poor relief in a revolutionary manner. The early church


18 Tierney, p. 36.

19 Ibid., p. 37.
fathers and canon law had provided him with his fundamental position on the obligation of charity. To this tradition Vives added Scripture. Chapter XI of Book I is outline of his scriptural justification for poor relief. 20 He used Scripture to prove that natural law demanded charity, the distribution of superabundance. Vives' sources were tradition and law. In addressing himself to the whole question of poor relief, he restated and reaffirmed legal and theological precedent.

Many authors feel that Vives' most innovative contribution to the system of poor relief was his emphasis on the right officials to control and administer relief efforts. Carl Steinbecker stressed this aspect of Vives' plan throughout his discussion of the De subventione pauperum. 21 The Nürnberg ordinance, which predated Vives' plan by four years, accepted the right of the council to control begging as a matter of course. The council felt no need to justify its right to legislate concerning


social matters. This should, therefore, not be considered revolutionary. A. Emminghaus points out that civil authorities had long been involved in social problems. He cites the directive of the Council of Tours\(^2\) of 567 A.D. to the cities to provide for their poor\(^2\) and brought other examples to bear to support his claim. The failure of the church to respond to the growing number of beggars and destitute led naturally to a common tendency to turn from reliance on outmoded forms of relief and control. The outcome seems to have been that different people in different areas arrived at similar conclusions. If local ecclesiastical officials failed, then local civil officials must be trusted to improve the system. In a world of two options, when one fails, it should not be surprising that the other is strengthened. If the church had failed in Bruges, as Vives maintained that it had, then it is hardly revolutionary or unique that Vives turned his attention to the civil institutions which, being unencumbered by massive charitable establishments, would be more flexible and responsive to contemporary social situations. What is important is that Vives'
innovations were totally structural in nature. He did not alter the traditional justification for poor relief. His structural changes were twofold. He merely transferred traditional responsibilities from a system which had failed to function adequately to a system which he hoped would function more efficiently. He also responded to a practical situation. In true humanist fashion, tradition formed the basis of Vives' plan.

Vives began by identifying the poor. He named the house poor, beggars, and those living in hospitals, "establishments where the sick are fed and cared for, the needy supported, children educated, orphans raised, lunatics restrained, and the blind given refuge." Two members of the city council and a secretary were to visit and inspect all hospitals and record the names and conditions of the people found there. Every parish was to have two deputies to seek out the house poor and to investigate their character. These parish deputies were also to report emergencies and request aid from the council for immediate relief. All able-bodied beggars (who became known as "sturdy beggars" in the English Poor Laws of

1547) were to register with the local magistrates and state their justification for begging. If their reasons were not accepted and they refused to work, they were to be imprisoned.\textsuperscript{24} The problem of begging was one of the most serious that Bruges faced. Apparently there was a labor shortage in Bruges and the impressment of beggars into the labor force was a practical means of solving two problems at once.\textsuperscript{25} Vives proceeded to outline the types of work suitable to the beggars' abilities. Light tasks were to be assigned to the elderly or infirm beggars while heavy labor was recommended for the able-bodied. Vives drew a line at how severely the beggars should be treated. "They must not die of hunger, but they must feel its pangs."\textsuperscript{26} Vives also stressed special concern for the blind and the insane. This special concern displays Vives' humanitarianism and is, perhaps, the most unique and innovative element of his tract. Institutionalized compassion for the insane and vocational training for the blind were quite unique in the sixteenth century. 

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., pp. 469-470.

\textsuperscript{25}Atkinson, "Luis Vives and Poor Relief," p. 98.

\textsuperscript{26}Joannis Ludovici Vives, \textit{Opera Omnia}, IV, 474.
Vives provided for close supervision of the relief system. The house poor had to work. If their income was inadequate for their needs, they could receive supplemental income but this was to be closely regulated by the supervisors of charity.

Education was a major concern for Vives. The sons of the poor were to be educated. Vives stipulated,

The school should be in charge of men who have a strong and broad education and can infuse culture into the school. Nothing is more harmful to the sons of the poor than a perverse, low-quality, barbaric education. In order to procure schoolmasters of suitable character, the council should spare no expense. . . . Similar institutions should be provided for girls. They should be taught correct doctrines and piety. They also should learn to spin, sew, weave, embroider, to cook well and to manage a house as well as learning modesty, frugality, gentility, good manners, and, above all, to keep their chastity, persuaded that this is the special virtue of a woman.27

Every year two censors were to be appointed by the city council who were to investigate the life and morals of the poor. This investigation was to be most thorough, even determining what sins they had committed. In this way Vives hoped to create a virtuous community.

27Ibid., p. 476.
The problem of financing the work of charity did not interfere with the normal income of the church. Only in the case of bequests were the supervisors of relief empowered to meddle in church financial affairs and then to demand that the poor receive their fair share of the money. Vives also stipulated that revenue for relief was to be obtained both from the hospitals and from donations. He stated:

Let the annual income of the hospitals be reckoned together and I do not doubt that when work has been assigned to those who are able to do it, not only will the income be sufficient for those who do live in the hospitals but there will also be enough left for those who live outside the hospitals. .. In case of necessity, the wealthy hospitals should share their abundance with poorer institutions.28

These revenues were to be supervised at each hospital by two appointees of the city council who were accountable annually for the financial management of their respective hospitals.

Further funding could be extracted as necessary from donations. Vives suggested that funerals be less elaborate and that the money saved be given to the poor.

28 Vives, Obras Completas, I, 1400.
In three or four of the local parish churches, poor boxes should be available for people of good will to use as their consciences prompted them. These boxes were only to be placed in the churches when funds were actually needed. Two men were to be appointed by the city council to supervise the collection and distribution of these alms collected in each church.

Vives cautioned against the accumulation of vast amounts of money for poor relief. He apparently felt that it was this accumulation of money which had led the church away from interest in the poor. The temptation to use this money fraudulently or for investments would be too strong to be easily resisted. Particularly in times of natural disasters and other emergencies, the conversion of investments into cash could be too slow, thus making it impossible to aid those who needed help immediately.

There was a great deal of optimism in Vives' plan. He felt that orderly charity would eliminate the hatred and envy of the poor for the rich because the poor would now see the rich as their benefactors. The rich, knowing that they were not supporting useless beggars, would love and respect the poor and not be resentful about sharing
their wealth. Crime would be eliminated and the city would become a desirable place in which to live. 29

The plan called for municipal control of poor relief efforts which would lead to a direct relationship between money received and money disbursed. Too many of the charitable foundations and memorials of the church had ceased to function properly and had become self-serving instruments for those who were supposed to be merely dispensers of goods received. Vives thought that the de-institutionalization of poor relief would eliminate the abuses which had become a part of the ecclesiastical structure of alms giving. For this reason he forbade vast accumulations of reserve funds and forbade the investment of any poor relief funds. His contempt for begging brought a sharp response from the mendicants of the Bruges who demanded the right to beg because of religious motives. The Sorbonne upheld this demand in its decision of 1531 regarding the Ypres Ordinance. 30

The practicality of Vives' plan was attested to by the later role that it played in the formation of poor

29 Ibid., pp. 1409-1410.

30 Steinbicker, pp. 124-125.
laws for the Low Countries and England. Pirene judged
Vives' plan as being neither Catholic nor Protestant but
a work of the Renaissance. It was a document which grew
out of the thinking of the medieval church. Vives tried
to revive old values in a way that had practicality for
the moment. This practicality decreed an attack on
begging, and provided for a fresh supply of workers for the
labor force, an elimination of methods that had brought
on fraud and ineffectiveness, a new bureaucracy free from
the shackles of the old. His solution was innovative in
the provisions for the care of the blind and the insane
and in the total elimination of begging. It was not a
revolutionary solution, however, for the basis of his
concern remained the traditionalist concern of the
Fathers and the Decretals. It was a reforming document
based on an ancient foundation.

Before Vives' plan and concurrent with the Nürnberg
Ordinance, poor relief systems were developing among the
active reformers of Wittenberg. In January of 1522, while
Luther was still at the Wartburg, Andreas Bodenstein von
Carlstadt issued a Common Chest Order for the city of
Wittenberg. Hermann Barge judged Carlstadt to be socially
motivated in contrast to Luther's purely religious
motivations found in his early pamphlets.\textsuperscript{31} Karl Müller categorically denies Barge's right to make such an absolute distinction and claims that the principles of the Wittenberg Common Chest Order are derived from Luther's pamphlet to the German nobility and his discussion of Christian freedom.\textsuperscript{32} There is strong evidence to support both theories. Generally Barge is probably nearer the truth even though he overstates his case. One need only look at the positions of Luther and Carlstadt during the Peasants' Revolt 1524-1525 to judge which of the two men had a better grasp of social reality and a commitment to radical social reform.

Despite their differences, Carlstadt and Luther produced the first two decidedly evangelical poor relief plans. In order to provide a complete view of the variety of systems established, it is important to see what these men did. The Barge-Müller debate over authorship of the Wittenberg Order of 1522 is of minor importance in this

\textsuperscript{31}Hermann Barge, \textit{Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt} (Leipzig: Friedrich Brandstetter, 1905), I, 391.

\textsuperscript{32}Karl Müller, \textit{Luther und Karlstadt} (Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, 1907), pp. 56-57.
particular discussion. More important is what the Wittenberg and Leisnig orders said.

The Wittenberg order began by demanding that a common chest be established and be supported by the income from church property, confraternities, guilds, and vacant benefices. This common chest was to be administered by two members of the city council, two local citizens, and a secretary.

The order attacked begging in a way similar to Luther's attacks on begging in his Address to the German Nobility of 1520. Any able-bodied beggar who refused to work should be expelled from the city but the old and infirm beggars could be assisted from the common chest. Clerical mendicancy was abolished and a record was to be kept of all monastic valuables such as chalices, patens, and monstrances.

Student begging was restricted by forbidding foreign students to enter the city when local students were not yet provided for.

The common chest was to be used to supplement the income of laborers whose wages were inadequate for them or

33 Grimm, p. 225.
who were hampered in some way from working enough to earn an adequate wage. Orphans, especially girls, and the children of the poor were to be provided for from the common chest.

Priests' income was to be put in the common chest and those who had previously earned eight gulden from saying Mass and holding novenas would be given six gulden annually. The idea was to let Masses and novenas lapse and allow time for the clergy to tend to the poor and the sick. The order then digressed into liturgical rubrics before returning to the question of the common chest. Concern was reaffirmed when wealthy citizens were urged to contribute four gulden for every hundred they had to the chest.

The order ended with the admonition to educate the children of the poor so they could improve the social position within the community and avoid falling into poverty themselves. If they could not be sent to school then they should be given training which prepared them for a specific trade.  

---

The city council of Wittenberg attempted to take this order and revise and implement it in the city. It provided a more specific organizational plan such as placing poor boxes in parish churches and having three keys to the box for reasons of supervision. The council also divided the city into four districts with a supervisor for each district appointed by the mayor. The four supervisors had to report weekly to the mayor concerning their purchases and disbursement of funds to the house poor of their districts. These supervisors were also able to buy up wheat at times of abundance to store and disburse in times of need.35

The order provided for relief for the house poor and poor laborers, for poor students, and helpless, and the sick. It also provided the funds necessary to pay the clergy an adequate salary in hopes of freeing them from rituals and allowing them to care for the poor and sick of Wittenberg. As early as 1522 the evangelical reformers were providing for the centralization of municipal and ecclesiastical incomes to alleviate poverty and maintain the clergy. Bugenhagen would later create

35 Barge, II, 559-561.
two separate funds, divide incomes between them, and establish municipal supervision of both.

The Leisnig Order of 1523 is, most probably, the work of Heinrich Kind and Johann Gruner who served the parish of St. Matthew in Leisnig as parish priest and preacher respectively.\(^{36}\) Luther, however, gave his full support to the order and, in fact, wrote a special preface which outlined his own basic thoughts concerning the proper use of church property in the new evangelical organization. The order was printed in Wittenberg in 1523 and carried the title, \textit{Ordenung eyns gemeynen kastens. Radschlag wie die geystlichen gutter zu handeln sind 1523}.\(^{37}\)

Luther's preface began with the problem of ecclesiastical property, especially the proliferation of monastic and religious foundations. The decline in the number of religious in the houses of Germany was a cause of great concern for the Roman Church which placed blame


for this phenomenon on Luther and his evangelical message. Luther realized that this exodus of the religious could lead to serious social and economic problems; thus he had great hope that the Leisnig Order would provide a practical solution to the problem while using evangelical principles for its justification. Luther's concern was clear in his statement,

At the same time for this very reason there is need of great care lest there be a mad scramble for the assets of such vacated foundations, and everyone makes off with whatever he can lay his hands on. I have, therefore, resolved to the extent of my ability and duty to forestall such a catastrophe while there is still time, by offering Christian counsel and admonition. For since I have to take blame whenever monasteries and foundations are vacated, when the number of monks and nuns decreases, and whenever anything else happens to diminish and damage the clerical estate, I refuse to accept any additional responsibility if some greedy bellies should grab these ecclesiastical possessions and claim as an excuse that I was the one who put them up to it.\(^{33}\)

He offered his solution to this increasingly serious problem in a series of five recommendations.

The doors of the monasteries were to be opened and the monks and nuns encouraged to leave of their own free will. No new applicants could be accepted and those who

\(^{33}\) Luther's Works, Vol. 45, 170.
remained could be transferred elsewhere or merely allowed to die out. The religious were not to be coerced into accepting the evangelical message as many were innocent victims of their own blindness while others were simply not capable of providing their own livelihood. Whichever the case, those who remained were to be provided for because God commands us to take care of both the good and the evil Matt. 5:45. The properties, however, were not to remain in the hands of the religious orders but were to be assumed by the proper governing authorities. In the case of Leisnig this was the town council and the ten supervisors of the common chest. These authorities were to be more generous than was customary in order to impress upon the monks the benevolence of evangelical society and thus, perhaps, lead them to conversion.

The property of the confiscated monasteries was to be used, therefore, to support recalcitrants in a generous manner but also to help those who left to reestablish themselves in a new occupation. Whatever remained was to be deposited in a common chest and used for the relief of the needy through gifts or loans. The inheritances, which comprised part of the monastic wealth, could revert
to the heirs of the original donor if they were in need. To the objection that, human nature being what it is, this would leave nothing for the common chest. Luther replied: "This is why I said that Christian love must judge and act in this matter; it cannot be handled by laws and regulations."\textsuperscript{39}

Bishoprics and chapters were to experience similar fates by being converted into secular jurisdictional areas with the incomes reverting to needy heirs, relatives, and the common chest. Such also was to be done to the "repurchases"; a subtle form of usurious sale of property usually transacted by a religious foundation to procure or make loans which were otherwise condemned by the church's sanctions against usury.

The final point of the preface was to urge the conversion of urban friaries and monasteries into schools for both boys and girls. Luther was confident that this proposed order would solve the problem of begging, "which does so much harm to land and people in soul and property,"\textsuperscript{40} as well as other property-related problems which

\textsuperscript{39}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 173.

\textsuperscript{40}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 176.
faced the nascent church organization.

The order itself, though not of Luther's authorship, outlined the manner in which Luther's concerns would be practically implemented. The basic justification for the establishment of a common chest was the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers and the right of believers to possess ecclesiastical goods in common, a theory based on a modified interpretation of Acts 6 where it was shown how the early Christians held all property in common. Luther's preface had referred to the "bona ecclesiae," using "ecclesia" in the Greek sense of community rather than of institution.\(^{41}\) The rationale for the order was, therefore, Acts 6 and the evangelical emphasis on the universal priesthood of believers.

"All incomes, properties, rights, moneys, and goods everywhere amassed, collected, brought, vested, and assigned in perpetuity"\(^{42}\) to the church were the sources of support for the common chest. Comestibles and donations could be brought to the church and deposited in casks or, in the case of money, boxes. There were,

\(^{41}\) Ibid., pp. 172-173

\(^{42}\) Grimm, p. 227.
therefore, provisions for stable church income and free-will donations to be used as income for the common chest.

The administration of the chest was the responsibility of the town council which met annually on the first Sunday after the octave of Epiphany and selected ten supervisors of the chest. Two of the supervisors were to be noblemen, two members of the city council, three local citizens, and three peasants. Each of these groups was to maintain a key to the chest, thus making a total of four keys necessary to open the chest and disburse its contents. Two of these supervisors were also charged with the supervision of church buildings, schools, hospitals, and the solicitation of alms in the church.

Begging was completely forbidden by either laymen or monks and by students from outside the Leisnig parishes. Anyone begging was to be expelled from the city by the council and the supervisors unless they were elderly or ill, in which case they were to cease begging and be cared for from the common chest. The only way an able-bodied beggar could remain was to find gainful employment within the city.

The funds of the chest were to be used primarily for paying pastors' salaries, sacristans' wages,
schoolmasters' income as well as relieving the financial problems of aged and infirm, house poor, newly arrived workers who accepted the evangelical faith, maintenance of church and school buildings, and the purchasing of grain stores for disbursement when necessary. In every case the council gave final authority for the disbursement of funds and the ten supervisors were charged with determining the legitimacy of each claim upon the common chest. This right to determine the legitimacy of the need permitted both financial and moral investigations by the supervisors and became a standard provision in most subsequent systems of poor relief. Both Bugenhagen and Vives gave this right to their deacons and administrators.

In order to insure a steady income for the chest above and beyond confiscated properties and incomes, as well as free-will offerings, the town council instituted a mandatory tax of one silver Groschen to be paid quarterly on the four Ember days. This tax was minimal and, apparently, designed as a symbolic action which showed the liberation of the citizenry from the financial oppression of the old church.

Three times annually the entire parish was to assemble and listen to the reading of the order.
The supervisors were then to present a general accounting of their books and make what comments and additions they felt necessary. The citizens could respond, challenge, and suggest as they deemed necessary. These provisions are similar to those introduced into Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel in 1543 by Bugenhagen, Corvinus, and Görlich.

The most important general accounting day was the first Sunday after the octave of Epiphany at the meeting of the town council when the ten new supervisors were elected for the ensuing year. The new election did not completely relieve the outgoing supervisors as they were admonished to remain as advisers to the newly elected group.  

The Leisnig order is important for a number of reasons. Its purpose was primarily to deal with the church properties which were being deserted and stolen in the wave of evangelical fervor of the early 1520's. The situation was a serious problem and demanded firm measures to provide for an orderly transferal of ecclesiastical property from Catholic to evangelical ownership. Luther and the authors of the Leisnig order turned to local

---

municipal authorities to implement this difficult task. Unlike the Nürenberg ordinance of 1522 and Vives’ *De subventione pauperum* of 1526, for which the immediate problems to be faced were the elimination of begging and the care of the incapacitated poor, the Leisnig order is first and foremost an attempt to deal with church property in a responsible manner. This is most clear from Luther’s own preface.\(^4^4\) The Wittenberg Order of 1522 saw financial reform as an instrument of liturgical and clerical reform and, as at Leisnig, provided that the clergy receive set salaries from the funds of the common chest. Neither Nürnberg nor Vives provided for clerical support. Nürnberg suggested that wealthier beneficed clergy care for their own less fortunate brethren\(^4^5\) while Vives asked only that clerical begging be eliminated as it was a contributing factor to social unrest.

There is, then, a tendency to agree with Felix Pischel in saying that the primary motive for the Nürnberg ordinance was to respond to a serious socio-economic problem. While faith was mentioned, practicality appears


\(^{4^5}\) Winckelmann, ARG, X, 238.
to have been the major concern in the institution of the ordinance. Vives, using the imagery of the "Corpus Christianum" and the canonical concept of equitable distribution of wealth, apparently sought to cure the contemporary social ills of Renaissance Bruges.46

The Leisnig order explicitly used Scripture and Luther's teaching on the universal priesthood of believers as justification for the establishment of a common chest, confiscation of church property, and systematic poor relief. The Nürnberg ordinance was introduced by a short discussion of faith as a motivation to charity but made no attempt to firmly base its provisions on Scripture or theology. Vives did employ Scripture in Chapter XI, Book I, but this was significantly placed at the end of his theoretical discussion, which discussion dealt with traditional concepts of the distribution of wealth, humanitarian concerns, and the role of the civil government in the social and moral life of the citizenry. Scripture was used to confirm what he said. It was not used deductively or argumentatively.

46 Juan Luis Vives, Obras Completas, I, 1356.
It would appear, then, that there were real differences among the early systems of poor relief which stemmed from a variety of motives and situations. There were also many similarities which could have arisen from interdependence or through limited means of response. They could have, in other words, been obvious solutions to similar problems. It would seem, at least, that there is a fairly large degree of independence to be found in various poor relief traditions of the Sixteenth century. It remains to be seen to which, if any, of these traditions Bugenhagen belongs as well as what contribution he made toward a solution of the entire problem.
If we wish to be Christians we must be aware of the consequences. We must avoid monkish charades and penitential liturgies lest God despise us. God has not commanded us to perform any of these. We must carry out the true worship of God, that is, true good works of faith which were first commanded us by Christ. This is primarily that we bear the burden of our neighbors' needs as Jesus said (John 13:35): 'So will all people know that you are my followers if you always love one another.'

This introduction to the Braunschweig Church Order reflects the tone and direction of all Bugenhagen's social and theological thought. His source is firmly based on the Bible and Luther's position on justification by faith as well as Luther's ethical system pertaining to the

---

"coram hominibus" obligations of the Christian believer. There is no real distinction in Bugenhagen's thought between theological and social teachings. He viewed man as Christian man and did not distinguish between him as a social being and as a believer.

By 1525 when Bugenhagen sent his tract Van dem Christen louwen unde rechten guden wercken to the city of Hamburg, his basic position was clear and unyielding. Man's social responsibilities flow from his relationship to Christ for Christ has bridged the gap between heaven and earth. Man must act on earth as Christ commands him, not because man merits grace by obedience but because Christ commands. The reason for obedience is seen in the role Christ plays in salvation.

Christ came from his heavenly Father to us in order to save us from the kingdom of Satan and place us in his Father's kingdom. We see clearly in these words that Christ stands between heaven and earth, between God and man as a true mediator and reconciler, God and man. He takes the poor sinner to his Father and thanks the Father for such grace.

---

Just as there is no one in heaven or on earth who is both God and man except Jesus Christ, our Lord, so too is there nothing in heaven or on earth, neither creature nor deed, through which we men can come to God except the one mediator, Jesus Christ. He is God with God, and man with men, an eternal God with the Father but he became a man for the sake of men. He did this because he wished to bring men, partially damned and lost in sin, to God.3

This statement which Bugenhagen repeats often and in various ways established his fundamental position on Christ's role in salvation. Christ's salvific role became the basis for Bugenhagen's application of faith to human behavior. His social ethics may be sought in various humanistic writings and contemporary practices but in vain. His social ethics flow from his understanding of

---

3Johann Bugenhagen, "Van dem christen louen unde rechten guden werchen," ed. by C. A. T. Vogt in Johannes Bugenhagen Pommeranus: Leben und Ausgewählte Schriften (Elberfeld: Verlag von R. L. Friderichs, 1867), p. 104. Bugenhagen uses the term partially damned and lost (halber verdammt und verloren) which seems much more in line with the Catholic teaching on original sin and human nature than pure evangelical teaching concerning the depravity of human nature after the fall. A thorough reading of Bugenhagen's works often shows this type of ambiguity. It must be remembered that he was not a systematic dogmatician whose theological reasoning was so tightly constructed that a logical error could shatter the whole structure. He was doctrinaire but in a pedagogical and rambling way. There are many inconsistencies in his writings. His writings should be understood in a general sense, not in careful analysis of his use of words.
Christ's role in man's justification. The practical application of these ethics is a rather different question and was, naturally, subject to a variety of contemporary influences.

Bugenhagen used the popular polemical attacks of his time to clarify his position and teaching. To strengthen the theoretical foundations of justification by faith, he explained what it did not mean in terms familiar to the people of Hamburg.

When the Scripture speaks in such a way and when one preaches about the Lord Jesus Christ people quickly contradict and say: Is Jesus Christ the only mediator through whom we alone can come to God, without whom no one can be saved just as we sing 'If this Child were not born, we would all be lost'? If this is true then why have we done the things that were taught to us by priests and monks, such things as obtaining indulgences and forgiveness for sin when we fasted, prayed, had masses said and attended many masses, when we gave money for letters of indulgence... when we built churches and altars... when we made pilgrimages to Rome, went to St. James in Compostella or made it possible for others to go, when we had Marian and Corpus Christi sodalities, when we were blessed with the bishop's finger, attended the consecration of churches and the blessing of bells, when we had masses said for the dead so that souls would be released from the priests' purgatory when all they really wanted was to replenish their priestly pockets...?  

---

4Ibid., pp. 105-106.
This was the practical man speaking. These pious practices were concrete examples of good works which were rejected by the evangelical teaching for if Christ alone takes men to the Father, then the Catholic idea of personal merit is false. This was all Bugenhagen was saying. In the method of the school master, he used repetition and concrete examples to emphasize what he wanted to say. His argumentation flowed from Scripture which he used doctrinally. He used Scripture deductively to teach what should be done, thus his social teaching can only be understood through his interpretation of Scripture.

Good works performed for merit were useless according to Bugenhagen. Commenting on Matthew 15 he said "all those plants not planted by my Father will be uprooted," thus attacking the theory of good works. "Plants that God has not planted are works that men have invented so that they can earn forgiveness of their sins and be holy before God. God knows nothing of these kinds

of works. He has given us Jesus Christ alone to make us holy and children of God if we believe." He continued that it was anti-Christian to teach that one can do enough human works to atone for sin.

Bugenhagen's attack on good works is not a condemnation of acts of human kindness or concern. He is concerned about intention and motivation.

Here I would like to make an important observation. We are not condemning good works which flow freely from the heart in accordance with God's Word and, for his sake, in service to our neighbor. We do condemn all works no matter how good they may be if they do not come freely from the heart but from a heart bound to and dependent upon the intention of meriting heaven and the forgiveness of sin.  

He implicitly denied, in this passage, communal well-being as a proper ethical end for Christian man. The emphasis is on the internal disposition. If a deed is done freely out of pure generosity, it is an acceptable expression of Christianity in the social context. If it is performed with the intention of accruing spiritual benefits or merit, the act itself loses any

---


7 Ibid., p. 110.
goodness. Whether the hungry man eats or does not eat is not the fundamental issue. The issue is, why was he given food? This is not to imply that a Christian could not feed a man if he were truly needy. This simply is not the question.

Works of themselves are so valueless that Bugenhagen even rejects the position that works are evidence of belief. It is not true, "because the correct belief is that we are saved only through Jesus Christ who has given us to his and our Father and will acknowledge absolutely no other way to salvation." He also rejected this position because those who held it really believed "that you want to merit heaven and therefore your works are not based solely on faith but are directly contrary to the correct belief which Christ, through faith, has placed in the heart."8 It is not so much that they are not evidence of belief but the position is very vulnerable to misinterpretation. It should, therefore, be denied rather than allow misunderstanding.

This intensely internal ethical system flowed from Bugenhagen's understanding of faith. Like Luther, he

---

8Ibid., p. 112.
distinguished two types of faith. The first is doctrinal, the second is that faith by which we are justified. He explained:

The first is when one believes that Christ is true God and true man, conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the pure Virgin Mary, that he preached and worked great miracles, that he made the lame walk, the blind see, the deaf hear, the leper clean, the possessed free from the devil, the dead live; that he died, was buried, and descended into hell, on the third day he rose from the dead, ascended into heaven and sits at the right hand of God his heavenly father; that he will come again on the last day to judge the living and the dead. 9

Bugenhagen said even monks and priests believed this as did the devil in hell. He considered these events historical fact and used belief in the sense of knowing. In the first kind of faith he dealt with the process of accepting fact as truth, truth which the theologians of his day defined as the correspondence of reality with the intellect ("adequatio re et intellectus"). Bugenhagen then explained the faith by which man is justified.

The second type of faith is the true Christian faith (about which the Scriptures of both the Old and New Testament speak). It is a pearl, an understanding of Holy Scripture, a light and a blessing to man, a power of God. This

9Ibid.
faith is that which I hold in my heart which sustains me in all needs of body and soul. It is that Christ, God and man, despite his greatness is mine alone, that he was born, endured death, and conquered hell for my sake, for my good. That he has saved me from sin, death, hell, the devil, the law and from the fearsome judgment of God. That he has taken me from the kingdom of Satan to the kingdom of his heavenly father. That I (although a poor sinful man) am a child of God. That God my dearest father protects me in body and soul, in time and in eternity for the sake of his loving son Christ, who is mine personally through faith in his God head and in his humanity, with his death and resurrection, with everything he has done and everything that he is for all eternity.\textsuperscript{10}

The flaw in the faith of knowing was that Christ is not personally possessed by man.

The devil has that kind of faith. . . just like the Pharisees and the learned monks and priests who lead people away from Christ the Lord by means of their works through which they merit heaven. Of what use then is the Christ about whom they have so much to say? If I can save myself with works then Christ and God's grace are unnecessary.\textsuperscript{11}

Bugenhagen stressed the incompleteness of the faith of knowing. The true believer also acknowledges and believes the first kind of faith about which we spoke but

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., p. 113.

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 116.
he does not consider that to be sufficient. He believes with the heart and acknowledges with the mouth that Christ, with all the passages one can quote from Scripture concerning his essence and his deeds, his life, his death, is his."\textsuperscript{12}

True belief is experiential and personal with knowledge of doctrine serving as an element of faith. An essential prerequisite of this true faith was the admission of what man is. "You must admit that you are a poor, powerless, sinful man."\textsuperscript{13} The devil is more powerful than man. "The devil is a powerful lord not only over you and your sins but over the whole world. He holds all godless hearts in his power and holds them prisoner to his wishes."\textsuperscript{14} For man to presume to do something good is a totally false presumption for man is nothing in himself and is powerless to resist Satan.

The emphasis thus far has been on the futility of good works and the absoluteness of man's justification by experiential personal faith in Christ. How could any

\textsuperscript{12} Tbid., p. 117.

\textsuperscript{13} Tbid., p. 115.

\textsuperscript{14} Tbid.
social ethic of communal responsibility be implied from this extremely individualistic basis? The Holy Spirit was, for Bugenhagen, the vehicle for the expansion of his concepts of faith and justification. He insisted that:

The holy Spirit will make a communal christianity, a community of saints of true Christians, a forgiveness of sin, a resurrection of the body and eternal life, a Kingdom of Christ which is, though, not glorious by the standards of the world.15

It was, then, the Holy Spirit who would bind together those who have faith into a community and it is in this community that the obligations of mutual concern are imposed by commands of Christ found in Scripture.

It is very clear that our human nature is incapable of doing good. This same nature is incapable of cooperating in its own salvation. Only faith, a personal and experiential faith, leads to salvation which is brought about by Christ for his Father's sake. Man's only response to Christ is a passive acceptance of salvation through faith. This passivity and obedience formed the basis of Bugenhagen's social teaching. He searched the Bible for what Christ commands men to do and deduced from

15 Ibid., p. 121.
these commands the communal obligations which a Christian must fulfill. It is here also that he differs from Luther. For Luther, men encounter their faith in Scripture. For Bugenhagen the Bible is the doctrinal norm of faith.\textsuperscript{16}

Bugenhagen then accepted good works, understood in a passive sense, as evidence of faith. He totally had rejected this idea earlier in the tract when there had been any possibility of understanding it in an active sense.

The love with which we serve our neighbor in all his needs is when we utilize what we have and respect him insofar as we are able. We prove to the world that we are Christians. \ldots We ourselves will know that our faith is genuine when we suffer for the sake of truth and serve our neighbor through love.\textsuperscript{17}

This obedience to Christ's command is the consequence of being Christian that Bugenhagen referred to in his introduction to the Braunschweig Church Order.

The theoretical basis for social concern had been revolutionized throughout the areas reformed by

\textsuperscript{16}Krumwiede, p. 39.

\textsuperscript{17}Bugenhagen, "Van dem Christen louen. \ldots" p. 239.
Bugenhagen. He had challenged and overturned, with his evangelical teaching, the conviction that social service was an active participation by man in the process of salvation through freely choosing to do good deeds. Salvation no longer depended on men's relationship with their neighbors but on their faith in God. However unclear this revolution was to his contemporaries, it lightened the burdens of community responsibility for them and turned what had been considered justice into charitable benevolence.\textsuperscript{18} The task which faced Bugenhagen was to impress upon the people that Christ's commands to be charitable, while they did not effect individual salvation, were to be adhered to and taken seriously. He could not and did not resort to the founding of new church law. This would have denied the evangelical position that Christians were free from the law. Instead Bugenhagen expounded the biblical commands of Christ, argued why and how they should be followed, and presented these arguments and explanations to civil

authority for legislative promulgation and enforcement. He justified the right of civil authority to coerce in his letter to Hamburg in 1525\textsuperscript{19} and in his doctoral defense in 1533.\textsuperscript{20}

How all this is applied to the question of Poor-Relief can be seen in his introduction to the poor relief sections of his Church Orders. Braunschweig, being the first and most inclusive, sheds light on Bugenhagen's process of deducing social norms from Scripture as well as clarifying the cultural situation to which he applied these norms.

Good works are not meritorious but constitute worship, that is, they are a response to faith, not an aid to believing. Bugenhagen made it clear that obedience was worship.

We must carry out the true worship of God, that is, true good works of faith which were first commanded us by Christ. This is primarily that we assume the needs of our neighbors as Jesus said John 13:35 : "So will all

\textsuperscript{19}Bugenhagen, "Van dem Christen louen...", p. 239.

people know that you are my followers if you always love one another."

"Assuming the needs of our neighbors" meant that the poor must be provided for. To find who was responsible for providing assistance to the poor, Bugenhagen turned to the Bible and in 1 Timothy 6:17-18 he found admonitions to the wealthy to be generous. The rich, therefore, had an obligation to help the poor as did "all artisans and laborers whom God has blessed. That is, those who are able to support themselves by their own labor." Ephesians 4:28 justified Bugenhagen's inclusion of the artisan and laborer. "Let the thief no longer steal but rather let him labor, doing honest work with his hands, so that he may be able to give to those in need."

Bugenhagen then enumerated the categories of the poor who must be helped.

The poor referred to are first of all the house poor (Hausarmen), artisans and laborers who do not spend their time in idleness or drunkenness but instead work diligently, lead praiseworthy and upright lives, and still are beset with misfortune which imposes suffering through no fault of their own. Also, those who through sickness or loss of limbs

\[21\] Lietzman, ed., *Braunschweiger Kirchenordnung*, p. 135

are not able to support themselves. Also widows and orphans who have nothing, cannot support themselves by working, or have no friends who can or will take care of them. They must lead an upright praiseworthy life and not be blasphemers. . . Also young women in distress and worthy servant girls who are upright but have been deserted by everyone. One should also help those recovering from illness who have sunk into poverty because of their illness. We are responsible for giving help to them and similar people. 23

Bugenhagen drew these qualifications for receiving relief from Scripture. 1 Timothy 5 outlines the procedure for providing for widows as well as imposing the obligation to care for one's own family. The stipulations were clear in Bugenhagen's treatment of the question of who were to be considered poor. The other specification which Bugenhagen drew directly from Scripture is Galatians 6:10, "let us do good to everyone but especially those of the household of faith." 24 What is presented in the enumeration of those who are to receive help in the church order is Bugenhagen's understanding of who belongs to the household of the faith. It is a very striking example of his deducing social obligations from scriptural commands as

---

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid., p. 136.
he understood and interpreted those commands. He provided, as Galatians demanded, for everyone, even those not of the faith. In his missive to Hamburg he provided for monks and priests who would not give up their old ways. "If they (monks and priests) remain obstinate and stay in their old ways, leave them to their fate, if hungry, feed them. The Gospel orders us to give to friends and foes alike." The whole command is expounded in the prefaces to the poor chest orders. The emphasis, however, remained, as Galatians allows, on those of the household of the faith.

Service to the poor is worship of God. It is thankfulness to God for his gift of faith. Bugenhagen repeatedly used the quote from Matthew 25:34-40;

Come blessed of my father sit at the right, a place which has been prepared for you from the beginning of the World. When I was hungry you fed me, thirsty you gave me something to drink. I was naked and you clothed me, in sickness and need and you visited me. What you have done for one of my least ones,


you have done for me. On these works, not on hypocritical works, will Christ turn his attention on the last day. . . . All other worship is lost and in vain because they (those who teach good works) teach the wisdom and precepts of men and not of God Matt. 15:9. 27

Poor relief is true worship and real obedience to God's commands.

Throughout this treatment there is a problem which centers on an understanding of Bugenhagen's treatment of good works. The intensity of his attack on the whole concept of good works would seem to be a defense of total quietism, and yet, he spent much of his life actively instituting provisions for the relief of the suffering of the poor. The first attempt at a solution to this problem is the question of obedience to Christ's commands, as has already been seen. Understanding also depends on what Bugenhagen seems to have meant by good works performed for merit. Nowhere in the church orders or his other writings did he condemn Catholics for giving relief directly to the deserving poor. Catholics most certainly did give to the poor yet he never singled this out for condemnation. He did condemn, however, the means which

the Catholic Church used to collect money and, of course, the misuse by priests, monks, and charitable foundations of these revenues. Throughout his writings there appeared litanies of the sinful practices of the Roman Church's gathering of money in exchange for merit. The Braun- schweig Order is very explicit in condemning these practices.

Before men gave the monks many coins, they gave so much to Vigil masses, masses for the dead and other masses and beatings. They gave without limit for marriages, funerals, baptisms, feasts of the Apostles, Marian devotions. They gave for pictures, plaques, bells, organs, and innumerable vigil lights both in churches and in their homes. We don't even mention the endless benefices, memorials, confraternities, letters of indulgences, pilgrimages, etc. The rich have given a great deal of money for such things, as even the poor woman who earns her livelihood at a spinning wheel. There are too many others to even mention.²⁸

Good works were condemned by Bugenhagen in the context of false piety and meritorious acts. He does not mention the actual distribution of relief to the deserving and should not be misconstrued to have condemned it simply because it was done by Catholics. His general charge would have been that very little relief reached the poor.

²⁸Ibid., p. 137.
An essential difference was also that the evangelical was giving to God out of gratitude while the Catholic was giving to another man for the reception of merit.
Clearly Bugenhagen's concern is theological. He is not dealing with social structures. His social concern is based on his theology and his motivations are religious. 29

There is no evidence in Bugenhagen's writings that he, in any way, viewed poverty as a virtue. The "Holy Poverty" of the monastic ideal, the "raison d'être" of the Franciscan Order had no place in Bugenhagen's theological understanding. His bourgeois background and values left little room for the idealization of want. He did not avoid the issue nor did he sidestep the example of communal ownership of property set forth in the Acts of the Apostles. He clearly distinguished between scriptural narration of events and explicit commands which had to be obeyed. The core of his social teaching is derived from the commands alone. He stated

that:

it is good and necessary that we do as the true Christians of the Apostolic times were bound to do. We should bring together a common fund and common possessions, not for ourselves as the first Christians in Jerusalem did who possessed nothing individually. This cannot happen now and it isn't necessary because it is not commanded. Even the monks no longer do this. They don't hold their goods and labors in common but take their possessions from other good people. We do say, however, that we do need a common fund, not for ourselves but for the needy. We can sustain this willingly, when we wish, by giving 'pfennig,' 'groschen,' and moderate gifts and bequests... (if we do this) we will not have a bad conscience because the poor are not cared for. God loves a joyful and willing giver as Paul says, in 2 Cor. 9:7.30

Here Bugenhagen arrived at the reason for establishing a common chest for the relief of the poor. He applied the principle differently in different cities but the reason for the establishment of a poor chest came from Scripture. He had proven to his satisfaction that poor relief was commanded by God and used the example of the early Christians to determine administrative procedures; that is, the establishment of the poor chest and provisions for its maintenance.

30 Lietzmann, ed., Braunschweiger Kirchenordnung, p. 139.
Bugsenhagen dealt at length with the qualifications of the supervisors of the poor chest, that is, the deacons of the poor. Their qualifications, as will be seen, were distillations of his interpretation of scriptural admonitions. These interpretations were heavily influenced by the late medieval German experience of what it meant to be a Christian. His ability and effort, whether conscious or not, to translate the biblical experience in the light of his own was the source of much of his practicality and popularity. This was exemplified in his approach to the institutionalization of the reform as well as in the devotional character of most of his writing and conformed, in general, to the cultural life of the German townsmen of the Sixteenth Century.

In his treatment of the qualifications of the deacons of the poor, we find Bugsenhagen's understanding of the Christian man as he should be identified within society. It was the archetype which became a proper goal for all men and an underlying purpose of supporting the worthy poor. The worthy poor should be helped to become upright evangelical citizens. Bugsenhagen provided for the care of the permanently disabled also but stressed the goal of improving the lot of the rightly disposed in
order that they might be more worthwhile citizens. There was, then, a practical goal of charity: to help build up the Christian community by improving the material lot of individuals within it. Assuredly this was to be done out of love of neighbor which was commanded by Christ. Love, as applied to poor relief, was helping those who could not be self-sufficient and improving the lot of the ambitious poor by making it possible for them to become self-sufficient. The old way had made giving mandatory but Bugenhagen made it a free act of charity. "We are released from the error that we must give." 31 The old way demanded giving out of justice with a reward of personal merit. Bugenhagen demanded it out of charity, as commanded by Christ. The practical outcome was to be the improvement of the community by raising the worthy poor into the middle class.

The deacons of the poor were presented as the ideal for the evangelical citizen. "These deacons should be upright, just Christian men and worthy providers for

31 Ibid., p. 137.
their wives and children, as St. Paul wrote. In his letter to St. Nicholas parish in Hamburg in 1525, Bugenhagen said the deacons should be "God fearing and wise townsmen who are not seeking their own pleasure or their own profit. Neither should they be so naive as to give to everyone nor should they be deceived by any liar or lazy rogue." The most complete discourse on the deacons is in the Braunschweig Order. Bugenhagen, in fact, referred readers to the Braunschweig Order both in Hamburg and Lübeck Orders where he stated:

Which citizens should be elected deacons is clear from the words of the Apostle and the first Christians as written in Acts 6:3.

Therefore, brethren, pick out from among you seven men of good repute, full of the Spirit and of wisdom whom we may appoint to this duty and by the Apostle in 1 Tim. 3:8-9 Deacons likewise must be serious, not double tongued, not addicted to much wine, not greedy for gain; they must hold the mystery of the faith with a clear conscience. First, they must be full of the Holy Spirit and of wisdom. Such people as far as we can know, must believe in the gospel of Christ in their hearts and must have love in their hearts. Otherwise, as

---


33 Bugenhagen, "Van dem Christen louen, ..." p. 261.
men, we are able to make an error in the election as Christ has made us aware of by entrusting Judas with his funds when he was, in fact, a thief.\textsuperscript{34}

Bugenhagen then described again what it meant to believe, stressing the importance of God revealing faith to men rather than man acquiring faith. The deacon must be one to whom faith has been given. He must hold this faith with a clear conscience:

A clear conscience, for us in this situation, is that we are served by supervisors who perform their duties for the sake of God. A clear conscience for Christians should be that they do not act, speak, or do things which they know to be contrary to faith and to God's Word but that they act, speak, and do things according to faith and God's words. God's Word and a good conscience go together. It is not enough that you, although never blameless, have good intentions. The conscience and the good intentions must be based on God's Word so that you can follow God's intentions and not your own interests and thoughts.\textsuperscript{35}

Bugenhagen went on to explain that good intentions, of themselves, often led to evil. He quoted John 16:2, "The hour will come when everyone who kills you will think that he is doing God a service," as an example of the

\textsuperscript{34}Lietzmann, ed., \textit{Braunschweiger Kirchenordnung}, p. 139.

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., p. 140.
dangers of an unregulated conscience. Here is, perhaps, an excellent example of the relationship between the two kinds of faith which had already been explained. "A good conscience or faith cannot exist without God's Word." 36

The Deacons must be believers in the full evangelical sense. For Bugenhagen, this means they must possess certain qualities.

They cannot be two-faced. How could liars and back-biters who tell me something is white while telling another that it is black be entrusted with money and service to the poor. . . . They cannot be souses or drunkards because such a person would seek his funds from the poor's money or, if he were too honest to take the money, would be so concerned with gathering his own finances that he would ignore the poor. . . . They should not be greedy in order to avoid their handling of the purse as Judas did for Jesus. They should also be the kind of people who provide well for their children and their household for how could they help other good people when they ignore their own and do not tend to their own with love and joy as a Christian provider should? They should be married men who live in a legal and upright marriage where the man and wife form a single life. Whoever lives otherwise is disreputable and unworthy to hold an office to serve the poor. Even if they are themselves blameless they should not be elected if they have a troublesome or wicked wife. The wife should enjoy a good reputation in all her dealings with her servants and her children, her relationships with the working

36 Ibid.
people, her management of her kitchen, her obedience to her husband, and should be generous in her aims to the poor. She should not be a blasphemer who backbites and gossips about others as is a common fault among women and is very blameworthy. . . . The wife should be moderate and not drink too much. Such is common among the Greek women but not among the German women. From all of this it is obvious how clearly the Apostles saw that good and holy men should alone be chosen to dispense temporal goods. It is a proverb: Money makes a knave out of a man whose heart is not pure for the sake of God. 37

These are the qualifications necessary for a deacon. Bugenhagen has deduced them from Scripture and interpreted them in the light of his own evangelical, bourgeois background. The reward for service is not merit but "an enlightenment and strengthening by the power of Holy Spirit against sin, death, failures, and frivolity. The losing of oneself in God's grace and mercy through Jesus Christ our Lord." 38 There is then, for Bugenhagen, also a spiritual reward for living an upright Christian life. It differs from merit in that it is only personally rewarding but not efficacious toward salvation.

37Ibid., p. 141.

38Ibid., p. 143.
The emphasis throughout this problem has been on the Braunschweig Order. In no other order or visitation did Bugenhagen deviate from the scriptural texts which he used to support his fundamental position in the Braunschweig Order. The orders differ in practical organization but not in the theoretical justification for poor relief.

In successive church orders the poor chest was progressively deemphasized while the treasury, or common chest, emerged as most important. The common chest stressed the need to provide for the preachers and teachers, those who actively sustained the evangelical cause. "On these declarations rest the whole Order, namely, that we provide for the laborers of the Holy Gospel of Christ and the laborers in the schools both of whom we cannot do without." 39 Secondly, he dealt with the provisions for the "worthy poor." 40 The words, "worthy poor" ("rechte armen"), became the standard reference for the recipients of relief in all Bugenhagen's

39 Sehling, V, 337.

orders, especially those in which he did not deal at length with the theoretical positions on poor relief. Who these "rechte armen" were was most fully explained in the Braunschweig Order.

Ernst Wolf maintains that "the spirit of faith, God's love, and the reliance on Holy Scripture: these three things are the basis of Bugenhagen's Church Orders."41 This is most certainly verified in the examination of Bugenhagen's theological writings. On this basis, he attempted to create a functional evangelical community bound together by the Holy Spirit and sustained by the Word of God. Men's obligations toward one another were based on the commandment of love of neighbor. "The obligation of love of neighbor is for Bugenhagen, not simply the fulfilling of an obligation. He expected that the citizens, under the influence of the new teaching and for the sake of the Gospel, would exemplify Christian action in the community."42 To determine the success or failure of this goal would entail another complete study.


42Kalberrah, p. 114.
The basis of the practical results would, however, have to be found in what Bugenhagen thought, said, and did in the context of his historical situation.

There is strong evidence that Bugenhagen presented a revolutionary approach to social thinking which was rooted in evangelical theology and applied in the context of the social realities of German townsmen of the Sixteenth Century. The first step of his thought was to establish an understanding and a position on the definition of man. This step, though often left implicit, is necessary for the development of any social philosophy. Bugenhagen could only understand man's nature in his relationship to God. Man was a destroyed nature, a sinner saved by the grace of God through faith in Jesus Christ. As a sinner man could do no good. The idea of humanitarianism for its own sake was foreign to Bugenhagen. The justification for humane deeds is, therefore, found in service to or worship of this saving God. Bugenhagen defends this by acknowledging that the source of this obligation to perform good or humane deeds is the command of Christ to do so. The source of these commands is Holy Scripture, the ultimate authority. Man, in gratitude for salvation, obeys the commandments of his
Savior and his Savior commands him to care for the poor. This is the basic and fundamental core of Bugenhagen's social thought. Its source is evangelical theology which he deduced from Scripture.

To leave the whole question there would be to miss much of what Bugenhagen himself has said. Ideas do not exist in a vacuum and Bugenhagen was indeed a very practical man, immersed in his world and very much a part of it. His theory found expression in the concrete situations and social values of his time. It is, therefore, important to observe that each of Bugenhagen's orders was written primarily for a municipality. The orders for Lübeck, Schleswig-Holstein, Denmark, Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, and Pomerania were to be implemented throughout the areas under the municipal, ducal, or royal control but each town was merely to imitate the urban plans. The poor relief segments deal with the organization of charity in municipalities and do not specifically provide for rural relief programs. Bugenhagen also was particularly concerned with the worthy poor, that is, those who were unable to help themselves or those who had experienced misfortune and were temporarily in difficult straits. These poor were of the
household of the faith and thus the most deserving of assistance. Those who could have contributed to the material well being of the community but did not were seen not only as material parasites but as spiritual hazards. He stressed that to be a good provider was part of being Christian. The whole person was involved in sustaining the evangelical community and this meant civic as well as spiritual responsibility had to be shouldered by each citizen. Charity had, therefore, a two-fold purpose. The first was to provide for the helpless; the second was to provide assistance to those who strove to be responsible citizens in order that they might attain their goals. Scripture commanded that Christians help their enemies and Bugenhagen repeated this but made minimal provisions for social undesirables and actively sought civil legislation to keep them away from the community. The enemies were, for Bugenhagen, not merely unbelievers but those who, through begging or general irresponsibility, would not contribute to the quality of life sought by the German townsmen. There is then, in a sense, an equation of the social values of the upright citizen with the ideal of a good Christian. This is reminiscent of the humanist emphasis on civic virtue but
it also shows the tendency of Bugenhagen to accept civic authorities and values as integral parts of evangelical community life. This is not to say that he despiritualized man, only that in "coram hominibus," in the concrete world, man's behavior should conform to the values inherent in the urban middle class. Bugenhagen outlined his theology, which was highly spiritualized, and deduced from it his practical norms. That these practical norms reflected his background, his times, his social experience, should hardly be surprising.
CHAPTER V

THE ORGANIZATIONAL PLANS FOR POOR RELIEF

IN EVANGELICAL GERMANY

Bugenhagen's intentions in the establishment of a practical system of poor relief, as has been seen, were two-fold. Poor relief was an act of charity done joyfully for God's sake by men justified and happy in Christ. It was, in fact, a "Gottesdienst," an act of worship, of divine service. Poor relief was also a practical means of strengthening the economic structures of the burgher communities of Germany and making the ideal of the German townsmen the best expression of the Christian citizen. "It was only with the Reformation that the ideas of wealth and poverty, property and alms, work and vocation were put right again."¹ This joining of the concept of Christian man and the German townsmen led to a

very prominent role for the civil authority in the maintenance of Christian society. The church community was, in fact, inseparable from the town community. As has been seen, Bugenhagen was a staunch defender of the dual role of ecclesiastical and civil authority in the structuring of evangelical society.

Very important and quite distinguishing in Bugenhagen's thought is the lack of ideas of universality. The civil authorities, which are of greatest concern for Bugenhagen, are the local civil authorities. The king of Denmark, the elector of Saxony, the dukes of Pomerania were all of great importance as superior authorities but were viewed more as general overseers than as functional elements in local societies. When Bugenhagen turned the final authority for poor relief over to civil authority for implementation and enforcement, he turned this authority over to local groups, to city councils and citizen committees. Christian society was seen as local municipal society. The sweeping visions of universality found in the Church of Rome were of little concern to the evangelical communities of Braunschweig, Lübeck, and

\[^2\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 576.\]
Hamburg. The emphasis on the local municipality or provincial boundary is clear throughout the church orders. It stands as a monument to Bugenhagen's concern with the practical and immediate problems of establishing and organizing the evangelical church in areas of the north.

The convergence of all these trends can clearly be seen in the actual organization of the poor relief provisions of the church orders. Here, as with the theoretical basis for poor relief, the Braunschweig Order stands as the norm. It would dominate any investigation of Bugenhagen's system but, because of local variations and concerns, it was not adhered to rigidly as the only possible form of organization. Variations based on local needs can be discerned throughout the various orders.

Bugenhagen's first outline for poor relief was contained in the letter to Hamburg in 1525, Van dem Christen louen unde rechten guden wercken. He suggested a common chest which was to be used solely for the purpose of poor relief. "This common chest should be used for the relief of widows, orphans, the poor, the sick,
the house poor, poor girls, and the like."³ This is in contrast to the example approved by Luther in the Ordnung eyns gemeinen kastens for the city of Leisnig in 1523.⁴ Luther's common chest at Leisnig was to be used to pay pastors, teachers, and custodians as well as provide for poor relief. Bugenhagen showed a strong degree of independence when, a year later, he changed Luther's idea of the common chest and recommended that Hamburg have a separate fund for poor relief.

In Braunschweig the common chest was also exclusively a poor chest. Braunschweig was not highly centralized as Leisnig was for each parish in Braunschweig was to have a common chest. "In all large parishes a common chest should be set up for the benefit of the poor and the indigent and other needy people."⁵ In Lübeck the


arrangement is also for a separate poor chest. "In every church there should be a public common chest for the benefit of the worthy poor." Hamburg was given a separate poor chest in Bugenhagen's Order for that city in 1529 and in 1535 Bugenhagen established a separate poor chest for Pomerania. "There must be two chests, one called the poor chest, the other called the church chest." By 1543 however, Bugenhagen had combined the two chests into a single common chest in the church orders for Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel and for Hildesheim. In 1542 the revised Danish Order was established in Schleswig-Holstein and provided for a general fund to provide for poor relief, maintenance of church personnel, and provisions for the schools. Uhlhorn maintained that the reason for this was a growing inability to maintain a distinction between ecclesiastical and civil society. Since, however, the early poor chests were supplied by continuous free will offerings and the church chests by

---

6Ibid., V, 359.

7Ibid., IV, 336.

traditional church incomes, there was the problem of decreasing funds for the church chest with the increasing secularization of church property. Certainly this was the case in Denmark when Christian III seized all episcopal property in 1536. The free-will offerings given to the poor were increasingly necessary for the maintenance of the church and school personnel and, finally, the local authorities found it easier to take over the entire operation and use civil law to tax in order to provide for church needs, education, and whatever poor relief there was. This last development was not yet a reality when Bugenhagen finished his last order in 1543 and retained his confidence that the love of God was enough to stimulate provisions for all necessary municipal social services.

The means of funding these chests is of considerable importance. In his letter to Hamburg in 1525, Bugenhagen made no mention of a church chest. The reform had not yet been so effective as to disrupt the traditional sources of ecclesiastical income so the concern centered on a problem which plagued Hamburg as it did all cities. This was the problem of responding to the needs of the urban poor. Bugenhagen put all church income into
poor relief. He was not present in Hamburg and was, therefore, not faced with a practical situation. These provisions might be considered most in accordance with his social thought. They are the most sweepingly inclusive and the least encumbered by a real situation.

When such a chest is established, all benefices and foundations which become free through the dying out or disappearance of men or through men of good conscience who, when the truth becomes apparent, desire change. These together with the donations of good people and all bequests that are left should be gathered together for the establishment of a common chest. This common chest should be used for the relief of widows, orphans, the poor, the sick, the house poor,\(^9\) poor girls, and the like.\(^10\)

The provisions for funding the poor chest in Braunschweig were more detailed and less inclusive. Bugenhagen stipulated that all inheritances were to be given to the poor chest. Collections taken on special occasions were also designated to provide funds for poor relief.

---

\(^9\)The "Hausermen" were local people who were too ashamed or too proud to publicly ask for assistance. They were given alms privately in their homes without public knowledge. Their names were, however, recorded in the deacons' account books. I will refer to them as "house poor." For a more complete definition see: Grimm, Wörterbuch.

Braunschweig held a special reverence for St. Autor whose appearance in 1200 A.D. had, according to legend, saved the people of Braunschweig from the oppression of the anti-king Philipp. A relic of St. Autor was kept at the monastery of St. Giles and candles were brought to the reliquary annually on St. Autor's feast day, August 20.\textsuperscript{11}

In the 14th century money could be substituted for candles and by the 16th century a general collection was taken up annually throughout the city for the maintenance of the shrine. Bugenhagen stipulated that this collection should be deposited in the poor chest. In addition to this general collection, the money taken in by the city council for poor relief expenses should also be added to the poor chests on St. Autor's day. In order to deemphasize the saint's day, however, the collection was to be transferred to the Sunday after August 20.

The offerings that were collected on St. Autor's day should now be collected on the Sunday following St. Autor's day and be deposited in the poor chest. To this should be added the money promised by the city council for the expenses incurred in helping the poor which they have also given on St. Autor's day.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11}Sehling, VI/1, 398.

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., p. 451.
Traditionally money had been spent on funerals and memorial masses for the dead. That money should now be given to the poor. "Previously men gave money uselessly to the dead and neglected the living poor. Now it would be good to change useless customs into useful customs."13

Weddings had also been occasions of great generosity. Money had been given to the bridal party when it entered the church and even greater amounts had been spent on celebrations after the wedding. Bugenhagen was not puritanical about the celebration, remembering that Jesus had attended wedding feasts and provided jars of the finest wine for the occasion, but he did feel that the poor should not be completely forgotten in the midst of such lavish generosity. "Previously," he stated, money was given when the bride entered the church; wouldn't it be Christian to give to the poor chest also? We like to eat, drink, and celebrate at weddings. Certainly God allows this when nothing is done that is forbidden. Christ himself enjoyed wedding feasts and even gave the farmer good wine for the occasion. Wouldn't it, though, be a good thing if we attended to the hungry and the thirsty with a 'heller' or a 'pfennig' lest

13 Ibid.
we be reprimanded by God like the rich glutton when the poor Lazarus came to his door.\textsuperscript{14}

A degree of enjoyment and fun was certainly desirable but life should never be allowed to become totally selfish.

Bugenhagen then dealt with the custom of paying for bells to be rung at funerals. He allowed that enough should be given to compensate the sexton for his troubles but anything over that amount was to be put in the poor chest. Finally, Bugenhagen appealed for other donations for the relief of the poor, "However much good christian people are able to help the poor; their gifts belong to the chest."\textsuperscript{15}

The Lübeck Order also stressed free-will offerings as the main support of the poor chest. Bugenhagen reiterated that money spent on funerals and memorial masses would be put to better use in the poor chest as would excessive money spent for weddings and wedding celebrations. Money expended on other pious practices should also be given to the poor. Christians should not be

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
unfruitful, as Paul warned in Titus 3, like those who previously gave for vigil masses, votive lights, etc., and performed such duties as giving monks bread, meat, malt, candles, etc. These people should turn away from such practices and turn toward true service of God, that is, toward the necessities of the poor.\textsuperscript{16}

The Hamburg Order also stressed free-will offering for the support of the poor.

Working people should help with 'pfennig' and 'schilling' or whatever God moves them in their hearts to give. This cause will thereby be greatly helped without overburdening any particular person. Nevertheless not only will the soul benefit spiritually but also the means of livelihood will be given to the needy out of love and with a good conscience. This chest can also serve a valuable purpose in providing anonymity to a rich man who wishes to give large sums to the poor with only God knowing what he has done.\textsuperscript{17}

The poor chest revenues were, therefore, to be dependent upon charity. Bugenhagen's assumption was that everyone would give a little out of love and this would suffice to provide for those who deserved to be helped. In his directions for the distribution of these funds, it is clear that he expected an abundance of alms for he

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., V, 359.

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., p. 532.
ordered what was left over to be put in a centralized
fund. The whole system depended on the charity of every
man. Bugenhagen's continued emphasis on small donations
from most people and anonymity for major contributors was
designed to eliminate the sense of performing good works
for merit. By eliminating personal satisfaction as a
motivation, he hoped to eliminate a sense of merit. The
worthy poor would then be amply provided for from pure
evangelical motives.

The provisions for funding the church chest in
Braunschweig, Hamburg, and Lübeck were quite different
from the methods of providing for the poor. These chests
were funded through the traditional means of church sup-
port and were administered by the "Schatzkastenherren"
(supervisors of the chest). These chests were not placed
publicly in the church but were kept in the sacristy. In
Braunschweig, Bugenhagen provided for income for the
church in the following manner:

Memorials established by the church and kalends
(alms collected on the first of each month by
the Kalend Confraternity), bequests and the
income from benefices, of which the rightful
benefactor has died, should be placed in the
church chest. . . . Benefices belonging to
St. Peter's and St. Michael's should be
deposited in the church chest of St. Martin's
when they are vacant. This would facilitate
administration. . . . Also the quarterly money (a specific pious donation) that is collected should be given to support the preachers. 18

In addition to these stable sources of income, Bugenhagen added others. The money normally spent by guilds and confraternities for memorial and vigil masses were to be given to the church's common chest and lay people, who had benefices from which they supported a priest to say masses, now had to pay that sum to the church chest.

Provisions for support in Hamburg were similar. A fixed amount of four quarterly Lübeck "pfennige" was to be given by every man over twelve years of age for the support of pastors and chaplains. The income of all church property as well as the quarterly donation were to be deposited in the church chest and kept in the sacristy. Silver pictures and plate were not to be used but kept by the church as security. The income from benefices and bequests was to be put into this general fund as were gifts of gratitude for favors received. 19

18Ibid., VI/1, 453.

19Ibid., V, 533.
The Lübeck Order is more specific in some instances. Again the quarterly donation (collected on Easter, Pentecost, the feast of St. Michael, and Christmas) went into the church chest. It was to be collected in an open container which was to be placed in front of the altar near the choir. Every man over twelve was here, too, obligated to contribute. The rest of the provisions are virtually identical with those for Hamburg. There were provisions for patrons and rightful possessors of benefices to retain their legal income.\textsuperscript{20} Bugenhagen was most careful throughout his orders to allow those protected by law to retain their legal incomes. Those incomes reverted to the church only if the possessor freely gave them or if the benefices became vacant through death.

Although the Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel Order of 1543 provided for a poor box to be placed in the church, it was not administered separately but was brought to the supervisors of the common chest and placed in the general fund. The deacons of the poor were to collect money for the poor from the sources outlined in the three major

\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., p. 362.
orders of Braunschweig, Hamburg, and Lübeck. Income from benefices, memorials, consolations, stations, kalends, confraternities, guilds should be placed in the common chest. Bugenhagen retained the collection of the quarterly donation from all men over twelve years of age in the 1543 Order. If there were a shortage of funds, the monasteries' possessions were to be confiscated for the common chest for, "What should such cloister possessions be used for if not for the honor and service of God?"  

In the Schleswig-Holstein Order of 1542, Bugenhagen did not make specific provisions for the gathering of funds for church support or for poor relief. He merely stated that two elders of the parish were responsible for fulfilling the material obligations of the parish. These obligations included paying the pastor and school master as well as providing alms for the poor. He stressed the care of widows as the prime objective of poor relief and was satisfied to allow the old methods of collecting alms to remain. "Whatever was established for taking care of the poor in times past should be retained. Free-will offerings and collections on feast days should

\[21\] *Tbid.*, VI/1, 77.
also be taken by two supervisors or deacons.22 This was the extent of Bugenhagen's provisions for establishing a common chest in Schleswig-Holstein. The Hildesheim Order was merely an abridgement of the Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel Order of 1543.

The Pomeranian Order of 1535 is identical, in its provisions for relief, with the three major Orders. There are no particular provisions made for any local situation as the order applied to an entire territory rather than a specific city within the territory but the structures suggested for the various localities were similar to those for the cities. As in the principal orders, there was a provision for the pastor to call for a special collection in the event the poor chest would have insufficient funds to fulfill the obligations of charity. In this case, it was the responsibility of the deacons of the poor to take the collection which was to be gathered in the church and publicly put into the poor chest lest anyone would have cause to doubt how their alms were being spent.23

22 Richter, I, 358.

23 Sehling, IV, 336-337.
The basic organization of the chests and the means provided for funding them were similar in Braunschweig, Hamburg, Lübeck, and Pomerania. Poor relief was heavily emphasized but was subordinate to provisions for preaching, ceremonies, and schools. The fact that less attention was given to charitable obligations in the orders of Schleswig-Holstein, Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, and Hildesheim shows Bugenhagen's increasing awareness of the growing imperial threat to the evangelical faith. He became more concerned with the survival of the church than with the social problem of the poor. More and more emphasis came to be placed on preaching and teaching and the practical means of supporting these essential instruments of evangelical survival.

The sources of funds for poor relief were only one aspect of the problem of the establishment of the poor chest. Once the sources were determined, the actual money had to be collected and properly administered. Deacons of the poor were, therefore, to be elected as overseers of the chest. They were to work closely with the preachers, whose duty it was to admonish the people to be more generous in their charity toward the poor. What personal qualifications these deacons should possess has
already been discussed. What public or civic qualifications they should possess is an essential element of the entire organization.

In the Braunschweig Order there were provisions for three deacons to be elected for each chest. These deacons were to be chosen by the city council and by the individual parish communities throughout the city. The deacons of each parish had to keep accounts of their collections and disbursements and were responsible for these accounts to the city council and the Ten Men\(^{24}\) (a group of men from the city council, guilds, and civic leaders who met yearly to review the work of the city council. This council of Ten Men was established in 1513.)\(^{25}\)

Lübeck had similar provisions but the line of responsibility was different. In Lübeck there was a poor chest in each parish but the funds were not administered locally. There was a central poor chest in the Marienkirche where the funds from local poor chests were brought and centrally administered. The three deacons elected in

\(^{24}\)Ibid., VI/1, 453.

the individual parishes were called minor deacons of the poor. These three minor deacons were to record the collections and take the money and accounts to the five major deacons who supervised the central poor chest. The order did not stipulate how these various deacons were to be chosen. The personal qualities elaborated upon in the Braunschweig Order were repeated in Lübeck and a clear responsibility to the city council was provided for. There were, in Lübeck, fifteen minor deacons who had to meet weekly with the council.\footnote{26 Schling, V, 361.}

The organization of poor relief in Hamburg was very similar to that of Braunschweig. Only those funds that were left in each parish after local distribution of alms were gathered in a common fund. This common fund was supervised by all the deacons of the poor of the whole city. No provisions were made for any direct responsibility for this fund except that the deacons were generally responsible to the city council for its proper supervision. Undoubtedly these loose provisions of Braunschweig and Hamburg did not work out well, thus leading to a tighter organizational plan for Lübeck. With respect to who the
deacons were to be and how they were to be chosen, Bugenhagen referred Hamburg to the Braunschweig Order.

"Where and to whom people should give and which pious, upright, and christian men should be deacons is taken from Holy Scripture and written down in the Braunschweig Order." 27

The provisions for Pomerania in 1535 showed a greater flexibility since the order was to be applied to a variety of cities and towns.

Deacons or supervisors should be elected for the poor chest and related services. Two should be chosen from the city council and three or four from the citizenry. This applies in places with only one parish church. Where there is more than one parish church and each one has its own chest (which chests should all be brought together), more deacons should be elected according to need. 28

Bugenhagen reiterated that the deacons should be upright Christian men and reputable providers for their wives and children.

The provisions for supervisors of the common chests in the later orders of Schleswig-Holstein, Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, and Hildesheim remain the same as

27 Ibid., p. 532.

28 Ibid., IV, 337.
far as the types of men to be chosen. In Schleswig-Holstein two church trustees were to supervise all expenditures from the common chest in each city and village. There were no specific provisions for the selection of these men but they were directly responsible to the bishop and their immediate local civil authorities to whom they had to give an annual accounting of collections and expenditures. In accordance with the organization of the common chest, they paid the pastors, teachers, and other church-related employees as well as distributed alms to the poor. 29

The Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel Order resembles the Pomeranian Order.

For such a common chest or treasury for the poor and church employees, six supervisors or deacons should be elected. Two should be elected from the city council and four from the local citizenry. Such men should be honest men, not liars or drunks or swindlers but honest husbands with exemplary legal wives and children and should be full of the Holy Spirit and of wisdom. 30

Throughout all these orders there is the consistent demand for the deacons to be upright, Christian family

29 Richter, I, 358.

30 Sehling, VI/1, 78.
men. Bugenhagen did not waver from his first discussion of the deacons in his letter to Hamburg in 1525 until his final church order in 1543. The exemplary evangelical burgher was the acceptable deacon candidate. These men were not preachers or pastors but laymen. In every case, where specific qualifications were stated, at least one of the men had to be chosen by the city council (as in Braunschweig), but usually the number was two. These deacons supervised the collection and disbursement of both alms for the poor and salaries for church employees, yet were directly accountable to an ecclesiastical authority only in Schleswig-Holstein. Even there this accountability had to be shared between the bishop and the local civil authorities. In all other cases where accountability was specified it was to the city council and the municipality. The clergy had the role of admonishing the people to give by preaching the Gospel but the clergy did not directly participate in the administration of church income or the distribution of alms. This system, often called the secularization of poor relief, was, to Bugenhagen, merely the proper separation of responsibilities in an integral Christian community. Bugenhagen certainly did not originate the idea of civil control of
poor relief. Geiler von Kaisersberg had proposed that the civil government assume complete control of poor relief as early as 1501.\textsuperscript{31} Bugenhagen, however, instituted this system as a practical reality throughout the territories he reformed. All areas, in both Germany and Scandinavia, where Bugenhagen's orders were used as models adopted the same system of civil poor relief.

The recipients of the alms were generally categorized but their identification became much clearer in the discussion of the administration of alms. The orders are in general agreement as to who should be helped from the poor chest. "This common chest should be used for the relief of widows, orphans, the poor, the sick, the house poor, poor girls, and the like."\textsuperscript{32} These were the stipulations of \textit{Van dem Christen louen unde rechten guden wercken}. Braunschweig was more explicit but followed similar norms. Hamburg tended to repeat the conditions for being a member of the worthy poor but rearranged

\textsuperscript{31}Harold J. Grimm, "Luther's Contribution to Sixteenth Century Organization of Poor Relief," Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, LXI, 224.

\textsuperscript{32}Johann Bugenhagen, "Van dem Christen louen unde rechten guden Wercken," p. 261.
priorities.

All of the worthy poor should be helped from this poor chest. The most deserving of these are the house poor, especially the artisans and laborers whose misfortune does not stem from indolence or negligence but who are industrious, live a praiseworthy and upright life, and still are beset with misfortune and want through no fault of their own. Those who, through the lack of limbs or through illness, cannot support themselves, widows and orphans who have nothing and cannot work or support themselves and have no friends who are willing or able to take care of them should be provided for. They must lead praiseworthy lives and not be blasphemers, as Paul proscribes for widows in 1 Tim 5.33

The description is virtually the same as in the Braun-schweig Order except that in Hamburg the stress on the local poor is complete. Above all, Bugenhagen stressed that the obligation of poor relief was to the local community.

The Hamburg Order, following Paul's letter to Timothy, urged that husbands be found for young widows and poor maidens. If this were not possible then these women should be trained in order that they themselves could work and support themselves. Money from the poor chest could be used as modest dowries if a suitable husband

33 Sehling, V, 534.
could be found.

The provisions were continued with greater clarification of the possible conditions which justified the reception of alms. Artisans of good reputation who were in need, through no fault of their own, should be helped along with their wives and children. They should be admonished to repay the money given them and be given only enough for necessities and no more. The object of this was not to harm the poor by giving to them in excess of their needs. The deacons were to use good judgment in such matters.

Help was to be withheld from foreign beggars and others who could work or who did not need assistance. Such men were not to be welcomed in Hamburg. If such people were ill they were to be cared for even though they were strangers. Travellers could receive money, trousers, or shoes from the poor chest if they were recommended by a pious townsman or a preacher and if the gift would in no way deprive a local person of something he needed.

Bugenhagen also dealt with the problem of monks who would not join the evangelical movement and were beset by old age or illness, or who merely were irascible. These men should be provided for in order to help them
live good lives, not so they could remain in their evil ways. "They should not carouse and should know we will be forgiving with them in accordance with God's will. They should also be aware that we will not leave them in need."34 It at all possible, these men should be retrained as evangelical preachers and teachers. If this were not feasible, then they should be trained in a trade in order that they could support themselves. Bugenhagen allowed that whatever they believed was their problem and should be left to God. These monks were not to be allowed, however, to interfere with the spread of the evangelical faith.

The Lübeck Order began quite differently from that of either Braunschweig or Hamburg. "We must have a house for those whom God has burdened with the plague and for others who have nowhere to stay."35 The house or hospital was to be divided into two parts. One section was to be for those infected with the plague and one section for those who were not infected. Funds given for poor relief were, therefore, to provide a hospital and a poor house

34 Ibid., p. 535.

for the people of Lübeck.

Bugenhagen also stipulated that beggars were not allowed to remain in Lübeck if they were men capable of earning their own living. Travellers who fell sick in Lübeck while passing through were to be taken care of as long as necessary, that is, until they could again take up their journeys. In addition to sick travellers, poor travellers could also receive assistance if their need were attested to by a reputable citizen and if there were enough money in the poor chest to provide for all local needs. No stranger could be helped at the expense of the local people. The following shows that concern was also extended to the clergy.

Poor monks who are old and sick or who have led charitable and good lives, who have good reputations and who do not hinder the spread of the Gospel should be modestly provided for and be left to believe whatever they wish. If any of them wish to leave the cloisters they should be given adequate clothing and sufficient money and helped to learn whatever they can in order to earn an adequate living. 36

This same attention should also be extended to students in the city who were in need.

36 Ibid., p. 361.
Priests, whose incomes were derived from Masses, novenas, or choir obligations and who did not actively oppose the preaching of the evangelical faith, were also to be provided for. If they were too frightened or forbidden in conscience to ask for help from evangelical deacons, they should be treated like the house poor who were too ashamed to ask for charity. Bugenhagen allowed these people to remain anonymous and gave them aid secretly.

The Lübeck Order assumed much of what had been stated in the Braunschweig and Hamburg Orders. Bugenhagen therefore stressed those occasions, not specified in the previous orders, when assistance should be provided. Thus, in Lübeck, he emphasized the maintenance of a hospital, a shelter for the homeless, and aid for priests whose sources of livelihood had been terminated by the Reformation.

In 1535 Bugenhagen drew up the organizational plans for the evangelical church in Pomerania. He placed emphasis on his scriptural basis for organizing a system of poor relief but relied on his previous orders for a discussion of who should receive assistance. There is, however, evidence in the Pomeranian Order of a hardening
of his position against indiscriminate charity and a growing concern for the worthiness of the poor who received aid from the poor chest. "The poor who are to be registered should have the testimony of their neighbors that they live a praiseworthy life and are of good reputation." 37 Assistance was to be denied to godless men, idlers, or men who squandered what they had. "We have more than enough good poor people who are really in need even though we should be kind to our enemies." 38

Again Bugenhagen stressed help for those who could not earn their own living through no fault of their own. He urged the deacons to use their own discretion in determining who should be helped and who should not. He especially urged aid for those people who were suddenly taken ill and particularly for those women who were pregnant or had new-born babies.

Poor relief had ceased to be one of Bugenhagen's major concerns by the time of the promulgation of the Schleswig-Holstein Order of 1542. In this Order he stipulated only that a poor chest should be maintained by the

37 Ibid., IV, 337.

38 Ibid.
bishop, the dean, the burgomaster, and the city council. This chest should support a hospital and provide for poor relief. The only detail offered was a procedure for caring for the widows and orphans of evangelical preachers. These were not to be helped from the poor chest, however, but from regular parish income and then only for a limited period of time.\textsuperscript{39}

Poor relief became more important again in the Hildesheim and Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel Orders of 1543. As with the Schleswig-Holstein Order, these orders were not solely the work of Dr. Pomeranus. Both Hildesheim and Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel were cooperative efforts of Bugenhagen, Anton Corvinus, and Martin Görlitz. This order dealt extensively with the income from benefices. It encouraged those who had patronage rights over particular benefices to give their incomes to the common chest. If the chest was abundantly funded, they could direct the income toward the maintenance of a poor student or domestic servant. If the patron wished to be anonymous then he could appoint the deacons of the common chest to administer the income for him. It could then be used

\textsuperscript{39} Richter, I, 357-358.
either for ecclesiastical or educational expenses as well as for poor relief.

There were specific provisions made for assistance to be given to poor women and to hospitals. Money was not to be a criterion for acceptance into the hospital. The deacons of the common chest, the city council, and the clergy were to determine who deserved to be admitted and who did not. Needy townspeople who led good lives were those for whom the hospital was maintained.

There was a great deal of concern shown for the clergy who were caught in the difficult transition from Catholic ecclesiastical organization to evangelical church organization. Priests whose incomes were dependent on a liturgical chaplaincy and who did not resist the evangelical teaching were to retain their incomes for life. They had to be upright men and had to accept the new church order established in their territory. If their incomes were insufficient, they were to receive supplements from the common chest. Monks who wished to leave the cloisters should be assisted in finding a preaching position if they wished to find one. If they did not want to be preachers or pastors, they were to be trained for new jobs and money from the monastery was to be used to
support them during their training period. The same applied to nuns who wished to leave the convents.

Those who did not wish to leave their monasteries and convents were also to be provided for as long as they did not blaspheme against the gospel, gave up the mass and the common office, ceased wearing their religious habits, and severed their obedience to their religious orders. They were to study Scripture, read approved literature, and listen to evangelical sermons. They were also forbidden to accept new members into their convents and monasteries. Their liturgy was to conform to that prescribed by Bugenhagen in his *Pia et vere Catholica et consentiens veteri ecclesiae ordinatio caeremoniarum in ecclesiis Pomeraniae*. If any of the monks or nuns resisted the prescriptions of the order, their land was to be seized and their incomes withheld until such time as they did conform. The fact that Bugenhagen was referred to in the third person as Dr. Pomeranus in these provisions shows that he himself did not write them. He did, however, sign the order and therefore did approve its contents.

The order continued with provisions for aging and sick mendicants. These men were to be cared for regardless
of their acceptance or rejection of the evangelical faith. The church workers and those connected with the schools were especially singled out for assistance when they became disabled, sick, or old and could no longer function.40

Those who were to receive aid from the poor chests were clearly defined for each city or territory. Nevertheless in each case there was ample room allowed for the discretion of the local supervisors. As the poor chest disappeared and the common chest replaced it, there was a much heavier emphasis on provisions for charitable institutions such as hospitals and shelters for the homeless and less emphasis on individual relief. A greater concern also emerged for the dispossessed Catholic clergy which would seem to indicate a growing concern with ecclesiastical problems and a lack of attention to the more general problem of the plight of the poor. Poor relief was increasingly limited to the evangelical communities within given areas and cities. It appears that by 1542, at the latest, Bugenhagen's treatment of poor relief in the church orders is a treatment of

40 Schling, VI/1, 79-80.
ecclesiastical problems much more than an attempt to solve social problems. These two spheres certainly did overlap but a shift in emphasis from the poor to the church is very clear.

The individual elements of Bugenhagen's plans for the organization of poor relief have been presented. There remains the problem of how these elements coalesced into the actual implementation of the collection and distribution of alms. These practical matters were dealt with in the directions for the administration of the poor chests or common chests. The definition of authority over the funds and the provisions for the practical functioning of the deacons of the poor show how the whole system was supposed to actually work.

In the Braunschweig Order, Bugenhagen began with directions for the collection of free will offerings. After admonishing the deacons of the poor not to be ashamed of their office, he stated that they should go around the church on all holy days, both before and after the sermons, with a pouch. The pouch should have small bells attached in order that the people will know they are there without having to speak or converse. Whoever does not give willingly should not be compelled to give because Paul says 2 Corinthians 9,7 that God loves a joyful giver. There should be two deacons. One
should go up one aisle, the other up the other aisle. Everything collected should be placed in the poor chest.\textsuperscript{41}

The preachers were supposed to admonish the people to give to these collections. Exhortations from the pulpit were the only type of pressure to be exerted on the people in the solicitation of alms for the poor.

The deacons were to be cautious in the distribution of alms and were to be neither too tightfisted nor too willing to part with alms. Bugenhagen's Braunschweig Order remained faithful to the principles laid down in his letter to Hamburg in 1525 where he said,

These men the deacons of the poor should distribute the goods in an honest and upright way. . . . They should be God-fearing and wise townsmen who are not seeking their own pleasure or their own profit. Neither should they be so naive as to give to everyone nor should they be deceived by any liar or lazy rogue. From time to time, they will be deceived, as are all men who work diligently, but this does no real harm. On the other hand, they should not be so uncharitable as to want to give no one anything and would not reduce or cancel the debt of a poor man to whom they have loaned money and who wishes to repay it but is unable because of his poverty.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{41}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 451.

\textsuperscript{42}Johann Bugenhagen, "Van dem Christen louen under rechten guden wercken," p. 261.
To insure responsible management of the poor chest, Bugenhagen insisted that accurate records be kept of all transactions. The deacons were to write down how much money they collected and the name and address of those to whom they gave alms as well as the amounts given. This allowed them to know who received the money and to determine if these people deserved continued assistance. The records were to be reviewed by the city council and the Ten Men. After this accounting, all surplus funds were to be gathered into a central place. Bugenhagen did not specify where this was to be. The amount brought in from each parish was then recorded and the general fund preserved for community crises such as the plague or famine.

The deacons themselves were to meet weekly in the individual parish churches where the poor would come to collect alms. The deacons would also determine how much money would be given to those who were ill and to the house poor. In the event that there were insufficient funds for all the demands, the preachers were to exhort the faithful to contribute to the poor chest in order to provide alms for the worthy house poor. The names of the house poor were not to be made public but the deacons
had to record them "to avoid scandal or suspicion." 43 All other poor had to personally appear to receive alms in order that their true need be subject to public scrutiny.

Bugenhagen had to deal with the problem of beggars also. Students were not to beg but were to come to the church with the other poor. This was to prohibit other beggars from posing as students and thereby fleecing the local people. Beggars from out of the city or those who could work but didn't, should be prohibited from begging and should be banished from the city.

The obligation of providing a hospital for Braunschweig where the sick could be cared for in times of plague fell to the supervisors of the church chest. The deacons of the poor, however, had to recruit and pay workers to care for the plague victims. If the local people would not release their servants and maids for hospital duty, the deacons themselves must feed, give drink, bandage, nurse, and clean the beds for the poor. All good people should be willing to help them. If those afflicted with the plague were adequately cared for, a

43 Sehling, VI/1, 451.
person could go and help other people but to leave plague victims unattended was declared an evil and pagan thing to do.

There is little difference in the administrative procedures for Braunschweig and for Hamburg. Bugenhagen stipulated that the Hamburg deacons were also to keep accurate written accounts of collections and disbursements and were cautioned against being stingy or extravagant in their charity. They were to employ an investigator and a secretary who could keep accurate accounts as well as be able to write well. The secretary was to be paid on the basis of his worth and the amount of work he did.

The deacons of each parish were to meet in their respective parishes every Saturday in order to distribute alms. All the income from the hospitals was to be put into the poor chest. This included the income from the Holy Spirit Hospital, Saint Ileseben Hospital, and the special smallpox hospital. These incomes were specifically mentioned in relationship to the distribution of alms because all hospitals, except Saint George's, were under the supervision of the deacons of the poor. Saint George's hospital was directly under the supervision of
the city council. Bugenhagen warned that the hospitals were to be run in such a way that they didn't drain all the funds from the poor chest. In addition to the existing hospital, a special hospital should be built for the care of plague victims. As had been provided for in the Braunschweig Order, it was to have several rooms so that the uninfected poor who used the facility could be safe from infection. The poor were to be cared for in this new hospital rather than in those already established. All gifts given for this hospital were to be deposited in the poor chest.

The deacons also shared responsibility for keeping accounts or regular incomes from benefices with the city council. Those patrons of benefices who willingly spent their income on students and poor people could give this income to the deacons for distribution in which case the deacons were responsible to both the patron and the city council for the appropriation of the income. Thus, in matters of wills and set incomes, the deacons became immediately responsible to the testator or patron as well as to the city council.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{44}Ibid., V, 532-534.
The provisions for administrative procedure in Lübeck vary according to the different organizational structures of the Lübeck poor chest. At a specified hour on each Saturday, the three minor deacons were to go to church and, with their keys, open the three locks of the poor chest. They were to count all the money, record the amount, and take it to the central poor chest in the Marienkirche. The five major deacons then recorded each parish's contributions and took charge of allotting the amounts to be given to those in immediate need such as the sick and poor women. The minor deacons brought their list of the needy of their parish with them to the Marienkirche. In cases of emergency, the minor deacons could take money directly from the local poor chest at any time during the week but this was not to be done unless there was a true emergency.

If any individual parish did not have adequate funds to respond to all the needs of the poor, especially the house poor, it could be subsidized from the central poor chest. This meant it could spend more than had been collected there. It was important that these house poor were registered so that a close watch could be kept on their needs and their use of the alms received. This
careful accounting was to make sure that funds were not
given to the godless or the lazy who were also to be
barred from the hospitals lest they take places or funds
away from the good and worthy poor people of Lübeck.

The local citizens could go to the deacons and
register the poor who were unknown to the deacons. If
the local citizen was known to be upright and honest, his
testimony of another's need was sufficient to procure
relief.

The establishment of a hospital for the care of
those infected with the plague was the first priority set
by Bugenhagen. The care of the plague victims was the
responsibility of the five major deacons who were to
insure that there were people available to nurse the
patients, feed them, supply firewood for heating the hos-
pital and provide for clean bedding and bandages. Bugen-
hagen said it would have been sinful to neglect these
obligations and stipulated that the deacons were also to
insure that all plague victims were brought to the hos-
pital for there was a danger that those not confined to
the hospital itself would infect others. The object of
the hospital was to care for the plague victims and to
confine the disease.
One section of the religious houses was to be used as a shelter for the indigent poor and those with diseases other than the plague. Living areas for the house poor who had nowhere else to live were to be established in the other sections of the convents. The five deacons were responsible for their welfare and care. In many cases those who were ill were not poor and so should pay for their hospitalization or, if relations or friends could afford to help a patient, they were bound to do so.

The poor chest was to pay for the services of midwives for poor women and the five major deacons and two members of the city council were to insure that there would be midwives when needed and money to pay them. If a woman could afford to pay for the services of a midwife, she was obligated to do so.

The major deacons were to have the right and the means of collecting extra money from the local citizens to provide for the needs of the house poor. This provision seems to imply a right to tax, but Bugenhagen only said the "power to gather extra funds."\footnote{Ibid., p. 361.}
to be used with great discretion and needed the approval of the city council and the fifteen minor deacons of the city.

Bugenhagen again demanded that begging by those who could work must be forbidden. He did not include poor travellers who fell sick. Since the distribution of funds fell under the supervision of the major deacons and four city council members, it was their combined responsibility to regulate begging.

As in the other orders, the deacons were to hire a competent secretary and bookkeeper. This man was to receive a just salary for his services and was to be selected on the basis of his skills as well as his moral character. The investigator who was hired by the deacons should also be justly paid and should, if possible, be a poor man who needed money.

Bugenhagen completed his discussion of poor relief in Lübeck by saying: "With such work and with great benefit the poor townsmen and upright priests can be cared for. In this manner they can be made contributing citizens and not harmful to society." 46

46 Ibid., p. 362.
Bugenhagen's statement of the need for a poor chest in Pomerania in 1535 stressed the coercive role of the preachers. He repeatedly urged the preachers to exhort the people to give generously to the relief fund for the poor. The role of the preachers was outlined in the preceding orders also but was given special emphasis in the Pomeranian Order.

The terms of the Pomeranian Order were necessarily more vague but not different than those for specific cities. There were to be four or five keys for each chest and these were to be held by the elected deacons for a year at a time. In other words, the deacons were elected to a one-year term. At the end of the year, a new election was held but at least two of the old deacons were to remain in office to provide continuity of administration. These deacons were to inform the preachers when to preach on the obligation of making donations to the poor chest and were also partially responsible for the maintenance of hospitals. They shared the hospital responsibilities with the local city councils. Bugenhagen said that if people could be cared for privately it was better to do so and funds from the poor chest could be used to assist those willing to privately care for the sick or
the homeless. In places too small to support a hospital, a home had to be subsidized for the care of the indigent and the ill.

The deacons were to keep an account book of the income and another book was to contain expenditures or disbursement of funds. Both of these accounts were to be matters of public record and a yearly audit of the books was to be prescribed and verified by the city council, the supervisors of the church chest, four local elders, four ordinary workers, and the local pastor. These were the same people who elected the deacons of the poor each year. In the event that either the poor chest or the church chest ran out of funds, the money in one chest could be used to help pay the expenses of the other chest. This was the final step in joining the two chests into a common chest exactly as Luther had done in 1523.47

The structure of poor relief in Schleswig-Holstein was part of the larger structure of church administration. All church income was under the supervision of the church supervisor and two trustees who were responsible to the area dean. City parishes were to have at least

two supervisors while one was sufficient for rural parishes. The two trustees were to insure that the supervisors handled church finances honestly and reasonably. Part of this responsibility was to provide for the relief of the poor according to customary norms.

The only specific provision for the administration of relief funds, aside from the provisions for the use of church income to provide for the widows of pastors, was for the establishment of hospitals for the sick and the poor. This responsibility fell to the bishop and the city council. Deacons of the poor were to be chosen by the bishop, the pastor, and the city council and were to give an annual accounting to those who chose them.48

The order for Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel of 1543 was more specific in the treatment of church income and financial responsibilities. There was a common chest only and this was supervised by six deacons of the chest. Two of these deacons were from the city council and four were townsmen from the local parish. These deacons were to meet every Sunday afternoon after the sermon and appropriate money for the poor whose names had been

48 Richter, I, 357-358.
registered and whose eligibility for relief had been established. The deacons were to hire a secretary who was skilled in bookkeeping and was an exemplary Christian citizen.

Annually, during the week before Palm Sunday, the deacons had to go to the city hall for the auditing of their accounts by the city council and church officials. The Sunday before this audit there was to be a public announcement from all the pulpits stating when the audit would take place. Anyone with a complaint was free to appear at the city hall and voice his grievance or make suggestions for improvements to be made in the disbursement of funds. At the end of the audit, the two deacons who were members of the city council were to resign as were the four local people. The pastors and the city council then elected the new deacons for the following year. One of the city council members who had just resigned was reelected as were two of the four local parishioners thus three of the previous deacons were experienced while another three were newly elected. The three who were not reelected remained as substitutes and advisers to the new deacons for a period of two years.
after which they were completely free of all obligations to the diaconate.

The common chest itself had three keys. One of these keys was kept by a deacon from the city council, another by a deacon from the local parish, another by a church trustee. After the first visitation, the key was taken from the church trustee and given to the pastor. Whenever the deacons determined that funds should be appropriated for poor relief, the three men with keys would open the chest and allow the specific amount to be removed. The same process was employed when the church and school employees were paid. The legitimate uses of the funds for poor relief were carefully outlined and have already been discussed.

There were special provisions made for the establishment and administration of the hospitals. The deacons of the common chest were responsible for the hospitals but could choose as many as four special administrators if this were necessary. They were to oversee the admission of the sick and the poor but their judgment on which poor were to be given shelter and care was subject to the approval of the church trustees, the city council, and the deacons of the common chest. The poor had to be
tow people who led good lives and were not responsible
for their poverty. Care should be given to the standards
of cleanliness maintained in private homes in an attempt
to curb the spread of disease. This was the responsi-
bility of those who supervised the hospitals. These
hospital administrators were subject to reappointment
each year by the new deacons of the common chest but they
did not have to be changed or rotated, merely reconfirmed
or dismissed as the deacons saw fit. Finally, the
preacher had to pay a weekly visit to the hospital and
deliver a sermon for the edification of the poor and the
sick.

As impending political crises appeared and as
Luther became ill and disenchanted, Bugenhagen tended to
remain closer to Wittenberg. Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel
was his last major organizational effort for the evangeli-
cal church. From 1543 until his death, his energy was
spent in the service of the Wittenberg church and uni-
versity. Pressure from the Emperor and the growing
disorders in Germany continually forced Bugenhagen's
attention to more practical matters of ecclesiastical
structure. What had begun as a social ideology derived
from the content of faith was tempered by the practical
realities of widespread poverty, restlessness among the newer classes within the cities, and finally by the sheer need for evangelical survival. Bugenhagen responded to these pressures, adapting himself and his organizational reforms to local and provincial needs. In Lübeck where the populous was rebellious and the council reactionary, there was an espousal of the townsmen's cause and an offer for the city council to join the citizenry rather than battle it. In Pomerania, where Erasmus von Manteuffel struggled so futilely to preserve the Roman Church, Bugenhagen showed great concern for the dispossessed and uprooted Catholic clergy. In Schleswig-Holstein, where his good friend Christian prevailed as duke, Bugenhagen let things stand as they were with only minor additions to the traditions of centuries.

Where there was social unrest within the cities, Bugenhagen espoused the cause of the townsmen and used poor relief as a tool of reconciliation and the transference of power from the clerics and aristocrats to the middle class. Where there was order, he accepted the structures which already existed. Where there was real adherence to the past in social structures and values he treaded lightly. In each instance he responded to the
local situations. His ideology was flexible and adaptable and his motivation was permanency and stability for the evangelical faith. Every other consideration was secondary. Poor relief was, therefore, a subsidiary function in the creation of an evangelical community and was emphasized or neglected depending on the ability of the new church to adapt and to survive.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

Before 1525 the evangelical movement had spontaneously erupted throughout Germany. The first taste of spiritual freedom had created an atmosphere of optimism which dominated the hearts and the minds of men, leaving them confident that an age had dawned in which nothing could stop the inevitable progress of the new spirit. The Peasants' War brought this heady vision crashing down in sorrow and tragedy, forcing those who had positions of leadership within the movement to salvage the reform from anarchy and chaos. Bugenhagen was one of the first and most determined of the men who had to grapple with the practical problems of introducing structure, order, and stability into what had begun as a truly charismatic movement. Despite a combination of many and diverse factors, it remains an impressive tribute to his success that Scandinavia and North Germany, the areas, either directly or indirectly, organized by
Bugenhagen are, even today, the most solidly and consistently Lutheran part of the modern world.

It is within this framework of church organization that the question of poor relief must be viewed. As early as 1523, Luther addressed himself to the problem of the use of confiscated church property as many opportunists had seen the break with Rome as an occasion to be used for plunder and personal gain. In his preface to the Leisnig Order, Luther attempted to provide a means of controlling ecclesiastical property and of preserving this same property for use in Christian service. Poor relief was the solution he found to insure Christian use of property. It was a solution which had dominated the thought, if not always the practice, of the medieval church for centuries and certainly must be considered a traditional solution to an ancient problem. The situation was considerably more complicated, however, and a major organizational effort had to be undertaken. Men cannot maintain for long the enthusiasm necessary to live an ideal. Eventually there must be structure, organization, and law to preserve whatever charismatic gains have been made in bursts of enthusiasm and vision.
Bugenhagen's systems of poor relief cannot be taken in themselves and linked to Catholic or humanist sources but must be taken as one part of a major organizational effort aimed at spreading and stabilizing the Reformation. The experience of the Peasant's War had taught Bugenhagen that religious stability was inseparable from social stability. He therefore, used poor relief to insure social stability for religious reasons, not as a pragmatic response to socio-economic problems, or a humanitarian response to the suffering of mankind. The purpose of poor relief in Bugenhagen's church orders was two-fold. It was a necessary part of Christian life as described and commanded in Scripture and it was a useful tool to introduce social stability and values into a fluctuating and potentially explosive society.

Because there is such a vast amount of personal testimony by Bugenhagen himself concerning the sources of his thought on poor relief, there is little value in idle speculation on the origins of his ideas. Religiously, according to the primary evidence available, the systems of poor relief flow from evangelical theology. In the hundreds of pages of explanation which Bugenhagen produced, it is clear that the primary motivation to
charity rests in the relationship between a saving God and sinful man. Man's response to this salvific relationship is gratitude and obedience. Bugenhagen searched the Bible to discover how man expressed gratitude for salvation and what commands there were to obey. His conclusions were that proper gratitude was an act of worship and could be expressed in good works performed out of a selfless love of neighbor and in obedience to the command to love one another. This particular command to love one another, the command which made poor relief obligatory, was further embellished in specific commands throughout Scripture, particularly in the Pauline epistles and the Acts of the Apostles. The fundamental motivation for poor relief was an internal ethical relationship between an obedient man and a saving God, a position quite distinctive and independent of the Nürnberg city council, Juan Luis Vives, and Catholic canon law. This individual motivation was given communal dimensions by the Holy Spirit who would infuse the gathering of individuals and make them a community of saints. To insure the evangelical interpretations of poor relief, Bugenhagen made provisions to restrain excessive giving in an attempt to reduce the element of personal satisfaction, thus curbing
the danger of preserving a desire for merit.

It could be argued that this religious issue is peripheral to the more central question of the interdependence of sixteenth-century provisions for poor relief. Such an argument is weak for two reasons. The first is that the primary sources do not substantiate the charge of the irrelevance of religious motivation. Bugenhagen spent a great deal of his time in writing on poor relief, emphasizing the religious dimensions of the problem and the evangelical justification for involvement in the issue. He was also explicit and firm in the acknowledgement of his indebtedness to Luther and to Scripture. Not once among his frequent citations of sources did he claim reliance on humanist sources or civic documents and only in Schleswig-Holstein did he leave the old mechanisms of poor relief intact. The second weakness of the argument is that poor relief was dealt with as a part of the whole problem of church and community organization. The problem of the poor is a part of a single program to organize ceremonies, schools, pastoral responsibilities, preaching, and sacraments. The fact that implementation of all of this was made the responsibility of civil authority cannot be misconstrued as secularization of
intent and interest for, as has already been argued, civil authority was seen as a part of the Christian community and not as an outside secular force. Again, Bugenhagen made poor relief part of a general program to extend and stabilize the Reformation. To deny his evangelical motivations would be to question the religious motivations of the reformers themselves and I am not prepared to take the position that the Reformation was a humanist and/or secular movement in its origins and intent.

If the introduction of poor relief into the church orders, although done so primarily for religious motives, was also an attempt to provide for social stability, then Bugenhagen's understanding of societal values is important. In this most difficult question, a person's own environmental background and personal experience cannot be neglected. Bugenhagen was a townsman and a member of the middle class who attended a university and became a schoolmaster in Treptow, both at the Marienkirche and at Belbuk abbey. When he left Treptow, he went to Wittenberg and subsequently to the urban centers of northern Germany and Denmark. There is no evidence that he had any first-hand knowledge of the peasantry or the rural way of life, except perhaps viewing it as a traveler on his
journeys from city to city. His understanding of societal values was conditioned and formed by his urban middle-class experience, an understanding which helped to form his concept of good men and therefore good Christians. That the upright middle-class citizen was the prime candidate for election as a deacon of the poor clearly shows the overlapping of the idea of the ideal burgher and the ideal Christian. The cultural impact did not end with the qualities sought in the deacons, but also in the rules for those who were worthy to receive aid. The recipients of aid had to be either unable to help themselves or merely temporarily hindered from becoming self-sufficient. Anyone who did not accept self-sufficiency as a value was not allowed to remain within the city or town. This spirit, which exalted the virtues of hard working townsmen, led to the prohibition of begging. In a spirit of charity, temporary exceptions were made for the Catholic clergy who were too old, sick, or inflexible, to accept the evangelical church but this was an immediate problem which would eventually eliminate itself through death. This type of aid was not established on a long-term basis.
This view of society coexisted with the problem of widespread begging and poverty. Since the middle class was a mobile class always in flux and constantly striving to arrive at a different social level, it was not as prone to give away money as would be a settled nobleman or affluent peasant whose social position was static. There was, then, a decline in loose money concomitant with an increase in the number of beggars who absorbed the limited surplus and whose presence put pressure on the community to part with more than they cared to part with. If the demands of the beggars exceeded the supply of available alms, there would be a potentially explosive social situation. If society was to be stabilized, the problem of begging had to be controlled and the position of the wage earner strengthened. The Nürnberg Ordinance attempted to legislate against begging and placed strict controls on what little of it was allowed. Bugenhagen did not dwell at length on the question but stressed the positive limitations on charity while Juan Luis Vives proposed vigorous legislation to eliminate all begging in Bruges.

Throughout northern Europe, the earliest poor relief systems were proposed by members of the city
councils, humanists, or, as in Bugenhagen's case, clergymen. The proposed solutions, therefore, came from members of the urban middle class. This fact is at least as important as the ability to trace direct interdependencies among the various poor relief systems. Felix Pischel claimed that Bugenhagen's practical system of poor relief was derived from the Ypres Ordinance of 1525 which in turn was related to the original plan of Vives in 1526. The problem with this line of argumentation is that Bugenhagen had already established his plans for poor relief by 1530, a year before Ypres had received wide publicity from the Sorbonne's condemnation of it and two years before Vives' plan was published in Germany. Whatever direct relationships existed between Bugenhagen's plans and those of the various cities would be difficult to determine for Bugenhagen himself does not admit any dependence except on Luther and therefore, by inference, on the Leisnig and Wittenberg Orders. It is significant that Bugenhagen's response was rather a typical response of the middle class than a studied reconstruction of a system developed by a particular city or person.
Bugenhagen therefore can be said to have viewed poor relief as a basically religious problem which had to be implemented within the general structure of church organization. One of the primary reasons for organizing the church was to insure an extension of the evangelical faith and create a stable social situation within which it could exist. A stable social situation was understood as one which protected the rights and values of the urban middle class. These factors constituted the basic elements of Bugenhagen's poor relief systems which he incorporated in his church orders for some of the most important cities and territories of reformation Germany.
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