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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

On the eve of the Reformation the free imperial city of Nürnberg was at the height of her international prestige as a center of commerce, industry, and culture. Her merchants roamed the furthest reaches of Europe in pursuit of raw materials and new markets. No fewer than twelve major trade routes converged upon her territory. Her handicrafts were considered among the finest anywhere. Her precision navigational instruments, clocks, and metal wares, ranging from heavy cannon to finely turned needles, were recognized as having no equal with regard to the integrity and quality control with which they were made. Her artists, creative craftsmen, and humanist scholars made her the center of the Renaissance in Germany, as the names of Albrecht Dürer, Veit Stoss, Adam Kraft, Peter Vischer, Willibald Pirckheimer, Lazarus Spengler, and Hans Sachs, to name a few, testify. The pre-eminence of this South German city, which even Augsburg could not yet rival, was not due to mere chance. A well educated and wealthy patriciate was proverbial throughout Europe for its wise and prudent management of not only business affairs, but also government and foreign policy. The city was considered to be a familial organism, and its city fathers managed all aspects of society as the head of any good household would. Nothing that occurred within the city's walls or territorial boundaries was outside the realm of the
governing council's concerns.

The rights and privileges that made Nürnberg a free, imperial
city had been won and sometimes fought for over several centuries. For
the sustenance of an ever increasing populace the city had to expand
the territory outside her walls. Security meant self-subsistence.
Nürnberg could only grow at the expense of her neighboring territorial
lords, the margraves of Brandenburg-Ansbach-Kulmbach of the house of
Hohenzollern, the Wittelsbachs of the Upper Palatinate, and the bishops
of Bamberg. The last great territorial expansion came as a result of
the Bavarian War of Succession, in which Nürnberg sided with the Duke
of Bavaria and the Swabian League, of which it was a member, against
the Elector of the Palatinate in 1504. The territory won by the city
for its part in the winning cause more than doubled its previous area,
and as a result left the boundaries between it and the Wittelsbachs
rather clearly defined. Such was not the case in its relations with
the margraves where the territories of the two overlapped geographi­
cally and jurisdictionally in that bewildering array that characterizes
feudal Germany. Peace between the two was always precarious, and often
erupted into war.¹

Relations with the bishops of Bamberg were better. Slowly but
surely over the course of the years, Nürnberg had gained effective
ecclesiastical control over its domains, usually with the aid of the
emperors. By the turn of the century the council had gained patronage
rights over the city's two parishes, St. Sebald and St. Lorenz, and
control over the revenues and expenditures of all churches, hospitals
and convents in the city.² In March, 1525, Nürnberg made its religious
independence complete by accepting the evangelical teachings of Luther.

As an imperial city, Nürnberg owed allegiance only to the emperors. But for protection, she could not depend on the emperors. Still she did not join the Swabian League, a defensive alliance of South German cities and princes, until 1500. Prior to that date, the cost of membership apparently outweighed the advantages which the city saw for itself by joining the League. Afterwards she took an active role in trying to make her own interests those of the League. Increasingly her political interests became entangled in her religious views.

The War of the Bavarian Succession had brought Nürnberg, besides additional territory, perhaps as many rural subjects as she had had prior to the war. Estimates of the total rural population range anywhere from 40,000 to 50,000 for the first years of the sixteenth century. A wider discrepancy occurs for estimates of the urban population, but it might be safely put at 25,000 to 35,000. A recent study of the social and economic breakdown of the city's inhabitants suggests that 6-8% of the population was made up of the wealthy and very wealthy, the great merchant families of Nürnberg. Beneath them ranged what might be called a middle stratum of master craftsmen and local merchants and shopkeepers, numbering perhaps 60% of the total urban population. About a third of the population belonged to the lower stratum of society.

Within each of these broad divisions, one can designate further stratifications. But first a word should be said about coinage in the city and its relative buying power in the sixteenth century. The
basic unit of coinage was the silver Pfennig (denarius, d.). Smaller than the Pfennig was the Heller (hl.), two of which equaled 1d. Six d. were equivalent to one Schilling (solidus, s.). Five s. made up one "old" pound (lb.), a coin of account which did not circulate. For accounting large sums, there was also a "new" pound, equivalent to four "old" lb. The gold coin minted in Nürnberg was the Gulden (florin, fl.), officially worth eight old lbs., but increasing in value throughout the century as silver coins deteriorated.6

As for the cost of living around 1500, beef and pork sausages cost 4 d. per pound, pork and lamb, 5 d. per pound. Poultry products were luxury items, with eggs costing 2 d. for three, and chickens costing 20 d. each. Salt herring, a staple, cost 2-3 hl. Milk was 2 d. per pint and a half measure. Beer was 3 hl. to 2 d. per quart, depending on its quality. Bread was 1-2 hl. per pound loaf. With regard to clothing, a plain cloth coat cost at least 3 lbs. A pair of shoes cost about 1 lb.7 Prices, of course, fluctuated, depending upon where the purchaser did his or her shopping, and of what quality the goods and food stuffs.

At the very top of society were 42 families, Nürnberg's great merchant and manufacturing families. These were the patricians, men rich enough to live for politics, not from politics, as Max Weber formulated it. As of 1521, they were an exclusive class, defined as those who formally were asked to dance at the town hall, and from whose ranks 34 of the 42 members of the Small Council, the governing body of the city, could be chosen. They were the government, and the only authority, in Nürnberg. These 42 families were themselves
divided into three further classifications, based on the length of time they had been patrician. Beneath these socially and politically, but still of the uppermost class of society, were 300-400 “Honorable” families, who made up the large council which was summoned in times of emergency, not for advice usually, but to be informed of the situation confronting the city. These, too, consisted of merchants, but also included lawyers, physicians, trained officials, and the most important master craftsmen and artists.

The middle range of the city’s populace covered a large economic spectrum from the masters of the specialized crafts upon which Münster's export trade depended to the masters of the local crafts which were found in every city and town. No doubt, one’s economic status depended upon his own skills in large part. Those who turned out piece goods enjoyed a higher income than, those whose work was seasonal or amounted to no more than skilled labor, such as the building trades. The city council's control over the crafts was complete as a result of a revolt of the guilds in 1348-1349, after which guilds were forever abolished. Thus the council could effectively control prices and wages. Inflation was every city dweller's enemy, but, at least in the period covered by this study, was contained in Münster.

To establish a somewhat arbitrary figure for annual income, above which one could support a moderately sized family at a moderate level, barring unforeseen circumstances, and below which one could be considered to be living at subsistence level, that of 150 lbs. will suffice. This would be the approximate income of the average journeyman of the building trades, based on records of the city's construction
office (Bauamt), with their masters earning 20–30% more. Most craft journeymen would fall within this income range of 150–200 lbs. To call this group poor could possibly be an exaggeration based on twentieth-century perspectives. In normal times, the council’s close supervision of the economy made their living fairly secure. Certainly Münnerberg did not have a large volatile population of dependent wage earners, simply because its close control of apprenticeship did not allow the accumulation of large numbers of unattached workers, and its ruling patriciate had no intention of allowing experimentation with the putting-out system. Münnerberg’s patriciate merchants were content with small, sure profits. The possibility of great profits through entrepreneurship of the kind that built great fortunes in Augsburg was not worth the risk of upsetting the stable society which had been so carefully nurtured. To say that there was no urban discontent would, of course, be unrealistic, and one of the purposes of this study is to explore the possibility of such discontent manifesting itself in the Radical Reformation.

At the bottom of society were the indigenous poor, the ill and infirm, widows, orphans, the unemployed and unemployable, whose very survival depended upon the charitable agencies of the city, which, with the exception of private benefactors, were also controlled by the council, even before the city accepted the Reformation. In addition to these unfortunates there were society’s outcasts—vagrants, beggars, prostitutes, grave diggers, privy cleaners, and others whose only employment was to do what no one else would do, but whose services were indispensible to the operation of the city. As long as these
persons did not seek to supplement their incomes by engaging in
criminal pursuits, they also enjoyed the patronage and protection
of the city fathers.\textsuperscript{13}

In all respects, one would have to say that the people of
Nürnberg had as high, if not higher, standard of living as those of
most cities in the Empire. Government, to be sure, was totally in
the hands of a small patriciate, but they took their offices of
Christian magistracy seriously. The analogy to a corporate family
is not an exaggeration. Nor is it an exaggeration to say that in
every action undertaken by the council, however great or small its
consequences, the overriding motivation of the city fathers was their
concern for maintaining and providing for the welfare of all the
city's inhabitants.

Nevertheless, beginning in 1524, the council was confronted
with dissent among the city's populace, dissent which overwhelmingly
took the form of religious heterodoxy despite the council's conversion
to the evangelical faith in the spring of 1525. In the following
pages the nature of that dissent will be discussed, with special
attention being given to the kinds of people who turned to radical
teachings rather than to the evangelical faith as interpreted by
the city preachers of Nürnberg and backed by the city council. More
important, however, than a mere statistical analysis of the Radical
Reformation in Nürnberg, will be the examination of the social content
and appeal of the writings and sermons of the radical leaders, as
well as the opinions of the followers of the various movements.
That is to say, this study is concerned with individuals and not
with numbers primarily, and one of the main concerns in dealing with those individuals is to understand what they believed, as well as what the leaders of the movements taught.

In the first half of this study, those persons still best characterized by Luther's generic term Schwärmer, which translates into English as "fanatics" or "enthusiasts," will be discussed. Until the advent of the Anabaptists in South Germany in 1526, the term covered persons as diverse in their theological views as Thomas Müntzer and Ulrich Zwingli. In addition to this, the term "sacramentarian" was often used interchangeably with Schwärmer to designate those who did not accept Luther's doctrine of the real presence in the Sacrament of the Altar, thus also including a broad spectrum of diverse views. Attempts to coin more exact terms to distinguish the various streams within the general movement of the Radical Reformation have not been totally successful. Thus the attempt will be made to follow the terminology as used in the sources, supplying the German where an English translation may be ambiguous. Worth pointing out, however, is the fact that the terms Schwärmer, "fanatic," or "radical" are not synonymous with "social revolutionary," in the sense of one willing to use violence to effect social or economic change. Instead, the officials of Nürnberg generally refer to such persons as "rebels" (aufrurer) and in the use of the term make a clear distinction between religious radicals and social revolutionaries.

The second half of the study, covering the years 1527-1530, is concerned primarily with the Anabaptist movement as it touched...
Nürnberg and especially the villages surrounding the city, including the area north of Nürnberg which was not properly a legal part of Nürnberg territory, but which nevertheless was treated as if it were when the city felt it to be in its best interests.
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CHAPTER II

THE BEGINNINGS OF RADICAL DISSENT

A. The Peasant from Wöhrd

The first person to gain a popular following in Nürnberg which the city council at length found alarming was Diepold Beringer, known at the time only as "the peasant from Thon" or "the peasant from Wöhrd," after the two villages near Nürnberg where he first began preaching. Posing as an illiterate peasant, Beringer began preaching in December, 1523, and by the opening of the Reichstag in Nürnberg in January, 1524, was already drawing large crowds composed of rural peasants, city dwellers, and even high ranking representatives to the Reichstag. Among those favorably impressed was Georg Spalatin, Luther's friend and the secretary to the Elector of Saxony, Frederick the Wise. But as Beringer's popularity increased, so did the apprehensions of the city council, which on February 23, 1524, ordered him to desist from public preaching. Beringer continued to preach, however, and on February 29, the council reiterated its order for him not to preach in public, but with the qualification that he could accept invitations to private homes to act as a spiritual guide. That the council, too, was favorably impressed by Beringer, or at least not immediately hostile, is apparent from its response to an inquiry from the Archduke Ferdinand, who apparently had been receiving
alarming reports from his representatives to the Reichstag concerning Beringer's sermons. The council replied to Ferdinand that it found nothing either unchristian or unsuitable in the peasant's sermons.⁴

Beringer could not, however, confine himself for long to the limited audiences of private homes. On May 6, the council again had to warn him about preaching in public,⁵ and finally issued an ultimatum that he must either stop his preaching or leave the city and its territory. Beringer responded by saying that he was not a preacher and had no intentions of performing the duties of such office, but when his neighbors asked him to relate to them Christian teachings from the Gospels, he could not refuse them out of brotherly love. Furthermore, he stated, if there was such a demand from the people to have such instruction, he could not comprehend why they should have to remain at home and hear it in private. To this the council responded that it had good reasons for its prohibition against him, which it did not need to reveal. He could abide by the council's decision, or he could leave the territory. Beringer responded that he would seek the Lord's counsel before making his decision.⁶

Apparently the Lord's advice was to move on, for we hear no more of Beringer in Nürnberg.

Among the good reasons the council had for its ultimatum to Beringer was that through his inspiration and example, a number of other lay persons felt called upon to expound publicly upon their interpretation of the Gospel. These included a Gallus N., a journeyman linen weaver from the village of Nürdlingen, an unknown thimble maker, and an anonymous woman, who on Easter Monday stood up in the middle of
That Beringer did decide to move on was probably fortunate for the council. No illiterate peasant, Beringer was an exiled Swabian priest named Diepold Schuster from Aichenbrunnen near Ulm. This, at least, was the opinion of Spalatin and the Nürnberg chronicler, Anton Kreutzer. From Nürnberg he went on to Kitzingen, preaching first at the request of several townspeople, then at the request of a local abbess, and finally for the town council, which disregarded a specific order of Margrave Casimir against it and allowed Beringer to preach before an assembly reported to have been attended by more than 8000 persons.

From Kitzingen, Beringer passed quickly through Jena, where he was uncovered as a fraud, to Rothenberg, where in October he was preaching to huge crowds and apparently contributing to a large extent to the beginnings of radical movements there. Little is known of Beringer thereafter, although there is some evidence that he made an appearance in Schweinfurt and eventually met his death through decapitation at the hands of the authorities in Württemberg.

Although Beringer's activities and possible influence in Nürnberg have frequently been mentioned in accounts of the Reformation in Nürnberg, little attention has been given to the subject matter of his sermons. There are two extant works of Beringer that were published in his lifetime. The better known of the two is his most popular sermon preached at Nürnberg on February 7, 1524. But before
considering that work, the earlier, less well known treatise, is worthy of attention. Printed in Augsburg in 1523, the full title of the work is *A Beautiful Interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, Which God Himself Taught Us, Brought to Consideration by a Poor Peasant Who Can neither Read nor Write, a Quite Thorough and Useful Account for the Good of All Christian Professing Men, Out of Brotherly Faith in the 23rd Year.*

A straightforward exposition of the Lord's Prayer, this treatise demonstrates that Beringer, by 1523, had imbibed deeply of the evangelical teachings of the Wittenberg reformers. The central message is to demonstrate the absolute unworthiness of depraved and sinful man before the total righteousness of a perfect, omniscient, and omnipotent God. Man can do nothing for his own salvation but plead for the mercy and grace of God, who alone can forgive sins and grant salvation. If Beringer here was touching upon Luther's doctrine of justification, he was even more moved by the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. "When we speak 'Our Father,' we should understand that He is our Father," he wrote, "and rejoice in Him that we are His children, and in so doing remember the old covenant [Bruderschaft] in which God has assembled us and ordained that we all are brothers and sisters, and then remember that we must love one another."

Beringer's concern and message is for the masses and especially the rural poor, but he offers them not an earthly solution to their woes, but the promise of spiritual reward. The only compensation for the "miserable wretchedness" of this life is the knowledge that through the grace of God one will come to his true "inheritance and fatherland,
that is, eternal blessedness."

To the poor he said, "You should not be anxious over what you will eat or drink. The Lord has given you the soul, which is more to the body than eating and drinking. In fact, He will even give you less [material things], since He knows that you are His poor." As the Gospel teaches, "Man lives not alone for daily bread, but of the unremitting Word, which is uttered from the mouth of God."

Certainly this treatise contained nothing that should have caused alarm to the authorities, at least those magistrates who were already leaning so far toward the evangelical position as those at Münster. The pamphlet does, however, indicate the direction in which Beringer's thought was going, and the pamphlet concludes with a somewhat bitter note, which would appear to throw some light on Beringer's struggle with the Swabian authorities at Aichenbrunnen. Throughout the treatise, Beringer used the word "Fatherland" to designate Heaven, where the Christian would dwell with his true Father. In speaking of the entreaty, "Deliver us from evil!" Beringer, no doubt, still has this meaning of the term in mind, but in the following passage the literal meaning of the term seems to be obviously intended:

Lord Heavenly Father, save me from the temptations of the flesh and the evil spirit, and the temptations of the world and from the devilish and ungodly riches which are damaging to my soul. Lord Heavenly Father, before these and all my enemies and adversaries that daily are struggling against me and desire to deprive me of my Fatherland, I beseech you...put me in your Grace and protect me before my enemies.

Thus, beginning as early as 1523, a lingering and growing bitterness has begun to shape the direction of Beringer's thoughts as he repeatedly meets the opposition of both secular and spiritual authorities.
Although there is nothing any more radical in the early writing of Beringer than the Sermon on the Mount, the basic elements are already present, which he elaborated upon in his printed sermon of 1524. This popular sermon Beringer himself had printed after a number of unauthorized editions, compiled from notes taken by his listeners, had appeared in Nürnberg, Augsburg, and Erfurt.\textsuperscript{13}

The subject matter of the sermon concerned the free will of man and the practice of praying to the saints. Here Beringer draws the logical conclusion to the view expressed in his exposition of the Lord's Prayer, that as a sinful and unworthy creature absolutely dependent upon divine grace, man has no free will:

\begin{quote}
Because all things happen through divine providence, the freedom of man here on earth, [to do] either good or evil, as has hitherto been supposed, and as some would still maintain, cannot be. [These] would have themselves able to acquire honor, as once was generally believed. Nevertheless, that is not [true], as I will clearly prove from Scripture.
\end{quote}

Beringer then quotes profusely from Scripture, both the Old and the New Testaments, to support his argument for the bondage of the human will to the absolute will of God, and to show that God works both good and what appears to be evil in man. Obviously then, man can do nothing for his own salvation. Beringer's message is to believe and trust in God alone, and His promise through Jesus Christ.

If God is responsible for all things and only He can grant salvation, it follows that praying to the saints is at best worthless, and at worst idolatry, and this consideration forms the second major point of Beringer's sermon. For a long time, he stated, Christians have followed not God, but the saints, and "have trampled God under foot."
This is a pitiful state of affairs. We have been blind and have not sought consolation where it is truly available. The fault does not lie with the masses of the laity, however. The practice developed because our priests and monks seduced us. In the most evil ways, they have dressed up man-made images, and in false and deceptive ways have adulterated [them, so that] in one they have poured oil into the back of its head, so that it flows out the eyes [like tears]. And into another they poured blood so that it would 'sweat' blood. And by such means they have said, 'Look! Is that not a great, miraculous sign?' Then the poor, simple peasants would run there and pray to the saints and abandon God.

Such vituperative anti-clericalism and iconoclasm, together with an obvious appeal to the urban poor and rural peasantry, explains why Beringer was viewed with such alarm by the Catholic authorities, even if, for a time, the council of Nürnberg was content merely to prevent him from speaking publicly. But given the situation in Nürnberg in the spring of 1524, and the apparent popularity of Beringer, the council could not long tolerate his presence if he disobeyed its authority. Already the peasant rebellion in South Germany was beginning to gain momentum, and if Beringer's concerns were largely spiritual, he could still be misunderstood, or worse, misused by supporters of the peasants. One of the editions of his sermon carried a woodcut print of a peasant holding a flail, an often used symbol of the peasants' revolt.

In addition to this, an imperial diet was meeting in the city at that very moment, considering, among other things, what to do about the spread of the Lutheran Reformation in Germany. Although the council was already leaning toward the adoption of the evangelical faith, and though the diet would eventually adopt the position that
each territory should handle its own religious problems, Nürnberg was in no position at the time to flaunt its independence before either the Archduke Ferdinand, the Catholic princes at the diet, or its own bishop of Bamberg by taking a too benevolent attitude toward Beringer.

One further element of Beringer's sermon should be considered as one of the possible reasons the council had for expelling him, which it did not feel it should reveal, and also because it helps to understand further the reasons for his popularity. Having attacked the veneration of the saints as idol worship and the priests and monks for leading the simple folk into such idol worship through the deceptive manipulation of images and relics to create miracles, Beringer cannot resist a subtle crack at the earthly lords.

Taking as a text the story in Acts 12 where the king Herod is slain by an angel of God because he took away from the glory that belonged to God, Beringer draws a lesson for those persons who are esteemed and honored on earth. One must remember that whatever honor one enjoys, all praise rightfully belongs to God, "and who does not praise God for it, is a despiser of God." He who requires his subjects to prostrate themselves and bow before him, runs the risk of also being worshiped, like Herod, and usurping the honor due to God. This kind of talk must surely have stirred and excited the masses who came to hear Beringer preach.

Beringer's wholehearted acceptance of the teachings of Martin Luther, especially the theologically revolutionary pamphlets of 1520, and of these, in particular, On the Freedom of a Christian, is evident. Considering its own leanings toward Luther's position, the council of
Nürnberg had little choice but to reply to Archduke Ferdinand that it found nothing unsuitable or unchristian in Beringer's teachings. At the same time, however, the actions of the council, which resulted in Beringer's expulsion from the city, demonstrate the beginning of a policy in which the council's apparently natural inclination toward leniency in questions of religious heterodoxy is never allowed to interfere with what the council considers to be political exigency.

No charge of religious radicalism could or can be made against Beringer. His role in the early phase of the development of religious radicalism in Nürnberg is important, however. He stirred up the populace with new religious ideas which hitherto had been largely confined to the Nürnberg intelligentsia. His example, albeit he was only playing the part of an inspired peasant, led others of the laity also to feel justified to expound publicly upon their own religious views. He sowed the seeds of religious unrest in a wide stratum of the Nürnberg populace, which would be nurtured and cultivated by real revolutionaries, whose followers would spring forth in full bloom before Beringer was far from the city. For almost a decade they would grow and spread in spite of a concerted effort of repression by the Nürnberg authorities, until the spirit that fed them began to ebb.

B. Müntzer and Karlstadt: Their Following in Nürnberg

The problems which confronted the council in its affair with Beringer were slight in comparison to those which came to the fore in the fall of 1524 and spring of 1525. In the first place, like all major German cities, Nürnberg had its brush with the great peasant
rebellion, and only through the granting of major concessions to redress the economic grievances of its subject peasantry, alert diplomacy, and, finally, the quick and thorough, if brutal, military action of the forces of the Swabian League under the leadership of the ruthless Georg Truchsess was it spared an actual invasion of its own territory. Still a not inconsiderable number of Nürnberg peasants left their homes to join the nearby peasant armies, and fears generated by the revolt had their effects upon council policies with regard to religious radicalism. In addition to this, the council was still nominally Catholic, but well on the way toward the acceptance of Lutheranism. The final step was taken in March, 1525, but throughout the period covered by this study the council wanted to proceed as smoothly as possible. Yet within its own walls had already sprung up a veritable coterie of men who were going far beyond anything the council had or would consider to be acceptable.

Soon the printing presses of the city began to turn out radical pamphlets authored by Luther's greatest enemies to the left, Thomas Müntzer and Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt. Karlstadt had long counted a number of prominent Nürnbergers among his friends, and in his quarrel with Luther, he turned to these, hoping for support for his program of reformation. Müntzer was already on the run from Allstedt in Saxony and nearby Mühlhausen in Thuringia where he had been charged with fomenting social revolution. Like Karlstadt, he turned to Nürnberg to have his most recent pamphlets published and found there a warm welcome and protection. With him Müntzer brought Heinrich Pfeiffer, who had been working for the popular overthrow of
the government of Mühlhausen since 1523, and Hans Römer, who would be instrumental in the development of Anabaptism in Thuringia. The man who had originally contracted with the Mühlberg printers for the publishing of Müntzer's work was Hans Hut, who with the death of Müntzer and Pfeiffer in the Peasants' War became the most hunted radical leader in South Germany. In addition to these, there is a strong possibility that Leonhard Schiemer was in the city at this time, where he was learning the tailor's trade, and Ludwig Hützer and Hans Schlaffer. All three of these men also became instrumental in the spread and formulation of Anabaptist doctrines in South Germany.

If there is one common factor that all these men shared, with the exception of Karlstadt who was not personally in the city, but was represented by his disciple, Martin Reinhart, it was that all were acquainted with Hans Denck, the humanist schoolmaster attached to the church of St. Sebald. With men of such personality and appeal as these in the city, it was almost inevitable that they would establish a circle of followers. An investigation of these is necessary to determine the nature of radical activity in Mühlberg in the same period, and the kind of men who were attracted to the radical position.

Not until October 26, 1524, did the city council of Mühlberg discover that there existed a radical element in the city. On that day it began an investigation to find out if a "young man in the Deutschenhof subscribes to the false prophet named Müntzer."17 The young man turned out to be none other than Heinrich Pfeiffer, and a routine inquiry opened up a Pandora's box.
On August 7, 1524, Thomas Müntzer quietly left the city of Allstedt where he had served as evangelical pastor since the spring of the previous year. In that short time, the radical religious views he had begun to express at Wittenberg were being transformed into radical socio-religious views that none of the secular lords—neither Elector Frederick of Saxony, Duke John of Saxony, Count Ernst of Mansfeld, nor the city council of Allstedt—to whom Müntzer owed nominal obedience was willing to accept. Müntzer's greatest hope was to convert the elector, but between Müntzer and Frederick stood Martin Luther. Thus Luther became, with the count of Mansfeld, Müntzer's greatest enemy, both theologically and politically. From Allstedt Müntzer travelled to Mühlhausen, approximately forty-five miles southwest of Allstedt, where the ex-monk Heinrich Pfeiffer had been attempting to implement his own conception of a new Christian polity with some degree of success. Pfeiffer had once been expelled from the city. Now, with a warning from Luther of Müntzer's coming, the city council of Mühlhausen was in no mood to tolerate two men bent upon destroying their already shaky control over an aroused populace. On September 27, both Müntzer and Pfeiffer were expelled from the city.¹⁸

Between August 7, the date of Müntzer's flight from Allstedt, and August 15, the date of his arrival in Mühlhausen, he spent a "day and a night" with Hans Hut at the village of Bibra near Meiningen in Thuringia and "gave him a pamphlet to publish."¹⁹ For Müntzer to go out of his way to seek Hut as an intermediary in finding him a publisher suggests that the two men were already well-acquainted,
or at least well-known to each other. Müntzer would hardly have
entrusted an important and valuable manuscript to someone he did not
know to be trustworthy and at least sympathetic to his views. At
any rate, the pamphlet given over to Hut was Müntzer's Aussgedruckte
Empfohlung des falschen Glaubens der ungetreuen Welt, durchs Gezeugnis
des Evangelions Luce.²⁰ Hut proceeded to Nürnberg, finding a printer
for the pamphlet through the press of Hans Hergot. When Müntzer
and Pfeiffer were expelled from Mühlhausen, they seem to have left
immediately for Nürnberg to oversee the publication of this pamphlet,
as well as to find a publisher for a new pamphlet Müntzer had composed
at Mühlhausen, Hoch Verursachte Schutzrede und Antwort wider das
Geistlosse Sanftt Lebende Fleysch zu Wittenberg.²¹

How long Müntzer remained in the city is not definitely known.
Georg Baring²² has suggested that Müntzer was in the city for four
weeks. For one of his notoriety to remain in a closely supervised
city for that length of time without drawing attention to himself
would only be possible if he were well shielded by those who gave
him refuge, thus further indicating that Müntzer's commissioning of
Hans Hut to find a publisher for his Aussgedruckte Entblössung, Hut's
turning to Nürnberg to find a printer, and, finally, Müntzer's
personal appearance in the city were not accidental, but a connection
between Müntzer, Hut, and sympathizers in Nürnberg already existed.
Evidence tends to confirm the connecting link to be Hans Denck.

Certainly Pfeiffer was in the city for close to a month before
the council discovered his identity. On October 29, the council
recorded for the first time that the Aussgedruckte Entblössung had been
printed in the city. Copies of the pamphlet were confiscated and
turned over to Dominicus Schleupner, pastor of St. Sebald's Church,
for his examination to determine "what good and evil" were contained
therein. At the same time, an order was sent out for the arrest of
Hans Hergot, on whose press the pamphlet had been printed. Later
in the same day, the council discovered that Hergot was not in the
city and in his absence ordered an interrogation of his employees.

Meanwhile the council continued its investigation of Pfeiffer,
whom it obviously considered behind the affair, and who, the council
believed, was in the city for the express purpose of stirring up
sedition:

Because he is understood to be acquiring many followers,
through disputations, for unchristian and seductive purposes,
Master Heinrich from Mühlhausen, follower and disciple of the
fanatic [Schwermer] Dr. Thomas Müntzer, is to be sent to and
informed that the council and the community here have a suf­
[functions of that office]. In addition, he and Müntzer
caused the rebellion at Mühlhausen and his [Pfeiffer's]
presence here will not be tolerated. He is to leave immediately
and spend his money elsewhere.

Taken from Pfeiffer when he was initially seized were two
handwritten manuscripts and a Bible. The Bible was turned over to
an unnamed comrade of Pfeiffer, probably Hans Römer. Römer had
either travelled with Pfeiffer and Müntzer to Nürnberg or had met
them there later. He is mentioned only once in the documents
and the council apparently did not consider him dangerous enough
to include in the banishment against Pfeiffer. The pamphlets
found on Pfeiffer were turned over to Andreas Osiander, pastor of
St. Lorenz Church for his examination, but after Pfeiffer had been
expelled. Thus the contents of the pamphlets had nothing to do with Pfeiffer's expulsion.

Having rid itself of Pfeiffer, the council turned its attention to those who had printed the Münzer pamphlet. On October 31, further samples of the pamphlet were confiscated and four of the aides of Hergot were imprisoned in one of the city's tower prisons on the charge they had, by their own admission, taken it upon themselves to print the pamphlet in the absence of their master without its first having been inspected by someone in authority. Two days later, having received Schleupner's report on the pamphlet, the council ordered the confiscation of all remaining pamphlets in the city "since they serve more to create civil unrest than Christian and brotherly love."

The council added, however, that the bookseller, most certainly Hans Hut, who had ordered the printing of the pamphlet, should be reimbursed from charity funds for the cost of printing 400 of the pamphlets. In addition, the four printer's aides were to be released from the tower upon the payment of a jailer's fee and boarding costs (Atzung) and the giving of an oath promising they would not seek damages or ever again print anything prior to its formal inspection.

While the council was conducting its investigation of Pfeiffer and the printing of the Aussgedrückte Entblößung, or perhaps prior to those events, Münzer had already found a printer for the second pamphlet, Hochverursachte Schutzrede, another Nürnberg citizen, Hieronymus Hültzel. This was not discovered, however, until December, 1524, while the council was in the middle of an investigation of Hültzel for the surreptitious publication of a Karlstadt pamphlet.
On December 16, the council discovered that a pamphlet of Karlstadt was circulating in the city and ordered all copies confiscated and an investigation made to determine if they had been printed in Nürnberg and by whom. The pamphlet in question was Karlstadt's Von den widerchristlichen Missbrauch des Herrn Brot und Kelch and had been brought to Nürnberg for publication by Martin Reinhart, a disciple of Karlstadt who had been working on the publication of Karlstadt's works in Jena when both he and Karlstadt had been expelled from Saxony by the elector. The printing of the pamphlet had quickly been traced to Hültzel, who was imprisoned, and all the pamphlets still in his possession were confiscated. At the same time, the discovery was made of Hültzel's having printed the second Müntzer pamphlet. Hültzel apparently confessed that Reinhart had commissioned the Karlstadt work. The council ordered Reinhart to take his wife and children and immediately leave the city and "spend his money elsewhere than in council territory. Should he refuse to comply, his person will be seized and he will be removed from the city in another way." What method the council had in mind was not stated, but certainly no gentle means were implied. In addition to the charge of commissioning the Karlstadt work, the council also connected Reinhart to Müntzer and possibly thought he had commissioned his pamphlet too. In listing the charges against him, the council stated, "Dr. Martin Reinhart was [also] the pastor at Jena and is connected to the Allstedter fanatics, which is why the elector of Saxony has banished him."

Hültzel was to be retained in prison until his house had been
thoroughly searched and all works in his possession for future publication had been confiscated. Apparently the council's intentions were to examine the works before releasing Hültzel. No mention is made of any further punishment of Hültzel, leading to the conclusion that the council was satisfied with the discovery and removal of Reinhart. Hültzel was soon, however, involved in another dispute with the council of more serious consequence.

The affairs with the works of Karlstadt and Müntzer and the involvement in them of two of its own printers caused the council to issue the first of a series of censorship measures it would take in this decade with regard to potentially dangerous works being printed or sold in Nürnberg. Still on December 17, a directive was sent out to everyone offering books for sale in the city, ordering them to draw up a list of all the titles they had in their inventory. Samples of each title were then to be collected and examined. The council's secretaries were then to make a second list of all works which could not be sold in the city, and order these to be removed from each bookseller's inventory. The council's problems with its printing industry were only beginning, however.

To surmise the respective influence of Karlstadt and Müntzer, let alone Pfeiffer, in Nürnberg is somewhat difficult. For one reason, as in the case of Reinhart, the council, and even the theologians, tended to lump all the "fanatics" together. As the story of the radical movement in Nürnberg is further related, however, distinct trends begin to become discernable.

In the case of Müntzer, if the length of his stay in Nürnberg
were definitely known, more certain conclusions could be drawn. At the time of his stay in the city, his thought was in a transitional stage of development. The evidence suggests that he may have been content at the time to limit himself to reflection and discussion with the more educated of his friends in Nürnberg. Müntzer himself, however, gives another impression in a letter written soon after his stay in Nürnberg to a friend, Christoph Meinhard in Eisleben:

I would have played a fine game with the people of Nürnberg had I had the desire to cause a rebellion, as the lying world accuses me. But I wanted to make cowards of my enemies with words, so that they will not deny it [that is, so that they will have to answer me intellectually]. Many from Nürnberg advised me to preach, to which I answered, I did not come there for that purpose, but to justify my position through the press. The lords discovered this and their ears were set to ringing [klungen inen die ohren], but good days do them good [denn gute tage thun inen wol]. The sweat of the artisan tastes sweet to them, sweet but turning to bitter gall. There will be no help through rationalizations; the truth must be brought out. Fabrications from the Gospel will not help them. The people are hungry, they must and want to eat, as Amos [8:11], and also Matthew 5 [:6] say.

The letter would suggest that Müntzer had substantial contacts with religious and social dissidents in Nürnberg, especially among the artisans. Baring goes so far as to suggest that as a result of his stay in Nürnberg, Müntzer began to speak in his letters and writings of the needs of urban craftsmen, and even made some changes in the manuscript of the Hochverursachte Schutzrede to include such concerns.

Since the early days in Wittenberg, through his pastorate at Allstedt, Müntzer had developed an extreme eschatological-apocalyptic world-view. He radically took issue with Luther's doctrine of faith, saying that both the law and grace needed to be accepted by the Christian—that he had to take both the "bitter" and "sweet" Christ.
Faith could not be put on like a cloak, but had to be infused by the Holy Spirit into the elect of Christ, each of whom had to bear a personal cross. Scripture was not the "sole authority; but had to be interpreted through the Spirit, the source of continuing revelation. The full development of these ideas was expressed in a sermon delivered on July 13, 1524, before Duke John of Saxony and his son John Frederick, entitled, "Exposition of the Second Chapter of Daniel."\

In this "Sermon Before the Princes," Müntzer interpreted Daniel as stating that there would be five historical monarchies before the end of the world. The fifth monarchy was feudal-papal Christendom, which would be destroyed by the elect, a royal priesthood of the common man. At this point in his development, Müntzer included among the elect the minor magistrates of the empire. To the duke and the heir apparent he said, "The poor laity and the peasants see it much more clearly than you....You esteemed princes of Saxony, step boldly on the Cornerstone as Saint Peter did (Matt. 16:18) and seek perseverance [imparted] by the divine will....Your ways will be right.... Get the wicked out of the way and eliminate them."

The princes had to take their stand. The day had come when the righteous, the elect, would take up the sword and slay the godless. The final chance for the princes to be counted among the righteous was here, and Müntzer made his final appeal to them:

The sword is necessary to wipe out the godless (Rom. 13:4). That this might now take place, however, in an orderly and proper fashion, our cherished fathers, the princes, should do it, who with us confess Christ. If however, they do not do it, the sword will be taken from them (Dan. 7:26f.).
Müntzer's hope in the princes, however, was destroyed at Allstedt. In the *Aussgedrückte Entblößung*, composed at Allstedt, he had already begun to accept the poor, specifically the peasantry, as the elect who would destroy the godless. In the *Hochverursachte Schutzrede* he expanded his concern for the poor to the urban artisan, saying that the poor farmer and the artisan had been exploited by the princes and the rich who demanded all created things for their own, while keeping the masses from them through the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." Luther, against whom the tract is directed, "Dr. Liar," says "Amen." The poor become the enemy. Since those in power do not remove the cause of rebellion, rebellion becomes inevitable.

Müntzer's apparently newly awakened concern for the artisan classes, when taken together with his letter to Christoph Meinhard, does suggest he had a certain amount of contact with the artisan classes in Nürnberg. But Müntzer's position at this stage of his development was that of radical theologian. By his own statement to Meinhard, his concerns were to answer his enemies with the pen. The lack of awareness by the Nürnberg authorities of Müntzer's presence in their city indicates that if he had been in the city as long as some suppose, his personal contact with the populace had been kept at a minimum, and his knowledge of artisan discontent had been acquired by hearsay.

Such was not the case, however, with regard to Pfeiffer. At this stage in the careers of the two men, Pfeiffer was much more the activist, and obviously was circulating throughout the city. The
direct personal influence to which Müntzer pretended in his letter to Meinhard may have been realized by Pfeiffer. The pamphlets taken from Pfeiffer were surely of his own composition, written in response to a suggestion by Müntzer to the people of Mühlhausen to write down the events that transpired in the city as a witness to the whole world of the justness of their cause.\textsuperscript{50}

In his summary of the works, Osiander stated that the first dealt with an explanation of how the uprising at Mühlhausen came about, the second with how to deal with false prophets according to the Mosaic Law. Osiander attacked the writings for their appeal to Mosaic Law, which, he said, everyone knew had been superseded by Christ's law of Love. The appeal to Mosaic Law was contrary to both Scripture and reason. The Mosaic Law says false prophets should be killed, and the author (Pfeiffer) would do this to anyone who disagreed with him. Summing up an argument which could be used against both Müntzer and Pfeiffer, Osiander said:

So they would make Jews of us all, when they will, and when it is of worth for their fanaticism they would stand upon the Mosaic Law. But where the Scripture is against them, they ridicule it and point us to their spirit and deny that this spirit is given through the ear of faith. They introduce murder, sedition, the overturning of the spiritual realm of Christ, they make an earthly kingdom that is not ruled by God's word but by the sword and force.\textsuperscript{51}

If Müntzer's activities in Nürnberg were constrained, Pfeiffer's certainly were not. If Müntzer's works to this point can be interpreted on a purely theological level,\textsuperscript{52} Pfeiffer's cannot. The Hochverursachte Schutzrede was a vociferous attack on Luther, in which Müntzer repeatedly denied that he wanted to stir up sedition, but if
revolt came, there was no question with which side he would be allied. Pfeiffer was already prepared to lead that revolt. The fact remains, however, as Müntzer implied in his letter to Meinhard, many in Nürnberg were leaning toward a radical position, and they began to surface in the city in the fall of 1524 and spring of 1525.

On October 31, 1524, an investigation of the artist Hans Greiffenberger began on the charge of creating an unsuitable and offensive painting and "because he seduces the people to a new sect." On November 10, an innkeeper named Marx von Wiblingen was called before the council to find out "what kind of disgraceful activities took place [in his inn] that despised the body and blood of Christ, and to find out from him the names of all of his guests." On December 28, a scribe, Erasmus Wisperger, was imprisoned for reading a Karlstadt pamphlet in public. On December 31, Kuntz Kobalt, a journeyman (Knapen bei der Reussin Huterin), was interrogated for an "unsuitable speech on the sacrament," as well as the artist, Hans Platner, concerning the circumstances of the speech. Finally, on January 10, 1525, the council ordered the investigation of the brothers, Sebald and Barthel Behaim, journeymen painters of the school of Albrecht Dürer, "concerning their unchristian view of the sacrament of the altar and baptism." This investigation would reveal the apparent leader of a somewhat substantial circle of religious radicals to be the schoolmaster Hans Denck. Before considering the case of "Hans Denck and the godless painters of Nürnberg," some attention must be given to the interesting figure of Hans Greiffenberger.
C. Hans Greiffenberger

As already mentioned, Greiffenberger first came into conflict with the city authorities on a charge of seducing the people to join a new sect and producing an unsuitable painting. Unfortunately none of Greiffenberger's paintings remain, but the council described the work as "a shameful painting which he made against papal sanctity." The council said he deserved a severe punishment for the painting. He was released, however, with only a reprimand and his promise henceforth to refrain from such works. The charge of seducing the people to join a new sect was likewise discharged with the warning that he would be carefully watched in the future, and he should give up his "association with the particular sects in which he has erred concerning the sacraments." In comparison with the actions the council would take in other cases of religious "errors," its lenient treatment of Greiffenberger seems surprising. With regard to the anti-papal painting, the council was probably acting upon complaints from the Catholic elements in the city, or possibly from external forces, as in the case of Diepold Beringer, and was not itself overly offended by the caricature. The leniency with regard to the charges of sacramental error, however, require some explanation.

In addition to being an artist, Greiffenberger was also a prolific lay theologian, somewhat like the meistersinger, Hans Sachs, but without the latter's poetic ability and humor. And also like Sachs, he became an ardent follower of Luther, his written works echoing the hopes of the common laity in the reforms of the Wittenberg monk. For this reason he deserves more attention than he has
In the years 1523-1524, Greiffenberger wrote and saw to print no fewer than seven religious pamphlets. These apparently caused no concern with the authorities until the scandal created by Greiffenberger's anti-papal painting. After his initial investigation by the council, he drew up a statement of his position, which was turned over to Andreas Osiander for his perusal and expert opinion. Before considering Greiffenberger's statement of faith and Osiander's reply to it, an examination of the nature and development of his thought as reflected in his printed works is in order.

The first of Greiffenberger's extant pamphlets is entitled, *The World Says It Sees No Improvement in Those Who Call Themselves Lutheran. What Improvement Exists Is to Be Included Here.* As a scriptural text for the work, Greiffenberger took Luke 17:21: "The kingdom of God will not come by outward signs....The kingdom of God is within you."

The change wrought by the spread of the Word of God, said Greiffenberger, would not be observable. It would be quiet, inward, and barely perceptible, save to "the candlemakers, protectors of idols, and keepers of the mass." Men have been misled by the papacy into thinking that the outward show of faith is faith. They have been taught that good works lead to salvation. Men are led away from true faith to hypocrisy, as in the monastery, where outward piety is professed and true faith ignored. Men are led not to God but to damnation.

True faith is internal, Greiffenberger maintains. It is the
acceptance of God that allows God to work within man. Hence the only improvement from it is spiritual, and not at all like that we have been taught. For those who think the new faith and spread of the Word of God will result in material improvement, their hopes are false and selfish. The true Christian will not find that he now has plenty to eat and drink, but rather, that he no longer has enemies, and that he no longer need fear death or the trials of earthly existence.

Are there no improvements, then, in the man who has found true faith? Yes, said Greiffenberger, the true Christian will be moved to avoid all that the Word of God is against, and do all that pleases God. Every Christian should daily strive to keep the law and Word of God. A hypocrisy as bad as that of the work righteousness of the priests is demonstrated by those who profess faith, but demonstrate by their outward actions that they have not truly experienced the Word of God. "They also have not improved who have a trade or handcraft and would annoy or cheat their neighbors without suffering from it, as several do, like sculptors, painters, and engravers."

Except for Greiffenberger's obvious acceptance and reliance on Luther, the most interesting aspect of this pamphlet is his emphasis on ethics, especially as applied to urban culture. The theme is a recurrent one, indicating the influence of lay piety, mysticism, or simply a disdain for contemporary business practices. But above all, in his first pamphlets, Greiffenberger was a follower of Luther. His second pamphlet of 1523 demonstrates that dependence almost to the point of plagiarism. But that was precisely Greiffenberger's reason for writing. He was a layman writing for laymen, trying to explain in
his own words the essence of the evangelical faith as he perceived it.

The second pamphlet of 1523, *This Pamphlet Demonstrates What Is Taught Us by Our Masters of the Bible, Before Which Christ Has Warned Us, Which Outwardly Seem Proper But Are Full of Deceit and Falsehood*, is a virulent attack upon the so-called "learned" and scholastics, who think only they can interpret the Word of God, and that through the study of the heathen Aristotle. Taking as his major text the soliloquy of Christ in Matthew 23, Greiffenberger calls the schoolmen "lawyers, Pharisees, hypocrites," who would make the common man, the laity, feel incompetent to read Scripture. Worse yet, they would even withhold the Word of God from the laity. Still, Greiffenberger says, the sum total of their discipline is such that "if you ask them about Scripture, they know as much as our local miller's ass....The laity can learn nothing from them about true Christian faith, and so should not be concerned with their teachings and unnecessary prattle."

The new Pharisees, the scholastics, the priests, and the lawyers care nothing for "the common folk," who have been betrayed and misled into thinking they are too ignorant to be able to understand Scripture and the teachings of Christ. The priests and lawyers have only their own bellies in mind and satisfy their gluttony by keeping the laity under foot. "Simple men" should know that they are the sheep of Christ who now find themselves in the care of wolves. And now, when one tries to raise himself up and be able to say that he is a Lutheran, the scholastics say he is a Lutheran heretic, as they have said that Erasmus of Rotterdam has brought errors and evil
into Christianity. One must ignore them. They are the real anti-
Christ. Their books are collections of fairy tales. The hope of the
common man is to seek truth in the Gospels and Epistles of Paul.

Greiffenberger might have added, as he implied, that the hope
of the common man was Luther, for the remainder of his pamphlet is a
capsule of Luther's theology of justification by faith. Faith is not
something that can be taught as the scholastics say. It is not
effected by good works. True Christian faith is a work of God in
man, in which "the old Adam is killed and we are made entirely
different men....Faith is a living and awakened confidence in the
Grace of God" that effects a complete change in man.

Greiffenberger concluded this treatise with a discussion of
ethics, a matter of prime concern to him, as evinced by the fact
that in 1524 he devoted a second full treatise to the problem.

Entitled A Brief View of Good Works, Which Please God and Scorn the
World: A Great Lamentation How No One Does Good Anymore, and All
Shrink from God's Service, and What One Is to Make of This. An
Answer as to What Good Works Should Be, the pamphlet is an elabo-
ration of Greiffenberger's first book on good works combined with
the anti-clericalism of his second treatise. Worth mentioning,
however, is Greiffenberger's explicit reference to the doctrine of
the priesthood of all believers, that hitherto was only implied:
"I pay no attention to what one wears, black or blue cowls, white or
brown cloaks, such dress amounts to nothing before God."

Apparent through all his works is his thorough acquaintance
and acceptance of Luther's On the Freedom of a Christian. Greiffen-
berger's constant reminder to his readers, not to expect an improve-
ment in their material existence, but to know that the comfort
promised by the evangelical position is spiritual, demonstrates not
only that he has read Luther, but read him correctly. In two of his
pamphlets of 1524, *A Christian Answer to Those Who Say That the
Gospel Has Its Power from the Church* and *A Warning Against the
Devil, Who again Is Selling His Trinkets in Places of Concern to the
Christian Life in a Deceitful Disguise,* he uses Luther's three
central doctrines to attack the Roman Church, and, indeed, defends
those doctrines against the counter-attack of the Church. In the
first of these pamphlets he attacks the institution of the Church,
in the second the ritual of the Church.

*A Warning Against the Devil* is important in understanding
the nature of Greiffenberger's faith because it demonstrates his
extreme individualism and almost mystical approach to religion. All
outward signs of worship—compulsory prayers, confession, the ritual
of the mass, public bowing and kneeling—are the work of the devil,
he contends. True faith and the religious expression of that faith,
are inward and strictly the concern of the individual and God, with
Scripture alone as guide. Faith cannot be taught but must be ex-
perienced by the individual. Truth comes from God alone, working
secretly in the hearts of men, and through His Word, that is, Scripture.
Outward forms and rituals are the work of the devil and are nothing
more than lies, deceptions, ghosts, phantasies, and whiffs of smoke.
Such radical individualism and anti-clericalism would seem to make
inevitable Greiffenberger's ultimate clash with the spiritual and
secular authorities of Nürnberg.

In Greiffenberger's final two works of 1524, he demonstrates his greatest theological depth, and shows that his writing and organizing skill have considerably improved with practice. Of these, *A Comforting Admonition to Those Troubled in the Knowledge of Past Sins* is an attempt to explain how "several men contend that through the grace of God the Father they are drawn to believe the Word of God spoken by Christ, so that they are completely freed from and untroubled by sins." The subject is a favorite and important element of Luther's theology, and Greiffenberger's use of the term "Anfechtung" shows his complete dependence on Luther. As a sinful creature, man can do nothing to remove his own sin. Good works and the corresponding concept of work righteousness not only are of no value to man but may actually be a detriment to salvation if they falsely reduce the anxiety of sin-guilt.

Man can do nothing but recognize his condition and realize that righteousness comes not as a result of his own efforts, but only through the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. But once having recognized this condition, and then placing all one's "faith, love, and hope" in the redemptive Christ, one becomes freed from the Old Law, that one cannot keep, and thus from the anguish of sin. Greiffenberger's desire is to free man from the tyranny of the priests, and to this task he directed his final work.

*This Pamphlet Points Out the False Prophets about Whom Christ, Paul, and Peter Warned Us, and in Which Is Found What and How We Christians Should Act Now, in This Dangerous Age* identifies the
pope as Antichrist, raised to power by Satan, justified through the
heathen Aristotle. The pope-Antichrist has flung to the wind the
eternal truth of Scripture and constructed in its place an elaborate
framework of ritual, so that natural man, the fallen Adam, clings to
this false god, and when confronted by a dire situation, cries out
for a priest and the sacraments and knows nothing of true faith.

In a passage reminiscent of Diepold Beringer's Nürnberg
sermon, Greiffenberger strongly attacks the practice of saint worship,
which he, like Beringer, sees as a principal means used by the Roman
Church to keep the poor masses in its control:

[Christ] did not say "come to my mother" or to the
Apostles or to these or to those saints....The poor have
been gravely misled when they each have their own Apostle
and no one knows who Christ is, or why He came, so that the
simple people hope more in the saints than in Christ....
Christ did not teach us to say "Hail Mary's" or other fancy
prayers, like the heathens, but simply the Lord's Prayer,
for He knows our needs and wants....If one wants to know what
ture prayer is, he should read Martin Luther's exposition
of the Lord's Prayer from the Gospels, then he would know
sufficiently how to pray.69

In this, the longest of his printed pamphlets (21 pages),
Greiffenberger is able systematically to present the elements con­
tained in all his previous works—justification by faith alone,
Scripture as sole authority, the priesthood of all believers, the
suppression of the masses by the Roman Church, anti-scholasticism,
anti-clericalism, and ethics. In addition, he introduces for the first
time, an indication of the sacramentarian position that would ulti­
mately result in his most serious confrontation with the spiritual
and secular authorities of Nürnberg and a strong apocalypticism.
Ironically, this is the only work in which Greiffenberger refers
to specific writings or Luther as authoritative on the point in question, and one of these references is to Luther's interpretation of the Eucharist.

Early in the treatise Greiffenberger refers to the Eucharist when discussing the redemptive character of Christ: "Christ says, 'He who wants his sins forgiven believes in my promise in my blood,' that is, who drinks the sign of my cup." Later he speaks of the mass as used by the "sophists," that it works for our sins and does good work. But in truth, he suggests, a layman could perform the mass just as well. Within a short time, Greiffenberger was in serious trouble for having done just that. And yet he cites Luther as his authority:

You should read the Lutheran book on the Mass, where you would find the correct basis for it in the Gospels. There is shown much that we have not known for a long time and attention is given to the purpose and reason the Mass was established by our head Christ, the true master.

To summarize Greiffenberger's position in 1523-1524, he was a man who had drunk deep of the teachings of Martin Luther. Except for the potentially symbolic interpretation of the Last Supper that he demonstrated in his last printed work, there seems to be nothing heterodox in his lay theology according to the Lutheran position. In all, Greiffenberger is an excellent example of the hope generated within the common man by Luther, and, when that hope was not fulfilled, an example of why some men turned to radical leaders who still held out the old hope.

Greiffenberger's printed works demonstrate his thorough knowledge of Scripture and Luther. His confession of 1524 indicates
his acquaintance with Sacramentarian works as well, most probably those of Karlstadt. He began his statement by saying that he had been asked to reply to certain questions concerning his pamphlets and paintings, but of the total essay, only the last paragraph mentions the painting that originally attracted the attention of the authorities and his printed works:

Concerning my work, which I previously painted, it truly did not occur because of any unbelief or misunderstanding of divine Scripture, but as I know that it is not pleasing to you, I henceforth want to avoid such things. Concerning the books which I have allowed to go out and into other hands, since they were up for sale and were purchased, you might read them with the view to [point out] what is the basis [of objection], so that I will be instructed in the name of God and divine understanding of the Holy Scriptures, that I want to accept as a member in Christ my Saviour.

The latter part of the confession is a discourse on the meaning of the sacrament of the altar as he understands it, based on Scripture. After relating the Lukan account of the Last Supper, Greiffenberger sought to show other instances from Scripture where Christ uses the word "bread" in a symbolic sense, asserting that the bread and wine of the sacrament were commemorative of Christ and the promise that He would die for the salvation of all men. The bread and wine were a sign of Christ's broken body, and the blood shed that man might find eternal life. From this, Greiffenberger concludes, there are three things that occur in the sacrament. First, when the individual partakes of the sacrament he is to "remember" that Christ shed His blood that he might live. Second, he is to reflect upon this promise of Christ. Third, by partaking of the sacrament, the individual demonstrates his faith in the redemptive character of Christ.
Nowhere does Greiffenberger find that by participating in the Eucharist the individual actually partakes of the body and blood of Christ. "Thus," he concludes, "I call this a sign of remembrance [gedenckzaychenn] and not flesh and blood." The Eucharist was merely a sign of the new covenant between man and God.

The remainder of Greiffenberger's confession consisted of an elaboration of these points. But he also included many of the elements found in his printed works, indicating that his caricature of the papacy pictured the pope as Antichrist. As seen in the conclusion of the confession above, Greiffenberger made it quite clear that he was willing to take instruction. This, together with his obvious piety, must have gone a long way in causing Osiander to recommend leniency. How sincere Greiffenberger was in his willingness to take instruction remains to be seen.

According to Osiander's memorial, Greiffenberger, before he had made his decision, made an appeal to him through a "Matthew Jorian and five or six others," to be able to meet with Osiander personally. From the written confession, Osiander said he could find fault only with Greiffenberger's contention that the bread and wine of the sacrament were not the flesh and blood of Christ. In the rest of the confession he had stated his position "very well and in a Christian way." In addition, his conversations with Greiffenberger demonstrated he was quite willing to accept the "true" teaching. Now matters of faith, contended Osiander, should be opposed only by the Word of God. Since Greiffenberger had accepted true instruction and promised to cling to it, he could only serve as a
good example to the whole community. This is very important, he continued, since it appeared that others were also coming into error. Thus Greiffenberger's promise should be accepted and no further punishment given him unless there are other charges against him, for the example of one man who had erred and repented was more valuable than the punishment by the civil authorities of ten men who cling to their erroneous faith.

Thus Greiffenberger received only a warning. Within two years, however, he again was called before the council, this time on more serious charges, not the least of which was his betrayal of faith and relapse into heterodox views concerning the Last Supper. The question should be raised, however, whether Greiffenberger ever really gave up his views in the first place. Considering Greiffenberger's virulent anticlericalism, his hatred of scholasticism and reason in matters of faith, and his radical interpretation of the priesthood of all believers, one can well ask if he could ever have been willing to take instruction, especially from Osiander, whose arrogance must surely have seemed the same to Greiffenberger as that of the priests and monks he attacked in his writings. Was Osiander's tyranny any more acceptable because his "orthodoxy" was evangelical? Greiffenberger was not a raving fanatic. He must have been like countless others of the educated laity, particularly those from an urban culture, who became ardent supporters of Luther. And if he soon came to see that the priests and monks of the old Church, whom he exuberantly saw destroyed, had merely been replaced in their religious authority, that is, tyranny, by the city government and its appointed
pastors, would not others like him also be so inclined? When the new religion does not meet the expectations of the men who profess it early, they appear to be willing to move beyond it and at least give more "radical" teachers a sympathetic ear.
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Luke 22:19-20: "This is my body which is given for you, do this in remembrance of me. This cup is the new testament in my blood which is shed for you."
CHAPTER III

HANS DENCK AND "THE GODLESS PAINTERS"

Only gradually did the flurry of council activity in uncovering pockets of religious heterodoxy in November and December of 1524 begin to narrow down to a central group, with the newly appointed humanist schoolmaster Hans Denck as its suspected leader. The investigation of Hans Greiffenberger did not reveal that he was specifically involved with other so-called radicals, despite Osiander's mention of others in the city who were falling into error. Nor do the documents indicate what was discovered when the innkeeper, Marx von Wiblingen, was investigated. Apparently, however, the interrogation of the scribe Erasmus Wisperger did begin the series of discoveries that ultimately led to Denck.

On December 28, 1524, Wisperger was arrested for having read a Karlstadt pamphlet in the public market place. On the following day, the city's five principal pastors were each to talk with Wisperger, after which Dominicus Schleupner was to instruct him in the "fundamentals of divine truth." On December 30, he was again interrogated, this time specifically regarding what his beliefs were concerning the sacrament of the altar. This examination revealed the supplier of Wisperger's copy of the Karlstadt pamphlet to be a Jacob Hetzel, who must certainly be Hieronymus Hültzel, the printer.
of the pamphlet. He was asked why he had given the scribe the pamphlet and what his own views on it were.4

On the following day, the interrogation of Wisperger, this time under torture, continued. Apparently this interrogation implicated Cuntz Kobalt and Hans Platner, another artist. Kobalt was seized for making an unsuitable speech on the sacrament. Platner "and others" were to be questioned on the details surrounding the speech—"in what way and by whom the speech was agreed with."5 Apparently satisfied with Wisperger's statements, the jailer was given permission to put him into a cell, since he was ill "at the stone.6 On January 10, 1525, two more artists, the brothers Sebald and Barthel Behaim, were ordered questioned "concerning their unchristian view of the sacrament of the altar and baptism."7 Later in the same day, their "statement of their unchristian attitude" was to be examined by the city's five pastors, who then were to specify the charges to be held against them by the council.8

On January 12, a third person was imprisoned with the two Behaims,9 who was revealed later to be Georg Pentz, yet another of the students of Albrecht Dürer. On January 14, "the three imprisoned painters" were to be "thoroughly questioned together in the torture chamber," not with regard to their religious beliefs, but concerning "the worldly authority and what other kinds of associations they have and from whom they [receive] comfort [trost]," meaning, presumably, to whom they looked for spiritual and worldly advice, or, specifically, who was their leader. In addition, the council sought to determine "what manner of speech they were to have made in
the market place to persuade [others] to accept.\textsuperscript{10}

This investigation was apparently that which led to Denck's being held in suspicion, for later in the same day, January 14, the council recorded, "Immediately request the schoolmaster at Sebald's Church to record his position on the two articles [that is, baptism and the mass] and present everything to the preachers."\textsuperscript{11} Then the council's spiritual and legal advisors were to examine the case and submit their expert opinion to the council.

On the next three working days the council continued its simultaneous investigation of Denck and the three artists.\textsuperscript{12} Finally, on January 18, it decided to concentrate its investigation on Denck and leave the artists alone, apparently feeling that he was the center of the whole problem, and that until his case was decided, that of the others could wait. The council did not deliberate long. On January 21, it decreed:

\textit{Item since master Hans Denck, schoolmaster at St. Sebald, has introduced many errors touching upon our holy faith, propagated the same and defended [his] understanding [of them], also maintained himself completely unsuitably and contemptuously before the spiritual and highly learned [advisors] in the presence of the representatives of the honorable council, refuses to take instruction concerning the same [errors] based on Scripture, but trusts more in his own willful head, as he then gave his answers in writing on the presented articles not only insufficiently, but also in a complicated and cunning form; from that it is concluded that any new instruction from Scripture will bear no fruit with him, which [is] seen by the council as shocking, seductive, and unchristian at the least to tolerate his person in this city and Christian community. Therefore, for these and other weighty reasons, is the named Johann Denck forever forbidden [to be] within ten miles of this city...on pain of death.}\textsuperscript{13}

With that Denck was ordered to swear to leave the city before nightfall, otherwise he would be immediately imprisoned. Meanwhile, his
wife was to be informed of the punishment so she could make provisions for the children.\textsuperscript{14} Denck apparently left the city immediately, without attempting to appeal the council's decision. Before considering the nature of Denck's thought and activities in Nürnberg, a brief summary of his life to that point is necessary.

Called variously by his contemporaries the Apollo, the abbot, the bishop, and the pope of the Anabaptists, Denck was born about 1500 in a small town in Upper Bavaria, of a family with at least enough resources to provide him with a sound education. From 1517 to 1519, he matriculated at the University of Ingolstadt, too late to hear Conrad Celtis lecture, and too early to hear Johann Reuchlin, who arrived in November, 1519. From the autumn of 1519 to the spring of 1520, he was in Augsburg, associated with a lively humanist circle that included Veit Bild and Adelmann of Adelmannsfelden, the latter a friend of Willibald Pirckheimer of Nürnberg. Possibly between his departure from Augsburg and his arrival in Regensburg in 1521, where he can next be positively identified, Denck returned to Ingolstadt to hear Reuchlin. At any rate, somewhere along the line he became extremely proficient in the study of Hebrew, as well as of Greek and Latin. In Regensburg, he was able to find a teaching position. He next departed for Basel in 1522, where he was apparently drawn by an interest in Luther's teachings, but especially in the hopes of making the acquaintance of Oecolampadius.\textsuperscript{15}

While in Basel, Denck earned his living as a proofreader for the famous printers there, first Cratander, and later Valentin Curio, editing for the latter an edition of Theodorus Gaza's Greek grammar.
More important, he attended Oecolampadius' lectures on Isaiah, and possibly some lectures of Erasmus. Oecolampadius was sufficiently impressed to recommend the young linguist and humanist to Pirckheimer in Nürnberg for an important position as rector of the St. Sebald school.16

Denck took up his new position at Nürnberg in September, 1523. Sometime during the first year there he was married, the council awarding him 52 fl. to provide food and shelter for himself and his wife.17 The first indication that Denck would cause trouble occurred on June 13, 1524, when the council called him to account for having forbidden his students to serve as acolytes.18 Until that time, he apparently lived a blameless life as schoolmaster, but surely, also, became involved in the intellectual and religious life of the city. But not until January, 1525 did the council discover that its prized schoolteacher had gravitated to a radical position.

Denck's confession19 consists of two parts, the first a statement dealing with the nature of faith, the second a discussion of the sacraments of baptism and the mass. Although the council, on the advice of the theologians, implied that Denck consciously made his "confession" vague by writing in a "complicated and cunning form," one should bear in mind that he was still a young man, in his early twenties, of a sensitive and questioning nature, who had not yet formulated a coherent and consistent theology. His, like the young Luther's, was a deeply personal quest for religious certainty, and a quest that continued to the end of his short life.20 Shortly after his banishment from Nürnberg, he became the spokesman of South
German Anabaptism, but before his death, just two years later, he had already turned to a more rational evangelical spiritualism. Already apparent in the confession of 1525, however, are the heavy influences of humanism and mysticism.

He confesses that man is innately a miserable (armutselig) and wanton (muttwillen) creature. But at the same time, there is something within him that opposes this innate wretchedness and points to "life" and "blessedness." One (Luther) says that through faith one achieves life. That may well be, but from whence comes this faith? In these few sentences with which Denck began his confession, he, in fact, laid the groundwork for the direction of his own thought. The problem with justification through faith becoming doctrinal is that it soon becomes an inherited and false faith. "Is faith, too, innate?" he asks. Obviously it is not. He was taught faith by his parents, he read about faith in books. He reached the point where he even boasted of his knowledge of faith—this faith that is supposed to combat man's innate miserable condition. (Disen falschen glauben strafft gewiss vorgemelte angebore armutseligkayt.) Inherited faith infers inherited salvation. But the more one prepares, the more this innate wretchedness increases. (Ye mer ich mich butz und mutz, ye mer sy von nötten zurymbt.) Hence inherited faith is a false faith. In truth, he says, I have never properly considered that which is innately within me, and which opposes my naturally miserable condition. Truth must be with this inner voice. (Dises wayss ich bei mir gewiss, das es die warhayt ist.)
Denck admits that he has not yet achieved true faith himself, but he is convinced that the key to it is "conscience," that innate "inner" "something" that opposes the natural, imperfect, miserable nature of man. He has vowed to give reign to this, to listen to it, to follow its commands, and allow no one to cause him to swerve from obedience to it. This inner voice caused him to want to read Scripture, which "by nature" he could not believe:

Thus I read it and find in parts of it testimony which bear witness to the fact that even that which motivates me is Christ, of whom the Scripture testifies that he is the Son of the Most High.

The humanist and mystic influence in Denck is readily apparent. No one can convince him that man is wholly evil. The natural propensity to good, or better, an impulse struggling toward goodness, is the spark of the divine in each man. It is the "inner Word," a continuing revelation, that helps the individual to understand the written "Word" of Scripture. Without it Scripture is but a lantern in the dark until the "Eternal light" breaks through. Each man must await the revelation of God. He who tries through his own endeavors to understand Scripture, which of itself is confusing and at times contradictory, can only foment division and sectarianism in Christianity, as its history shows, and establish a false faith that leads to legalism. As Austin Evans points out, the formulation of Denck is not radically different from Luther's belief in the Word of God in Scripture, but Denck sees the dangers of institutionalism and legalism even in Lutheranism, and falls back upon a totally subjective norm.22
Turning his attention to the sacraments in the second installment of his confession, Denck again has not come to a set conclusion, but he demonstrates the direction in which he is going. He draws the distinction between "inner" and "outward" baptism. Inner baptism is the baptism of the Spirit and is necessary to salvation, wherein the Word of God lodges in the heart of man, leading him to a conscience at peace with God. "Outward baptism is not necessary to salvation," but is a demonstration of the "convenant of a good conscience with God [I Peter 3:21]." At this point, Denck does not expressly conclude, as he will a short time later, that water baptism is an outward sign of spiritual baptism, that, by definition, is valid only as believer's baptism. Inner baptism is the true meaning of the scriptural pronouncement, "He who believes and is baptized will be saved." Without it, water baptism is no more than the washing of vegetables while they still grow in the dirt. Like baptism, the Lord's Supper has inner and outer significance. The partaking of the outward bread and wine is not necessary to salvation and is only a sign that one has eaten and drunk the spiritual body and blood of Christ. The Eucharist is the outward sign of inner love and faith and has no efficacy for the man who has not been inwardly cleansed.

The response of the theologians to Denck's confession showed none of the leniency that shortly before had been granted to Greiffenberger. Too many persons had now been revealed to have dangerous leanings for repressive action not to be taken. The theologians were concerned not only with the written confession of Denck, but also his oral response to their questions, and in a
significant and wider context, because of his position as leader of
the other sacramentarians. Denck was impelled, they said, not by an
inner voice to the good that is Christ, but rather by a foreign spirit,
the working of the devil. Scripture could be interpreted in only one
way, and whoever wanted to comprehend it and follow its precepts
could do so with no difficulty. Those having difficulty understanding
Scripture were those not really wanting to abide by it. Since Denck
admitted that he had not attained faith, it was clear that the devil
was working within him.

Concerning the sacraments, the theologians stated that the
necessity of baptism by water for salvation was clearly written
in Scripture. With regard to the Eucharist, they devoted themselves
to demonstrating the doctrine of the real presence. They apparently
were ascribing to Denck the symbolic interpretation of Karlstadt,
although in his confession Denck never actually denied the real
presence of Christ in the sacramental elements, but stated only that
the efficacy of the sacrament depended upon the faith of the
participant, and in itself was not necessary for salvation. Above
all, the greatest charge the theologians felt should be held
against Denck was that he was spreading error among the people.
Since he would not listen to reason and accept instruction from
the theologians, they maintained that the council had the duty to
take what ever measures it felt necessary to prevent the further
spread of Denck's errors. Thus Denck was immediately expelled
from the city.

Nothing in either Denck's confession, the reply of the
theologians, or the council's final action in expelling Denck suggests that his expulsion was for any other reasons than religious ones. However, the trial of the others, whose leader the council apparently took to be Denck, indicates that the council did fear sedition, inferring they held Denck responsible for it.

The exact chronological order of the interrogations of those held suspect by the council is difficult to determine because the confessions contained in the protocol of the case are undated. However, by comparing the individual statements contained in the protocol with the council's recorded minutes, a reasonable conjecture of what must have taken place is possible. On the reverse side of the last page of the protocol is inscribed, "Action and questions of the council concerning Sebald and Barthelemites Behaim and Jorg Bentz, painters, and several more persons involved in the affair concerning our holy faith, including their answers. Because of this the two Beheims and Bentz were imprisoned."

The several other persons involved were Sebald Baumhauer, Veit Wirsperger, and Ludwig Krueg. From the testimony of Wirsperger, Sebald Baumhauer was the son of Sebald Baumhauer, also an artist, and since 1510 the administrator of St. Sebald's Church resources. Veit Wirsperger, likewise, appears to be the son of a famous artist, Veit Wirsperger, the sculptor, the quality of whose work ranks only below that of Veit Stoss and Adam Kraft. The young Wirsperger is called by Sebald Behaim, "Veit Glaser's Sohn." Ludwig Krueg was a goldsmith. All the testimony contained in the protocol must have been
taken between January 10, the day the Behaim brothers were first questioned, and January 18, when the council turned its full attention to Hans Denck. Two separate testimonies are contained in the protocol from the Behaim brothers, and internal evidence strongly suggests that these testimonies were given on different days. The first testimony of Sebald implicated Hans Denck, Veit Wirsperger, and Jorg Pentz in the affair. Although the imprisonment of Pentz on January 12 could suggest that this was the initial testimony of the Behaim's on January 10, the strongest evidence is that it occurred on January 14 for two reasons: first, on that day the council ordered the "immediate" investigation of Denck, suggesting it had not held him suspect until that day; and, second, the testimony of Barthel Behaim mentions the charge of denial of the civil authority which the council specifically laid on January 14. The remainder of the testimonies probably were given on January 16, including the most damaging testimony of Veit Wirsperger, which implicated Sebald Baumhauer in the affair. Thus the order of the testimonies contained in the official protocol of the case must have been as follows: first, the initial testimonies of the Behaim brothers, second, the testimony of Veit Wirsperger, and finally, the second testimony of the Behaims and those of the other defendants.

In the first testimony of Sebald Behaim, he denied having taught anyone anything, as "rumors" suggested, although he did admit that there were several comrades with whom he had many times discussed his doubts (mangel). One of these doubts was that he could not believe that the body and blood of Christ were
truly present in the form of wine and bread. The understanding of what takes place in the sacrament is not something that can be taught. Instead one can only cleanse, or prepare one's self and be willing to have patience until God gives him the correct understanding. Sebald's view was certainly in keeping with Denck's concept of the inner spirit. He also stated that he had heard many sermons by the preachers but had not seen evidence that they produced any improvements in those who heard them. Apparently in response to a question suggesting that perhaps he was only confused in his understanding of the sacraments, Sebald said he had not been confused by either the writings of Luther or other preachers, but had always been of the opinion that he now held. He had, however, been persuaded to receive the sacrament at the Augustinian church, even though in his heart he felt otherwise, and thus feared he had done wrong. Thus he had not partaken of the sacrament since then, nor did he want to partake of it again, unless he was informed differently in the matter. The preacher, he said, although he did not state which preacher, had said the same thing, that a strong man did not need signs. Since he, Behaim, held the Eucharist to be a sign, he felt he did not need it either.

Concerning baptism, he knew nothing, and could neither condemn nor praise it. But of this he was certain, baptism had nothing to do with water (Es lig am wasser nichts). Sebald Behaim concluded his testimony by saying he had never made any unsuitable speeches. The only persons with whom he had discussed his doubts
were the schoolmaster of St. Sebald, his brother, Barthel, Georg Pentz, and Veit Glaser's son (Wirsperger). His last remark was to request to be allowed to make restitution for his misdeeds through instruction, that he was now willing to accept.

The statements of Barthel Behaim were not so conciliatory. He stated that he could not believe that the body and blood of Christ were present in the form of bread and wine, nor could he hold baptism to be anything. They were both simply trifles created by men, that if removed from arguments of the heart, could not be believed on the basis of Scripture. Further, he said, he had spoken to many people about these things, including Osiander, whose sermons he had been hearing for two years, and still he had not heard a satisfactory explanation. So far, he had seen nothing beneficial in what the preachers had to say. And in these questions, he wanted to stand by his own opinion.

Concerning a suggestion that had been made to and by the council that he and his brother proposed that no one should work, and everything should be shared, together with the accusation that he was a despiser of secular authority, Barthel's response was that he recognized no overlord but God the almighty. Then, apparently anticipating a severe judgment by the authorities, he concluded:

[Even]if one's brothers are against him, and punish him, each one must obey the other, and one brother must punish the other, nowhere is it written, "When your brother sins and calls you malicious, take him and justify him, and [such] punishment is to be a hand for a hand and an eye for an eye and thus to death."
The implication of this final statement of Behaim's is that even if it can be substantiated from Scripture that a secular authority is necessary and ordained, if that authority is truly a Christian magistrate, it will operate according to the Sermon on the Mount, and not according to the Mosaic Law.

If Barthel Behaim's testimony was not self-incriminating enough, that of Veit Wirsperger made certain that the Behaims would not get off lightly. Asked what commerce he had had with the two brothers and what manner of unsuitable speeches he had heard from them, Wirsperger replied that it was not without reason that he recognized these two men as persons who were reported to be evil in matters of faith and had therefore been seized. These men, said Wirsperger, had had much commerce with a priest whom the council had banned from the city. The priest to whom Wirsperger was referring can be none other than Heinrich Pfeiffer, the revolutionary from Mühlhausen. The identification of Pfeiffer as the priest to whom Wirsperger referred is confirmed by a council directive of January 17, that "the three painters be further questioned concerning what intercourse they have had with the Schwertschmid at Erlangen." Wirsperger continued by saying that although this priest had several times come to them, that is, at his own initiative, they had also invited him to be with them "for the sake of brotherly love." Apparently Wirsperger was referring only to the Behaims here, and was not including himself in the discussions with Pfeiffer. At any rate, he went on to say that the intention of these meetings was to come to the truth.
The sum total of it all, said Wirsperger, was that the brother called Barthel had stated that he knew no Christ and knew nothing to say concerning him. It was just as he had heard said of a duke who had ascended a mountain to inquire about faith and then had to ask if he could now be informed as to who was answering him. The same could also be said about Sebald Behaim, said Wirsperger, who is no less obstinate and devilish (teuffelheftiger) than the other. Both were troubled that Christians should have the same kind of authority over them as their wives.

Besides all of these errors, said Wirsperger, the two brothers have been going about with pamphlets of Künstzer and Karlstadt, and with them has been a young man, master Sebald Kirchner's son Sebald Baumhauer. Wirsperger stated that he personally had heard the brothers say that authority amounted to nothing and in time would pass into ruin. He said he did not know what they meant by that, and they had not revealed their meaning to him. He did know, however, that they maintained that the government should be allowed to exercise no authority that had not been granted to it by the teachings of St. Paul.

No doubt the council found the testimony of Wirsperger extremely alarming. For the final round of questioning it drew up a list of six specific questions, designed to be answered with a clear affirmation or denial, indicating the council was tired of what it considered to be vague and, possibly, purposefully ambiguous responses. The council's questions and the respective answers of the defendants, as recorded by the council secretaries,
were as follows:

Question 1: "Whether he believes there is a god."

Answers: Both Behaims—"Yes."
Jorg Pentz—"Says he accepts it in part, however, whether he holds what he is supposed to hold about this god, he does not know."
Sebald Baumhauer—"Says he accepts that there is a god."

Question 2: "What does he maintain concerning Christ?"

Answers: Behaims—"Hold nothing of Christ."
Pentz—"Hold nothing of Christ."
Baumhauer—"Holds that Christ Almighty is of the Father."

Question 3: "If he believes the Holy Gospel and Word of God are confined to Scripture."

Answers: Behaims—"Does not know if it is holy."
Pentz—"Can not believe the Scripture."
Baumhauer—"From his own power he does not believe the Son reveals that to him through the Holy Ghost. Gladly would he accept that it loves him."

Question 4: "What he maintains concerning the Sacrament of the Altar."

Answers: Behaims—"Holds nothing of it."
Pentz—"Holds nothing of the Sacrament of the Altar."
Baumhauer—"Of the Sacrament of the Altar, [he] does not know if the flesh and blood of Christ are there. One says that, another says something else. He can not believe it."

Question 5: "What he maintains concerning the baptism."

Answers: Behaims—"Nothing."
Pentz—"Holds nothing of baptism."
Baumhauer—"Baptism is an outward sign. He who has not been baptized inwardly has not discovered the power [Crafft], baptism is not effective. Who eats the body of Christ and discovers the compassion in Him, that he maintains is the proof that he is also baptized."

Question 6: "If he believes in the secular authority and recognizes the council of Nürnberg as his lord over his body, his goods, and what is external."

Answers: Behaims—"No."
Pentz—"He knows no lord but God alone."
Baumhauer—"In so far as they have the authority from God, they are our superior [oberer]."
The final person whose testimony is included in the protocol is Ludwig Kreug, the goldsmith. The charges against Kreug were that he had made unsuitable speeches concerning "the almighty God, Holy Scripture, and His Testament." He was asked what he had to say in response to these charges. His reply was that despite appearances to the contrary, he was innocent of all charges. True, he said, he had stood with other good apprentices on the market place before the apothecary's, where an offensive sermon was delivered by a monk. He had reflected much on the great difficulties one observed as a result of this offensive outpouring in the city. Various persons followed the monk in the same manner, although he did not know everything that was said. He did not know that if he held the opinion pronounced by others, that Christ was absolutely nothing, it might follow that he would be taken to task by the council. Nevertheless he was always of the opinion that these people did not speak wisely and were not correct in what they said, for he, Kreug, believed that one should believe in Christ. Further, Kreug continued, he had no doubts or hesitations about anything in spite of the contradictions between what the monk had said and the pastors' sermons. And from that point on, said Kreug, he wanted to stay away from too many speeches concerning these things.

Although the testimony of Kreug and Wirsperger indicates that they were not as innocent as they pretended, the cases against both men were dropped. The same was true of Baumhauer, even though he clearly was in error. Perhaps these three were felt to be amenable to instruction. Perhaps it was because of their age, for
they all must have been young men. For whatever reasons, the council mentioned them no more, and after the disposition of the case against Denck, full attention fell upon Pentz and the two Behaim brothers. On January 26, the council ordered the case to be reviewed by the city's five theologians and three lawyers, for their advice on what the council's final actions should be. On the same day, "the learned" returned their opinion. The conclusions of the theologians were that even if the three artists would accept instruction, which was not likely, for one of them had uttered upon leaving a session with the preachers, "Yes, there is certainly sufficient talk, but little proof," the danger remained that their errors would be spread and cause blood letting and rebellion. Should that happen, the Gospel would be discredited, the advancement of God's truth hindered, and the devil again allowed to take the place of God. The only recourse was that the men be banned from the Church and expelled from the city.

The legal advisers, on the other hand, argued that the artists had been sufficiently punished by their two-week imprisonment. They cited as a precedent for their position that even though by imperial law the civil magistrates had the authority to banish those who fell away from the true faith, the fact remained that the followers of Arius himself were not banished when they acknowledged their errors. The recommendation of the lawyers, therefore, was that the three men should be further instructed, while, at the same time, the city's preachers cautioned the populace against falling into such errors. If, after that, the men continued in their errors,
the council would have a free hand to do with them as it pleased.

The theologians countered this view on the grounds that the council would in that instance be threatening the artists to profess the views of the city government in public. This would amount to religious coercion, and that was not acceptable. At the same time, it would not prevent the contamination of the faith of the people in the city. As Austin Evans pointed out, the lawyers were arguing from the viewpoint of punishment for past offenses, while the theologians were concerned about how to protect the community from heretical contamination. In the view of the theologians, to compel their subjects in religious faith was beyond the legitimate powers of the civil government, whose responsibility was to protect the faithful from contamination.  

A final document, in the handwriting of the council secretary Lazarus Spengler, presents six "reasons why it would be troublesome to tolerate the three painters here in this city." First, the document reads, the painters, despite all warnings and instruction, appeared to be completely godless and heathen, not only on the first, but also on the second and third days of questioning. They would listen to no one and held the preachers and secular authority in contempt.

Secondly, the importance of the case extended far beyond a mere concern for the private or public beliefs of these three painters, the author continued. All evidence indicated that their intentions were to spread their views among others and that should they be tolerated, they would attract to them many of a frivolous
and sensual nature, thus giving the painters an opportunity to make their views known. It cannot be assumed that these men would remain silent. To the contrary, their attitude throughout has indicated their purpose to be the continued spread of their evil ways.

Third, stated the author, there is a great fear that the dungeon jail has done more than the Word of God to bring about a confession and alteration of the position of these men, while their hearts remain steadfast in their previous beliefs. This is evinced by the overheard remark, "Much has been said to us, if only they could prove it."

Fourth, these men, in the presence of their lords, have denied their duty and oath before the secular lords, which even the schoolmaster never did. Indeed, Denck was not as godless as these people in his beliefs, yet he has been banished from the city. Why now should these be given more consideration?

Fifth, these men are so odious for the most part to all men that if they were allowed to remain, they might in time be slain, and that would be an evil consequence.

Sixth, one must also fear that, as already mentioned, many erroneous beliefs and opinions could arise among many men as a result of the presence of these painters in the city. That would mean that henceforth sermons and instructions would not suffice for the community as a whole, but each one's errors would have to be dealt with separately. Such a situation would be intolerable, creating an unbearable load not only for the preachers, but also for "my lords."
The council accepted the recommendations of the theologians and, if he is the author of the last piece of advice, Spengler. As of January 27, the city jailer no longer listed the three artists as part of his expenses, indicating that the men were immediately expelled from the city, although no mention is made of the final disposition of the case for several months. The council had already, on January 23, found a replacement for Denck as rector of the school at St. Sebald in the person of Sebald Haiden. Denck, after leaving the city, first accepted an invitation from Müntzer to teach at Mühlhausen, where he remained until May, 1525, before being forced to flee from there with Pfeiffer and four hundred others. Next he appeared at St. Gall, where Anabaptism was beginning to take hold. From September, 1525 to October, 1526, he was in Augsburg, there coming into his own as a prominent and creative leader of South German Anabaptism.

All three of the exiled painters requested permission to return to the city in early March, 1525, and to have their sentences reduced. The council refused this request, as it did another on March 18, that came, strangely enough, through Count Albrecht von Mansfeld. On May 28, however, the council began to relent. Jorg Pentz was given permission to take up residency in Windsheim, about twelve hours distant from Nürnberg, on the condition that he avoid the city of Nürnberg and all the villages within the council's jurisdiction. On July 10, another supplication by the Behaims was refused, and on August 19, all three artists were refused a request for a further hearing.
Finally, on November 16, 1525, through the intercession of the provost of St. Sebald, Melchior Pfinzing, the council repealed the sentence against all three men, but with the threat that they would be closely watched and any unsuitable activities on their part would result in another expulsion. When the three men accepted the reprieve is uncertain. Jorg Pentz eventually returned to the city and apparently maintained good relations with the council thereafter. Barthel and Sebald Behaim probably both returned to the city some time before August 16, 1526, at which time they were again questioned by the council concerning their views of the sacraments and again threatened with imprisonment. Barthel then appears to have left the city forever, following an itinerant career as an illustrator and engraver. Sebald Behaim remained in Nürnberg until 1528, when he had a final altercation with the council for attempting with the printer Hieronymus Formschneider (also called Andre) to put out a surreptitious edition of Albrecht Dürer's *Four Books on Human Proportions*. Dürer had died April 6, 1528, before the work was in print. After his death, his widow was trying to see the book into print. Behaim and Formschneider were ordered to wait until the first edition was off the presses and in circulation before they put out their version "on pain of severe punishment to body and goods." After this episode, Sebald also left the city permanently, following the same kind of career as his brother.
The torture in Nürnberg. The suspect's hands were tied behind his back, a rope attached to his wrists, and in that manner he was hoisted until his feet were well off the ground. Then stones of increasing weight were attached to his feet. The council usually specified precisely which stone should be used, either a small or large one, the first to cause great pain, the second was expected to cause internal bleeding. A hole had been drilled from the council chamber to the torture room below it so that the council could always hear the effects of their measures. All torture had to be supervised. For a discussion of torture in Nürnberg, see Strauss, pp. 225-227.

zuverkaufen — literally, "to talk others into buying."

Apparently the entry refers to Denck's own children and not his pupils, although the evidence suggests that they had only one child at the time.


16 Ibid.

17 RB 12, 218v., February 10. Previous to this he had received free lodging.

18 Rv. 704, 15r.


20 Cf. Williams, p. 150.

21 Denck does not go into the question of predestination here. As a humanist in the Erasmian tradition, he dismisses it out of hand. Later he devoted an entire treatise to the problem, entitled "Whether God is the Cause of Evil." In Denck's Schriften, II, pp. 27-47, "Was geredt sey, das die schrifft sagt, Gott thue und mache guts und böses. Ob es auch billich, das sich yemandt entschuldige der sünden und sy Gott überbinde."

22 Evans, p. 74.

23 Cf. Williams, p. 154: Denck's employment of Luther's "unique translation of 1 Peter 3:21...marks the moment in church history when a tremendous personal conviction is on the point of acquiring constitutional significance, for as soon as Denck's inward faith, to which he here bears testimony, will have been outwardly confirmed by believers' baptism at the hands of Hubmaier in Augsburg, the covenantal ecclesiology of the Anabaptist churches of South Germany will have taken form."


25 StAN, S I L 78, Nr. 14 ad. Printed in Kolde, Zum Prozess, pp. 243-247, but not without errors.

26 Kirchner. Cf. Baring, pp. 176-177. Thus Hans Denck, ostensibly an employee of St. Sebald, received his stipend from the elder Baumhauer, providing at least one initial connection with the son and possibly the whole artist circle.
For a discussion of the elder Wirsperger, see Pfeiffer, Münchner Geschichte, p. 241.

Glaser=glazier. See also Kolde, Zum Prozess, p. 246, fn. 1.

Kolde, BBKG, p. 64.

See above, p. 55.

"wisz sich des pisher nit zu unterrichten, müsz und woll damit pacientz haben pis Im got geben well." Cf. Denck's Schriften, II, p. 20, fn. to line 23, the use of the terms "putzen und mutzen," meaning "sich putzen," by both Müntzer and Denck. Of course, Behaim may here be using only "muss."

Possibly this refers to Wenzeslas Linck, who frequently preached at the Augustinian chapel. The sermon to which Behaim referred was probably an evangelical sermon against Catholic ritual, work righteousness, or the sacramental system.

This difficult passage reads: "Wan seyn brüder wider ine sind und er ine straff, sey eyn yeder dem andern zu gehorchen schuldig, und ein bruder hab den andern zu straffen. Es stee nirgent geschriben, wan dein bruder sindigt und dir dein bosheit sagt nym in und rechtferzig in, und die straff sey ein handt umb ein handt, ein aug umb ein aug und also furt aus."

Rv. 712, 10r. Italics mine. Friedrich Roth, Die Einführung der Reformation in Münster (Würzburg: A. Stubners Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1885), p. 250, first stated that this referred to Heinrich Schwertfeger, whom we now know was Heinrich Pfeiffer. Kolde, Zum Prozess, p. 246, fn. 2, however, says it was probably Martin Reinhart. The council reference of January 17 confirms that it was Pfeiffer and not Reinhart, since the council documents refer to him as Schwertschmid in other places.

The same person to whom Wirsperger referred, that is, Pfeiffer.

Rv. 712, 17r. The city's theological advisers in this period were Osiander, of St. Lorenz; Dominicus Schleupner, of St. Sebald; Thomas Gechauf, known as Venatorius, of the New Hospital Church of the Holy Spirit; Wenzeslas Linck, of the Augustinian church of St. Vitus; and Friedrich Pistorius, of St. Egidien. The lawyers in the case were Christoph Scheurl, Michael Marstaller, and Johann Protzer.

Schlb. 4, 195v.–197v. Also in S I L 78, Nr. 14 ad. Printed in Kolde, Zum Prozess, pp. 247-249.

This belief on the part of the city's theologians, that to tolerate any form of theological radicalism, let alone whatever social
or political manifestations such radicalism might take, could dis-
credit the "Gospel," that is, the evangelical faith, would become
a recurrent motivation in their advice to the council for repression
of dissenters. In turn, that advice would have its effect upon the
council's diplomatic activity after it officially adopted the
evangelical position.

39 Evans, p. 86.

40 Ursachen warumb es beschwerlich sey, die drey maler hie in
der Statt zu gedulden, in S I L 78, Nr. 14. Printed in Kolde, Zum
Prozess, pp. 249-250. Kolde contends this is a further "advice"
from the theologians. The work is written in the first person,
however, suggesting that it was Spengler's opinion, or a summary of
all the arguments, including those of the council itself.

41 "furwitz und leichfertigkait"—The use of "furwitz" here
possibly refers to another serious problem confronting the council
at precisely the same time, an outbreak of bigamy and polygamy,
which the authorities seem to connect with religious heterodoxy.
This will be discussed below, Chapter IV.

42 Kolde, BBKG, p. 69, fn. 1.

43 Rv. 712, 15v.

44 For an account of the later career of Denck, see Williams,
pp. 155-162, and Jan J. Kiwiet, "The Life of Hans Denck (ca. 1500-
1527)," MQR, 31 (1957), 227-259, and "The Theology of Hans Denck,"
MQR, 32 (1958), 3-27. Hereafter cited as Kiwiet, MQR, 31 and MQR, 32.

45 Rv. 714, 4v., March 8. The request was apparently made
through the Behaims' mother. Cf. Kolde, BBKG, p. 70.

46 Rv. 714, 13r.: "Graf Albrecht von Mansfeldt seiner gnaden
furpitten fur die drei maler mit erbern worden und bericht irer
handlung lainen."

47 Rv. 717, 11v.; EB 89, 239v.-240r.: "Nurnberg an Jorg Penz,
maler."

48 Rv. 718, 19r.; Rv. 720, 9r.

49 Rv. 723, 11r.

50 Rv. 733, 27v.: "Sich Peheim, malers, der des sacraments halb
auch verdacht ist, sag dismals benugen zulassen und doch daneben
seinerhalb in geheimd kindschaft zu machen, wie ers halt. Semen des
Pehaims bruder, der uf beschicken ungenorsam erschienen ist,
widerrumb zubeschicken zuvernemen und, wo er aber nit kam, in ins
loch furen zelassen." This must surely refer to Sebald and Barthel.
Barthel apparently never answered the summons.
51 Rv. 759, 14v.-15r., RB 14, 228v.-229r., July 22, 1528, and again on August 26, 1528, RB 14, 249r.

52 For a discussion of the careers of the two brothers, see Adolf Rosenberg, Sebald und Barthel Beham, zwei Maler der Deutschen Renaissance (Leipzig: E. A. Seeman, 1875). Hereafter cited as Rosenberg.
CHAPTER IV

THE CONTINUATION OF URBAN RELIGIOUS DISSENT

The strong measures taken by the council against Hans Denck, Jorg Pentz, and the Behaims did not stem the rising number of persons who daily were charged before the council for religious heterodoxy or religious related "crimes," contrary to the opinions of the theologians in their advice on the three painters. In addition to these problems with the "fanatics" and "sacramentarians," the council also found that some persons felt the "freedoms of a Christian" ushered in by the evangelical reformation included a suspension of moral and marital law.

On January 16, 1525, the council discovered that Adam Satler, probably a harness maker, and a number of others in his "circle," had developed some strange ideas about marriage, and were attempting to implement those ideas. Satler and his two wives were imprisoned while two other men and their wives, two each, were summoned to testify before the council. The whole affair was then turned over to the city's provosts, lawyers, and preachers for their expert opinion. The council's advisers concluded:

On the confession and statement of Adam Satler and his followers, the honorable council's doctors, provosts, and preachers say that the case of these persons stands thus: They indeed intended to come together and be treated as married persons, according to the report of Satler to the
preacher of St. Lorenz [Osiander]. They have brought to this solemn ceremony guests and have made a contract while they both [Satler and his second wife] knew that his former wife was still living. It is apparent that Adam Satler is not so pure and blameless that he may be allowed another wife to live with the first. 4

The council was advised that this was adultery and a crime against God and the state. As such, it should be handled seriously or there would be no end to such cases. Such "frivolity" could not be tolerated. 5 The advisers suggested that the guilty pair, Satler and his second wife, be made to swear to stay away from each other and be given additional punishment, such as being placed in a tower or similar place for a long time or else be banished from the city. Thus others could clearly see that such iniquity would not be allowed in the city.

The testimony of Adam Satler also implicated two members of prominent Nürnberg families, Georg Kress and Hans Tucher, who apparently were supposed to negotiate with Satler and his first wife, but in so doing made statements belittling the institution of marriage and tending to sanction the bigamy. For their aid in the affair, the two patricians each received fourteen-day sentences in a tower, half of which was converted to a money fine. 6

Three other men were also implicated in the bigamy affair. The printer, Hans Hergot, was questioned concerning his connections with the group, though nothing seems to have come of it. 7 The other two men, Fritz Hamer and Merton von Kronach, both printers' engravers (Formschneider), possibly in the employ of Hergot, were ultimately imprisoned for having "more than one wife." As in the
case of Satler, the council's advisers recommended harsh punishments, but the final verdict of the council is not recorded. 8

Again in July, 1525, the council found itself confronted with questions of bigamy and concubinage. On July 28, an investigation of the bigamy of Wolf Henrichs was ordered, and a wholesale investigation of concubinage among priests and laity. 9 Finally, in December, 1526, after another outbreak of bigamist activity, this time centering around Wolf Seulich and Margaret Harder, who being already married, betrothed themselves to each other, 10 the council issued a general proclamation that henceforth "all subjects who are married and in the life span of their marriage partner marry another without proper divorce" would face punishment in life and limb. 11

Having decided upon a concerted policy in cases of bigamy and concubinage, the council seems to have stemmed the tide of at least one aspect of moral laxity that arose apparently as a result of popular misunderstanding of the kind of "freedom" provided by the evangelical faith. Ironically, one of the chief complaints of many of the spokesmen of the Radical Reformation against the evangelical position was that justification by faith, as generally understood by the masses, could and did lead to moral laxity, while the same charges of immorality were made against the radical sects. The ethical concern was apparent already in both Hans Greiffenberger and Hans Denck. At the same time, bigamy and even polygamy appeared among the most radical and individualistic sects that cropped up in the countryside surrounding Nürnberg in the late 1520's. 12

At any rate, the council's responsibilities as moral guardians
for its subjects increased considerably when it became the head of the church in Nürnberg, and as in everything else consequential to the acceptance of the Reformation, a considerable amount of time was needed to work out set policies for given cases. Meanwhile, the ethical issue was important for those who wanted and expected total reform.

On March 3, 1525, the council, at long last, began to take the final steps toward the formal transformation of the city's official religion from Catholicism to Lutheranism. A debate between partisans of both sides, although overwhelmingly arranged in favor of the proponents for Luther, was held from March 3-March 14, and three days later the Lutheran position was adopted, the break with Rome and the bishop of Bamberg was complete. For the next three years, one of the most serious problems confronting the council and the spokesmen for the new religion was the question of how to deal with those programs and demands for reform which went beyond anything either the religious or secular authorities could accept.

At first, the council and theologians seem to have thought that the greatest danger to religious solidarity in Nürnberg was coming from outside agitators, as evinced by their quick action against Beringer, Pfeiffer, Martin Reinhart, and finally Hans Denck, and their attempts to suppress the writings of Müntzer and Karlstadt. Christoph Scheurl, one of the legal advisers in the case against the three artists, wrote confidently to a friend in Genoa on January 22, 1525:
Everthing is quiet here in Germany except that the followers of Karlstadt are increasing. They deny that the body of Christ is in the host and combat the baptism of infants. They destroy the images and interpret the Scripture for themselves. But this poison is no longer being spread abroad among us: three painters have been thrown in jail.

But such confidence was premature. A major difficulty confronting the council, if indeed it could have controlled religious radicalism within its own populace, was how to stop the dissemination of radical ideas that came off the presses of its own printing industry at an alarming rate.

When the first unauthorized pamphlets of Karlstadt and Müntzer began to appear in the city in late 1524, the council reacted with a decree of December 17, that all books had to be submitted to the authorities before being put into print. On March 14, 1525, as a further precautionary measure, a warning was sent to the city's bookbinders that they were not to handle books deemed unsuitable for the citizenry. On April 26, a similar directive was sent to all of the book pedlars, specifically referring, however, to the works of Karlstadt. These, the council ordered, were not to be sold, either publicly or in private, and anyone found in possession of such works was to be immediately arrested. On the following day, decisive action was taken against certain pedlars in the city—"The book pedlars who are selling [on the street] below the council building are to be forbidden for three years within five miles of the city because they have offered for sale and sold a slanderous book against Martin Luther." The council then went on to require that all book pedlars in the city submit their total inventory of merchandise to council
inspection before permission would be granted for the sale of such merchandise. They further stipulated that anyone who attempted to avoid such inspection would be immediately arrested.17

The council's measures were not successful. Less than a week after the stringent measure against the book pedlars, a textile worker, N. Kämpf, was ordered interrogated for supposedly selling a Karlstadt pamphlet in secret.18 In the months to come, the council's inability to control its printing industry without even more sweeping measures became evident, raising the question of why the printers were willing to risk the council's wrath by continuing to print contraband material.

During the period 1524-1530, a total of eleven printers were operating at various times in the city. They were, with the dates of their operations in Nürnberg, as follows: 1) Hieronymus Hültzel, 1500-1525; 2) Hans Stuchs, 1509-c. 1530; 3) Friedrich Beipus, also called Peypus and Arthemius, 1512-1534; 4) Jobst Gutknecht, 1514-1542; 5) Wolfgang Resch, also called Wolfgang Formschneider and "the learned [Gelehrter] Formschneider," who probably did not possess his own press, 1517-1537; 6) Hans Wandereisen, 1523-1542; 7) Johann Petrejus, 1524-1550; 8) Hans Hergot, 1524-1527; 9) Hieronymus Andreae, usually called Hieronymus Formschneider and sometimes Hieronymus Grapheus, 1525-1556; 10) Georg Wachter, 1526-1547; 11) Hans Guldenmund, 1526-1560. Of these, the most important in the extent of his operation was Friedrich Beipus. Upon Beipus' death, his place as the most eminent of Nürnberg printers was taken by Johann Petrejus.19
Competition among these men must have been intense, and evidence suggests that several were having a difficult time staying in the black, especially the oldest of the printers, Hieronymus Hültzel. On January 20, 1525, for instance, Hültzel was ordered to acknowledge a promissory note held against him by one of his typesetters, as well as back wages owed the man.²⁰ The printer Hans Hergot had begun to resort to pirating the works of other printers in the city, and in March he was censured by the council for attempting to reprint a work originally printed by Jobst Gutknecht. Hergot was told to remember his duties as a printer, and the incident probably cost him a chance to become a citizen of the city.²¹

All told, the evidence seems to suggest that certain of the risks some of the printers took in publishing radical works were economically motivated. As will be seen, the council itself appears to have looked upon the transgressions of the men as being the result of a desire for profit and not for religious or seditious reasons, and at times, when the council was prosecuting them for violation of censorship regulations, it was also interceding with other authorities on their behalf for the payment of debts owed them outside of the city's jurisdiction.

After the affairs concerning the publication of works by Münzer and Karlstadt by Hieronymus Hültzel and the aides of Hans Hergot had blown over, Hültzel, as well as a new printer in the city, Hieronymus Andreae, became involved in an even more serious breach with the council's policies. The whole affair is extremely complex and difficult to untangle, primarily because of the
similarity of the two men's names, a fact that apparently caused Andreae to be implicated in the clandestine publication of a seditious work that actually had been printed by Höltzel. On May 15, Andreae was seized and imprisoned for having made an "evil, improper speech." On May 18, the council ordered an investigation of his possessions. But a diplomatic dispatch of May 20 reveals that the council's arrest and search of Andreae was not a routine affair, but probably had been prompted by an unofficial report that he was suspected of seditious activity.

The diplomatic dispatch states that a letter had been intercepted from the peasant army near Würzburg to "Jeronimus Formschneider" containing "many poisonous statements" (vil giftigen clausel) that Formschneider was to make public to his other Christian brothers in Nürnberg. This was on a Friday, and the council ordered the imprisoned Andreae to be questioned before the "assembled council" on the following Monday.

Over the weekend, apparently something happened to suggest to the authorities that not Andreae, but Höltzel should be held suspect, for on May 23, he also was imprisoned and ordered to be "put to pain" if he failed to respond adequately to questioning. On the same day, Höltzel's son-in-law (aidem), Hans von Frankfurt, was also ordered arrested, and the wife of a Nürnberg book pedlar, Marx Kiener, was questioned in an attempt to locate "examples" of a suspect pamphlet thought to be in Kiener's possession. The interrogation of Höltzel under torture, and his son-in-law under the threat of torture continued until May 27. On that day, the
order was given that should the book pedlars Marx Kiener and Hanns von Costniz attempt to enter the city, they too were to be immediately apprehended. Meanwhile, Hieronymus Andreae was kept in prison, under guard if necessary.

For the next week, the council ceased its interrogation of its prisoners, apparently awaiting further news from outside the city, especially with regard to Marx Kiener. Meanwhile, the city's censorship laws were extended, with the hope of preventing such episodes in the future. Perhaps the council felt its printers and merchants to be too mercenary to expect them to follow the letter of the law. At any rate, on May 30, it ordered that the city's typesetters were not to set up any works that had not been inspected and approved by the authorities, and each typesetter was to take an oath that he would abide by the decree.

By June 5, Hültzel had confessed to the publication of a pamphlet, that in the council's view could lead only to "rebellion, insurrection, and the spilling of blood." The council ordered the homes of Hültzel and Hans von Costniz searched in an attempt to confiscate all remaining copies of the work. The pedlar, Marx Kiener, however, had already taken a number of the pamphlets to the peasant army encamped near Bamberg for sale there.

Strangely enough, although Hültzel was obviously the man the council should have suspected all along, it did not cease its interrogation of Hieronymus Andreae, still imprisoned as late as June 20. The council suspected that Andreae was involved in the affair, and that the intercepted letter of mid-May referred to him.
His interrogation was to continue until it was discovered "who the brothers are with whom he is supposed to have dealt." On the following day, however, the council seems to have been convinced that Andreae had been mistakenly involved, as the true connections in the affair became known. He was questioned a final time and then probably released.

For their transgressions, Höltsel was expelled from the city while Kiener was simply not allowed to return. What at first sight might appear to be a lenient punishment by the council was tantamount to economic ruin for the two men. In her husband's absence, Kiener's wife sought to keep the business going, but she herself suffered from what amounted to economic sanctions by the council. The choice selling space Kiener had occupied on the central market place beside the Church of Our Lady (Frauenkirche) was taken away from his wife, although "out of pity" she was allowed to occupy one of two available spaces far removed from the major market area. At the same time, she was held to be accountable for her husband's debts.

In August, 1525, Kiener's fellow merchants petitioned the council to allow him to return to the city, but they too were refused. Finally, on September 1, the council granted Kiener a one week safe conduct to return to Nürnberg to pick up his wares. And at the end of that month, Margret Kiener appealed to Margrave Georg to intercede with the Nürnberg government for her and her children. Reluctantly the council agreed to permit Kiener's return, but only after carefully relating the seriousness
of Kiener's crime of contributing to the peasant cause in their opposition to the margrave. The ploy worked. Georg withdrew his request, and the council reiterated its banishment of Kiener.\textsuperscript{43}

Kiener periodically reapplied to the council for permission to return to the city. Some time before June 11, 1526, he must have received such permission, for on that date he appears again in the council documents—having received a one-month prison sentence in a tower for having an unauthorized pamphlet printed, which the council ordered off the presses and confiscated.\textsuperscript{44} By this time, Kiener's family was in such dire straits that the council wrote a debtor on their behalf, asking for repayment of an old debt so that Kiener's wife and small children might have some means of support.\textsuperscript{45} The last mention made of him in the council records appears on February 22, 1527, with the short entry: "Refuse to lessen the punishment or to give a reprieve to Marx Kiener."\textsuperscript{46} No mention is made of what the punishment was for, or what it entailed.

The fate of Hieronymus Höltzel was hardly better. On Christmas Eve, 1526, he was finally granted permission to return to the city, on the condition that he be carefully watched "to see how he behaves."\textsuperscript{47} But by then he was apparently a ruined man. During the one and a half years since his implication in the printing of the peasant pamphlet, a steady stream of suits was filed against him involving debts he owed. On October 4, 1525, the council wrote to Bishop Gabriel of Eichstätt, asking that a debt of 32 fl. he owed Höltzel be paid instead to the Nürnberg
book merchant Caspar Widlein, to whom Hültzel was indebted. On December 22, the council set up a meeting with his son-in-law to discuss how Hültzel’s heavy debts were to be paid. Although Hültzel lived at least until 1532, his last provable printing was that of 1525. Perhaps he retired, but the evidence tends to suggest that he never recovered from economic ruin.

The evidence also suggests that Hans Hergot’s economic position led him to take untoward risks. After his brush with the authorities over the publication of a Münzer pamphlet by his aides, in late 1524, he apparently never again printed anything offensive to the council. There was of course his attempted piracy of another printer’s work, and his indirect involvement with some bigamists, but after these events, the council wrote letters for him to solicit the payment of back debts owed him. But if Hergot stayed out of trouble with the Münberg authorities, he was not so careful elsewhere. On May 20, 1527, he was executed in Leipzig by order of Duke Georg for the printing of the radical treatise, Von der newen wandlung eynes Christlichen lebens.

As with the others, the economic condition of Hieronymus Andreae also appears to have been a factor in his difficulties with the council, although none came to such dire consequences as effected Hültzel, Hergot, or Kiener. In March, 1526, the council interceded with the Austrian chancellery for Andreae in an attempt to bring about payment for an engraving of the Emperor Maximilian that Andreae had done. The council extolled greatly the quality of the work, saying it would make Andreae famous throughout the Empire,
and asked that he be paid in full, not only "to bring Jeronimus out of his difficulties," but also to restore confidence to other artists.\(^{52}\)

In May, 1528, Andreae received two days in a tower for blasphemy and slander in a suit brought by one Wilhelm Weidol, but an investigation proved the plaintiff to be just as guilty of the same crimes in what seems to have been a normal, though heated, quarrel.\(^{53}\) Andreae's last difficulty with the council was his attempt with the artist Sebald Behaim to print Dürer's *Proportions*, which he ultimately did in October, 1528, before Dürer's wife had published the official first edition.

The strong stance taken by the council to gain control of the Nürnberg printing industry, its censorship measures and the examples made of those who did not take the measures seriously enough, was effective. On July 22, 1525, Simon Schrautenpach of Mühlhausen was immediately apprehended and expelled from the city when he came there to find a printer for a pamphlet that the council determined to be of an unsuitable nature, designed to further stir up peasant rebellion. Schrautenpach was said to be connected with the "spiritual fanatics and rebels of Mühlhausen," and would not be tolerated in the city.\(^{54}\)

On the other side, the council's measures had adverse effects on the city's book merchants, as well as the printers. On August 30, 1525, the council refused a request from the "book sellers below the council building" to be reimbursed fifty to one hundred florins from the community treasury to pay off their debts.\(^{55}\) The reason for their indebtedness seems clear from a directive of October 7, that they
should not sell what had not been examined by the council.\textsuperscript{56} Obviously the booksellers had back stock which they now could not unload because of the council's prohibitions and few were large enough to absorb the losses. Those who held the wares of Hieronymus, Hültzel could also not hope to recoup their losses from him, in that he not only was in exile at the time, but himself heavily in debt.\textsuperscript{57} Nothing was totally safe, as the printers who began to run reprints of a Luther work found out.\textsuperscript{58}

Although the council's censorship measures had their effects, these were felt most by those economically dependent on the printing industry. The purpose of the censorship laws, however, to protect the subjects of the city from unorthodox and seditious ideas, was not fulfilled. Censorship did not stop subversive works from coming into the city. More important, censorship of the press could not stop the word of mouth spread of new religious ideas. Throughout the years 1525 and 1526, the council was repeatedly confronted with religious extremism, ranging from iconoclasm among the masses—as at the beginning of Lent, 1525, when the council had to investigate a bit of revelry that included mockery of the Crucifix\textsuperscript{59}—to suspected heterodoxy among government officials—as when the council had to reprimand the secretary to the rural administrative center (Landpflegeramt) of Hersbruck, Georg Selnecker, for "unsuitable speeches concerning his faith."\textsuperscript{60}

Usually the problems were more serious. Repercussions continued to be felt from the circle that had surrounded Hans Denck and the three painters. While those men were still under trial, the
council severely reprimanded a Caspar Korn for "running after the
fanatics" although nothing further seems to have been done with him.
A cutler (messerer), Jorg Kunig, was exiled from the city for making
"great unchristian complaints of God," although, in consideration of
his young wife and three small children, the punishment was commuted
to four weeks in a tower with the warning that a repetition of his
blasphemy would result in corporal punishment.

Two of the original sacramentarian circle caused the council
considerable trouble. Both the scribe, Erasmus Wisperger, whose
public reading of a Karlstadt pamphlet had begun the investigation that
led to Denck and the artists, and Kunz Kobalt, the hatter's appren­
tice, not only continued their radical activities after accepting
instruction from the preachers and renouncing their former views,
but also made the transformation from sacramentarian to Anabaptist.
Of these, the most interesting is Kobolt.

Kobolt had agreed to accept instruction from Dominicus
Schleupner, and apparently recanted his "erroneous views" and swore
that he accepted the true teachings. But in August, 1525, the
discovery was made that he and two others, N. Zieglein, also a
hatter, and Loisel Knapen, who also may have been a hatter, certainly
a journeyman of one of the textile trades, had been reading Karlstadt
pamphlets at St. Lorenz Church. The investigation that followed
showed that the three men had been reading the pamphlet during the
preacher's (Osiander's) sermon, thereby hoping to cause a crowd to
gather and bring about a disputation.

On August 10, three pastors and two lawyers were asked to
advise the council in the case of one Mathes Lossel. Although no mention is made of a Karlstadt pamphlet, Lossel appears to be identical with Loisel Knappen. He had been giving the preachers, especially Osiander, trouble for some time, according to the statement of the theologians, and in their opinion could not be expected to accept further instruction in a sincere and heartfelt way. Lossel's particular offenses are not listed, although they most certainly concerned his view of the Lord's Supper and an accusation that the preachers were teaching that the participation in the mass and acceptance of the body and blood of Christ removed one's sins. The preachers emphatically denied this charge, saying that they taught that faith was necessary for the forgiveness of sins. Recalling the case of the godless painters, "the learned" advised that neither Christian instruction nor a jail sentence could correct the attitude of this "spiritual fanatic" (schwirmer geist), and justice would best be served if he were expelled from the city. The actual disposition of the case is not recorded, nor is there further mention of what transpired with Zieglein and Kobolt. Given Kobolt's earlier record and his later life story, he probably fled before being apprehended by the council.

In May, 1526, the council had to reprimand one of its rural pastors at a time when Philip Melanchthon was in the city for a visitation. Philip Münch, pastor in the village of Altdorf, was ordered to appear in Nürnberg for examination by the city's pastors and Melanchthon for a sermon alleged to have contained questionable material on the sacraments that was said to have caused confusion and
even unfaithfulness among the people of his parish. Münnich apologized for his sermon and the council accepted the apology, although it advised the local Landpfleger to keep an eye on him.

In February, 1526, the council had ordered an investigation of persons reported to have "held an assembly [sinagog] to speak contrary to the Word of God." But no report was given as to the kind of assemblies in question. Then, in July, what appeared to be a routine investigation of adultery turned into the sacrilegious use of the Host of the Mass, stolen from St. Sebald Church. The investigation began with the arrest of Seiz Beringer and Martin Brachman, and probably the wives (anhang) of both men. Beringer specifically was charged with adultery, but, under the threat of torture, was also questioned on the "second affair." Agnes Brachman, Martin's wife, was also interrogated "concerning the Host," with orders given, that if the charges were born out, her husband was to be proceeded against with all good speed. Further investigation revealed that Martin Brachman had stolen the chest containing the sacrament, presumably from St. Sebald. The council sought to determine where the chest had been taken, and for what purposes, but the documents do not reveal the results. All of those investigated were expelled from the city, as their repeated application for readmission demonstrates.

On July 16, the council turned the affair over to the theologians for their advice. In addition, the council asked that they make a formal reply "against the fanatics [with] the clear Word of Christ, that such errors might be rooted out." The theologians must have
responded quickly, for on that very day, the council issued a general proclamation to remedy the situation in which "many persons, citizens and non-citizens alike, have been gathering to dispute unsuitably the holy, most worthy sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, and to speak in a contemptible manner of it. They have also confounded the clear Word of Christ and drawn it down to the level of human opinion. For the most part, these things have taken place in the wine cellars and guest houses."72

The council went on to say that the point had been reached in which even the churches were subjected to contemptuous gestures and frivolity (leichtfertigkeit), directed at those who served the sacrament. This, the council said, it could not tolerate. All manner of sects and errors were being promulgated, where eternal truth was overthrown for personal opinion, and where the peace of the community was being destroyed. Since the council believed that its position as secular authority was God given, it felt it its responsibility to deal forthrightly with such sects, which were destroying the unity of the city. Therefore, the council decreed that throughout the city and all council territory, citizens and non-citizens alike were henceforth to avoid all such gatherings and disputations. Such prohibition was now to be considered a part of the standard obligations and responsibilities of the inhabitants of Nürnberg territory to their secular overlords, so that the devil no longer could disrupt the community. If anyone had questions concerning the faith, the council went on, or was in need of Christian instruction, he should henceforth proceed directly to the ordained preachers of the city who were
properly trained in the Word of God. On the other side, should any­
one take up such questions with unauthorized persons, or continue
to meet in assemblies or conventicles (conventikel) to proagate personal
errors, such persons would be energetically searched out and suffer .
the strongest punishment at the hands of the council.73 .

The implications of the council's edict are many. First, it
had given notice that it was totally in charge of religious questions
and religious transgressors would have to answer to it. The edict
thus gave it an open hand in dealing as it saw fit with such persons.
Second, the council had pronounced that whatever the subjects of the
council believed to be the results of the acceptance of the evangelical
faith, the Reformation in Nürnberg was still basically a conservative
one and the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers was not to
be taken literally. If the people of Nürnberg felt that the city's
preachers were continuing to act more like priests than pastors, they
were not entirely wrong. The spiritual superiority of the ordained
preachers was now confirmed, in so many words, by council decree.
For a man like Hans Greiffenberger to accept that situation would
be surprising and many, like Greiffenberger, would not accept it.

Third, the public promulgation of the council's position now
made it clear that those who were dissatisfied with the conservative
nature of the Reformation in Nürnberg and publicly made known their
dissatisfaction were breaking the civil law and faced civil penalties
for doing so. One could accept the situation as it stood, or openly
defy the city government and accept the consequences.

Fourth, the possibility cannot be overlooked that many who
prior to the edict saw their differences with the theologians of the city as mere differences of opinion, but not contrary to the evangelical position, now would challenge that position or, at least, the Nürnberg interpretation of the evangelical faith. In other words, the either/or attitude of the council and its spiritual advisers threw open the door to radical sectarianism, or individualism, for the spiritual malcontents of the city. Not surprising, then, is the increase in the number of persons who now, both secretly and in public, challenged the religious position of the council after the decree of July 16.

The sweeping proclamation of the council had been building for some time. The council had been inclined to blame religious disturbances upon outside agitators in the past. In the case of the godless painters, even though their attitudes were much more radical and seditious than Hans Denck's, Denck was given the most attention because the council, in effect, looked upon him as the leader and seducer of the native Nürnbergers. Müntzer, Pfeiffer, Martin Reinhart, the writings of Müntzer and Karlstadt, and others were all systematically removed for fear of their evil influence upon the peace and unity of the city.

At the conclusion of the Peasants' War, many, probably homeless, refugees turned to the imperial city for possible refuge and employment. As early as August 30, 1525, the council decreed that the "many foreigners in the city, even though their presence might be innocent," now, in light of the recent peasant rebellions, could not safely be tolerated in the city or its environs. All were
ordered expelled unless they could provide the council with a "written
leave or passport from their overlord." 74

Twice in April, 1526, the council found it necessary to issue
sweeping decrees for the banishment of undesirables. On April 5, it
stated that there were many persons in the city who previously
belonged to the peasantry and were now leading evil and frivolous
lives. These, the council ordered, were to leave the city or face
imprisonment. 75 On April 10, it decreed that there were many
formerly rebellious peasants in the city whose presence would not
be tolerated because they were not suitable to become subjects of
the council. Further, it stated that, at this particular time,
no one would be accepted to citizenship or as new subjects of the
city. 76 Apparently the council felt the risks were too great to
try to distinguish between those legitimately seeking residency
in the city and those whose presence could only lead to evil
consequences.

Only two days before the decree of July 16, placing all
authority in religious questions into the hands of the council and
duly appointed pastors, the council expanded the list of works and
teachings that would not be tolerated in Münberg:

All the book printers and pedlars are hereby informed
that to print or sell the books of Karlstadt, Oecolampadius,
Zwingli, or their followers, or those things that were dis­
puted at Baden in Argau will be severely punished by the
council, for they contain nothing but the work of the devil. 77

In addition to the general proclamation of July 16, the
council sent a statement to all the pastors in the city, and
presumably those in the rural areas under council jurisdiction,
informing them that the views of Karlstadt on the Lord's Supper were "totally contrary to the clear words of Christ, that he is present in the sacrament of his body and blood." The pastors were to strive in their sermons "to demonstrate the clear speech of Christ, so that such errors might be rooted out through your teachings." 78

The council hoped that religious problems could be handled by the city's pastors. The statement of July 16 to the pastors even went so far as to say that the chief responsibility for the enforcement of the decree of July 16 rested with the pastors. This meant, of course, that the pastors themselves would have to be supervised. As will be seen, Nürnberg was not without her share of preachers who came under the radical influence. 79

In spite of the council's decrees of July, 1526, it once again discovered that several of its more prominent citizens were involved in radical activities. On July 31, 1526, an investigation was ordered of a report that there were several "foreigners" in the city who discussed the sacrament of the altar in an unfavorable way. 80 Beginning on August 3, a book pedlar, Linhart Finck, was arrested and interrogated on the charge of having "chopped up several paintings" at the old Franciscan (barfusen) convent. 81 As an apparent result of these two investigations, on August 9, the council charged eight persons with fanaticism or "sacramentarian fanaticism." Hans Greiffenberger, the artist; Hans Sachs, the cobbler-meistersinger; Endres Leone, the cantor of St. Sebald's Church; and Linhart Finck were declared to be fanatics. Hans Greiffenberger was specifically charged with having administered the sacrament of the altar to his...
wife. Two artists, later revealed to be Sebald and Barthel Behaim, just returned to the city after their previous exile, were ordered interrogated for "fanaticism concerning the sacraments." A foreign priest (pfaffen), Hans von Landsberg, who was living with the Nürnberg, Bernhard Glazen, probably a glazer, was to be interrogated on the same charge.  

Also in August, a new pamphlet by Hans Denck, defending freedom of the will, appeared in the city, causing the council to issue a special prohibition against its sale in Nürnberg. The new involvement of Greiffenberger and the Behaims in a sacramental controversy, together with the appearance of Denck's work in the city at the same time, gave the council cause for alarm. It immediately requested the advice of the theologians and lawyers on how to handle the cases of Greiffenberger and Leone. The advice returned by "the learned" is of interest because it demonstrates that at least some of the lawyers did not feel that the so-called sacramentarians were in contradiction to the evangelical position as it had been presented by the theologians in the March debates.

The theologians, with minor exceptions, agreed with the opinion of Wenzeslas Linck. He stated that while Greiffenberger had no right to administer the sacrament to his wife, since he was neither ordered to do so nor had been appointed as a server of the mass in the churches, nevertheless, he was a pious man, not inclined to disturb the peace or foment rebellion. Linck went on to say that Greiffenberger had always maintained himself in a proper manner. In addition, although there is no suggestion as to how long before the
charge was made the alleged event occurred, Linck stated that it was a considerable length of time. Therefore he felt that a verbal reprimand was quite sufficient punishment. Greiffenberger's weaknesses should be demonstrated to him with the hope that since nothing really evil had thus far transpired, nothing worse would occur in the future.

Leone was charged with having denied the presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in the sacrament. In his case, Linck's advice was to attempt to ascertain the reasons for his position and to offer him instruction. Then, if he did not prove amenable to such instruction, he could be handled in such a way that others would not be tempted to follow him. The suggestion was made by Dominicus Schleupner that banishment was the best form of punishment, if Leone would not accept instruction.

Out of the six lawyers who gave advice, one, Johann Protzer, agreed with the theologians, and one, Christoph Scheurl, suggested harsher penalties. Scheurl felt that Greiffenberger should spend a day or two in prison, to serve as an example to others, and that Leone should be immediately imprisoned or exiled, because he was incapable of benefiting from instruction.

The remaining lawyers, however objected to the theologians' opinions. Michael Marstaller agreed that Greiffenberger should receive a verbal reprimand. But concerning the cantor, he felt that although he obviously had done wrong, it did not follow that he should be punished. The encounter of faith, he said, was a gift of God. Leone should be allowed instruction, but if he
received no value from it, then the question of his faith should be left to the grace of God.

Johann Hepstein, the chief legal adviser of the city, went even further. Greiffenberger, he said, should be released immediately for two reasons. First, the alleged event transpired so long ago that Greiffenberger's wife had since died. But more important, in the beginning of the Reformation in Nürnberg, many of the preachers stated that all men were priests and in righteousness before God equal. The preachers still told him this and no one had yet revealed anything different. Was Greiffenberger to be punished for accepting the evangelical doctrine literally? Leone, on the other hand, should receive a reprimand and be told that further trouble from him would result in his expulsion. Hepstein concluded his opinion with a general piece of advice for all his colleagues: To punish these or any men as an example to others was neither proper nor good. Every man should be judged and sentenced on the merits of his particular case.

The final two lawyers, Valentin Ketzler and Christoph Gugel, agreed with Hepstein and Karstaller, with Ketzler adding that Leone should be told to keep his lack of faith to himself and not to spread his error. If he broke such a vow of silence, then he could be expelled from the city.

Considering that Greiffenberger was a repeat offender and Leone was quite obstinate in his contrary view of the sacrament, the views of the theologians and jurists were moderate. On August 16, the council delivered its verdict:
Greiffenberger, who in the past administered the sacrament to his wife, a deed not suited to him since it is not his office and it is not satisfactory for him to serve in the church, is to leave the city.

The cantor from St. Sebald, who holds nothing of the sacrament, is first to take instruction from a preacher and after that also to leave the city. The two men were further informed that the ban included all council territory, and, until the council said otherwise, was permanent.

On the same day, the council returned its verdict on Bernhard Glazen and the priest, Hans von Landsberg. The priest, who was judged to be a fanatic, sacramentarian, and follower of Karlstadt and Zwingli, was to leave council territory immediately and "spend his money elsewhere." The latter phrase, generally used in the banishment of non-residents, apparently was meant to demonstrate that, even to the merchant-patricians of Nürnberg, some things took precedence over profit. For harboring the radical priest, Glazen was ordered flogged (bernen). The council had also discovered that Hans von Landsberg was on his way to nearby Windsheim, where he had been called to a pastorate, and promptly wrote to the authorities of that city, informing them of his sacramentarian fanaticism.

With regard to the Behaim brothers, the council informed Sebald that it was satisfied, for the time being, with his answers. Barthel, however, had not complied with the original order for his interrogation. The council, therefore, reissued its summons, adding that if he was again disobedient, he was to be imprisoned. But he had already fled the city, never to return. No report is given regarding the final verdict against Linhart Finck. Possibly he was
exiled with Greiffenberger and Leone. At any rate, he appeared before the council on similar charges in April, 1527, and was permanently banished from the city.

Hans Greiffenberger's exile lasted only one month. On September 18, the council gave him permission to return to the city without the usual warning that he would be closely watched and further transgressions would lead to dire punishment, suggesting that the council never intended to make his exile permanent, but was making of Greiffenberger an example for others. Nothing further is mentioned of the fate of Leone.

For the next few months after the last outbreak of sacramentalism in Nürnberg, any mention of religious radicalism in the city is conspicuously absent from the documents. In February, 1527, however, the council discovered that all was not calm on the religious front. In fact, Nürnberg territory was being well-worked by a new brand of radicals—the Anabaptists—and a new phase of the radical reformation had begun.
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CH.apter v

The Beginnings of Anabaptism in Nuremberg

A. Background

The development of South German Anabaptism began with the rebaptism of Hans Denck by the Swiss Anabaptist Balthasar Hubmaier in Augsburg in April, 1526. After his expulsion from Nuremberg, Denck had travelled to Muhlhausen at the invitation of Thomas Muntzer. From Muhlhausen he fled before the Peasants' War to St. Gall, and finally returned to Augsburg in September, 1525. Although Anabaptism was already beginning to flourish in St. Gall during Denck's stay there, the Swiss movement apparently had little influence upon him. In Augsburg he returned to the humanist circle of which he had been a part before his career in Nuremberg. Days before his arrival in Augsburg, Ludwig Hutzer had been ousted from the city as spokesman for a minority party of sacramentarian followers of Karlstadt and Zwingli. Gradually Denck stepped into Hutzer's place as leader of the sacramentarians in contrast to the Lutheran majority headed by the humanist Urbanus Rhegius.

The step from spiritualist-sacramentarian to advocate of believers' baptism can be a short one. Hubmaier, himself in flight from Zurich to Moravia because of his views, had little trouble convincing Denck to accept re-baptism. In turn, Denck was able to persuade Hubmaier to change his Zwinglian position on predestination.
Hubmaier continued on his journey to Moravia, and, as recent studies suggest, any direct connections between the Swiss Brethren and what became South German Anabaptism were severed.

To the South German movement Denck gave the spiritualistic tendencies already evident in his Nürnberg confession and to which he clung the remainder of his short life, even after he forsook organized Anabaptism in Basel because of its growing divisiveness and sectarian nature. His immediate influence upon the Anabaptist movement did not derive from preaching, teaching, or other direct contacts with large numbers of persons, but was based upon his theological works and personal contacts with a relatively few persons who became leaders of the movement. The most important of these persons was Hans Hut, won to the cause and rebaptized by Denck on May 26, 1526. The act was the only recorded rebaptism ever performed by Denck.

Since Hut had visited Denck in Nürnberg, he had become, if not a follower, at least a sympathizer with the socio-revolutionary program of Müntzer and Heinrich Pfeiffer. The failure of the Peasants' Revolt and the tempering influence of Denck had mollified the most extreme of these views. But Hut always retained an element of the revolutionary, chiliastic fervor of Müntzer that gave his interpretation of Denck's views a distinctive bent, and at the same time helped him become the most dynamic and successful missionary of Anabaptism in South Germany.

The exact chronology of Hut's missionary journey is difficult to trace. To be sure, he headed north from Augsburg a very short time after his own baptism to those territories he knew best and in
which he already had contacts and friend. One of the first places he
stopped in his extraordinarily successful journey was the village of
Eltersdorf, in Münster territory and under Münster jurisdiction.
His first convert there was the pastor of the parish church.

B. Wolfgang Vogel: The Discovery of the New Sect

Wolfgang Vogel had been appointed to the pastorate at
Eltersdorf in 1524, having previously been the first evangelical
pastor at Bopfingen near Regensburg. After his departure from
Bopfingen, the city soon returned to the Catholic faith, a turn of
events that deeply effected Vogel. In late 1526, he addressed an
open letter to the people of the city entitled, A Comforting Letter
and Admonition to the Gospel to the Council and Entire Community at
Bopfingen, and All Those Who Have Fallen Away from the Gospel and
Word of God. At the time of the writing of the pamphlet, a
council of Catholic princes was meeting at nearby Regensburg, to
which Vogel referred in passing as "the mad and blind fools at
Regensburg." Otherwise, the work was not especially vociferous.
Nevertheless, the council of Münster was informed, no doubt by the
Regensburg authorities, that Vogel had written a public letter which
was "offensive to the princes sitting in full armor at Regensburg
and the city of Bopfingen."

Münster's position was not so strong that she could afford to
have her pastors cast insults at Catholic notables, especially when
they were as close and well-armed as those at Regensburg. The
council ordered an investigation of Vogel and the city's printers to
see if the pamphlet had been printed there. Any copies of the pamphlet still available were ordered confiscated. The council's judgment against Vogel was lenient. He was given a gentle reprimand and warned to display more caution in his public statements.\footnote{7}

Ten days after the disposal of the case against Vogel, however, the council ordered a new investigation into his religious opinions. The council did not give the reasons for its suspicion but ordered the city's five municipal preachers to interrogate Vogel with regard to his views of the sacraments.\footnote{8} At first the council considered the affair to be of a strictly theological nature that could best be handled by the theologians,\footnote{9} but on February 14, it charged Vogel with fanaticism and informed him that his case had been taken out of the theologians' hands and henceforth would be handled directly by the council. He was also ordered to present to the council copies of his sermons for their examination.\footnote{10}

Whether or not the new charges brought against Vogel were a result of the original investigation is not clear. In the midst of the proceedings against him in February, the council had begun to receive communications from the Saxon officials at Coburg concerning the discovery of a circle of "fanatics and rebels" in the Saxon territory of Königsberg in Franconia. The Coburg authorities suggested the possibility that these were connected to several persons in Nürnberg who were holding secret gatherings and spreading the heresy.\footnote{11} Perhaps an earlier letter from Coburg that is no longer extant had mentioned Vogel as a possible suspect. At any rate, on February 14, Nürnberg officially requested further
information. 12 The response from Coburg revealed for the first time the presence in Franconia of an organized sect characterized by the Saxons as being intent upon "mutiny and rebellion" (meuterei und aufrur) and bound to one another by a "new baptism."¹³

Whether or not Vogel was implicated in these communications from Coburg, the council ordered its officials at Eltersdorf to apprehend the pastor for creating disturbances among the other pastors and causing general unrest.¹⁴ On the following day, February 19, the council ordered that "concerning the letter from Coburg regarding the radicals and new baptists, one should find out if the same people have influence here."¹⁵ The council's investigation bore fruit, and on February 22, in addition to Vogel, two other men from Eltersdorf were ordered arrested and brought to Nürnberg, "and questioned from that hour on to determine who their comrades are."¹⁶ Those named along with Vogel were Georg Harscher, called "the tall Jorg," and a needle maker, known only as the "Nadler from Büchenhof."

When making its charges against these men, the council stated for the first time that there was a definite "brotherhood" (gesellschaft) of persons connected by "fanatics baptism" (der schwirmer tauf) in Eltersdorf.¹⁷

Of the three men ordered arrested, the "Nadler from Büchenhof" was not apprehended.¹⁸ Harscher was taken into custody within a few days, and apparently through his testimony the council learned of the extent of the new sect's following in Nürnberg.¹⁹ Vogel was not immediately apprehended, and, in fact, was being protected by individuals in both Eltersdorf and Nürnberg. Within a few days of
the order for Vogel's arrest, an unspecified number of master craftsmen (*Zeichenmeister*), actually those persons charged with putting the "seal of quality" on goods manufactured in the city, had attempted to intercede with the council on his behalf. The council held off giving the craftsmen a reply, while at the same time subtly attempting to discover from them where Vogel was hiding. By March 4, the council had established indirect contact with Vogel, although at whose initiative is not clear. On that day, the council answered a request of Vogel for safe-conduct by informing him that "if he has done nothing wrong, then he has nothing to worry about." Meanwhile, on March 6 and 7, the questioning of Harscher turned up two further leads as to the pastor's whereabouts, an unnamed innkeeper and a cutler, Michael Kezman. By March 8, Vogel had been taken into custody and the interrogation process had begun.

For the next ten days the questioning of Harscher and Vogel continued daily. The assumption can be made that Harscher was the more cooperative of the two, suffering only the threat of torture, while Vogel required more stringent means, his interrogators finally being given the right to use whatever means they deemed necessary to elicit information. The questioning of Vogel undoubtedly followed the same lines as that originally ordered for Harscher—to find out who else belonged to the sect and what their beliefs were concerning the secular authority. The questioning revealed that the activities of the group were not confined to the outlying villages but involved citizens of the city itself. These included
a weaver, called Ulle; Conz Frei, a master smith possessing his own workshop and store; two innkeepers, one unnamed, the second called Osterpeck; an unnamed press-corrector of the printer, Friedrich Beipus (der Beipus Corrector), Peter Zinck and Mathes Schwalbach; two unnamed baker's journeymen; Martin Schotten; Hans Mühlberg; Fritz Romer; Jorg Röslein; and a women, Margret Bopp.

Far more enlightening, on March 16 the council ordered the arrest of two men involved in the thick of the sacramentarian troubles of 1524-1525, the wool worker, Conz Knapp (Kobalt?), and the scribe, Erasmus Wisperger. The investigation further implicated one of Nürnberg's city pastors, Jacob Dolman of St. Jacob's Church. Somewhat surprisingly, in dealing with the Anabaptists, the council concentrated almost exclusively upon Vogel, suggesting that it felt removal of the apparent leader of the sect would suffice to dissipate the movement itself. In March, 1527, the council had not yet realized the extent of the Anabaptist movement in its and the surrounding territories. The council's treatment of Harscher demonstrates its initial attitude toward the Anabaptists.

On March 6, the council appealed to the jurists for an opinion on the manner of punishment deserved by Harscher. The fact that the theologians were not called in is significant in itself. All of the jurists recommended leniency, and all were inclined to view Harscher as being a victim of circumstance and innocent of any intent to do wrong. The question became for them not how to punish him for any crimes but how best to use him as an example to others to
deter them from being misled. The opinion of three of the jurists is worth repeating for the insights it gives into the attitudes of the secular authorities concerning the radical movements touched off by the acceptance of the Reformation.

Doctors Protzer, Hepstein, and Ketzler stated that the case of "this peasant" should be excused, "since he and other simple peasants have seen so many innovations recently that are legal, such as receiving the sacrament in both kinds and a baptism in German whereas before it had only been in Latin. Is it any wonder that in this case they also are discussing [Baptism] in anticipation that it might be denied on the basis of Scripture, especially when their own pastor has allowed himself to be [re]baptized?"

The jurists recommended that although Harscher deserved no severe punishment, he could serve as a valuable example to others if he were publicly admonished by being put in the pillory for a short time and then temporarily expelled, "that such should be an example and disgracing, [rather than] either a punishment or torture [for a crime]." The jurists seemed intent upon preventing the authority from over-reacting or establishing legal precedent in a situation which required far more attention and careful consideration than the single case of Harscher afforded. Dr. Hepstein took the opportunity to present to the council some unsolicited advice.

Hepstein stated that he had learned from the pastor at Bruck near Erlangen that several peasants were teaching that "no one could be Christian who had any possessions" and that several had already quit theirs. The pastor had also reported that when he or any
other preacher spoke against such a view, they were subjected to hostility and threats on their persons. Hepstein advised the council that it was of the highest necessity for it to deal with the situation immediately, before the movement spread any further, by warning the peasantry throughout Nürnberg territory by means of a general edict or public instruction. The council did not act upon Hepstein's advice until three months later, by which time the territory was seriously infected by Anabaptism.

Meanwhile, the council concentrated its attention upon Vogel. By March 18, it had garnered enough information from the Nürnberg and Eltersdorf Anabaptists to be sufficiently alarmed to send secret dispatches to the authorities at Augsburg, Regensburg, Ulm, and Coburg, informing them of its findings. In these letters, the council designated Hans Hut as the principal leader and teacher of the sect, aided in his missionary work by Kilian Volckhamer, Sebastian N., Eckarius (Eukarius Binder), and Joachim (Mährz), all craftsmen from the vicinity of Coburg. Binder and Mährz were joiners (Schreiner), and the council confirmed that many joiners from Nürnberg had contacts with them and reported the same was true in Ulm, Regensburg, Augsburg, and other places.

In the letter to Augsburg, the council enumerated the following as the foundations for the brotherhood: First, that the Anabaptists believe in a second baptism since they consider the first to be invalid. Second, they do not believe in the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. Third, they do not believe in the redemptive character of Christ. Fourth, they believe that the devil also will
become blessed (das der teufel auch wird selig werden). Fifth, they believe that in a short time Christ will return to the earth and establish a new kingdom "and all the godless, those who are not Christian or in their brotherhood, will be punished with death, and they (who alone are Christian) will be saved." Finally, they believe that they are ordained to kill (umzubringen) and exterminate (zuvertilgen) all authority.46

A variant of this letter, sent a few days later to the authorities at Strassburg states even more significantly:

For out of the [initial] error of the Anabaptists stem even worse aberrations, namely, 1) that Christ was only a man and not God, 2) that he was conceived in sin, 3) that he has not done satisfaction for the sins of man, 4) that magistrates cannot be Christians, 5) that God will descend again to earth and a physical kingdom will be established, 6) that all governments will be wiped out and will not be endured, and 7) that all things should be in common.47

The significance of the letters of the Nürnberg authorities is in the politically revolutionary teachings they attribute to the leaders of the sect, allegations which form the foundation of the charges levelled against the Anabaptists by the South German authorities and which appear repeatedly as the famous "articles of Nielsburg" even though the letters antedate the Moravian disputation between Hut and Hubmaier by two months.48 A great deal of controversy has always surrounded Hut's teachings on eschatology and civil insurrection, and interrogations of captured Anabaptists invariably included questions about the articles attributed to the movement by the Nürnberg authorities. Whether Hut and his disciples did or did not preach social and political revolution to their followers is central to an understanding of the nature of the South German movement and official
opposition to it. In conjunction with this is the question of whether Hut continued in the sway of Müntzer after his baptism by Hans Denck. The very confessions of South German Anabaptists are contradictory, and one possible explanation for Hut's followers to confess to the more serious charges is that they did so under the duress of torture.49 Such methods are effective only if the interrogator asks the correct questions, and if he assumes the truth is already at hand. Were the Nürnberg authorities merely confirming preconceived notions of Hut and his followers or were they discovering first-hand from Vogel, Harscher, and others the alarming teachings of a new "fanatics sect?" Apparently, the latter was the case, even if the authorities at Coburg had communicated to the Nürnberg council the seditious character of the new sect's teachings before the council's own investigations began.

In its revelation of the case to other authorities, the council makes it clear that it has discovered the teachings of the sect from those imprisoned in Nürnberg, and the evidence suggests the most information came from Georg Harscher and Vogel himself. The council entertained no doubts that Vogel was the principal leader of the sect locally and that indeed he preached the violent destruction of the secular authorities. On this basis, the council ordered his execution by decapitation on March 26, 1527. There is no doubt that the deviation of his teachings from the orthodox religious position of the city of Nürnberg was secondary to the charge of revolutionary sedition as reasons for the harsh sentence. In its recording of the sentence, the council stated that Vogel's confession
had been freely given, once in oral testimony, a second time in
writing, and had been confirmed by others of his brotherhood,
indicating their adherence to an evil league intent upon the exter­
mination of all authority. Vogel had used his office as an ordained
pastor to seduce his parishioners and others into the sect.\textsuperscript{50}

In a further entry of the same date, the additional charge is
made that Vogel "was a promoter and author of the Peasants' War in
Nürnberg territory."\textsuperscript{51} No further elaboration of this last charge
is made, but if Vogel's political views were as radical as the
council portrayed them in 1527, the roots of those views could easily
have been developed in the period 1524-1525. Indeed, the possi­
bility is not so remote that Vogel's link with Hut may have dated
back to that period when Denck and Müntzer were active in the city.
In this context, it is not surprising that the council itself
established the connections between Hut and Müntzer in a letter to
the margrave Casimir of Brandenburg-Ansbach on the day of Vogel's
execution.\textsuperscript{52} Nor is it surprising that the council's concerns
with the new sect in its territory should be centered on political
ideology rather than religious extremism, or that it should connect
the new sect with the peasant upheavals of the recent past. Given
the alarming first impression of the new sect from the confessions
of Vogel and his followers, the surprising aspect of the Nürnberg
council's treatment of the Anabaptists in the future was the extent
to which it went to distinguish between seditious socio-political
teachings and religious heterodoxy, and the leniency with which it
treated the latter. Vogel was the only person convicted of plotting
the overthrow of the secular authorities in Nürnberg territory and the only person executed for his views.

The suggestion has frequently been made, most recently by Günther Bauer, that Vogel was the victim of political expediency. Based on the fact that Nürnberg wrote the city of Bopfingen immediately after the execution of Vogel to explain that there was no longer any need for that city to fear Vogel's agitation, Bauer asserts the probability that Nürnberg was acting out of standard foreign policy by demonstrating her loyalty to fellow members of the Swabian League as well as to the Empire and the Hapsburgs.

Such a view may be too apologetic. Vogel is not the only follower of Hut to postulate that the religious teachings of Hut included socio-political revolutionary ideas. Given the treatment of the Anabaptists by Nürnberg in the following years, its defiance of the Swabian League's attempt to enforce the death penalty in dealing with the sect, and Nürnberg's consistently concerted effort to try every case on its own merits, there is little reason to doubt that Vogel's religious views incorporated socio-political aims or that these were contrary to Hut's position when he re-baptized Vogel.

To accept the council's verdict does not deny that Hut mollified his position after the spring of 1527, as Hut's biographer does not deny the possibility of Hut's maintaining a revolutionary position before the spring of 1527. One must distinguish, however, between what the leaders of the new sect discussed among themselves and what they preached to the masses of their followers. For the most part, as will be seen, the normal adherent to the sect in the
environ of Nürnberg was unaware of any revolutionary program, and
certainly did not make any connection between the new religious
 teachings and the revolutionary agitation that accompanied the
peasant upheaval in 1524-1525. This fact would also tend to discredit
the view that secondary leaders of the movement, who confessed to
revolutionary views, had simply misunderstood Hut's eschatological
 teachings.

G. The Council's Initial Reaction to the New Sect

For the next three years, the council of Nürnberg found itself
continually having to deal with growing numbers of Anabaptists and
their sympathizers. In addition, as persecution of the sect by
other cities and territories increased, the problem in Nürnberg was
compounded by the influx of refugees into the city and its country­
side, who, to the alarm of the council, were readily harbored and
provided for by the craftsmen and laborers of the city.

During its investigation of Vogel and the Eltersdorf Anabap­
tists, the council was well aware of similar discoveries being made
by officials of the margrave Casimir in the border villages of Fürth,
Baiersdorf, and Erlangen. In its letter to the margrave relating
information on Hut and Vogel, the council included reference to
persons known to be associated with them—Hans Nadler from Erlangen,
Michael Maier from Alterlangen, and two millers from the Neumühle near
the Nürnberg village of Bruck. Information was passed between
Nürnberg and the representatives of the margrave, yet no concerted
effort was made by the authorities to launch a full-scale investi­
igation of the countryside to determine the nature and extent of the movement until September, 1527, despite Casimir's warnings to his fellow rulers that the situation warranted such measures as early as April, 1527.59

Whether Nürnberg felt that the trial and execution of Vogel removed the most serious threat to their sovereignty and the peace of the territory and therefore took the edge off their initial alarm is conjectural. Nevertheless, they dealt with his followers in the next few months routinely and leniently. The council continued the interrogation and torture of Jorg Pesolt until March 29,60 but no word is given of the final disposition of his case or the cases of the others arrested in connection with Vogel. One may surmise that all were exiled from the city, or at least those who were repeat offenders, from a statement of April 20 concerning the corrector of the printer, Friedrich Beipus: "Find out if the Beipus corrector, whom the city renounces, is still here."61 Apparently the man had left the city, for no further mention is made of him.

Considering the thoroughness with which the council investigated Vogel, and the sentence carried out against him, the lenient attitude taken toward the preacher, Jacob Dolman, is surprising. Dolman had been implicated by Vogel's own testimony as a follower of Hut.62 As the noon preacher at the important church of St. Jacob, such charges were indeed serious. Yet, after talking to the preacher, the council deemed that he had given "a satisfactory and worthy answer" to the charges. He was allowed to return to his duties, although the council warned, in an apparent reference to the first
trial of Vogel, that Vogel, too, had once appeared upright in his duties but had acted quite to the contrary. To prevent the possibility that Dolman might also have been less than honest in his explanation, the council ordered that "someone intelligent" should be sent in the future to hear his sermons to determine their content. In October of the same year, however, Hans Hut, himself imprisoned in Augsburg, in response to questions posed by Nürnberg officials, confessed that he knew Dolman well and had spent many nights with him discussing the Gospels. There is no evidence that the council reopened its investigation of Dolman. Whether the council was convinced of the innocence of these discussions because they occurred in the distant past or because of Dolman's reputable standing in the community is impossible to determine. Nevertheless, the case demonstrates that the council did not see all things in terms of black and white with regard to the Anabaptists.

In addition to the Anabaptists, Nürnberg was still discovering and would continue to discover the presence of others designated as "sacramentarian," "fanatic," and "rebel," the latter often being charged, still, with complicity in the Peasants' Revolt. In an effort to curtail some of this activity, especially that which might arise through innocent misunderstanding of the meaning of the adoption of the Protestant position by the city, on April 8, the council, in conjunction with finally abolishing the use of public confession in the churches, stated that "out of fear that many people through ignorance of the faith do not know the reasons for taking the sacrament aside from custom," the pastors should instruct the people before they be
allowed to partake of the sacrament. After the instruction they would be required to demonstrate that they had an understanding of their beliefs.66 This policy was the beginning of the council's attempt to prevent deviations from the faith by instructing the people in its essentials.

At the same time, the council reasserted to the city's printers and printer's engravers that they were not to engrave or put into print anything that had not been examined by city officials.67 In preparation for the influx of persons to the Easter fair in the city market place, the council took more than ordinary precautions. A warning was sent to all innkeepers that they were required to be especially alert for and turn the names into the council of any suspicious or foreign persons seeking lodging with them. Guards were ordered to be especially alert for suspicious persons wandering about the streets of the city after midnight, and anyone seen or suspected of riding or walking in the city's woods. In the same decree, however, the council was giving ammunition to those who felt the religious position of the city had changed very little since the Reformation by stating that although the use of relics was no longer necessary in the city, nevertheless, the council would allow the sale of holy items in a carefully supervised area of the market.68

For the remainder of the spring and summer, only three persons were arrested for radical actions, and two of these were labeled sacramentarian and not Anabaptist. One of these was Lorenz Edelman, a policeman and noble from Eltersdorf.69 The other was a book pedlar, Linhart Finck, who once again attempted to set up his business in
Nürnberg but ran into trouble with the authorities for his views on the sacraments. The third person arrested, known only as the "old farmer from Egenhof" (Den alten baurn zum Egenhof), was the father of one who would gain a considerable reputation as a leader of the Anabaptists in Franconia, Hans or Heintz Grubner. The interesting factor in this case is that the son is not mentioned in other sources until January, 1528, yet the Nürnberg authorities were aware of his "radical" activities in the spring of 1527, and thus arrested the father on charges of suspicion of the same activity. He was informed that he had nothing to fear if he were not connected with his son's activities. He was interrogated again, four days later, and presumably was released.

Considering the fact that margravial officials at Erlangen and Baiersdorf were taking stringent action to ferret out Anabaptists in their territories, and that Nürnberg officials must have been aware of Anabaptist activities within their own borders, it is strange that the Nürnberg documents are devoid of any reference to steps the city was taking to measure the extent of the activity of the sect or to attempt to bring to trial persons suspected of belonging to it, especially when it had just executed one of its own pastors for plotting to destroy the secular government. The closest the council came to developing such a policy in the spring of 1527 was a general edict of May 27 to all citizens in the city, villages, and countryside of Nürnberg territory. The edict stated that any persons connected with either spiritual or civil unrest, whether public or clandestine, would be severely punished by exile, death, or whatever means the
council felt appropriate. Specifically, it stated that no innkeepers should harbor or give lodging to any foreigners who might be suspect of "evil" activity, it being the innkeeper's duty to notify the council of such persons. More generally, the council stated that all citizens were obligated, on pain of serious punishment, to inform the council or the quartermasters of the city of any "unchristian activities." The documents do not record the results, if any, of this policy.

If the council was not taking specific action against the Anabaptists, it was at least thinking about them, and, finally, on August 30, wrote to the city council of Augsburg explaining the basic understanding and attitude of Münberg towards the sect, in response to a letter from the Augsburg authorities. Münberg stated, to paraphrase the letter, that it wished to examine its alternatives carefully and act prudently with regard to the sect. It admitted that it felt the foundations of the sect were based upon more than error in interpretation of the evangelical position. Nevertheless, it felt the imperial law with regard to the Anabaptists, that is, the death penalty, was too harsh. No one should be coerced in matters of faith, but should be compelled solely by the Word of God. Force can neither make a Christian nor alter the hearts of men. Only the Holy Spirit can bring about such changes, and a work of God is accomplished without mediation. Many articles of the Anabaptists are in error and need to be investigated and refuted by Scripture. Certainly no authority should act against them without distinguishing between the degrees of their error. Possibly corporal punishment should be used in some cases, but others could be handled with normal
(less severe) procedures. It is also apparent now that the radicals have spread their errors over a broad expanse of territory and Christian governments must not take actions which would serve no end but to sustain them. At the same time, evangelical governments must remember the harsh methods used by Catholic forces against Lutherans. Should those who follow the Gospels now also use the death penalty against those who are in error? Or would it be better to use lighter punishments? The tyranny of those who use such harsh measures against Christians is frightening. Are we to judge others, the council wrote, in such a way that where we claim to be Christian, in this instance we should act in an unchristian way and against the Word of God?  

The council went on to state that it recognized that the Anabaptists presented serious problems, especially when one discovered leaders like Vogel, who taught contempt for and destruction of the peace. But such persons could be dealt with, as Nürnberg had dealt with Vogel, without condemning all followers of the sect to the same fate, or blaming all trouble on them. Likewise, the council continued, one must distinguish between those who teach and baptize, and those who follow and are baptized. An example should be made of the latter by banishing those who pose a risk from the council's territory. For those who pose no danger, an appropriate and lighter punishment could be used.  

Considering the measures other authorities were taking and would take, the position of Nürnberg was rather remarkable. Not only was the council stating that one must distinguish between the views
of the Anabaptist leaders and those of the average followers of the sect, it seems also to recognize discrepancies between the radical views attributed to the Anabaptists by opponents, including those it promulgated itself in the letters of March 18, and the much milder views evident from an increasing majority of Anabaptist confessions. These basic views of the Nürnberg authorities would not change. Indeed, the council would go to great lengths to develop positive preventive measures to halt further defection from the evangelical position, even when great pressure was being applied upon the city by other South German authorities to join in a concerted effort at outright extermination of the sect.

Such drastic measures were precipitated by the alarming confessions extracted by the authorities at Augsburg from leading Anabaptists arrested during the famous Martyrs' Synod in that city in September, 1527, including Hans Hut himself. As early as September 13, 1527, representatives of the Swabian League, meeting at Nūrdlingen, concluded that the Anabaptists were working for a second peasant uprising and the final extermination of all authority. By February 20, 1528, this fear was so great that members of the League demanded the calling up of a contingent of 800 cavalry under the general command of the notorious Berchthold Aichelin to ferret out and execute Anabaptists.

The Nürnberg representative, Clemens Volckamer, opposed, with council support, the entire operation but succeeded only in having the size of the contingent reduced to 400 cavalry limited to three months in the field. For organizational purposes, League territory was to
be divided into four quarters, with Nürnberg in the Bamberg quarter together with the bishoprics of Bamberg and Würzburg, Brandenburg, the Pfalzgrafen, and Windsheim. Each quarter was to select its own captain. Captured Anabaptists were to be taken to designated points to be tried under torture. Unrepentant persons were to be burned, repentent men were to die by the sword, and women by drowning. Margrave Georg immediately demanded that his cavalry captain be named head of the Bamberg quarter and sought the aid of Nürnberg in reducing the harsh penalties. The margrave's concern was that the Catholic princes intended to use the pretext of proceeding against the Anabaptists to persecute Lutherans and especially Lutheran pastors. Nürnberg, of course, supported the margrave, but not primarily out of fear. Her position remained that which she spelled out to the Augsburg officials on August 30, 1527, and she held constant to that position in succeeding years, long after the Catholic threat to her position had diminished.

Nürnberg voiced her opposition against the majority opinion of the Swabian League, imperial law, and eventually the prevailing Protestant opinion as a matter of Christian conscience. A practical government such as that of Nürnberg could develop such a view only by supposing that the Anabaptists represented no threat to the existing political or social order. The view could come only from observation of the Anabaptists themselves, revealing that the council's initial contact with the movement through Wolfgang Vogel presented a distorted picture. What then was the true nature of Anabaptism in Nürnberg territory? That is the next question to be answered.
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In January, four persons were discovered "by energetic gathering of information" who were connected with the rebellion: Jorg Arnolt of Frostocken, Peter Beringer from Kuzing, and Linhart Gerung and Peter Wennzer, presumably from Nürnberg (RB. 13, 224v.). All were expelled from Nürnberg territory. On April 6, a cutler, Hans Weidenlich, was investigated as a possible rebel before being allowed to practice his trade in Nürnberg (Rv. 742, 4r.-4v.).
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CHAPTER VI

THE NATURE OF ANABAPTISM IN NÜRNBERG AND ITS ENVIRONS

A. Hans Hut's Missionary Journeys

From the map on the following page, portraying the villages in which Anabaptists were discovered, one can see that the movement was largely confined to the northwest corner of Nürnberg territory, between Nürnberg and Erlangen. The other extremes of the territory were scarcely touched by the movement. One explanation for this geographic factor is obvious. These villages lay on the principal trade and travel route extending from Augsburg through Nürnberg to Bamberg and then north to Saxony and Thuringia—the route Hans Hut took on his missionary journey of 1526-1527. Quite conveniently, these villages also lay, for the most part, in that ill-defined borderland between Nürnberg and the margravate, where jurisdictional conflicts made it difficult for either government to rule with total efficiency.

These facts explain in large part why the movement was able to survive as long as it did in some villages in face of the open hostility of the governments of Nürnberg and Brandenburg-Ansbach. Whether or not Hut actually sought out certain villages for such reasons can only be conjectured, but there is clear evidence that members of the sect took advantage of this territorial ambiguity.
Nürnberg Villages
with
Anabaptist Activity
When officials in Erlangen began to imprison adherents in Erlangen and Alterlangen, those who escaped began to gather in Bruck to the south, a village within the territorial borders of the margravate but mortgaged to Nürnberg, where neither authority felt inclined to take full responsibility for the activities of the residents.\(^1\) And as early as March 5, 1527, an official at Fürth reported to his superiors that up to thirty Anabaptists were meeting in inns at the Nürnberg village of Gründlach,\(^2\) yet Nürnberg officials were not moved to investigate the village until the following September.\(^3\)

Although, as mentioned earlier, only rarely do the records reveal the exact dates of Hut's visits to certain places, that he stopped in Eltersdorf on his northward journey to see Wolfgang Vogel and perhaps others of his old friends and contacts around Nürnberg is highly probable. Günther Bauer argues very persuasively that Hut also must have established an Anabaptist community in Erlangen-Alt-erlangen at the same time, which he dates as the summer of 1526, thus explaining the readiness with which Hut was received into various homes in early 1527 and the central role he assigned to Erlangen as a general meeting place for the sect and its leaders at that time.\(^4\) By the testimony of Marx Maier of Alterlangen, nearly thirty persons were present in Erlangen at the home of the peasant Hans Perr to hear Hut preach at the initial meeting laying the foundations for the sect.\(^5\) Whether this occurred in 1526 or early January, 1527, by mid-January, Hut could hold the first "baptist council" in the city, which was attended by such notable leaders of the movement in Franconia as Hut, Jürg Volk, Thomas Spiegel,
Wolfgang Vogel, Eukarius Binder, Joachim März, and Kilian Volckhaimer. Also present were two others from Eltersdorf, probably Jorg Harscher and "the Nadler from Büchenhof," five persons from Alterlangen, and the needlemaker, Hans Ritter, from Erlangen, who would also become an evangelist for the sect. For the next few weeks, Hut apparently used the city as a base of operations into the surrounding countryside, including possible excursions into Nürnberg.

Little more is definitely known about Hut's activities in the area, however, except for his brief appearance in nearby Uttenreuth one evening about March 5 (Shrove Tuesday), when he preached at the home of one Fritz Strigel to perhaps a dozen persons, baptizing most of them, and then disappearing. This was on the eve of the Nürnberg trial of Wolfgang Vogel, when several of the local Anabaptists fled the area. Hut returned to Augsburg for a brief time, and then passed on to Moravia to the famous disputation with Balthasar Hubmaier, then back to the ill-fated Martyrs' Synod in Augsburg in August, 1527.

Other Anabaptist leaders, however, continued to pass through the area, often staying over, preaching, and building upon the foundations laid by Hut. In addition, local leaders emerged, who also preached and baptized. As a result, it is not always clear who is responsible for the establishment of a community, and given the different emphases each might put on various aspects of Anabaptist teachings, it becomes difficult to simply categorize those teachings. To best understand the nature of the movement, each village where the sect developed must be studied separately.
B. The Border Villages

When Hut and his disciples fled the vicinity of Erlangen about March 5, 1527, apparently in the wake of the actions of the Nürnberg government against the Anabaptists in Eltersdorf and Nürnberg, the authorities representing the margrave at Baiersdorf and Erlangen were just beginning to realize that their own subjects were involved in the new sect. Finally, in the middle of the month, the bailiff at Erlangen, Erkinger von Seckendorf, began to investigate the affair, discovering that four men had already fled the area. These were the needlemaker, Hans Ritter; the smith, Kaspar Reuperger; and two farmers, Hans Perr the Elder and his son Hans Perr the Younger. The wives of the men were arrested and several of their neighbors interrogated to determine the nature of the sect, who its leaders were, and who belonged to it. From the initial testimonies of these persons, the story of Anabaptism in the area began to unfold for the authorities.

One of the most revealing statements was that of the needlemaker, Hans Ritter, presumably the father of the fleeing Hans Ritter. He is the only one to give an account of an Anabaptist sermon. Ritter never reveals the source of the sermon, but refers to the speakers simply as "they," suggesting that it was not delivered by one man, but perhaps took the form of a dialogue. Whoever is speaking, however, the story follows the standard pattern used most often by Hans Hut.

The evangelizing began with the command of Christ to his disciples "to go out into the entire world and preach the gospel
to all creatures. Those who believe and are baptized will be saved." This was the scriptural justification for the necessity of adult baptism, that "one must believe first and then be baptized."  

In addition, the text led to the second stage of the sermon, an explanation of the "gospel of all creation," also taken from Mark 16:15. Simply stated, "the gospel of all creation" read into the Marcan injunction that by the observation of creatures was revealed the relation between God and man. Above all, the revelation was one of suffering, but other lessons could be drawn as well.  

This part of the sermon always took the form of a parable. In this instance, as related by the elder Ritter, the Christian is compared to a fowl. As man is subject to God, so the fowl is subject to man. Its reason for existence is to bring pleasure to man, but much must transpire in its life before that. It must be fed and carefully raised from the chick until it is plump and juicy. But alive it is of no use. It must suffer to be slain, and finally plucked, cleaned, and cooked to perfection. Only then can it be eaten, that man may savor and enjoy the creature for its created purpose. Like the fowl, man before God must be nurtured and prepared. He attains his greatest glory on earth through suffering, and his eternal reward through death, thus pleasing God.  

Corresponding to this path to God is Hut's doctrine of the three-fold baptism—by water, by blood, and by the spirit. Thus followed the baptism by which the listeners could join the new covenant with the sect and with God. According to Ritter, this was hardly a ceremony.
They went to a flowing stream and filled a hat with water and poured it over one another. Thus they were baptized and with that were bound to God to suffer and be patient as all who stand in Him suffer. And they would bear His cross themselves and follow the Lord until death. Thus they had themselves baptized according to the will of the order that baptism does [not] come before belief, and belief after baptism. Instead, they command that by the Word of God one should believe before he is baptized.15

In addition to the theme of suffering, the parable of the creatures, as used here, seems to have carried another meaning, when the Sermon on the Mount is invoked to say, "One should also compare man to the creatures as held forth in the Gospels, that like the birds in the air who neither spin nor sew and yet God cares for them all, so you should not be anxious, etc."16 Although Ritter has not quoted the Scripture correctly, the meaning seems obvious, especially in light of the testimony of the others. The wife of the younger Hans Perr stated that her husband explained when he left her, in response to her beseeching him to remain with her to help rear the children, that he was following God's will to give up temporal goods.17

The smith, Kaspar Reuperger, left his wife with no warning. One afternoon he informed her he was going to have some grinding done at the mill in Bruck, and simply never returned.18 And whereas both Perr's informed their wives that they wished to learn more about the word of God,19 the smith seems to have been less spiritually motivated. Another needlemaker, Ulle N., testified that eight days after the others had left, Reuperger came to him, saying, "Do you want to work for a living for the rest of your life?" When Ulle responded that that was his intention, the smith said, "Dear Ulle, have you no desire to run after them, as the brotherhood does, to
run off and leave wife and children, hearth and home, all your goods?"\textsuperscript{20}

One may question whether Hut intended such a base appeal in his teachings, but need not doubt that it served as a strong motivation in many of his followers. These men lived a harsh existence and the temptation to live "like the birds in the air" and to "see the world," as even the elder Hans Perr told his wife,\textsuperscript{21} must have been great.

The followers of the sect also had other methods to persuade their neighbors to join them. The same Ulle N. testified to having been invited once to Hans Ritter's home for dinner. After dinner, they were visited by Frau Maier from Alterlangen, who brought with her a small boy that Ulle did not know and a book, which was either a Bible or "another evangelical book." The boy began to read from the book, and after every article the woman would interrupt him. "Then," Ulle related, "Frau Maier and Hans would put their heads together and dispute and interpret the article. I noticed that they played hide-and-seek with me, so I left."\textsuperscript{22}

The object of the ploy was obvious. The two hoped to excite their friend's curiosity, engage him in their discussion of the point in question, and persuade him to accept their view. From the testimony of another, a beltmaker's journeyman named Paulus, the followers of the sect were not beyond using more shocking methods. Paulus testified that one night at 11:00, while he was working at his bench in his master's house, four persons dressed in white clothing knocked on the door. When he went out and shouted, "Who's there?" they did not answer but fled over the wall. He ran to the top of the
house, but could not see them. He then shouted to them, asking if they were from St. Valentine, the patron of travelers and strangers. When they still failed to respond, he shouted, apparently now near panic, "Who are you? Why do you come here? What do you want of me? Come tomorrow! Tell me what you want of me and I will give you an answer."23

Paulus was convinced that the person behind the mysterious visit was the "Nadler from Büchenhof," who told another friend of Paulus that he was determined to lead him away, to follow him as long and as much as necessary until he converted him.24 This was the second testimony to implicate the "Nadler from Büchenhof" as a principal in the evangelizing efforts of the Anabaptists in the Erlangen-Alterlangen area. The elder Hans Ritter testified that the "Nadler from Büchenhof," and not his son, revealed to him the nature of the league and baptism and summoned him to join it.25 The elder Hans Perr's wife indicated that Hans Ritter had been responsible for involving her husband in the movement.26 This strongly suggests that the "Nadler from Büchenhof" was an important link for Hut—who, it will be remembered, baptized him about the same time he baptized Wolfgang Vogel—with the communities north of Eltersdorf.

It would be natural for him to have had relations with other needlemakers in the vicinity, and that is the group where conversion attempts were strongest. Also from these testimonies of the initial persons questioned by the authorities at Erlangen, the first suggestions are made that a great deal of the Anabaptist activity was centered around Neumühl, near Bruck, and in the house of Frau Maier.
An Anabaptist Song

Danksagen wir dir, Her der e·ren,
Das du uns thüst alle erneren,
Du geist uns von dem himel die speis,
Darr durch wir dich, Her, ewiglich preissen,
Durch Christus sterben, uns heil vom vater erwerben,
Das wir ewiglich nit verderben.

Das weizkornlein ist uns gemalen,
das unser sund thut besaln,
Das ware prot ist geprochen,
Davon die propheten sprochen,
Das prot zum leben sei uns geben,
Das Christus am creuz thet cre•shweben.

Das alle menschen hie unter das creuz thun eilen,
Sol man sie auch unterweissen,
In dem geist und in der wahrheit speissen,
Durch Christus sterben, uns heil vom vater erwerben,
Des vaters reich ist uns an ererbt.

Das er beweisse mit der speisse,
Darumb er ewiglich wirt gepreiset,
Das ware prot hat er geprochen
Und nemlich dopei gesprochen,
Als oft ir das hie thut essen,
Solt ir mein nit vergessen,
Ir solt gedencken, was ich euch thü schencken,
Darumb ich am creuz thu hencken.

Also ess wir den leip des Hern,
Wie wir aus dem heiligen Geist sein gelernt,
Das wir got warhaftig erkennen,
Das die gotlich lieb so in uns prennen,
Die macht uns zereben, der geist geit uns leben,
Also wirt uns der leipt Christus gegeben.

[Wappler, p. 248, possibly by Hans Hut.]

Sung by the Anabaptists at Uttenreuth when they were taken captive by the authorities from Erlangen.
in Alterlangen. Only gradually in the course of the next three years were these indications substantiated as more of the Anabaptist leaders returned to the area and were taken into custody by the authorities. From their confessions usually brought about under the duress of torture, more is revealed about the nature of the movement there.

The first important person to be taken by the authorities was Hans Ritter, in January, 1529, after he had returned to Erlangen to visit his wife and family. In Ritter one finds the true believer, the stuff of which martyrs are made. He was questioned steadily for a month and never deviated from his first statement of faith. In that statement he demonstrates himself to be an ardent follower of Hut, and from his testimony one can perhaps catch a glimpse of the man Hut in his last months.

In his lengthy first statement, Ritter shows that he has been a faithful student of the new sect. He testified that he had been baptized and instructed in the faith by Hut, and in stating the reasons for his belief he showed a thorough knowledge of Scripture, which he used to support his position. And yet, despite his knowledge of Scripture and Anabaptist theology, he testified in another instance that he could not read. This was in response to a written request that he respond to forty-two articles prepared by the theologians at Ansbach. Ritter's answer deserves full quotation as an expression of his simple piety and courage:

In response to your questioning concerning 42 articles, with the help of our God the almighty, I have answered you. In these answers I have demonstrated my beliefs as I have been
taught by God and through his word. I have no doubts that through these comes salvation. If not everyone believes it, that I cannot help. I, however, can believe in good faith, for I believe in the word of God. Lately you have written to me yet more articles. But I cannot read and much is in your writing that I do not understand. Also, I am not capable of debating with you. I can only try to learn. And what you have sent me is too highly learned for me. I am only a poor hand craftsman. And if I am not perfect, then I recommend to you God, who is perfect. Even his disciples, who were with him for three years were not perfect. I can only thank God for the gifts he has given me. He wants to make me perfect, and He will give me the truth. In that I have no doubt... With all humility, as a subject of your grace, if you think that my beliefs are dangerous to my gracious Lord or to what belongs to him, I request that you grant me leave to take my wife and children away and with time I will be able to sell my goods.

Ritter is one who has taken his new faith seriously and has received deep personal satisfaction. By his own testimony he had met all of the important Anabaptist leaders in South Germany, Austria, and Moravia. Almost all of them, he noted were dead. And he appeared ready to accept the same fate himself. From all that he confessed, there is no evidence that his motivation for joining the sect was for any reason but a spiritual one. By this time, of course, the authorities throughout Germany pressed captured Anabaptists more closely on their socio-political ideology than their religious beliefs. Ritter displayed a totally different view of the movement than was first assumed and still, with the exception of Nürnberg and Brandenburg-Ansbach, was generally assumed by most states.

As standard procedure, captured Anabaptist were asked the nature of their league, what kind of secret bonds they pledged to one another, what they held concerning the second kingdom, what they held concerning the secular authorities, and whether they advocated
rebellion against the authorities. In conjunction with these questions, they were generally asked what they knew of the "Nicolsburg disputation" between Hut and Hubmaier and the "Nicolsburg articles." Ritter gave them nothing to confirm their suspicions. They had no special bonds but to help one another in times of need. This was their Christian duty. They all must suffer as Christ suffered and their duty to one another was to give comfort and strength in that suffering.31

On their attitude toward the secular authority, Ritter responded that there must be authority and whether governments are good or evil, they are all ordained by God. In addition, it would be contrary to their beliefs to act against the authorities since no Christian should quarrel or fight. When asked specifically about the teachings of Hut and Wolfgang Vogel, Ritter stated that neither Hut, nor Vogel, nor any brother had ever spoken of or proposed to him rebellion against the secular authorities. On the contrary, they taught that the Christian should respond to anger with love, should harm no one, and should do only good to others, knowing that they should and must suffer persecution for Christ according to the will of God.32

The sources do not record the final disposition of Ritter's case, but on February 15, 1527, Erkinger von Seckendorf reported to Ansbach:

All efforts with the needlemaker have come to nothing. He sticks to his faith, saying, "A promise to God must be kept." The two pastors here have appealed to the official the difficulties they have had [with him]. The needlemaker has been in jail now for four weeks. This has become
expensive. Who is going to pay for it?\textsuperscript{33}

Probably, he was allowed to take his family and leave the territory as he wished. By the nature of his craft, Ritter was in a more fortunate position than most of his brethren. He was not tied to the land economically, since there was a universal market for his wares. He testified that he maintained himself during his travels by selling needles to cobblers and shoemakers.\textsuperscript{34} And the tools of his trade were easily transportable. As will be seen, however, for most persons the economic consequences of banishment would make them more amenable to giving up their Anabaptist views for the faith of the community.

In addition to Ritter and the mysterious "Hadler from Büchenhof," the most important of the local Anabaptist leaders in Erlangen-Alterlangen was Marx Maier from Alterlangen. In fact, according to the reconstruction of Günther Bauer, the entire Maier household in Alterlangen, consisting of the father Michael, his wife, and three sons, Marx, Michael, and Hans, were among the first converts to the sect in Alterlangen, with all three sons becoming leaders.\textsuperscript{35} Various members of the family were mentioned in the testimony of Wolfgang Vogel and the testimonies of those questioned in Erlangen in March, 1527.\textsuperscript{36} According to Hans Ritter, Marx Maier had been baptizing in Erlangen before he fled, presumably with the rest in March, 1527.\textsuperscript{37} He then went to Augsburg, possibly to Nikolsburg, and back to Augsburg during the Martyrs' Synod. For almost three years, he preached and baptized in numerous villages throughout Brandenburg-Ansbach and other areas of Franconia before
being captured in June, 1530, in Creglingen on the border between the margravate and the territory of Württemberg. Unlike Ritter, Maier in his travels fell in with the more radical leaders of the movement and his confession presents a sharp contrast to that of his fellow convert and neighbor. To paraphrase from the confession of Maier:

At the time they maintained a community at Augsburg and often met there by the hundreds, it was their opinion that the world was coming to an end and the saints would come to judge the world. From other Baptists he had heard that Hans Hut was supposed to have said that he, Hut, wanted to be one of those who helped judge the world and to root out and punish evil. Specifically, he had heard this from Bartel Tuchhefter from Augsburg, Jakob Schmid from Haundorf, and Conz Knapp who had fled from Nürnberg.

At the same time he had heard that in a statement from principal teachers at Augsburg it was decided that the authorities did not act correctly towards the poor people and imposed too many burdens upon them. Thus when God lets loose his vengeance, Christ will give them the vengeance to punish and exterminate the evil and the cruel. But they would have to wait for this. Hut felt that 3½ years after the Peasants' War the end would come. Then would the authorities be exterminated and all sinners punished by God. God would gather his own together to punish the authorities and sinners who were not of their faith. God would punish many through war, famine, and pestilence, so that not many would survive for them to punish. This had Hans Hut presented and prophesied.

Here was the eschatological extremism and revolutionary plot which had been attributed to Hut since March, 1527. The Nürnberg authorities had extracted the same information, with the exception that no precise time had been designated for the apocalypse, from the Eltersdorf Anabaptists. And another follower of Hut, Hans Weischenfelder, had confessed to the same views to the authorities at Bamberg in the same month. In addition, in the course of his testimony Maier revealed to the authorities that Jörg Nespitzer,
the famous Jürg von Passau, was working as a linenweaver in the village of Leutershausen near Ansbach. Nespitzer was immediately apprehended and in his confession confirmed what Maier had attributed to Hut and more. In the words of the secretary who recorded the confession:

Under torture he said concerning the authorities that Christ had given the Anabaptists the sword and the anger to punish all sin, to root out all authority, and with that to make all goods communal and to slay those that did not have themselves rebaptized.... Hans Hut taught him this and that it should come to pass 3½ years after the [peasants'] rebellion.

How is one to reconcile the contrasting views of their faith of a Marx Maier on the one side and a Hans Ritter on the other? Ritter, Maier, Nespitzer, and Weischenfelder all attribute their faith to the teachings of Hans Hut. Admittedly, in the passage quoted from Maier's testimony, his knowledge of the doctrine of the 3½ years is hearsay. But in a second portion of the statement he relates that two general meetings were held in Augsburg, each attended by over sixty persons, including Hut and Hans Denck, in which the eschatological position of the sect was discussed. In the first of these meetings the assembly came to a general agreement on the nature of the end of the world but did not accept the view that its occurrence could be predicted in time. In the second meeting, however, he stated, "Hut and Denck appeared before them and agreed that such an end would come in the named time."

Maier spoke here as if he were giving a first-hand report of the proceedings. And yet, of all his statements, this is the easiest to refute. Most certainly, Hans Denck would never have lent himself
to such an extreme eschatological position. To the contrary, the events of the Augsburg synod in their mildest version were enough to cause him to become disillusioned with the sect, leading to his ultimate recantation of his Anabaptist views and his turning toward a more rational, spiritualistic religious position. If Maier's statement lacks veracity with regard to Denck, could it also not be questioned concerning the teachings of Hut?

The argument could also be put forth that these confessions were extracted under severe torture, but so was that of Hans Ritter. In fact, one thing that the radical confessions have in common is that all those who made them recanted their views and threw themselves on the mercy of the authorities. The character of Nespitzer is related by a secretary at Ansbach: "Nespitzer was informed of the imperial law, but the prospect of a pardon was held out to him if he should recant. With that he fell to the ground, cried, and exclaimed, 'Thank God that I have come out of this error."

After their confessions and recantations, the authorities in charge made an appeal for leniency on behalf of Nespitzer and Maier to the margrave Georg, asking that they be pardoned from the death penalty and allowed to make the usual public confession and recantation. Could it not be said that these men were willing to attest to anything in return for their lives, while Ritter, made of sterner stuff, refused to compromise his faith and jeopardize the lives of his brothers in the faith? Before drawing conclusions in the matter one should look at other Anabaptist communities in the area. One point, however, should be brought out now. There exists one other
common factor not only in the confessions of Maier and Nespitzer from July, 1530, but also in that of Hans Weischenfelder from March, 1527. All of these men demonstrate a more than coincidental relationship with yet another principal Anabaptist leader, Jörg Volk of Thuringia, who served as a follow-up man to Hut in the communities established around Erlangen-Nürnberg, especially at Uttenreuth and Gründlach.

Before coming to those communities and the nature of Volk's teachings, the fate of the Erlangen-Alterlangen circle should be related. By the time of the discovery of the Anabaptists in Erlangen in March, 1527, the majority of those confirmed to be followers of the sect had already fled the area. The full extent of the sect's membership was only gradually discovered over the years as persons like Kaspar Schmid, Hans Ritter, Marx Maier and others returned to the vicinity, were taken prisoner, and revealed in their confessions the names of others of their brethren. Since the sources do not record any action against the majority of these, one may conclude that these had permanently left the community. Consequently there is little in the way of further protocol to reveal more about the teachings of the sect there. The Erlangen circle was not destroyed, however, but simply shifted to Bruck where the authorities were reluctant to enter.

Nürnberg had informed the margrave on March 26, 1527, that the two millers at Neumühle were confirmed Anabaptists. The testimony of those questioned by the Erlangen officials in the same month also indicated that Bruck, even then, was a general meeting
place for the circle. Yet the only action taken by those officials with regard to Bruck was to attempt to confiscate the property of the wife of one of the millers. This attempt failed and the reasons for its failure help to demonstrate why the Anabaptists there were left virtually undisturbed for almost a year. When the authorities moved in to confiscate the miller's wife's property and also that of Frau Kaier of Alterlangen, they discovered that the two women had already rented their belongings to other residents of Erlangen and that, indeed, the property actually belonged to the cathedral chapter in Bamberg. The bailiff reported that he could not ride out to Neumühle and inventory the goods without angering the cathedral provost. Not only was Bruck in limbo between Nürnberg and the margrave, but the bishop of Bamberg still had a stake in the area. Thus was Bruck left in peace until Nürnberg began to insist that the haven be destroyed.

Obviously feeling that it could not effectively proceed against the Anabaptists in Nürnberg territory as long as they were freely permitted at Bruck, on January 28, 1528, not even bothering with the local officials, it suggested to the margrave's advisor, Hans von Schwarzenburg that he could count on the services of Nürnberg to deal with the Anabaptists at Bruck and that Nürnberg would be happy to inform the margrave how best to go about the task of rooting out the sect in the margrave's lands. Von Schwarzenburg took this as a direct threat, as it was no doubt intended to be, of Nürnberg intervention if the margrave did not take immediate action.
Meanwhile, under pressure from von Schwarzenburg, Hans von Seckendorf finally began his investigation, receiving a report from the pastor at Bruck, Georg Vogelsang, that the Anabaptist circle at Bruck was not small. Indeed, he said:

Up to half the village has been secretly gathering. On January 9, thirty persons met at the home of Kuselmann and other gatherings have been held at the Schleufer's and the Pratter's [homes]. They reject infant baptism. The affair was revealed [to me] through the complaints of a woman whose husband recently was persuaded to join [the movement]. God grant that the authorities will soon give consideration to the matter. 54

Still, not until February 10 did the Erlangen authorities make any arrests. By then, Hans von Seckendorf reported that the Schleufers (probably grinders) and Pratters were not to be found and he had been able to arrest only five persons, Kuselmann and his wife, the wife of a Hans Maier, and two others whose names are not given. 55 One might question the vigilance of a pastor who would fail to notice that half his parishioners had gone over to a new sect, or even suggest that he might himself be in sympathy with the movement, but, in fact, even Hans von Seckendorf by this time questioned the necessity of further persecution against apparently harmless people. A week after the arrests, he wrote directly to the margrave Georg, saying that one of those imprisoned was a pregnant woman who had to be handled with the utmost care, the others seemed to be innocent, and he would recommend that all of them be immediately released. 56

The point was, and is, that the local officials of the margrave had yet to uncover anything dangerous about the Anabaptists.
Man Maier had not been captured yet, the majority of those revealed
to be Anabaptists had fled, and those remaining were more pathetic
than alarming. The bailiff, Erkinger von Seckendorf, was less
concerned about the religious views of his charges than the suffering
which persecution caused their families, as his letter to his
superiors demonstrate. 57 This attitude, which, as will be seen, was
also shared in Nürnberg, continued even after the discovery of the
Anabaptist circle at Uttenreuth, where Jörg Volk was operating.

Like the community at Bruck, the Anabaptists at Uttenreuth
were left undisturbed by the officials at Erlangen and Baiersdorf
for almost a year after Hut's visit in March, 1527. Also like
the community at Bruck, the local officials were prompted into a
raid on Uttenreuth only at the prodding of the authorities in
Nürnberg, who "advised" Hans von Seckendorf that it was clear that
the Anabaptists in Uttenreuth were seeking to expand and the situation
raised "grave difficulties." The council wrote:

It is our dutiful request that you would honor God and
His holy Word and also the land, the people, and the goods
which you oversee by bringing those connected to the sect
to prison for punishment. If any of those are our [subjects],
inform us of this in writing and we will bear the costs.

Von Seckendorf acted immediately. On New Year's Eve, he
imprisoned twenty persons, ten men and ten women. Two of the men
were strangers to the vicinity, so von Seckendorf, with the cor-
roborating evidence that one of them was in possession of a New
Testament, assumed that they were leaders of the sect. 59 These two,
both mill workers, were Wolfgang Wüst and Hans Zurl. The evidence
that they were leaders of the sect is not convincing. From the
confessions of those captured, a more complete picture of the Uttenreuth circle is available than of any other community.

Not all of those arrested were from Uttenreuth, although that village seems to have been where most of the gatherings were held. The circle was founded by Hans Hut about March 5, 1527, when he preached and baptized in the home of Fritz and Margaret Strigel. Those taken prisoner from the original group were Fritz Strigel, his wife Margaret, Jürg Ott, his wife Gerhaus, Margret Gross, Agnes Leitner, Cristina Grubner, and her two daughters, Els and Katherina, and Conz Beck. Another woman, an old widow named Katherina Schrenz, testified that she was baptized in her own home by Michel Hut. Presumably she meant Hans Hut. The Grubners were from Eggenhof and Conz Beck was from Weiher. The remainder were from Uttenreuth.

The remainder of those arrested were not baptized by Hut but by Jürg Volk, who appeared in the area in August, 1527. His tactics were to operate through the established circle, converting friends and relatives almost on a one to one basis. Of those imprisoned, Wolfgang Wüst, Kunigund Zeltner from Weiher, and Hans Jobst from Rosenbach were baptized in Conz Beck's house at Weiher. Another of the captured, Margaret Weit from Rosenbach, was baptized at the home of Hans Beck in Rosenbach. The final prisoner, the stranger Hans Zurl, had known Volk previously. He was baptized by him in his home in Staffelstein. Agnes Leitner also testified that Volk came to her husband Heints' mill and baptized him.

Hut and Volk were not the only Anabaptist leaders to visit
Uttenreuth. In September, after Volk had made his initial appearance in the area, Jorg Nespitzer appeared in the town with Jakob Leitner, the brother of Heintz, who had led him there in the aftermath of the Martyrs' Synod in Augsburg. There Nespitzer met Volk and visited with him in some of the Anabaptist homes. At the same time, in an unnamed village, he met Marx Maier, then presumably went on his own mission into other parts of Franconia. 76

Another Anabaptist leader who frequented the area with Volk was Balthasar of Gebirge, although the extent of his influence is unknown. 77 In addition to these men, the Uttenreuth community developed its own leader and apostle for the sect, Hans Grubner, "the Bauer from Eggenhof." He was baptized by Hut in the original meeting at Fritz Strigel's house and would appear to be yet another member of the Grubner family. 78 From the moment of his baptism he became an ardent evangelist for the sect in Franconia, working with Marx Maier. 79 Even taking into account that these men occasionally were in the vicinity, Hut and Volk must still be considered the primary founders and teachers of the sect.

Hut's contact in the area was no doubt "the Nadler from Büchenhof." Located across the Schwabach from Uttenreuth, in Nürnberg territory, Büchenhof's residents must have had daily contact with those from the larger village. Indeed, Margaret Gross stated in her testimony that her husband was with Jorg Harscher and Wolfgang Vogel when they were arrested by the Nürnberg authorities, 80 raising the possibility that he may have been the mysterious needlemaker. Nothing is recorded concerning the activities of the group between
Hut's one night visit in March and Volk's appearance in August.

There is no appreciable difference between the views of those baptized by Hut and those baptized by Volk, with one exception. Those baptized by Volk insisted that they had not been rebaptized, but were given only a sign that they should desist from sins and that they have entered into a covenant with God. Those baptized by Hut were emphatic in their repudiation of infant baptism and their assertion that faith must precede baptism.

All of those imprisoned testified that they knew nothing of any plots to exterminate the authorities. To the contrary, they had been told that they must always obey the authority and give to it what it asks of them. All testified that there was no special brotherhood or bond between them. They had only sworn to resist sin and live according to the faith. All of them perceived their new baptism to mean that they accepted the suffering of Christ as their own and that all must suffer before entering the kingdom of heaven. All of them interpreted the Lord's Supper as a memorial and remembrance of Christ's suffering and a recognition that they must suffer with Him. Most of them saw their new baptism as a renewal of faith; or a discovery of faith they had never known. All were willing to recant their second baptism and stand by their first, but the nature of their testimony indicates such willingness to be only an appeasement of the authorities. It is impossible to believe that they would summarily reject obviously deep convictions more significant to their lives than anything they had known before. Rather, they would outwardly fulfill the obligations imposed upon them and secretly continue
in their Anabaptist faith, suffering the persecution of which Hut had warned.

Something of the spirit of the Uttenreuth Anabaptists and their individual motivations for joining the sect can be seen through highlights of their individual testimony. With a touch of sarcasm, when Fritz Strigel was asked what he knew about revolutionary plans by the sect, he replied that he knew nothing of any plans to root out the authority or burn castles. He was a poor, sick, crippled man who did not go out of his house. If they beat him and cleaved him in two he could not tell them what he did not know. His wife's testimony revealed a simple piety. Hans Hut had come to her home, preached, and read accounts of the suffering Christ and his teachings. He said that if those gathered wanted to accept this teaching they would have to receive a sign of their faith, with which he took some water and made the sign of the cross on their foreheads. When asked of her views on the sacraments, she replied that her second baptism did not alter her first. She accepted it as a sign of her desire to follow Christ. She still believed in the Holy Sacrament although Hut had given her and others bits of bread and wine as a memorial of the Last Supper, signifying the suffering and death of Christ. She was a Christian, she said, and had done nothing contrary to the Christian faith.

Margret Gross and Agnes Leitner gave the fullest account of the Anabaptist views of the sacraments and their significance. The secretary recorded a joint statement for both of them:
First, concerning the sacrament, they said they had no
desire to believe that the body and blood of Christ was present
in the bread and wine, and that it effected no change in them.
Instead, they believe they receive the body of Christ in spirit,
not in bread, because through the spirit He becomes flesh in
men. At the Last Supper He had with His disciples, He gave them
only bread, as a sign, and not his body. He said, "This is
my body which will be broken on the cross. Whenever you eat
it, you should thus think about this and proclaim the dead
Lord until He returns." But when He gave them the cup, He
said, "That is the cup of my blood," that is, the suffering.
And only through suffering do you drink the blood of Christ,
not by drinking wine. Wine is only a sign.

Concerning infant baptism, they maintain absolutely
nothing, because children are pure from all sins for a time.
Thus, in no way are they helped by baptism....They accept
their second baptism as a sign that they are joined together
with the Lord and that henceforth they wish to die to this
world. They want no more to live in this world, controlled
by the desires of the flesh, such as fleeing, eating, and drink-
ing, swearing, and similar things. They know that only
through faith and suffering may they enter the kingdom of
God. Thus they have accepted that they should desire to
withdraw from the world....

To this they would hold fast, whether it goes well or
bad for them.

The testimonies of the Uttenreuth Anabaptists clearly demon-
strate the absence of any superficiality in their faith. They had
thought much about the message of Hans Hut, and the consistency of
their views demonstrates that they must have met together often to
discuss their faith and its implications. Ironically, most of them
were reported to have admitted that they had been seduced, misled,
or deceived by the devil and wished to return again to their old
faith. But their own confessions demonstrate that their faith was
not so frivolous.

Conz Beck testified that he had never been a God-fearing man
until the evening he met Hans Hut, and his case must be typical of
the majority of those who accepted Hut's message. All of those
arrested at Uttenreuth were poor, with the possible exception of the miller, Heinz Leitner, and his wife. For none of them did life hold much promise but that of a drudging, day to day existence. Hut's message was as old as Christianity itself. He gave meaning to their earthly suffering by promising them that through suffering they would attain the kingdom of heaven. Whether it was the crippled old Fritz Strigel and his wife, the elderly widow Katherina Schrenz, or the twenty-year-old Kunigund Zeltner, who in accepting the new covenant with God had to give up dancing, Hut gave them purpose to their existence and a community of "brothers and sisters" pledged to aid and comfort one another in times of need and share their love with all.

Nothing revolutionary was apparent among the captured Anabaptists at Uttenreuth. By January 20, all were released in return for public confession and penance. 85 If either Hut or Volk were preaching revolutionary political, economic, or social doctrines, the people from Uttenreuth did not reveal them.

C. Nürnberg and Her Villages

After the uneventful summer of 1527, during which the Nürnberg authorities seem to have been unaware of continued Anabaptist activity in their territory, their attention was dramatically brought back to the sect by the arrests in September of Hans Hut in Augsburg and Ambrosius Spittlemaier in Erlangen. Acting on information received from Erlangen, on September 11, the council ordered a night raid on the village of Gründlach and discovered there a small enclave of
Anabaptists, thus opening the second phase of action against the sect in Nürnberg.

Nürnberg was extremely interested in the proceedings against Hut, the chief apostle of the sect, and Spittlemaier, whom the council believed to have been teaching in its territory. It explained to the authorities at Ansbach:

We recognize our obligations to root out as far as possible these godless, seductive brotherhoods and sects and to bring an end to an evil, audacious plan formed against all governments. It is our aim to increase the number of those imprisoned to uncover what their teachers have undertaken and intended up to now, when they baptized in our city and villages, and with whom they have been hiding here. After that, we will be able to keep watch over guilty persons and those connected to these cases.

To find out first hand what it wanted to know, the council sent its own representative, Georg Grün, to Erlangen to witness the trial of Spittlemaier and maintained constant correspondence with Augsburg over the trial of Hut. Although neither Hut nor Spittlemaier admitted having taught or advocated the destruction of the secular authorities, their views could certainly be considered dangerous by the standards of the sixteenth century. From Hut, the revelation of his connections with Müntzer and Denck, of his residence in Nürnberg during the time of the sacramentarian controversies, of his involvement with Nürnberg residents, including Wolfgang Vogel and Jakob Dolman, was chilling. His confession that at one time he had been under the sway of Müntzer and himself preached to the peasants to rise up and slay their overlords was sufficient to confirm the worst suspicions of the authorities despite Hut's repeated statements that he had given up such views when he accepted his second baptism by
Denck, especially for Nürnberg which had already experienced the revolutionary views of Denck and "the godless painters" and Wolfgang Vogel and the Eltersdorf Anabaptists. And, of course, for Nürnberg, his heretical views of the sacraments were misleading, seductive, and endangered the very souls of her subjects. This last point is very important and must be remembered to understand the concern of the authorities in stamping out what proved to be in most cases an otherwise harmless movement. Such considerations loomed most important in the views of both Nürnberg and Ansbach with respect to Ambrosius Spittlemaier.

Like Hut, Spittlemaier denied any plans to exterminate the authorities, but said, on the contrary, that one must give willingly to the government what it demands. But as Spittlemaier's trial, which lasted from September to the following February, continued, his answers became, if not more evasive, at least more daring in tone. His overzealousness cost him his life. Like all Anabaptist prisoners, he was especially pressed for his views on the plan to annihilate the authorities, the nature of the Last Judgment, and the holding of property in common. He never admitted to the first point, but became increasingly zealous in expounding upon the latter two. On September 20, he testified:

Concerning the doctrine of equality before God and the equality of all members of the brotherhood: as Christ says, "From those among you, the great will become small."

On September 22, he testified:

[On Government:] The current authority was established as a rod and punishment of the true Christian....One cannot be saved by following the government of men, but only
...by following the command of Christ, and He says, "Leave what you have and follow me."

[On the Last Judgment:] The year, hour, or time in which God the Almighty will destroy the world is not known..., but we have signs by which we recognize the end of the world and the future judgment. The righteous who are long dead wait and sleep in the Lord until the day of judgment. After that they will be welcomed by the rest and together make up the kingdom of God on earth....

[On Equality:] If we were all the same, Christian and one in faith and spirit, then there would be total equality and communion. If we were all Christian we would have no enemies and remain equal with one another. No true Christian is lazy. If none are lazy, then none will depend upon the others. If we were all Christian, we would all work the same and earn the same bread.

[On the Evangelical Faith:] Current preachers do not proclaim the Gospels loudly and clearly as Christ ordained it. This is because they have no true foundation. They seek to learn from men. If they wanted to learn from [Christ], He would teach them.

On October 25, Spittlemaier was allowed to answer questions addressed to him from Nürnberg in his own hand. He could not resist the opportunity to preach to his captors and the tone of his writing speaks for itself that he no longer wished to compromise his faith:

The purpose of the league is to teach and learn from others and to keep its brothers on the proper path. It does not advocate the overthrow of governments. I say awake, awake! Throw off sin! Let Christ enlighten you! All men carry dead souls in living bodies. They should carry a living soul in a dead body (Job 12, John 15, Matthew 4 and 21, Luke 9).

The seven articles of the league are:
1) Baptism as the covenant with God.
2) Concerning the kingdom of God which God alone will establish. They are as one, poor in spirit (Mt. 5., Lk. 6).

No one can occupy this kingdom, in which the poor dwell with Christ. A Christian should have no property or anything to which he might incline his head. A true Christian should have no more on earth than the place he rests his feet. Not that he should not work here, or lie in the woods, or not have fields and meadows, but only that he would not use anything for himself alone so that he would say, "That house is mine. That field is mine. That penny is mine." Rather, everything belongs to us all....At best the Christian should have nothing for his own, but should hold all things with
his brother in the community, that none might suffer....

3) As Christ is the head, so Christians are the limbs of the body (Lk. 22, I Cor. 12, Rom. 14).

4) The end of the world: The time is here when God will destroy all things through fire, etc.

5) The future and the judgment day: After all men are killed, etc., Christ will come (Mt. 25, II Cor. 5) in His holiness and judge the living and the dead (Mt. 20).

6) On the resurrection: That all will be resurrected with body and soul (Rom. 6, Ezek. 18, Mt. 19, Lk. 12, 16, I Tim. 6).

7) On the eternity: The godless must be damned and go to eternal fire (Hebr. 4, Mt. 25)....

All authority from the time of Adam to the present was established by God, but it does not remain in God. They have overexerted their power and continue to do so. Originally the authority or power was established by God to set right those words and works which were against God. But the words and works which act against God are no longer being corrected. Thus they are the blind leading the blind. [But they fulfill God's purpose], for they really are with God and become like Pilate when he judged Christ.

Few authorities would have allowed Spittlemaier to escape with his life. But those from Ansbach offered to release him if he would swear to never come within thirty miles of Ansbach and pledge to refrain from his preaching. Spittlemaier refused the offer.

On January 24, 1528, the Statthalter at Ansbach sent three officials to him to question him further about his views. Informing the officials at Cadolzburg, where Spittlemaier had been moved, of this, the Statthalter added that they only wanted the truth from him, they did not want to make him a martyr. But Spittlemaier was intent now.

The officials at Cadolzburg replied, "He wants to suffer a martyr's death. Question: Is he thereby setting an example for others and in that way fomenting rebellion?"

Reluctantly, the Statthalter granted Spittlemaier his wish.

On February 6, he wrote, "We have decided that the prisoner is a
rebel and insurgent and is to be executed on the following Monday at Langenzenn by the sword. We have done all we can with him. He would awaken rebellion."  

Spittlemaier was an excellent example to the Nürnberg officials of the dangers inherent in the Anabaptist teachings. If the sect did not advocate an armed revolt, it was at least undermining all authority through the very nature of its faith. What would happen to the traditional order and stability of society if there were a thousand men like Ambrosius Spittlemaier in the countryside, or worse, in the city itself? Nürnberg fully recognized its obligation to prevent the development of such a situation, as it reiterated constantly to other governments in South Germany. But its own experience and conscience ruled out the use of the sword as a viable means of halting the growth and thereby the dangers of the sect. Nürnberg's further contacts with Anabaptists on its own soil merely reconfirmed its position as stated on August 30 to the authorities at Augsburg.

Five persons had been arrested in the raid of September 11 on Gründlach: Franz and Margaret Beheim, the innkeeper Hans Hirschler, Sebastian Schedels, and Hans Meyer. Franz Beheim was proclaimed innocent and released the day after his capture. The others were subjected to interrogation and the case finally turned over to the council's legal advisers, who returned their decision on September 14. The council summarized the lawyers' views and their own in a letter to Ansbach on September 23:

Although we are quite willing to pass sentence upon
the prisoners that we have seized and consigned them to the
dungeon because of this affair [of the Anabaptists], we
nevertheless regard such punishment as being totally fruit­
less and of no value in coming to a basic understanding of
this problem. These prisoners are but poor peasant people.
They have not themselves baptized anyone, but have received
baptism through seduction by the leaders of the sect, more
out of innocence and for what they considered to be a good
thing, rather than for ulterior motives. They have no
knowledge of the main articles of this league. 104

Whatever the teachings of Hut and Spittlemaier, the state
was in no danger from the likes of those seized at Gründlach. As
the council further explained to the Ansbach authorities, their
offense was more an affront to God than to the secular state. Not
the state, but men's souls were at stake and, as the lawyers put it
once again, force cannot be used in matters of faith. The obligation
of the secular authority, they suggested, was to sufficiently warn
the populace of the evils and dangers of the teachings of the sect,
let them know that such teachings would not be tolerated and would
be severely punished, and to make certain that everyone received
proper and sufficient instruction on the articles of the evangelical
faith. 105

Acting upon the advice of the lawyers, the council responded
to the Anabaptist threat with what amounted to a three-fold offensive
consisting of: 1) admonishing the people to be alert to the fallacies
and dangers of the new sect through published mandates and education
by the local pastors; 2) halting the influx of any more foreign
agitators, whether these were Anabaptist leaders or simply refugees
from other cities; and 3) seizing those who had already converted to
the new sect and, where possible, re-educating them in the tenets of
the evangelical faith or, where re-education was unsuccessful, administering a suitable punishment to fit their particular case. At the first end, the council issued a series of mandates to the public at large, occasionally, to certain segments of society. The first general mandate appeared soon after the advice of September 14 and outlined the teachings of the Anabaptists as they were perceived by the authorities at that time. Emphasis was placed upon the apocalyptic teachings of the sect which the council felt to be the most "seductive" aspect of the teachings for the common people. The mandate also emphasized that these teachings were not based upon Scripture and anyone tempted to follow them was endangering his own soul. If one were not concerned sufficiently for his soul, the council reminded him that rebaptism was contrary to imperial law and punishable by death. In short, it said, anyone who is rebaptized or guilty of spreading the Anabaptist errors would face the severest punishment to body and goods. It advised that should one come across an Anabaptist teacher, he should run for life and soul and immediately report the incident to the authorities. The mandate concluded with a special warning to innkeepers to be especially alert for strangers acting suspiciously or illegally, which included improper frivolity on Sundays and holidays.

A second mandate was issued on November 14, for all the pastors in the territory. It included most of the information of the first end, the council issued a series of mandates to the public at large, occasionally, to certain segments of society. The first general mandate appeared soon after the advice of September 14 and outlined the teachings of the Anabaptists as they were perceived by the authorities at that time. Emphasis was placed upon the apocalyptic teachings of the sect which the council felt to be the most "seductive" aspect of the teachings for the common people. The mandate also emphasized that these teachings were not based upon Scripture and anyone tempted to follow them was endangering his own soul. If one were not concerned sufficiently for his soul, the council reminded him that rebaptism was contrary to imperial law and punishable by death. In short, it said, anyone who is rebaptized or guilty of spreading the Anabaptist errors would face the severest punishment to body and goods. It advised that should one come across an Anabaptist teacher, he should run for life and soul and immediately report the incident to the authorities. The mandate concluded with a special warning to innkeepers to be especially alert for strangers acting suspiciously or illegally, which included improper frivolity on Sundays and holidays.
of the first mandate and was to serve as a guideline to the pastors on how to combat the Anabaptists in their sermons and instructions to the people "in order to gain the upper hand [and] so that a similarity is maintained in the sermons." Contrary to the harshness of the general mandate, however, the one for the pastors included an example of how they would deal with persons who "in spite of so much true warning and good instruction" allowed themselves to be rebaptized. If they accepted Christian instruction and repented their errors, grace would be granted and their punishment would be reduced to "standing three consecutive Sundays before the churches, publicly renouncing his views, that all might recognize his errors." The pastor's duty would then be to help the repentant sinner maintain his true faith. A final word of warning was expressed to the pastors that they themselves be alert and resist the temptations of the Anabaptists, for they, above all, could not expect a lenient treatment.

Perhaps the council was waiting for its new measures to take effect, for it made no concerted effort to seek out Anabaptists in areas it knew to have supported Anabaptist activity. Clearly, the council was already suspicious of Anabaptist activity in Tennenlohe, Kleinreuth, Grossreuth, Lohe, and Thon. And certainly they must have learned more about the Gründlach community from these imprisoned. On October 29, Hans Wilhelm, the second Anabaptist innkeeper from Gründlach, was in Nürnberg and known to be rebaptized. The authorities did not, however, record any action against him. On December 23, though, Wilhelm was imprisoned by Philip Truchsess, the bailiff at
Dachsbach near Neustadt a/Aisch, and from his testimony there something of the nature of the Grundlach community is revealed.  

He testified that on St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24, three strange men, Jörg Volk, Jörg from Regensburg, and Hans von Berg, had appeared at Reutles, a neighboring village of Grundlach. At Reutles, the three men preached on the theme, "He who believes and is baptized will be saved." This was followed by the revelation that a great battle would occur at Nürnberg and only those who had been baptized would not be slain. After the battle there would be a new kingdom established in which all would be equal. Thus Wilhelm presented a view of the teachings of Volk very close to that which Marx Maier would confirm later at Erlangen.

Wilhelm further implicated Fritz Harscher of Reutles as the principal local leader of the sect. Harscher, he stated, had brought Hans von Berg to Reutles from Herzogenaurach hidden in a covered cart. He also implicated all of those already imprisoned and released by Nürnberg and, in addition, named the following as members of the sect: Paulus N., Jörg Schuster, Conz Hilpret, also called Hilbrandt, and Margaret N., wife of Albrecht N., all from Grundlach; Paulus Hempelein from Reutles; and a shepherd from Herboldshof, near Fürth, whose name he did not know.  

The only plausible explanation for Nürnberg's not taking action against these persons, since, with the new cooperation between Nürnberg and Ansbach, it must have known of Truchsess' report, is that they must have fled when the others from Grundlach were arrested. Five of their number finally were imprisoned by Nürnberg the following
spring.

In the meantime, the council was gearing itself for an anticipated influx of Anabaptists from Augsburg and other places. The threat was not yet realized, but, in light of the harsh measures other states were taking in comparison to the relatively lenient attitude of Nürnberg, was well taken.\^11^2 On October 13, the council requested from Augsburg the names of persons known to be Anabaptists and those already expelled from the city so they would know for whom to watch.\^11^3 But the flood did not begin until January, 1528, when the city of Augsburg began its systematic elimination of the Anabaptist congregations there, and after the January 14 Decree of the Diet of Speyer against the sect.\^11^4 Beginning January 21, the council issued a rash of decrees to prevent, uncover, and halt foreign Anabaptists attempting to enter the city.\^11^5 On January 24, a general order was sent to the quartermasters and pastors on how to deal with the problem. The quartermasters were told to inform all of their important officers to be especially on the alert for hidden foreigners or suspect persons. In addition, they were to make known that a reward of two gulden was being offered to anyone with information on any Anabaptists. The preachers were told to "energetically" instruct the people against being seduced by the Anabaptists.\^11^6 On the following day the city preachers were instructed to write a general instruction about the Anabaptists for the use of all pastors in the countryside to further educate all the council's subjects.\^11^7 This work, which was not finished until the end of February, became the basic statement of the city on the
scriptural, theological, and legal errors of the Anabaptists. Entitled *A Basic Instruction of the Honorable Council of the City of Nürnberg, Composed for the Pastors and Preachers in the City and in The Countryside for Their Use in Providing True Instruction in Their Sermons from the Holy Scripture for the People against the Many Seductive Teachings of the Anabaptists,* the work was distributed throughout the territory on March 3. As the title suggests, the forty-four page work outlines the basic teachings of the Anabaptists and attempts to refute them on the basis of Scripture. Fourteen pages are devoted to the scriptural justification of infant baptism.

Also on January 25, the city's police were warned that it was probable that "many" Anabaptists were being concealed in inns and that they should survey these, keeping a list of anything suspicious, and be alert that "the rascals may be hidden in cellars." Finally, on January 26, the council issued another general mandate on the Anabaptists, stating, "it finds it necessary to repeat its position considering the substantial influx of them and especially leaders, resulting from their expulsion by other authorities."

The apparent urgency expressed by the council in this one week alone would suggest that the city was fairly teeming with Anabaptists. In truth it was not. And the council was taking precautionary measures so that it would not. Much of the alarm stemmed from the capture in mid-January of a weaver from Passau, Hans Öder, whom the council took to be an important leader of the sect. Accordingly, letters were dispatched to Augsburg, Bamberg,
Regensburg, Passau, Ansbach, and Windsheim, describing Öder and what was known of his activities and inquiring about additional information they might have on him. This was the beginning of a long and tragic ordeal for Öder and his wife, who was captured with him, that lasted from January, 1528, until March 12, 1529. Öder, it turned out, had preached and baptized, but after three weeks of steady interrogation and torture Öder had confessed to nothing that resembled revolutionary views. The consensus of the theologians and lawyers was that if and when he demonstrated that he opposed the secular authorities, he could legitimately be executed. As it was, however, the council's advisers were in a quandary as to what to do with him. As a leader, and since he would not recant his views, he was too dangerous to expel from the territory. Thus began a battle of wills that lasted for an entire year. After April, Öder was no longer tortured, was given a room of his own in a tower, and was given a New Testament and several pamphlets against the Anabaptists. He was given pen and ink to keep notes on his thoughts. In June, he was allowed to bathe. In September, he was given fresh straw. Five days later he made his first recantation, but it did not satisfy the council. All the while, the city pastors worked with him. By February, these meetings included some sociable drinking of wine. And on February 25, the council accepted his offer of recantation, finally releasing him on March 12, 1528, with an official document from the council that through the patient instruction of the council he had acquired true faith, recognized and confessed his old errors, and promised never to
Throughout the spring of 1528, the council maintained its vigilance against foreign Anabaptists, but the results were meager. Besides Öder and his wife, only six foreigners are named in the council records and three of these were not specifically deemed Anabaptists, but sacramentarians and "rebels." Three Anabaptists from Augsburg were caught and immediately expelled. Possibly there were more refugees in Nürnberg who were either turned back at the city gates or, in hiding with sympathetic Nürnbergers, were able to escape detention. There is evidence to suggest that this last possibility was the case. On January 25, two men, an innkeeper, Heinrich Flach, and a woolen weaver, Ulrich Risener, were charged with knowingly harboring and cavorting with "knaves, Anabaptists, and rebels." Both men were warned to tell all that they knew about such persons and were warned that they would be continually watched. These discoveries prompted the council to send a special warning to the master weavers and dyers in the city, stating:

The council has good knowledge that several evil knaves belonging to the Anabaptists are being harbored by both your handicrafts and that these are developing a following in both groups. [These things] will not be endured by the council. You are warned to cleanse yourselves of these people and are under a command to keep the council informed when you see such persons.

The council's threats either worked or their alarm was unfounded. Only one weaver, besides Risener, and no dyers were arrested during the whole period of the Anabaptist threat. The number of Anabaptists discovered in early 1528 were not many, and of those the council could write:
It is true that many of the Anabaptists who are ordained and sent out by their brotherhoods as leaders and teachers have especially evil views, practices, and errors. But for the most part they keep these things to themselves and do not reveal them to the common people. Up to this time we have uncovered no signs, events, or remarks to indicate that persons in this brotherhood are bound by any ties or secret signs, except that when they recognize a brother, they say, "May the peace of God be with you." And the other responds, "Amen." 33

Instead of the council growing less tolerant of the Anabaptists as it came into increasing contact with them, it became more tolerant. The council never made good its threat of death to Anabaptist leaders. Instead, it went to great lengths and expense to avoid such an easy course. In addition to Hans Üder, the council ran into other men who refused to renounce their faith regardless of the torture, threats, and instruction given them by the government of Nürnberg. In May, 1528, five Anabaptists from the Gründlach circle, Jorg Schuster from Gründlach, Fritz Harscher from Reutles, Contz Schultheiss, Hans Beck, and his wife, from Tennenlohe were imprisoned. On May 15, they were examined by Wenzeslas Linck and another pastor. During the examination, Beck and Schultheiss became engaged in a lengthy debate with the pastors over infant as opposed to believers baptism. Both sides argued cogently from Scripture for their position. During the course of the argument Jorg Schuster interrupted to say that he had been badgered into accepting a second baptism and was quite willing to recant it. To this Hans Beck responded, "May God help you!" Toward the end of the debate, Fritz Harscher said that he, too, had been seduced to accept the baptism, but frankly, after listening to the debate he could not
understand the difference between the position of the two sides, especially when they both taught that one should love God and his neighbor and do no evil. That ended the day’s session.¹³⁴

On the second day of the hearing, Schuster and Harscher still agreed to recant their Anabaptist views and take instruction from the pastors. The Beck's and Schultheiss, however, refused. Thus they joined Hans Öder in prison for an indefinite period. In addition, the council was reluctant to release Harscher, even though he was willing to recant. After all, he had been named by Hans Wilhelm as the principal leader of the sect at Reutles. Once again the council turned to the jurists and theologians, asking their advice on what kinds of punishment should be given to the Anabaptists, distinguishing between the various cases with which they had been confronted.¹³⁵ Each of the advisers wrote his own opinion and all were turned over to the council for its decision by July 14.¹³⁶

On that date, the council reached its own decision.

The council decreed that it would distinguish between three kinds of Anabaptists: 1) Those who consciously were planning the destruction and extermination of the authorities and seduced others to join them through baptism. 2) Those who had no such intentions but were themselves baptized and had baptized others. 3) Those who had only been rebaptized and planned no deceit. Accordingly, there would be three kinds of punishment. The first kind would be punished with death. The second kind, if they recanted their views, would be exiled. The third kind, if they recanted their views, took instruction from the pastors, and did public penance before the church.
doors of their home parishes, would be allowed to return to their communities. If they did not recant, they would be permanently exiled from council territory. But, after all the work of the city's lawyers and preachers, concerning these who preached and baptized and would not recant, the council could only say that they would be severely punished. In practice, that meant that they would languish in prison, like Hans Öder, until their will was broken.

With the exception of one man, however, the council never encountered any others like Hans Öder. With the adoption of this general policy for the punishment of Anabaptists, for the next two years the council dealt with them almost perfunctorily. More Anabaptists were uncovered from the villages of Tennenlohe, Reutles, Kraftshof, Eltersdorf, Kalchreuth, Wolfsfeldt, and Währd and, of course, in Nürnberg. Often, however, their imprisonment and sentence are recorded in one entry in the documents with no reference to the nature of the person's beliefs. Consequently, there is little additional information to present on these persons that is not included in Tables 6–9, in the following chapter. The one exception to this was a wood turner from Lauf, Bartholmes Friedrich Fridel.

On August 8, 1528, Friedrich was turned in to the authorities as an Anabaptist. The peasant who turned him in was duly rewarded, and Friedrich became involved in a process almost identical to that of Hans Öder. In fact, on February 27, 1529, after Öder had agreed to recant, Friedrich took his place in the tower and there he stayed for the next year. Until March 3, 1530, no more mention was
made of Friedrich. On that date, the affair was turned over to the legal advisers. Enough time had been spent, they said, trying to reconvert him through fatherly instruction. He would not lend himself to the truth and showed no signs of improvement. As an evangelist for the sect, the council had the legal right to execute him, according to common law and by the decree of the Diet of Speyer against the Anabaptists. But since he did not preach violence to the authorities or any other kind of rebellion, and since the council was inclined to show leniency to such persons, the only alternative was banishment. Objections were made to this by two of the lawyers, who argued that Friedrich would only resume his seduction of innocent people. If the council exiled him, it would become a party to his deeds. Finally the lawyers agreed. If he should take an oath never to preach again to others, the council could secretly expel him. If he would not take such an oath, or if he should break his oath, he should be left in a cell "unattended, even if he should die." The following day, the affair was turned over to the preachers.

The preachers reported that Friedrich was now refusing to eat or to talk, except to say that the council was a "godless authority and could do no more than to take his putrefiable flesh from him." If left in jail, the preachers advised, the man would kill himself. If let out, he might resume his preaching. Wenzeslas Linck stated that he could offer no other advice than to release the man from jail. The other pastors agreed, with Osiander adding that he should be kept imprisoned a while longer "to see if he will not break down and eat, drink, or talk. Otherwise, exile him and hope
for the best." Thus end the accounts of Bartholmes Friedrich. The silence of the records would suggest that the council followed the advice of both lawyers and clergy, secretly expelling him from council territory.

With Friedrich, the first phase of the radical reformation in Nürnberg came to a close, much as it had begun with the "peasant from Wührd," Diepoldt Beringer. Both men were unwilling to compromise the truth and the faith as they knew it, regardless of the threats and reprisals of the secular authority. But there was nothing revolutionary about either man, at least with regard to anything resembling an overt attack upon the political, economic, or social structure of their day. If, between February, 1524 and March, 1530, there were persons intent upon the overturning of secular society, they were not in the mainstream of those caught up in either the sacramentarian or Anabaptist movements. Our task now is to evaluate the events described in the past pages and to attempt to come to a general conclusion about the kinds of men involved, and the motivations which caused them to forsake—or, perhaps, merely to go beyond—the evangelical position of the city of Nürnberg for more radical religious reform. Before coming to any conclusions, however, an examination of the statistical breakdown of the radical movements is necessary to present a general view of the social backgrounds of the people who were attracted to radical teachings.
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Grundliche/unterrichtung, eins/erbern Rats der Statt/ Nürnberg, Welcher gestalt, ire/ Pfarrner und Prediger in den/ Stetten und auff den Land/ das volck, wider etliche ver/fürische lere der Wider/tauffer, in iren predisen/ auss heyliger Gülich/er schrift, zum getreulichen erma/nen und un/terrichten/ sollen. Printed by Jobst Gutknecht. (Nürnberg Stadtbibliothek, Amb. 3751. 8°.)

His name first appears in the documents on January 23—

Rv. 752, 25v.

The letters are in BB 96, 220r.-222v., January 25; and BB 97, 5r., January 30.

Rv. 752, 27v.-28r., January 24; Rv. 752, 30r., January 25; Rv. 753, 10v., February 6. Oder's wife, who was pregnant, was put in irons and also questioned.

Ibid. The council always felt that Oder was more dangerous than he probably was, because it felt that he had close ties with Hans Hut. This stemmed from the fact that when Oder was first apprehended, he and his wife had with them a young child. The child escaped but, apparently, from Oder's testimony, the council discovered that it was Hans Hut's son, who was being taken from Augsburg to his mother who was supposed to be travelling about Franconia with Jörg Nespitzer (BB 96, 221v.-222r., Nürnberg to Augsburg, January 25;
BB 97, 22r.-22v., Nürnberg to Conrad, bishop of Würzburg, February 15.
The Augsburg authorities could discover nothing on Oder (S I L 82, Nr. 40, XI, Augsburg to Nürnberg; January 30), but friends in Augsburg sent him a letter containing two gulden, which the council allowed him to use for whatever purpose he wanted (Rv. 753, 1v., January 30; Rv. 756, 13r., April 24).

---

127 Rv. 753, 17v., February 11; Rv. 753, 18v., RB 14, 158v., February 12; Rv. 753, 21r., February 14; Rv. 753, 22r., February 15; Rv. 753, 28v., February 20; RB 14, 167r., February 28; Rv. 754, 3v., February 29; Rv. 755, 1v., March 26; Rv. 755, 19r., April 11; Rv. 756, 6v., April 21; Rv. 756, 13r., April 24; Rv. 756, 29r., May 6; BB 97, 137r.-138r., May 12; Rv. 757, 23v., June 3; Rv. 760, 20r., August 27; Rv. 761, 1v., September 3; Rv. 761, 5v., September 8; Rv. 761, 17v., September 25; Rv. 762, 6v., October 10; Rv. 762, 18v., October 24; Rv. 765, 8v., January 7; Rv. 766, 18r., February 15, 1529; Rv. 767, 2r., February 19; Rv. 767, 3v., February 22; Rv. 767, 6r., RB 15, 2r., February 25; Rv. 767, 16r., March 10; Rv. 767, 18r., March 12; BB 99, 16v.-17r., March 12.

Oder's wife was expelled from council territory February 20, 1528 (Rv. 753, 28v.). For Oder to have refused recantation through all of this, especially the forced separation from his wife and unborn child, only further demonstrates how deep the faith of many of the Anabaptists, that they would, indeed, forsake everything for it.

128 These were Michel Glaser, a glazer from Vienna, and his two journeymen, Michel Wyncklen from Augsburg, and Hans Thoman from Strassburg (Rv. 753, 34v.-35v., two entries, February 26).

129 Mang Betz, a ring maker, was seized on May 14, expelled on May 16 (Rv. 757, 2r.; Rv. 757, 4r.-4v.; RB 14, 204v.). On September 14, he attempted to enter the city a second time, but was again expelled (Rv. 761, 10v.).

A woman from Augsburg, called simply "die Craffterin," was probably the wealthy widow, Honester Craffter. First seized on May 8, she was given a week to leave the city (Rv. 756, 31r.; RB 14, 199v.), but was still there on May 27, when she was again ordered to leave (Rv. 757, 15r.). Possibly she had her two daughters with her, although they are not mentioned in the documents.

A maid, Els Leutlin, was seized May 27, and expelled on June 2 (Rv. 757, 15r.; Rv. 757, 17v.; Rv. 757, 21v.-22r.).

130 RB 14, 135v., two entries, and Rv. 752, 34r., two entries. Further charges against the innkeeper were that he was living "an openly immoral and shockingly evil life," when at home he had a fine, upright wife. This was especially bad, the council said, since it had always allowed him to maintain a privileged position in the city.

131 RB 14, 138r., January 28.
This was Veit Schacher: Rv. 752, 13v., January 12.

BB 97, 44r.-45r., March 4, 1527: Nürnberg to the Statthalter and regent of the lands of Württemberg, explaining its view of the Anabaptists and the doctrine of the second coming of Christ.

The protocol is contained in Familien Archiv Spengler, Nr. 24, located in the Stadtarchiv Nürnberg. The protocol is dated April 15, but the date must have been May 15. There are no records of the arrest of these persons before this date, and the second day of the hearing took place on May 16.

Rv. 758, 19r., July 1; Rv. 758, 21r., July 2; Rv. 758, 26r., July 3.

The opinions are contained in Rep. 19a, E Laden, S VII L 116, Nr. 65, consisting of six documents in forty-five consecutively numbered pages.

The situation in Wührd is rather interesting in that a Nürnberg innkeeper, Sixt Koch, a confirmed Anabaptist, implicated the pastor at Wührd as having contributed to the Anabaptist cause in the village through his sermons and other activities. Indeed, the charges indicated his parish to be the center of Anabaptist activity (Rschlb. 6, 165v.-166v., February 6, 1529). The pastor denied the allegations and the affair was allowed to drop. But in April he was implicated in the conversion to Anabaptism of the Nürnberg cutler, Stephen Fellnstein. Both men were examined and, again, the charges against the pastor were allowed to drop (Rv. 769, 11r., April 12; Rv. 769, 14v., April 14). One is reminded of the case of the pastor Jakob Dolman and must wonder if pastors were not allowed considerably more religious and intellectual freedom than their flocks.

It is worth mentioning that Sixt Koch had been baptized by an Austrian, Jakob Schmidt, who, Koch's brother testified, had a large following in Nürnberg and Schwabach. He attributed to Schmidt a different version of the apocalypse than has hitherto been seen, namely, that God "would send a prophet around whom a small following would gather. These, in turn, would slay all of the godless and pursue them into the sea. Those not drowned would be slain. Following this, all would be free from tithes and good years would follow" (TA, Bl, 148-149). Sixt Koch was freed following the usual public confession (Rv. 766, 16v., RB 14, 295v., February 13, 1529).

For instance, in January, 1529, twenty persons were in prison, who were Anabaptists. The council dealt with them in one sweeping measure, "to recognize the oral recantation of the twenty persons, male and female, who allowed themselves to be rebaptized here and in the countryside." They were then to be instructed in the
faith and handled according to the proclamation of July 14 (RB 14, 290r., Rv. 766, 4r., January 26). In many cases, the only reference to the individual Anabaptists is contained in the Straffbuch, with a simple listing of the crime and punishment of the subject.

140 Rv. 760, 3r.

141 Rv. 767, 8r., RB 15, 3r. The intervening accounts, consisting of periodic reports on his lack of progress are: Rv. 760, 3v., August 8; Rv. 760, 8v., August 14; Rv. 760, 10v., August 18; Rv. 760, 12r., August 19; Rv. 760, 15r., August 21; Rv. 760, 16v., August 22; Rv. 760, 22v., August 29; Rv. 761, 1v., September 3; Rv. 761, 16r., September 24; Rv. 765, January 7, 1529.

142 Rschlb. 6, 257r.-257v.

143 Rschlb. 6, 258r.-259r.
CHAPTER VII

THE SOCIAL BACKGROUND OF THE RADICAL REFORMATION IN NURNBERG:

A STATISTICAL SUMMARY

On the following pages, an attempt will be made to examine the occupational, social, and economic backgrounds of the Anabaptist and non-Anabaptist radicals in Nürnberg territory as an aid to demonstrate the contrasting natures, or similarities, between the Anabaptists and other groups, and to understand better the nature and appeal of radical reform. For the most part, all of the tables which follow are self-explanatory. All persons are listed in the tables chronologically, according to the date of their first appearance in the documents. This method helps to prevent confusion concerning all of the anonymous individuals who often can be identified in time and space only as assigned to them by the documents.

The tables which present the social stratification of the movements are somewhat relative. Some attention was given in Chapter I to the social organization of the city of Nürnberg. As stated there, upwards of 60% of the city's residents belonged to the broad middle spectrum of society between the very rich and the very poor. In these tables, only two designations have been made within that spectrum, "upper middle" and "lower middle." Even within these designations, wide discrepancies might exist not only with regard
to the economic worth of those included, but also with regard to their social status within the community. The same qualifications can also be made concerning rural residents. One should keep in mind, then, that the tables only demonstrate a person's relative place in society. Tables 1-5 deal with those arrested or charged with non-Anabaptist "fanaticism" by the Nürnberg authorities in the years 1524-1529, and present them statistically according to residence, occupation, and social stratification.
TABLE I

CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING OF NON-ANABAPTIST "FANATICS"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (*=leader)</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Beringer, Diepolt</td>
<td>Ulm (Transient)</td>
<td>Priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. N., Gallus</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Journeyman linen weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. N., N. (m.)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Thimble maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. N., N. (f.)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pfeiffer, Heinrich</td>
<td>Mühlhausen</td>
<td>Priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Müntzer, Thomas</td>
<td>Mühlhausen</td>
<td>Priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Römer, Hans</td>
<td>Mühlhausen</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reinhart, Martin</td>
<td>Jena</td>
<td>Preacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Denck, Hans</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hölzel, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Printer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hergot, Hans</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Printer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. N., N. (m.)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Printer's aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. N., N. (m.)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Printer's aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. N., N. (m.)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Printer's aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. N., N. (m.)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Printer's aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Wiblingen, Marx von</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Wisperger, Erasmus</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Cobalt, Kuntz</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Journeyman craftsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Platner, Hans</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Artist (Painter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For non-residents of Nürnberg, their last known or original place of residence is given. Nürnberg villages are followed by (Nbg.), Erlangen villages by (Erl.), and Fürth villages by (Fur.).

For residents of Nürnberg, an "unknown" under Occupation would suggest a very low social position, such as day labor and unskilled labor. In the villages, this would indicate a lesser peasant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Behaim, Sebald</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Artist (Painter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Behaim, Barthel</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Artist (Painter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Greiffenberger, Hans</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Artist (Painter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pentz, Georg</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Artist (Painter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Baumhauer, Sebald</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Artist's son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Wirsperger, Veit</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Artist's (Sculptor) son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Kreug, Ludwig</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Satler, Adam</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Harnessmaker (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Satler, N. (First wife of Adam)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Satler, N. (Second wife of Adam)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Kress, Georg</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Patrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Tucher, Hans</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Patrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Hamer, Fritz</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Printer's engraver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Hamer, N. (First wife of Fritz)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Hamer, N. (Second wife of Fritz)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Kronach, Merton von</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Printer's engraver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Kronach, N. (First wife of Merton)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Kronach, N. (Second wife of Merton)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Henrichs, Wolf</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Henrichs, N. (First wife of Wolf)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Henrichs, N. (Second wife of Wolf)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Seulich, Wolf</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Harder, Margaret</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Kämpf, N.</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Textile worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Andreae, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Printer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Frankfurt, Hans von</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Printer's aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Kiener, Marx</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Book pedlar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Kiener, Margaret</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Wife of Marx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Costniz, Hans von</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Book pedlar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Schrautenpach, Simon</td>
<td>Mühlhausen</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Selnecker, Georg</td>
<td>Hersbruck (Nbg.)</td>
<td>Council official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Korn, Caspar</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Kung, Georg</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Cutler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Zieglein, N. (m)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Journeyman hatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Knappen, Loisel (Mathes Lossel?)</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Journeyman textile worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Münch, Philip</td>
<td>Altdorf (Nbg.)</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Beringer, Seiz</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Beringer, N.</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Wife of Seiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Brachman, Martin</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Brachman, Agnes</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Wife of Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. N. N.</td>
<td>Siechgraben (Nbg.)</td>
<td>Pastor at St. Peter's Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Finck, Linhart</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Book pedlar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Sachs, Hans</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Cobbler-Meistersinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Leone, Endres</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Cantor at St. Sebald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Landsberg, Hans von</td>
<td>Landsberg (?)</td>
<td>Priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Glazer, Bernhard</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Glazer (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Engelhart, Dorothea</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. N., Prilla</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Arnolt, Jorg</td>
<td>Frostocken (?)</td>
<td>Unknown (Peasant?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Beringer, Peter</td>
<td>Kuzing (Kitzingen?)</td>
<td>Unknown (Peasant?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Gerung, Linhart</td>
<td>Nürnberg (?)</td>
<td>Unknown (Peasant?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Wennzer, Peter</td>
<td>Nürnberg (?)</td>
<td>Unknown (Peasant?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Weidenlich, Hans</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Cutler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Seidenschwanz, H.</td>
<td>(Nürnberg or Wendelstein)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Rithauser, N.</td>
<td>(Nürnberg or Wendelstein)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Laistschneider, Katherina</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Seamstress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Glaser, Michel</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Master Glazer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Wyncklen, Michel</td>
<td>Augsburg</td>
<td>Journeyman glazer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Thoman, Hans</td>
<td>Strassburg</td>
<td>Journeyman glazer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Braunecker, Melchior</td>
<td>Nürnberg (?)</td>
<td>Craftsman (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Emirin, Heintz</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Emirin, Jorg</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Schlenck, Niclas</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Bath attendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Tolhopfen, Paulus</td>
<td>Velden (Nbg.)</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
BREAKDOWN OF NON-ANABAPTIST RADICALS BY RESIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Non-Anabaptist &quot;Radicals&quot;</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>Total Women</th>
<th>16 = 19%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Nürnberg city</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>= 81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Nürnberg villages</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>= 7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliens</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>= 12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
OCCUPATIONAL BREAKDOWN OF URBAN NON-ANABAPTIST RADICALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total = 67</th>
<th>51, 76%, male.</th>
<th>16, 24%, female. a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricians</td>
<td>Total ..........</td>
<td>2 = 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>Total ..</td>
<td>3 = 4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schoolmasters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cantor .........</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scribe ..........</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>Total ..........</td>
<td>40 = 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>Total ..........</td>
<td>18 (5) = 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printers ......</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engravers ......</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aides ..........</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peddlers ......</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aWomen are represented in the tables by ( ). Other numbers include both sexes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artists</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons of Masters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeymen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamstresses</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harnessmakers</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobblers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thimblemakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmiths</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutlers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaziers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath attendants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>20 (8)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4
SOCIAL STRATIFICATION OF URBAN NON-ANABAPTIST RADICALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patricians</th>
<th>Total .................. 2 = 3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>Total .................. 32 (7) = 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master craftsmen</td>
<td>9 (2) (skilled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers, Engravers, Booksellers</td>
<td>13 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>Total .................. 33 (9) = 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeymen</td>
<td>11 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath attendant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>20 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5

OCCUPATIONAL BREAKDOWN OF RURAL AND ALIEN NON-ANABAPTISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council officials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alien</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priests, Pastors</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glazers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journeymen glazers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What can be said in general about the non-Anabaptist phase of the radical reformation in Nürnberg is that it appears to be basically an urban movement. Statistically, the appeal of the movement is distributed equally between the upper middle—skilled master craftsmen, artists, professionals—and lower middle—journeymen and below—strata of society. There is virtually no appeal among either the uppermost or lowest classes of society. In addition, what may not be apparent from the statistics alone, the majority of those from the upper middle stratum of society could be classified as intellectuals. Further analysis will be deferred until an account of the Anabaptists is given.
In the next series of tables, a statistical breakdown of the Anabaptists is given. Table 6 provides a chronological listing of urban residents of Nürnberg arrested or charged with Anabaptism, together with their occupations and the names of those by whom they were baptized or of whom they were followers. The same information is given in Table 7 for those arrested from Nürnberg villages, in Table 8 for those from the villages bordering Nürnberg territory, and in Table 9 for Aliens. Table 10 provides the occupational breakdown of the urban Anabaptists, and Table 11 demonstrates the social stratification of the group. Tables 12 and 13 do the same for those from Nürnberg villages, and Tables 14 and 15 for those from the border villages. Tables 16 and 17 provide the same information for all rural residents. Such a breakdown is not necessary for the small number of aliens apprehended.

Most of those persons listed have been discussed in the text. Other names have been supplied from the same sources referred to in the text. Sources have not been indicated in the tables for the obvious reason that to do so would take up too much space and detract from the conciseness of the tables. Where a question mark (?) follows an entry, the information has not been specifically supplied by the sources, but has been inferred from the circumstances surrounding the particular figure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (leader) (also on Table I)</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Baptized by (follower of)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1527</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Kezman, Michael</td>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. N., Ulle</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Frei, Conz</td>
<td>Master Smith</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. N., N.</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Osterpeck (?), N.</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. N., N. (&quot;der Beipus Corrector&quot;)</td>
<td>Printer's Corrector</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Zinck, Peter</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Schwalbach, Mathes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. N., N.</td>
<td>Baker's Journeyman</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. N., N.</td>
<td>Baker's Journeyman</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Schotten, Martin</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mühlberg, Hans</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Romer, Fritz</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Röslein, Jorg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Bopp, Margret</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Kobalt (Knapp), Conz</td>
<td>Woolen worker (Journeyman)</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Wisperger, Erasmus</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Dolman, Jacob</td>
<td>Pastor at St. Jacob's Church</td>
<td>(Vogel and Hut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Baptized by (Follower of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Pesolt, Jorg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Lützen, Jorg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Butner, Jorg</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Schacher, Veit</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Flach, Heinrich</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Risener (Rixner), Ulrich</td>
<td>Wool weaver</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Schuster, Heinrich</td>
<td>Cobbler (?)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Franck, Conrad</td>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Franck, Hans</td>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Crametfogel, N.</td>
<td>Craftsman (?)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Crametfogel, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 28</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Roschman, Conz</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. N., N.</td>
<td>Prostitute (Dirne)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. N., N.</td>
<td>Prostitute (Dirne)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Harder, Veit</td>
<td>Jailer's aide</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Taschner, N.</td>
<td>Leather worker (?) and jailer's aide</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Koch (Prunsterer), Sixt</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>Jacob Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Fellenstein, Stephen</td>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Mayer, Hans</td>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Baptized by (Follower of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Mayer, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 37</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Strauss, Jorg</td>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Strauss, Els</td>
<td>Wife of 39</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Zeyller (Zeuller), Conz</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Schlegel, Adam</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Schlegel, F.</td>
<td>Wife of 42</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Linck, Hans</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Ottilgin, Margret</td>
<td>Mother-in-law of 44</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Brecht, Katherina</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Fürstenauer, Hans</td>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Fürstenauer, Barbara</td>
<td>Wife of 47</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. N., N.</td>
<td>Cutler's journeyman</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. N., N.</td>
<td>Beret maker (prietlein macher)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. N., N.</td>
<td>Wife of 50</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Strauss, Balthasar</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7

**CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING OF PERSONS CHARGED WITH ANABAPTISM FROM NÜRNBERG VILLAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (*=Leader) (+=also on Table I)</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Baptized by (Follower of)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELTERSDORF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. *Vogel, Wolfgang</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Harscher, Jorg</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. N., N.</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bielman, Lorenz</td>
<td>Policeman</td>
<td>(Vogel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mülich, Hans</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gruber, Jorg</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>(Hut?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hofman, Hans</td>
<td>Policeman</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. N., N.</td>
<td>Policeman</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. N., N.</td>
<td>Policeman</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. N., N.</td>
<td>Policeman</td>
<td>(Vogel?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BÜCHENHOF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. *(Gross), Jorg (The Nadler from Büchenhof)</td>
<td>Needlemaker</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEUKÜHLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. N., N.</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>(Vogel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. N., N.</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>(Vogel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Baptized by (Follower of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. N., N.</td>
<td>Wife of 12 or 13</td>
<td>(Vogel)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRÜNDLACH**

1527

15. Hirschler (Hirslein, Hirschich), Hans
   Innkeeper
   Jorg Volk

16. Wilhelm, Hans
   Innkeeper
   Volk

17. Beheim, Fritz (Franz)
   Unknown
   Volk (?)

18. Beheim, Margret
   Wife of 17
   Volk (?)

19. Mayer, Hans
   Unknown
   Volk (?)

20. Schedel, Sebastian
   Unknown
   Volk (?)

21. N., Paulus
   Unknown
   Volk (?)

22. Schuster, Jorg
   Cobbler (?)
   Volk (?)

23. Hilbrandt (Hilpret), Conz
   Unknown
   Volk (?)

24. Albrecht, Margret
   Unknown
   Volk (?)

**KLEINREUTH**

1527

25. Hurlmaus, Seblad
   Craftsman (?)

26. Hurlmaus, Bukarius
   Craftsman (?)

27. Karius, Hans
   Journeyman craftsman (?)

**GROSSREUTH**

1527

28. Schmitner, Conz
   Unknown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Baptized by (Follower of)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radner, Conz</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>LOHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bischof, Hans</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harscher, Fritz</td>
<td>Powder maker's aide</td>
<td>Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harscher, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 31</td>
<td>Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespelein, Paulus</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck (Schultheiss), Hans</td>
<td>Baker (?)</td>
<td>TENNENLOHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schultheiss, Conz</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainlein, Linhart</td>
<td>Bath Attendent</td>
<td>KALCHRSUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermann, Hans</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilden, Kunnegun</td>
<td>Maid Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipolt, Barbara</td>
<td>Shepherd's daughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Baptized by (Follower of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. *Fridel (Friedrich), Barthel</td>
<td>Wood turner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Fridel, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WÖHRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. N., N.</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOLFSFELDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Starck, Jorg</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Starck, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Starck, Cristina</td>
<td>Daughter of 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Starck, Els</td>
<td>Daughter of 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIBACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Satler, Hans</td>
<td>Harness maker (?)</td>
<td>Nespitzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Satler, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 48</td>
<td>Nespitzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERLENSTEGEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Melbeinger, Magaret</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Baptized by (Follower of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grubner, Helena</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaser, Katherina</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassel, Hans</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leutenpach, Paula</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grüner, Elenna</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teubler, Ella</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantzfussel, Attelia</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baller, Gretta</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtz, Gretta</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider, Bastian</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer, Petter</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engelhart, Barthel</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyss, Hanns</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haller, Hans</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8

CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING OF PERSONS CHARGED WITH ANABAPTISM
FROM VILLAGES BORDERING NUREMBERG TERRITORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (*=leader)</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Baptized by (Follower of)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ERLANGEN**

1527

1. *Nadler (Ritter), Hans  Needlemaker  Hut
2. Reuperger, Kaspar  Smith  Hut (?)
3. Reuperger, N.  Wife of 2  Hut (?)
4. Ritter, N.  Wife of 1  Hut (?)
5. Perr, Hans, the Elder  Peasant (Farmer)  Hut (?)
6. Perr, N.  Wife of 5  Hut (?)
7. Perr, Hans, the Younger  Peasant  Hut (?)
8. Perr, N.  Wife of 7  Hut (?)

1529

9. N., Sebastian  Miller's aide  Marx Maier (?)
10. Müller, Hans  Miller  Marx Maier
11. Ziegel, Hans  Unknown  Hut or Maier (?)
12. Beierlein, Hans  Peasant  Hut or Maier (?)
13. Bauer, Hans  Peasant  Hut or Maier (?)
14. Hafner, N.  Potter  Hut or Maier (?)
15. Hafner, N.  Wife of 14  Hut or Maier (?)
16. Schott, Veit  Cobbler  Melchior Rink
### TABLE 8—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Baptized by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Follower of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERLANGEN**

1527
17. Mayr, Michael | Unknown | Hut (?)
18. Mayr, N. | Wife of 16 (?) | Hut (?)
1529
19. *Maier, Marx | Unknown | Hut (?)
20. Maier, Uz (f.) | Unknown | Hut or Maier (?)
21. Hegenmuller, Barthel | Unknown | Hut or Maier (?)
22. Schelmmerk, Merken Hennslein | Unknown | Hut or Maier (?)
23. N., Hans ("der lang Schneider") | Tailor | Hut or Jorg Nespitzer
24. Beer (Perr?), Michel | Unknown | Hut or Maier (?)

**EGGENHOF**

1527
25. *Grubner, Hans ("der bauern von Eggenhof") | Peasant's son | Hut
27. Grubner, Cristina | Wife of 26 | Hut
28. Grubner, Els | Daughter of 26 | Hut
29. Grubner, Katherina | Daughter of 26 | Hut
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Baptized by (Follower of)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTENREUTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Wüst, Wolfgang</td>
<td>Miller's aide</td>
<td>Jorg Volk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Strigel, Fritz</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Strigel, Margret</td>
<td>Wife of 31</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Strigel, Els</td>
<td>Daughter of 31 (?)</td>
<td>Volk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Ott, Jorg</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Ott, Gerhaus</td>
<td>Wife of 34</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Gross, Margret</td>
<td>Wife of &quot;the Nadler from Büchenhof&quot; (?)</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Leitner, Heintz</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Volk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Leitner, Agnes</td>
<td>Wife of 37</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Schrenz, Katherina</td>
<td>Peasant's widow</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Schrenz, Hans</td>
<td>Son of 39</td>
<td>Hut (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Beck, Jorg</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Beck, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 41</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Geim, Katherina</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Hut (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Leitner, Jakob</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Jorg Nespitzer or Volk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEIHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Beck, Conz</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Baptized by (Follower of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Zeltner, Kunigund</td>
<td>Peasant's daughter</td>
<td>Jorg Volk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSENBACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Jobst, Hans</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td>Volk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Beck, Hans</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td>Volk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Beck, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 48</td>
<td>Volk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Veit, N.</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td>Volk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Veit, Margaret</td>
<td>Wife of 50</td>
<td>Volk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIEGLITZHEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Leutenbacher, Barbara</td>
<td>Peasant's daughter</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Kuselmann, N.</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Kuselmann, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 53</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Schleufer, N.</td>
<td>Grinder</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Schleufer, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 55</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. N., N.</td>
<td>Grinder</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Pratter, N.</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Pratter, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 58</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. N., N.</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Baptized by (Follower of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRUCK—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. N., N.</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Maier, Hans</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Maier, N.</td>
<td>Wife of 62</td>
<td>Hut or Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEUTENBACH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. N., N.</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Lukas, N.</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td>Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Lukas, N.</td>
<td>Mother of 65</td>
<td>Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLEXDORF (FURTH)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Muller, Erhart</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. N., N.</td>
<td>Miller's aide</td>
<td>Hut (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HERBOLDSHOF (FURTH)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. N., N.</td>
<td>Shepard</td>
<td>Volk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAFFELSTEIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Zurl, Hans</td>
<td>Miller's aide</td>
<td>Volk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VILLAGE UNKNOWN (ERLANGEN)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Bauer, Hans</td>
<td>Peasant (?)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9
CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING OF PERSONS CHARGED WITH ANABAPTISM
ALIEN SEEKING RESIDENCE OR REFUGE IN NUREMBERG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (*=leader)</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Baptized by (Follower of)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PASSAU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. *Oder, Jorg (Hans)</td>
<td>Linen Weaver</td>
<td>Jorg Respitzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Oder, Katherina</td>
<td>Wife of 1</td>
<td>Nespitzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUGSBURG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Craffter, Honester</td>
<td>Patrician</td>
<td>Hut (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Craffter, N.</td>
<td>Daughter of 3</td>
<td>Hut (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Craffter, N.</td>
<td>Daughter of 3</td>
<td>Hut (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. N., N.</td>
<td>Maid of 3 (?)</td>
<td>Hut (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Betz, Mang</td>
<td>Ring maker</td>
<td>Hut (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Leutlin, Els</td>
<td>Maid servant</td>
<td>Hut (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTRIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. *Schmidt, Jakob</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>Total: 23 (4) = 44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>Total: 12 (3) = 23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Cutlers</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeymen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>Total: 6 (1) = 11 3/5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolen workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beret makers</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>Total: 2 = 4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobblers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeymen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer's Corrector</td>
<td>Total: 1 = 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeyman Baker</td>
<td>Total: 2 = 4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>Total: 4 = 7 1/2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribes</td>
<td>Total: 1 = 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>Total: 1 = 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jailer's aide</td>
<td>Total: 1 = 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitutes</td>
<td>Total: (2) = 4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Total: 20 (5) = 38 2/5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Also served as a jailer's aide, that is, day labor.*
## TABLE 11
SOCIAL STRATIFICATION OF URBAN ANABAPTISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Stratum</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>13 (3) = 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Cutlers</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeymen, Bay laborers, Textile workers</td>
<td>12 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer's Corrector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>20 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>(2) = 4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitutes</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12

**OCCUPATIONAL BREAKDOWN OF ANABAPTISTS FROM NURNBERG VILLAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powder maker's aide</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath Attendant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodturners</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maid servants</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harness makers</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobbler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needlemakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown crafts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd's daughter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasants</td>
<td>21 (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 13

SOCIAL STRATIFICATION OF ANABAPTISTS FROM NURNBERG VILLAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper rural</th>
<th>Total ..................................</th>
<th>22 (4) = 34%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors ..................................</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innkeepers ................................</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police ...................................</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merchants ..................................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millers ...................................</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodturners ................................</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bakers ....................................</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harness makers ..........................</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cobbler ...................................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needlemakers ............................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower rural</td>
<td>Total ..................................</td>
<td>42 (17) = 66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unskilled craftsmen, servants, ..........</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>journeymen ................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peasants ..................................</td>
<td>22 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown (^a) ..........................</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Presumably peasant, although peasant is not synonymous with poor.
TABLE 14

OCCUPATIONAL BREAKDOWN OF ANABAPTISTS FROM BORDER VILLAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers' aides</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needlemakers</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinders</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobblers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasants</td>
<td>38 (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper rural</td>
<td>18 (6) = 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master craftsmen</td>
<td>13 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower rural</td>
<td>53 (21) = 75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasants, shepherds</td>
<td>39 (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers' aides</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 16

OCCUPATIONAL BREAKDOWN OF ALL RURAL ANABAPTISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peasants, Shepherds</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers' aides</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needlemakers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobbleres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powder makers' aides</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodturners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harness makers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown crafts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath attendents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maid servants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 135
Male: 87 (64%)
Female: 48 (36%)
TABLE 17
SOCIAL STRATIFICATION OF ALL RURAL ANABAPTISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Upper rural</th>
<th>Lower rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40 (10) = 30%</td>
<td>95 (38) = 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master craftsmen</td>
<td>19 (7)</td>
<td>61 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers</td>
<td>8 (2)</td>
<td>11 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasants; shepherds</td>
<td>61 (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled crafts, servants,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journeymen</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>23 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These statistical compilations demonstrate certain facts clearly. Of all those arrested or charged with being Anabaptists or Anabaptist sympathizers, fully 70% were from the countryside. This is in marked contrast to the earlier forms of religious radicalism where 81% of those arrested or charged were urban residents. When viewing the occupational and social breakdown of the urban Anabaptists, it also is apparent that only 25% could be considered to be of the upper middle stratum of society, and all but three of these were master cutlers. Also apparent, in contrast to the earlier movements, is the general lack of appeal of Anabaptism to the intellectual and artist classes in the city.

In the countryside, 70% of the Anabaptists were peasants or unskilled laborers. Although peasant is not synonymous with poor, the Nürnberg authorities generally referred to the majority of adherents as "poor" (arme leute or arme einfeltige bauern), and all evidence suggests this to be true. The 30% designated as upper rural themselves maintained a standard of living only slightly above subsistence level. The craftsmen produced only for the local rural markets and supplemented the production from their own land. With regard to material goods, they existed on a level somewhat equivalent to the lower middle stratum of Nürnberg society.

In general, then, the statistics demonstrate that the appeal of Anabaptism was to an essentially lower class, economically, socially, and educationally than that of earlier movements. In addition, the appeal, or success of the movement, was greater in the countryside than in the city of Nürnberg. The reasons for this
more general rural and lower class appeal of Anabaptism have been discussed in the course of this study and will be touched upon again in the general conclusion which follows.
FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER VII

One may take as fairly representative the holdings of four Anabaptists from Erlangen, as inventoried by the authorities there:

"Hans Perr's wife has three children, two girls, one boy; seven Acker [acres or fields], two meadows, one house (c. 170 fl.).

"Hans Nadler's wife has three children (one boy, aged five years, two girls, three years and nine months), has bought a house for 20 fl.

"Hans Perr the Elder's wife has five children (two boys, seven years and six months; three girls, seven, three, and two years), 18 Acker, five meadows. The farm yields 31 fl. and six measures of grain income annually.

"Caspar Schmid's [Reuperger] wife is pregnant, has a house and an Acker, and is purchasing [it] at 14 fl.

"Hans Perr the Younger: 2 cows, 1 bed, 1 bushel grain, 1 ham, 1 coat, 1 fur, 1 measuring can, 1 drinking mug, 12 hens, 3 geese, 2 trunks, 4 pans, 1 copper porridge pot, several breads and lard left for the children, 14 fl. cash.

"Possessions of Hans Perr the Elder: 1 ham, much dried meat, 1 fl. flax, 4 cows, 1 ox, 1 calf, 2 horses, 2 beds, 2 trunks, 10 measures of lard, 12 sows, 1 coat, 1 cloak, 2 aprons, 24 hens, 3 geese, 1 rooster, 1 rack of hay (12 fl.), 3 bushels grain, 1 bushel oats, 15 fl. cash, 13 fl. owed him for rent, 7 fl. for the use of a meadow.

"Hans Nadler [Ritter]: tools, 2 beds, 1 trunk, 1 table, 1 chair, clothing, 1 measure can, 1 drinking can, 2 fl.

"Schmid: 5½ for coal, 2 sows, 2 beds, 1 trunk, clothing, 4 cans, 1 tin plate, 1 kettle, 5 pans, meat, 1 Joachimtaler and two twelvers, smithing tools."

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study has been to examine the nature and causes of radical religious dissent in the city of Nürnberg in the first years of the evangelical Reformation. Its scope has been confined to a relatively small segment of the Reformation history of Nürnberg and an even smaller aspect of the Radical Reformation. It is felt, however, that such case studies are important to the development of more general overviews of the areas upon which they touch. In this instance, attention has been focused upon ordinary persons who were not satisfied by magisterial church reform but felt that the implications of the revolutionary theology of Martin Luther went beyond what the government of Nürnberg was willing to permit.

The first two men against whom repressive measures were taken were as Lutheran as Luther himself. Diepold Beringer and Hans Greiffenberger were, in fact, little more than popularizers of Luther's theology. They were vehemently anti-clerical and anti-scholastic, but even the city's pastors could not find their faith in error. Their crime, although none were willing to call it that, was overzealousness and popularity among the masses. They were imitated by others less competent than themselves to understand the depth of their message. Although all believers were now priests,
it became apparent that some were more priestly than others. From
the first, however, the official pastors advised, and the council
concurred, that no one could be coerced in matters of faith. But
one could not publicly expound upon his faith.

Beringer left the city, which was not home, and met his
death at the hands of a less tolerant government, but Greiffenberger
was home and could only swallow his exuberance. And for him, the
first disillusionment with the evangelical position pushed him out-
side that position. First, he leaned toward the Karlstadtian
position, then he administered the Lord's Supper to a dying wife.
For that he was exiled from the city. On his return to Nürnberg,
the enthusiasm he had had for Luther's message was gone.

There were many Greiffenbergers in this study—Hans Denck,
Hans Ritter, Hans Oder, Barhelmes Friedrich. Progressively, from
1524 to 1530, their religious views had grown more disparate from
the evangelical position, but they were the same kinds of men. They
possessed a deep and abiding faith in God and the teachings of Christ.
Their religion was intensely personal. And they refused to be
coerced to reject their faith for the interpretations of another.
In the handling of each case, there was a twinge of guilt, or at
least a recognition of the inconsistencies involved, on the part of
the authorities who had accepted justification by faith, the priest-
hood of all believers, and Scripture as sole authority for their
own creed.

Why, then, did the council prosecute these men? Because the
faith of one man is the excess of another, and radical reform was not
without its revolutionaries. From "the godless painters" to the radical Anabaptists—Jorg Volk, Marx Maier, Wolfgang Vogel, Hans Hut himself—these were men who wanted to press reformation theology into the service of wholesale reform of society. Thomas Müntzer was their spiritual father and a prototype for all future revolutionaries. Within this group, of course, not all were of the same character or motivated by the same considerations. They fall into two general groups. The first were the pure revolutionaries, the idealists turned fanatics by their ideals. Thomas Müntzer was the archtype, but also falling into this group are Hans Denck, Ambrosius Spittlemeyer, Wolfgang Vogel, and Hans Hut. For these men, there was evil in the world—evil that had to be rooted out at any cost. All, at first, saw Luther as the catalyst which would set right the sins of the world and usher in a new day of justice, freedom, even equality, in which all would stand on a level footing before God and man, in which all, as Müntzer put it, would reap the just rewards of his own sweat.

All of these men went through the same stages of development. All of them, one can say at the outset, had a strong vein of mysticism running through them. All became disenchanted with Lutheranism soon after they were initially swept away with it, when the world was not made better instantly. When the secular authorities refused to institute reform, they turned to the peasantry and artisan classes. When the peasants, with Müntzer, were destroyed, they turned to Anabaptism. Simultaneously, the foundations of their faith were turned inward and spiritualized. Outwardly this was reflected
first in their interpretation of the sacrament of the Mass and, then, in their view of baptism. When the world could not be reformed from above or below with the sword, they turned to the moral reform of the masses, offering as their reward a chiliastic vision of a perfect kingdom—won not with sweat, but by their own blood and tears. Each of these men died within three years of the day they adopted their final course.

Another sort of revolutionary character has been glimpsed in this study. One might call him a professional revolutionary. To this group belong Jorg Volk and Marx Maier, and the Nürnbergers Konz Kobalt and Erasmus Wirsperger. It is impossible to determine the motivations of these men except for an apparent disgruntlement with society and their places in it. Volk and Maier were not, however, willing to sacrifice themselves for their current adventure. Perhaps they sought adventure. Perhaps they sought self-gain. Jorg Volk proposed to the Martyr's Synod that they share not only goods but wives in common and his teachings led directly to the establishment of the fantastic "Dream Sects" of Franconia in which spouses were swapped as readily as bread was shared,¹ and in which Marx Maier was a driving force. These were the kinds of men that caused Hans Denck to forsake the movement he had founded and turn to a more personal Spiritualism. Doubtless, there were other men like these who were not important enough to attract the complete attention of the authorities.² But these must have been few.

To accept the adventurous life requires the sacrifice of livelihood and security, which in turn suggests youth and an absence of
responsibility for wife and family. Some, like Kaspar Reuperger from Erlangen, had the youth, but not the aptitude to forsake "hearth and home" (Reuperger's words) for more than a few months for so fleeting a desire as the pleasures of the world.

Coming to the vast majority of those discussed in this study, it is safe to conclude that they were honest and ordinary men and women caught up in exciting religious concepts, perhaps for the first time in their lives, for honest and ordinary reasons. No one, it appears, recognized this fact more clearly than the lawyers, theologians, and governing council of Nürnberg. And therein lies the great tragedy and irony of the Reformation.

Luther unleashed a folk spirit in the German people, the likes of which had not been seen in Europe since the fall of Rome and would not be seen again until the French Revolution. To the masses of people, Luther's central doctrines went far beyond their merely theological implications. One need look no further than Hans Greiffenberger to come to an appreciation of what Luther's message meant, not to an intellectual or a prince, but to an urban artisan. To Greiffenberger, and thousands like him, Luther gave dignity to the individual by dignifying him before God. But for some, the social and political corollaries to Luther's theology, which Luther drew himself, tended to overshadow the religious message. Luther also indirectly helped unleash the Peasants' Revolt.

The connections between radical reform movements and the failure of the Peasants' Revolt is not as direct as might be supposed, at least in that which is covered by this study. That is, people in
the countryside and from the lower urban classes did not turn to more radical movements out of disillusionment when Luther failed to support the cause of the peasants in the rebellion. In Nürnberg the popular expression of the Reformation became radical only as the government, reacting in fear from the peasant rebellion, made it so. Initially, such popularizers of the Reformation as Beringer and Greiffenberger were not considered unorthodox or dangerous until the Peasants' Revolt became a reality. Beringer and Greiffenberger did not change, only the attitude of the authorities did. And when the authorities began to suppress the popular Reformation, individuals such as Greiffenberger became more radical or lost interest in religion altogether. The excitement of the masses before the revolt turned to the apathy of the pre-Reformation period.

In point of fact, the most radical period covered by this study was from December, 1524 to March, 1525, covering the sacramentarian controversy and the affair of Hans Denck and the "godless painters." It paralleled, but only peripherally, the peasants' rebellion through the influence of Thomas Müntzer and Heinrich Pfeiffer, and the involvement of Nürnberg printers in printing and distributing peasant tracts. The council responded with a relatively lenient punishment for the "godless painters," even though their confessed views contained patently revolutionary attitudes toward the secular government, and more extensive censorship laws for the printers. Throughout the period, the council was convinced that its problems were the result of outside agitation—Müntzer, Pfeiffer, Karlstadt, Denck. As the sacramentarian problems
continued, together with some iconoclasm, the council passed increasingly repressive decrees until finally it proclaimed the reactionary edict of July 16, 1526.

At that point, one could either accept in silence the expressed, and basically conservative, orthodox position of the council or openly defy it. To defy it was to take one step further in the radical direction. And, in fact, radical activity actually increased immediately following that edict. But the economic consequences of such defiance were enough to make all but the most ardent of men back down. For many, the spirit went out of popular reform. Such spirit was only partially rekindled by the Anabaptists, the founders and leaders of whom were themselves victims of repressive measures. Their "Apollo" had been forced out of Nürnberg.

As for the Anabaptists, much has always been made of the fact that they generally had their greatest appeal among the rural peasants and lower urban classes. The movement in Nürnberg was no different, but the reason for the rural appeal seems to stem from the obvious fact that the Anabaptist preachers were active almost exclusively in the countryside. There are no recorded instances of public evangelizing by Anabaptists in the city of Nürnberg. The apostles were brave, but not suicidal. The sect spread by word of mouth and through established contacts, usually within specific societal groups. In Nürnberg, the metal and textile trades became infected, but virtually no other handicrafts.

In the countryside, there is, first of all, no evidence to suggest that persons involved in the Peasants' Revolt of 1524-25
were inclined toward Anabaptism. In comparing known Anabaptists with known peasant rebels, out of sixty-four Nürnberg peasants charged with Anabaptism, only six can be positively identified with the peasant disturbances. Again, the appeal of Anabaptism in the countryside seems to be attributable to the mere presence of Anabaptist preachers. Admittedly, Anabaptism spread secretly and through established contacts—Hut's contacts from previous years, or through native disciples, like the "Nadler from Büchenhof"—but there emerges from the confessions of those arrested the impression that the Anabaptist preachers were more competent and the message they carried more exciting than that being supplied by local evangelical pastors. This impression seems to be confirmed through the measures enacted by the Nürnberg authorities. From the first infections of their territory by Anabaptism, the Nürnberg authorities sought to combat the new sect through the education and improvement of their own clergy. The council felt that it was responding not with the sword, but with the Gospel. It failed to see, however, that in the eyes of those who recanted their Anabaptist views, its policies remained those of the tyrant.

The council dealt with Anabaptists in a routine manner after mid-1528. Almost as routinely, many repentant Anabaptists passed in the opposite direction from the evangelical position, to the fantastic Dream Sects of Franconia. The Dream Sects were not an extension of Anabaptism. Indeed, they rejected all the moral principles upon which the Anabaptist communities were founded. As the repressive measures of the authorities in Nürnberg and Ansbach removed the
more stable and sincere elements of the Anabaptist communities through exile, "then the less balanced spirits came to the fore...to dream dreams of the birds of heaven coming to devour the carcasses of the oppressors." Günther Bauer characterizes the Dream Sects of Franconia as "the last consequence of the destruction of the Baptist communities through the secular and spiritual authorities."

Ultimately, it can be said, the measures of the Nürnberg authorities in dealing with radical religious heterodoxy were successful. After 1530, incidents of sacramentarianism and Anabaptism dwindle to insignificance. By all standards of the day, the council's policies were lenient. It may even be concluded that for the overwhelming majority of Nürnberg citizens, the evangelical Reformation as adopted by the city satisfied their religious and, perhaps, revolutionary impulses. However one interprets it, the authority of the council triumphed in establishing religious conformity as it had long before established conformity in all other phases of life. But in so doing, it destroyed much of the dynamic character of Luther's theology, the implications of which would not fully be realized for generations and even centuries to come.
FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER VIII

1 TA, BI, pp. 198-199, Confession of Marx Maier. Günther Bauer, pp. 162-175, includes a chapter on the "Dream Sects" in his work on Franconian Anabaptism. They will be discussed briefly below.

2 The question must be raised in the case of Maier and Volk of why, given their confessed views, they did not preach more revolutionary doctrines to their followers. There seem to be three possibilities: 1) If Hut was the author of the politically revolutionary views discussed by Maier, Nespitzer, and others, he may have envisioned the day when he would be strong enough to announce to his followers that the Judgment Day was at hand. Too many people, however, who were close disciples of Hut and men of the greatest integrity, denied any such teachings to support a conspiracy theory of this scope. 2) These views were preached but the followers were warned of the consequences of such a view and so would not confess to it. This is highly unlikely. Too many weak characters cropped up to withstand the interrogation means employed by the authorities. 3) Volk, Maier, Nespitzer may have held these views privately, whether their own creation or a misunderstanding of Hut's apocalyptic teachings, but were too smart to risk teaching such things and jeopardize their own lives. This seems the most probable.

3 They are Contz Schultheiss from Tennenlohe, Hans Hoffman from Eltersdorf, Hans Mayer and Hans Wilhelm from Gründlach, Hans Bishof from Lohe, Fritz Harscher from Reutles, and Sebald Hurlmauss from Kleinreuth. A list of Nürnberg peasant rebels has been compiled by Buck, pp. 114-141.


5 Bauer, p. 177.
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