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INTRODUCTION

Nuremberg's provisions for charity and the influence exerted upon those provisions by the Reformation were conditioned by the organization of the city's government, social structure, and wealth. Nuremberg at the beginning of the sixteenth century was near the peak of its powers. It was a free imperial city, or Reichstadt, which also controlled approximately 450 square miles around its walls.¹ This was more land than any of the other German cities possessed. Its population was between 20,000 and 30,000 inhabitants and its surrounding territory had approximately the same number.

The city possessed an important geographical advantage because of its crossroads position on a number of major trade routes. The Baltic-Mediterranean routes came through it as did the routes from the Rhineland and the west leading to the cities in eastern Europe. There

were twelve major routes in all converging upon the city. Nuremberg was an entrepot with a group of very wealthy merchants who had formed a patriciate. Nuremberg also possessed extensive and highly profitable manufacturing industries. Its metal products were especially well-known. The manufacturers imported their raw materials and exported the finished products to be sold all over Europe. These products were highly prized for their excellence in quality which the city government insured by strict controls and inspections. The manufacturing industry's main source of energy was a medium sized river, the Pegnitz, which turned the water wheels of the manufacturers as it coursed through the center of the city. Nuremberg also controlled extensive forest reserves within its territory. The forests supplied the charcoal used especially in metal manufacturing.

The leading merchant families who formed the patriciate possessed a widespread system of trade connections which was actively encouraged by the government through its political efforts. These big merchant firms tended to be very stable, being owned and organized around a continuing line of managers drawn from the same families. This organization of trade through particular families gave
a stability to the city government since the leading merchant families also composed the leadership of Nuremberg's government. This system had grown up over several centuries and in 1521 membership in the governing ranks was closed. At this time Nuremberg was among the three or four most powerful and wealthy cities in the Empire. The city was envied and widely copied in its institutions and laws.

Nuremberg, by virtue of its trade position, had developed into a cosmopolitan city alert to new trends in ideas and the arts. This cosmopolitan quality made it more susceptible to the Reformation in spite of the conservatism inherent in the structure of its government. Many sons of patricians were sent to Italy to complete their education before being brought into the family firms and government. During this period of the early 1500's, the city acquired a group of humanists within its leadership with such men as Caspar Nützel, Hieronymous Holzschuher, Christoph Scheurl, Willibald Pirckheimer, Lazarus Spengler, and Albrecht Dürer, to name only a few.

The commercial and political advantages which the city had gained were due to the shrewdness of its great merchant families. Through their efforts, Nuremberg had
become a self-governing state. This position had been
achieved through the city's relationship with the emperors and this relationship continued to be carefully cultivated. Without Nuremberg's partnership with the emperors, the city would have been prey to the economic and political particularism of the princes.

Governmental power was controlled by the merchant patriciate which selected the Greater Council, called the Genannte, composed of about two hundred citizens. Membership in this Greater Council was considered an honor but the body possessed little or no power. The smaller Council had forty-two persons who qualified for membership by virtue of their patrician birth. Of this smaller Council, usually termed the City Council, or ehrbar Rat, only twenty-six actively functioned as administrators. There were thirteen Senior and thirteen Junior Mayors. Of the thirteen Senior Mayors, seven (who were called the Seven Elders, or Ältere Herren) held the decision-making authority. The Seven Elders selected one Senior and one Junior Mayor who served as governing administrators, Burgomasters, for each month. The year was divided into thirteen units. This arrangement usually produced thirteen books of the Council's daily records, or Ratsverlärse,
each year. Also from amongst these Seven Elders, the three highest officials, called the Oberste Hauptmänner, were chosen. Two of these three became the city's treasurers, Losunger, for the year. The chief of the city's administration was the Senior Losunger.

In this manner, all political authority was retained by the patrician families of which there were forty-three in 1521 when the patriciate's membership was closed. Beneath the patricians were the "honorable" citizens, called Ehrbare, who were successful merchants or professional men such as lawyers and doctors. The next group consisted of the tradesmen or artisans who worked with their hands. The bottom level contained the day laborers.

The city's social structure exactly paralleled the organization of the government. The patricians ruled with the "honorable" citizens being called on for advice but never for governing. The bottom two levels were not involved in directing the city's government. This system was often held as a model for other towns. The bulk of the citizens seemed content that this paternal oligarchy be directed by the patricians. The city was a well-run success and the citizen identified with it. He was proud of the security provided by the city's walls and its
general political and economic policies. The citizen felt a deep loyalty to the community, or Gemeinde. Nuremberg through its paternalism encouraged this loyalty by providing care for its citizens.2

The late Middle Ages posed new problems in the area of poor relief. In the earlier Middle Ages, the church had provided for the poor. This had been reasonably effective when Europe was an agricultural society; but with the growth of urban capitalism and the concomitant rise in population, an unbearable strain was put upon the church's resources. The church as an institution for relieving the indigent became inadequate. Both the religious orders and the parish priests who had previously carried the direct burden of dispensing charity found it impossible to cope with the increasing population and the

---

economic changes which displaced increasing numbers of people. Gifts and bequests continued to endow permanent institutions for poor relief, but neither these nor personal alms-giving were enough to offset the rising demand.

The problem of increasing numbers of poor and indigent and the relative decline in available money for its relief was felt in all parts of Europe that had reached the stage of commercialization and large population growth. Preachers, writers, and theologians began to advocate that the civil authorities should have control over poor relief and thus fill a vacuum left by the church. Poor relief by the religious had come under increasing attack. John Geiler of Kaisersberg, preacher at the cathedral in Strassburg from 1478 until his death in 1510, was deeply concerned with poverty and its relief. He gave many sermons and wrote about it. He proposed to the Strassburg City Council in a statement of twenty-one articles in 1501 that the Council take over all control of poverty and poor relief. The city should be divided into six or seven wards with competent officials in charge of each ward. Geiler did not specify the manner in which the church would remove itself or be removed from its financial involvements
in poverty relief. He did assert that there was no virtue in poverty of itself.\(^3\) His sermons contained constant admonitions and solutions for relief of the poor. "The thriving printing industry in Strassburg in this period is particularly significant, since most of Geiler's sermons were printed and circulated."\(^4\) The twenty-one articles, however, remained unpublished until recent times. Geiler's attempts to reform the life of society at large and that of the monastics and clerics earned him a place on the First Index in 1559 with all of his works prohibited. However, he was not mentioned in 1564 on the Tridentine Index.\(^5\)

Juan Luis Vives, in March, 1526, published his book On Assistance to the Poor. It had been encouraged by the Burgomaster Louis de Praet of Bruges where Vives was residing. In this short work, Vives outlines a program of

\(^3\)Otto Winckelmann, "Über die ältesten Armenordnungen der Reformationzeit (1522-25)," Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XVII (1914), pp. 197-702.


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 10.
poor relief to be instituted by the state. Vives' plan gave great power into the hands of the administrators. Among his proposals were the following: The poor must not remain unemployed. This included the elderly, the infirm, and the blind who must be occupied according to their abilities. Begging should be forbidden. The poor should be kept in their homes with their income supplemented by the state to provide for their basic needs. Vives' major theme consisted of the duty and the right of public officials to control and administer poor relief. Although Vives was a Catholic, his writings on the poor were suspected of being pro-Lutheran because of this emphasis on the administration by civil authorities. Whether or not Vives was influenced by Luther's ideas, the Spanish humanist added his voice to others in this period calling for reforms in the social institutions. There were systems of poor relief devised and implemented by city councils, humanists, churchmen, and even the emperor.

---

Martin Luther's primary interest was theology but he could not avoid involvement in the practical social problems of his day. Luther first discussed public poor relief in his Sermon on Usury in 1519. He denounced begging and said that the alms were not going to the poor. Instead, the money was employed for superfluous religious uses. He advised the rulers that they should require every city to care for its own churches and poor. In his Address to the Christian Nobility in 1520, Luther more directly emphasized that every city should look after its own poor and no begging by outsiders should be tolerated. Included in this prohibition were the mendicant monks and pilgrims. Each city should have officials who knew about the poor and their needs and could advise the city's council accordingly.

In January, 1522, the City Council of Wittenberg under the influence of both Carlstadt and Luther issued an Ordinance for a Common Purse which was to be administered by the civil authorities and supported by income from church

property, confraternities, vacant benefices, and donations. Wittenberg placed poor boxes in the churches. The city was divided into four districts, each with a supervisor reporting every week to the mayor. In this way Wittenberg centralized the maintenance of the clergy and provided for the relief of the poor. The Wittenberg order for a Common Chest attacked begging by the clerical mendicants and by able-bodied people who would not work.

The city of Leisnig requested Luther's opinion of their proposed ordinance for a common chest in January, 1523. Luther promptly wrote the council a letter of approval on January 29. He also wrote a preface to the Leisnig Ordinance and had both the preface and the Order itself printed at Wittenberg in August, 1523. In this preface Luther expressed a strong opinion that the civil


authorities expropriate all monastic and church properties and administer the proceeds through the common chest. In the Leisnig ordinance the directors were to pay the salaries of the preachers, teachers, and custodians. They were to disburse aid to the poor who were aged and infirm. The orphans must be supported and trained within their abilities. The directors must provide dowries for the orphan girls and for daughters of indigent parents. The ten directors were to meet every Sunday to make and to review their decisions. There was a provision for an annual tax on the people of the parish to be paid into the common chest. All begging must cease. The able-bodied must work and the directors must support those who were unable to work out of the common chest.\textsuperscript{12}

Luther's publication of this common chest ordinance with his preface gave a practical embodiment to his theological and ethical justification for the civil authorities to control relief for the poor. In the preface Luther states that

\textbf{... there is no greater service of God than Christian love which helps and serves the needy, as Christ himself will judge and testify}

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., pp. 176-194.
at the Last Day, Matthew 25:31-46. This is why the possessions of the church were formerly called bona ecclesiae, that is, common property, a common chest, as it were, for all who were needy among the Christians.13

Luther was emphasizing the communal aspect of church property, which ties in with his stress upon the universal priesthood of all believers. It was a sense of community engendered through the unmediated experience of God's love through each individual's faith. The individual then manifested this experience through serving his neighbors in the community out of love. Luther also used Scripture as his authority to point out the particular importance of showing Christian love by serving the needy.

The doctrines of justification by faith alone, the Bible as sole authority in religious matters, and the universal priesthood of all believers are the basis of Luther's work. His central point is faith. Man cannot through his own efforts save himself. He can acquire God's grace only through faith. No work performed can constitute the justification of any sinful man. This doctrine shifted the focus from the exterior to the interior. Man could save himself, be made just, only through his

13Ibid., pp. 172-173.
faith in God. Man was placed in a direct relationship with God. The individual's relation to a community was conditioned by his faith which was manifested by serving his neighbors, especially the needy, out of love.

Martin Luther's solutions for poor relief were consistent with his theology. For example, although turning poor relief over to the civil authorities was not an idea that was unique with Luther, he endorsed it strongly as the civil community was called upon to assume functions previously held by the church. Luther's condemnation of all begging and his emphasis on employment of the poor were in keeping with his doctrines as was the expropriation of all religious property by the civil authorities to be used for the maintenance of the preachers, teachers, and the poor. Luther provided a rationale for the solutions to the problems of poor relief. The Reformation, in Germany at least, provided an impetus to put into practice the systematic organization of poor relief by the secular authorities. It should be emphasized that the secular authorities were not considered as separate from the congregation of believers. There was no idea of opposing a secular community to an ecclesiastical one. Such a distinction did not exist in this period.
During the past century, there have been many views published concerning the poor relief measures that were taken during the Reformation era. There have been debates as to whether these measures were a product of Catholic, evangelical, or humanist influence. In 1881, a Jesuit cardinal, Franz Ehrle, wrote that the municipal charity systems were a continuation of a previous process having been established by Catholic cities within the tradition of the Catholic Church. Another Catholic historian, Georg Ratzinger, who published in 1884, three years after Ehrle, took a similar but less adamant position. Ratzinger regarded the poor relief measures for the most part as a simple continuation of Catholic charity. In 1884, Gerhard Uhlhorn published a book in which he held that the 1522 ordinance for poor relief in Nuremberg was a direct result of the Lutheran Reformation.

14 Franz Ehrle, S. J., Beiträge zur Geschichte und Reform der Armenpflege (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1881).

15 Georg Ratzinger, Geschichte der Kirchlichen Armenpflege (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1884).

writing in 1888, took exception to Uhlhorn's ideas. Ehrle cited material taken from the records of the city Council of Nuremberg and also printed a copy of the 1522 ordinance to show that Nuremberg had not acted under Lutheran influence. He stated that the ordinance had been part of the last phase of the Catholic tradition in poor relief.17

A socio-economic view was presented in 1908-1909 by Ludwig Feuchtwanger who saw these trends for poor relief measures as an evolution in secularization.18 His opinion was that the 1522 ordinance of Nuremberg was an example of social reform in the humanist Catholic sense.19 Feuchtwanger wrote: "In any case the Reformation did not create a system of poor relief in either the communal or the governmental sense."20


Otto Winckelmann took issue with the view that Nuremberg's ordinance of 1522 was a continuation of Catholic charity. He specifically denied Ehrle's treatment of the Nuremberg Council's records. Winckelmann printed a different text of the 1522 ordinance and asserted that the language used in the sections concerning the begging of students and the begging of the clergy clearly demonstrated a Protestant spirit. He also wrote that the Ypres ordinance of 1525 was influenced by Nuremberg, and that Strassburg had been influenced by Geiler of Keisersberg as well as by Nuremberg.

Felix Pischel, writing in 1916, found two sources for these poor relief measures. One was the humanist response to the social and economic conditions of the times as exemplified by Juan Luis Vives and Geiler of

---


23 Ibid., pp. 361-63.
Keisersberg and the other was the Lutheran influence. He stated that Nuremberg produced the first ordinance for poor relief among the free imperial cities and that it was probably influenced by Lutheran ideas.

Wilhelm Liese, who published his _Geschichte der Caritas_ in 1922, stressed the economic causes of civil intervention in poor relief. The citizens were not dissatisfied so much with the actual administration of poor relief by the church as they were by the expense of it. The church's all too apparent inefficiency caused the citizens to intervene and to utilize their practical financial ability in the management of poor relief. Liese noted that while Nuremberg was influenced by Lutheran thought, it was not an exception to the economic process that had begun several centuries before in the municipalities.

---


25 Ibid., p. 329.


27 Ibid., pp. 231-39.
Willi Rüger published all of the poor relief ordinances of the city of Nuremberg from 1370 to 1699. He took the view that the 1522 ordinance was influenced by the spirit of humanism coupled with the social and financial evolution that the city was undergoing. He also held that Nuremberg received a strong impetus to institute this new ordinance from Luther's teachings. Rüger makes a good point when he stresses that the distinction must be kept between the 1522 ordinance for poor relief and the organization in 1525 of the Common Chest by Nuremberg. The Common Chest was a direct result of the change in religions.

In more recent times a new interest has emerged concerning the provision for poor relief during the era of the Reformation. Natalie Zemon Davis in 1968 discussed Lyons and stressed the influence of humanism there on both practical and theoretical municipal poor relief.


Protestant cities and Catholic cities and cities of mixed religious composition initiated rather similar reforms, usually learning from each other's efforts. Lyons is an example of a religious coalition for welfare reform dominated by Catholics. Is Nuremberg an example of welfare reform by a religious coalition dominated by Protestants? The fact that reform in poor relief cut across religious boundaries and that Protestants and Catholics worked together on it shows the extent to which it rested on values and insights common to both groups.31

Brian Tierney has examined medieval poor relief in its application to England. He investigated canon law for the ideological and legal foundation of Catholic poor relief. Canon law had provided for systematic almsgiving in the Catholic Church and had attempted to deal with the problem of reconciling the increasing poverty of urbanization to the theological ideals of the Church. Canon law, however, became increasingly ineffective in the later Middle Ages partially as a result of the change in the economic environment.32 W. K. Jordan, also writing


on England, has written three volumes on charity. In

Philanthropy in England 1480-1660, he states,

The Middle Ages were acutely sensitive to the
spiritual needs of mankind while displaying
scant, or ineffectual, concern with the
alleviation or cure of the ills that beset
the bodies of so large a mass of humanity.
The medieval system of alms administered
principally by the monastic foundations, was
at once casual and in its incidence, never
seeking to do more than relieve conspicuous
and abject suffering.33

He wrote that for England poverty was first systematically
attacked in the sixteenth century with gifts for the out-
right relief of the poor.

Recent literature contains a number of excellent
studies concerning poor relief. One further article,
"Luther's Contributions to Sixteenth Century Poor Relief,"
by Harold J. Grimm, is useful for its general perspective
on Luther. Grimm maintains that Luther's "Doctrines of
justification by faith alone, universal priesthood of
believers, and freedom of the Christian, as well as his
emphasis on the inner spirituality furthered by the German
mystics, proved most important in the development of a new

33W. K. Jordan, Philanthropy in England 1480-1660
social ethics."^{34} His conclusion seems to be that Luther's work was of vital aid in helping to crystallize new attitudes towards poor relief.

Nuremberg has been a focal point for much discussion concerning the Protestant, Catholic, or humanist influences on its provisions for poor relief during the Reformation era. Franz Ehrle quoted from the City Council of Nuremberg's records to show that Catholic tradition was the more important influence. Otto Winckelmann cited different versions of the records to show that the Protestant influence was dominant. Willi Rüger, also citing Nuremberg records, insisted that humanism played a great role in the city's actions. Nuremberg's behavior has thus been used for illustrative purposes by many writers in the attempt to enhance the understanding of social change during the Reformation era. Without detracting from the great value of these works, there remains an avenue of investigation which has not been fully explored, that is, the examination of all eleemosynary activities as described in the daily records of

Nuremberg's city Council during the years 1521 through 1528 in order to ascertain if any changes occurred in the administration of the city's various charities by action of the Council and what, if any, changes can be ascribed to the influence of the Reformation. The years chosen, 1521-1528, are the four years before and the four years after the change in religions in Nuremberg in 1525. The major source relied upon here is the Ratsverlässe, or the daily account kept of the items of business that were brought up in the Council's meetings. Other Nuremberg records were utilized to clarify the Council's decisions.

The funding of charity was private in Nuremberg but its administration was under the increasing dominance of the Council. Also with the church, the Council used its control over the money to select clergy and to regulate their behavior. The Council had a deliberate policy of persuading all charitable donors to draw up their bequests giving supervision to the city. This process had begun in the early 1300's with the Council attempting to appoint its own members to supervise all charities, convents, monasteries, and charitable institutions.

A charity usually had as a supervisor (Pfleger) a member of the Council who was a patrician. With prestige
and power, he was in charge of all aspects of management involving property, land, and money and was strictly accountable for his management to the Council. The inescapable logic of the Council was that these charitable institutions were part of the city and thus must necessarily be under the legal control of the Council which insisted upon the right to make all decisions regarding management, construction, and real estate utilization within the city's provenance.

The ecclesiastical affairs were an area that the Council strongly felt a need to control. The city Council was concerned with both obedience to community mores and with the management of church revenues. In fact, the Council had more than once rectified a scandalous moral situation amongst the religious before the Lutheran Reformation. These patricians were earnestly interested in the mental and physical health of the community. Their local loyalty was strong enough that such concerns easily superseded any distant organization either of the emperor or the Church. The Council assumed the responsibilities and consequent authority over such secular and spiritual matters without any thought of church-state separation because of their paternalistic interest in the
commonwealth.

The charities existing before the 1525 Reformation are treated in the first four chapters of this study. Each charity's historical background is summarized and then all the actions taken by the Council during this eight-year period are described for each charitable foundation in order to find if any change occurs in administration that might show a possible influence of the Reformation.

The poor relief ordinance of 1522 is separately described in Chapter Five with the begging problem. This ordinance has received much attention and a detailed review of all the Council's daily actions concerning begging is necessary to place the ordinance in context to show how the Council came to create it and how begging was managed by the Council after its creation.

The Common Chest was not created in the form of an ordinance and Chapter Six describes its early evolution and how the Council by its daily activities set up the organizational apparatus on a continuing basis. The Common Chest's creation stemmed from the anticipation of the religious change in 1525.
The Religious Colloquy of March, 1525 was the opportunity that the Council took to have a public disputation between the anti-Lutherans and the reform-minded theologians in the city. The outcome was not in doubt. In February, preachers from the various churches and monasteries were asked to prepare statements of belief to be presented at the March 25 Colloquy. This colloquy marked the formal break with Catholicism and thereafter the Council openly acknowledged the Reformation within the city.

Most of the Council's leaders had been genuinely convinced of this new doctrine. The Colloquy also furthered the process that the city had been following for a long time which was to gain control over all the religious institutions within its territory. The bishop of Bamberg had been the spiritual overlord of Nuremberg. But the Council had won or purchased many concessions such as a decisive voice in the selection of the provosts for the two parish churches within its walls.

The city being governed through a small group of patricians tended towards a conservative rather than innovative behavior. With its long history of carefully acquiring control of the bequests and foundations, it was
logical that the Council should determine the spiritual affairs and the disposition of the church goods and possessions once the move for Reformation became strong. The movement afforded the Council an opportunity to create an organization, the Common Chest, that was responsive to its control. The change in religions produced a power vacuum into which the Council moved without any sense of impropriety. Inasmuch as the Council made detailed regulations for the physical well-being of all the citizens, it assumed quite naturally the responsibilities for the spiritual well-being of the citizens.

This study will attempt to describe the existing charities and the Council's new provisions for poor relief both in the 1522 ordinance and the creation of the Common Chest. The method will be a detailed examination of the Council's daily actions for an eight-year period with the religious change of 1525 as the center point. This examination will focus on any changes in administration of charity that the Council's activities over this period reveal which may possibly show an influence or lack of it by the Reformation.
CHAPTER ONE

THE CHARITY HOMES FOR THE AGED AND THE PILGRIM HOSPICES

The Mendel House of the Twelve Brothers

In 1388 Konrad Mendel, The Elder, established a charitable foundation for the care of indigent craftsmen who were too old or sick to practice their trade. He chose the name Zwölfterbrüderhaus (House of the Twelve Brothers) for his charity in honor of the twelve apostles. Twelve men were housed at its location in the St. Lorenz Parish near the Kornmarkt opposite the Chapel of the Twelve Apostles.¹ From its establishment in 1388 until 1397, he gave sixty-two gulden yearly for the support of the foundation. In 1397, with the approval of his relatives, he drew up a document of endowment requesting the Council's protection of his foundation after his death. Mendel was a member of one of the rich patrician

¹Emil Reicke, Geschichte der Reichstadt Nürnberg (Nürnberg: 1896), p. 289. (Hereinafter referred to as Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg.)
families who governed Nuremberg. The origins of the
family are unclear, but this rich endowment seems to have
broken the financial strength of the family. By 1406, he
had given 4,131½ gulden and a land site to the foundation.
Some of the monetary allocations were: 1,909 gulden given
for the land and building of the Brother House; property
outside the city which produced a yearly income of sixty-
one gulden for the support of the members; and the sixty-
two gulden mentioned above. The remainder of the 4131½
gulden was spent to decorate the Chapel of the Twelve
Apostles. Mendel's pious endowment received the papal
approval of Boniface IX in 1398.

Mendel's endowment was not for beggars. The members
had to be Nuremberg citizens, skilled artisans who were
single and could no longer support themselves by their own
labor. The rules for acceptance were strict. Lepers were
not admitted. If a member contracted the disease, he had

2 Werner Schultheiss, "Das Hausbuch des Mendelschen
Zwölfbrüderhauses zu Nürnberg," Mitteilungen des Vereins

3 Georg Ernst Waldau, Vermischte Beyträge zur
Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg, Vol. IV (Nürnberg: 1789),
p. 179 (Hereinafter referred to as Waldau, Vermischte
Beyträge.)
to leave the house. Persons having or later acquiring syphilis were sent away also. There was one mentally ill member who was transferred to the prison master.  

For offences against the house rules during the first century after its founding, members were punished by losing meals. Later they were punished by being compelled to spend a day in prison. Despite these stringent rules, voluntary withdrawals from the house were rare. Some of these withdrawals were caused by renewals of marriages, since only single men could live there, or because the accepted member could not accustom himself to the life of the Brother House.

Rules were established by Konrad Mendel concerning the members, the provisions for their clothing, food, drink, and burial. The foundation's guardian (Pfleger) was installed by the Council and it was understood that Konrad

---


Mendel was to be the first guardian, to be followed by men picked from his family. When the main branch of the family died out, the Council proceeded to pick one of its own members. Konrad Mendel died in 1414. Each succeeding administrator swore an oath of office to administer the foundation to the best of his knowledge and conscience.  

During the Catholic era, the administrators' reward was a complete indulgence at his death. The basis for such an indulgence, or God's reward, was derived from the bull issued by Boniface IX in 1398. After the Reformation, the Council-installed guardian was paid a salary for his services. The last administrator of the foundation before its dissolution at the time of the Bavarian occupation of Nuremberg in 1806 received per year 469 gulden, 21 kreuser, and 1/2 pfennig. Also, the administrator received a gift from each member at the time of his installation. The administrators were responsible to the Council and had to make an accounting of their work every year at Walpurgis (May 1) to two members of the Council.

---

7 Waldau, Vermischte Beyträge, Vol. IV, p. 179.
The guardian had an office in the Brother House, but he usually did most of the direction from his private dwelling which was often his place of business also. Reporting to the administrator were the manager, the caretaker, and the twelve members. Until 1605, when Georg Loesser was appointed, the manager was usually a house member. The manager had to see that order was kept in the house at all times. He had to make sure the doors were closed; he kept the keys to the storeroom, the cellar, and to the granary; and he had to settle the accounts weekly. The arrangements for feeding the brothers were good as shown by the menu for Sundays and holidays when the members received meat in a sauce along with cabbage or turnips and a mug of beer. The evening meal consisted of meat again with a vegetable and bread. The regular daily diet was also carefully planned.\(^9\)

After the acquisition of Nuremberg by the Kingdom of Bavaria in 1806, the government decided that this foundation was too expensive to retain and therefore combined its resources with The United Charities Foundation.\(^10\)


In its final accounting as a separate institution from the
time of its foundation in 1388 until 1799, 799 members had
been received into the Brother House. On October 1, 1807,
the functions of the Mendel Twelve Brother House were
joined to those of the Heilig Geist Hospital. The furni-
nishings of the foundation were sold for the sum of 633
gulden, thirty-seven kreuzer, and three pfennig. Today,
in the inner court of the Heilig Geist Hospital there is a
sculptured figure of a Brother House member. And the
Germanisches National-Museum occupies the site of the
Carthusian Monastery which was founded in 1380 by Markward
Mendel, the elder brother of Konrad. Across the street,
the former site of the House of the Twelve Brothers is a
vacant lot waiting for a new building.

The memorial that remains of the Mendel endowment
is Die Mendelischen Brüderbücher (The Books of the Mendel
Brothers) comprising three volumes. This is a House book
containing sketches of each member with the accoutrements
of his profession in each picture. The pictures are

sketched with brush and water color on good quality paper.\footnote{12}

These books permit us to see the Pfleger (guardians) and the members. They are a fine source of material for social historians, since each picture is usually accompanied by a short biography giving details of the beneficiary's life and death. However, only since 1501 were the ages of the members mentioned. The youngest was thirty-two, the oldest more than 100. The general age of the members ranged from sixty to eighty years.\footnote{13} Through occasional statements in the biographies we can learn something of the lives and illnesses that accompanied age in that period.

The Council made the choice for admission to membership whenever there was a vacancy caused by the death or withdrawal of a member. Usually there was a long waiting list. And long before the Reformation, being a citizen of the city was an important requirement for admission.

\footnote{12}{Heinz Zirnbauer, "Nachträge zur Geschichte und Datierung des Mendelbuchs I," MVGN, 54 (1966), p. 92.}

\footnote{13}{Goldmann, "Mendelschen Zwölfbrüderhaus," p. 11.}
The endowment was supplemented by four poor boxes that stood in various places in the Brother house; the money received from those boxes was divided half to the members for pocket money and one half to improve the sleeping quarters. The donor received an indulgence of one hundred days; this had been affirmed by Cardinal Henry of England.\textsuperscript{14} After the Reformation, many non-native people in Nuremberg converted to the Lutheran faith, some among them being Jews. These people were allowed to stay in a part of the Brother House until they could find suitable quarters elsewhere. The converts received care in return for a payment of money.\textsuperscript{15}

The Testament of Konrad Mendel states the purpose of the foundation, "... that this endowment is established through the will of God for the aid of poor artisans."\textsuperscript{16} Mendel was concerned with his salvation. Accordingly, he wished that the members, in addition to their customary prayers "... should pray on the founder's birthday for his soul and on the birthday of the Pfleger

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 17.
\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 18.
(guardian) for his soul also. Then the brothers should be given a little extra food and some wine."\textsuperscript{17}

Hans Imhof, Hans Volkamer, and Endres Imhof successively were the guardians (Pfleger) during these eight years.\textsuperscript{18} Hans Imhof, who died on August 12, 1522, is shown in the House Book in a pencil sketch partly outlined in brown pen.\textsuperscript{19} His death caused the Council to find a replacement:

In respect to the choice of the guardian (Pfleger) of the Mendel Zwolfbrüderhaus. The two Burgomasters chose a committee: Endres Tucher, Michel Beheim, Hans Stromer, Lazarus Holzschuher, and Wolf Bümer. These men then chose Jacob Muffel, Hans Volkamer, and Sebald Pfinzing. From among these men, Hans Volkamer was selected.\textsuperscript{20}

Hans Volkamer asked the Council on April 27, 1528, to release him from guardianship of the Mendel Zwolfbrüderhaus.\textsuperscript{21} The Council then had to go through the process of

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., p. 184.

\textsuperscript{18}Amterbüchlein, Nos. 40-49.

\textsuperscript{19}Das Hausbuch der Mendelschen Zwolfbrüderstiftung zu Nürnberg, ed. by Wilhelm Treue et al. (2 vols.; Munich: Bruckmann, 1965), p. 142.

\textsuperscript{20}RV 681, f. 34, September 3, 1522.

\textsuperscript{21}RV 756, f. 18 v., April 27, 1528; RB 14, 196r.
finding another guardian:

The Burgomasters have ordered a guardian (Pfleger) for the Mendel Zwölfrüderhaus chosen by a committee: Martin Auher, Hans Ebner, Hans Volkamer, Hans Haller, and Hieronymus Paumgartner. These men then chose Bernhart Paumgartner, Endres Imhof, and Lazarus Holzschuer. From among these three names, Endres Imhof was chosen as guardian.\(^\text{22}\)

The Council was concerned with the maintenance of the building also. In 1521 a workman was ordered by the building master to repair an entrance way.\(^\text{23}\) "The fountain at the Zwölfrüderhaus must be examined at the first opportunity to see if it needs repair and at what cost another can be built."\(^\text{24}\) The Council also concerned itself with the other properties of the Brother House. In 1524 it asked that the guardian "should ascertain if [the recent] hail damaged the property of the Mendel Zwölfrüderhaus at the village of Gunterspuhel and if so to allocate a proper amount of money [for its repair]."\(^\text{25}\)

---

\(^{22}\)RV 756, f. 19 r., April 27, 1528; RB 14, 196r.

\(^{23}\)RV 660, f. 19 v., March 9, 1521.

\(^{24}\)RV 677, f. 19 r., June 14, 1922.

\(^{25}\)RV 706, f. 17 r., August 13, 1524.
brothers: "Write to Kuast, who resides at the Zwölfbrüderhaus, and tell him that he will be disciplined if he continues to throw things into the moat."²⁶

During the Reformation, the Mendel Zwölfbrüderhaus bought, with the Council's permission, some of the Convent of St. Katherine's possessions at Schnigling and Wein­garten near Spalt. This sale was transacted by Hans Volkamer, the guardian for the Mendel house, and Lenhart Grundherz, the guardian for the Convent of St. Katherine.²⁷ The Council allowed this sale to occur with the consent of the convent's provincials.²⁸

There were a number of petitions handled by the Council for entrance into the Zwölfbrüderhaus endowed by Mendel. For example, "Eberlin Zwicher must be found a place in the Zwölfbrüderhaus or receive a badge in order to obtain alms."²⁹ Also, "Jorg Wagner should be brought into the Zwölfbrüderhaus because he cannot be taken into

²⁶RV 712, f. 28 r., January 5, 1525.
²⁷RB 13, f. 42 r., October 14, 1525; RV 722, f. 108, October 18, 1525.
²⁸RB 13, f. 40 r., October 18, 1525.
²⁹RV 712, f. 6 r., January 11, 1525.
the hospital.\textsuperscript{30} The Council permitted Wagner to play his horn while gathering alms.\textsuperscript{31} Sometimes it was not possible to place a man in the \textit{Zw"olfbr"uderhaus} immediately so the Council would give alms to the petitioner. For example, "Cuntz Hirlaub must receive money from the \textit{Reiches Almosen} Foundation until he can be admitted to the \textit{Zw"olfbr"uderhaus}."\textsuperscript{32} "The Ingolstädter must be given something from the alms fund for his needs until it is possible to receive him into the \textit{Zw"olfbr"uderhaus}."\textsuperscript{33} Not all petitions for admission were granted by the Council. Upon the petition of the Badgemaster concerning a poor man, it refused to accept him into the \textit{Zw"olfbr"uderhaus}.\textsuperscript{34} The Council made sure that the proper rules for admission were observed. "Jorg Swab must be investigated concerning his admission to the \textit{Zw"olfbr"uderhaus}. If he is still with his wife, he should receive a pension of twenty

\textsuperscript{30} RV 73G, f. 18 v., November 1, 1526.  
\textsuperscript{31} RV 736, f. 26 r., November 6, 1526.  
\textsuperscript{32} RV 741, P. 24 r., March 30, 1527.  
\textsuperscript{33} RV 756, f. 9 v., April 22, 1528.  
\textsuperscript{34} RV 759, f. 4 r., July 13, 1528.
gulden yearly instead of membership in the Zwölfbrüderhaus." 35

The administration of the Zwölfbrüderhaus continued from its founding until its dissolution much according to the original plan set down by Konrad Mendel himself. The rules of Mendel were followed closely and no item was too small for the Council's attention. The Council considered the important as well as the small details of life in the Brother House. Among the important actions that the Council reviewed and acted upon during the period of 1521-1528 were the resignation of Hans Volckamer and the acquisition of land by the Mendel Foundation through the sale of land by the St. Katherine's Convent. These actions, even during the Reformation period, departed little if any from precedent, and did not seem to be altered in style of execution despite the change in religious orientation.

The Landauer House of the Twelve Brothers

More than one hundred years after the Mendel endowment was started a second House of Twelve Brothers was established. The conditions of the second endowment

35 RV 14, f. 287 r., January 15, 1525.
resembled those that Konrad Mendel had set forth. Mathäus Landauer established this second house. His father, Marx Landauer, was noted for his pious good works. Mathäus Landauer inherited from his father a profitable business and increased its wealth. He was a merchant who participated in the exploitation of the Thuringian copper mines and the copper smelting works at Eisfeld. Through his copper business, he became rich so quickly that rumors spread that he had some uncanny method of obtaining gold.

In the first decade of the 1500's, Mathäus bought the necessary land and erected the House of Twelve Brothers and was responsible for the rich decoration of the Chapel of All Saints. The building process of the Brother House, completed in 1510, took about ten years. Mathäus himself lived in it the last five years of his life, dying


38 Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 80.
there in January, 1515. He was buried in the chapel. His grave was rediscovered after the destruction of the Second World War.  

At Landauer's death, he left the already operating foundation a bequest of 13,373 gulden. The remainder of his money, after the bequest, was left to his daughter Dorthea, wife of Wilhelm Haller, who had received a fair portion of the estate as her dowry at the time of her marriage.  

There was, therefore, no cause for bitterness over the money left to the foundation.

The Landauer House of the Twelve Brothers and chapel were located in the parish of St. Sebald near the Laufer Schlagturm. The master builder, Hans Beheim, who was responsible for several other noteworthy buildings of this era, directed the construction of the Landauer endowments. The chapel was richly decorated; especially prominent was the alter painting commissioned by Landauer to Albrecht Dürer. Dürer began the work in 1508 and completed it in 1511. This painting was later given to Emperor Rudolf II at his request in 1585, and eventually

arrived at Vienna where it is today.\textsuperscript{41}

Mathäus Landauer gave ultimate responsibility for the supervision of his endowment and for the appointment of the administrator to the City Council, as had Mendel. The Landauer endowment followed much the same pattern as the Mendel endowment. There were twelve members representing the twelve apostles. The members were to be chosen by the Council from among Nuremberg citizens, artisans who were poor and unable to work. The strictures against marriage, communicable diseases, and beggars were much the same as Mendel had set forth. As with Mendel, arrangements were made for their food, drink, churchly duties, and burial, and no member could leave the house without permission. The applicants had to have been Nuremberg citizens for ten years.\textsuperscript{42}

It was Mathäus Landauer's wish that no clergymen, neither priests nor monks, be accepted into membership. The clothing of the members was, however, monkish and similar to that of the brothers of the Mendel house. In the early 1500's they wore belted cowls of different

\textsuperscript{41}Reicke, \textit{Geschichte Nürnberg}, p. 622.

\textsuperscript{42}Eisen, \textit{Christliche Liebestätigkeit}, p. 81.
colors and flat felt hats. Most of them had beards as well. The circumstances of the times usually determined the fashion of their clothing.43

On Walpurgis Day (May 1) each year there had to be an accounting by the guardian (Pfleger) to members of the Council. The guardian was responsible for complete order in the foundation. There was one interesting dissimilarity between the Landauer and the Mendel foundations. The Landauer guardian had to reside in the Brother House.

Mathäus Landauer made provision for sickness among the old people by having a sick room constructed as a part of the building plan.44 There was always a physician available to deal with sickness of the body and a priest to administer to the soul of the sick or dying.

In popular speech the title of Landauer's endowment was shortened from Aller Heiligen Zwölfbrüderhaus to Landauer Kloster. The Reformation changed the religious service from Catholic to Lutheran but left the foundation undisturbed.

44Ahlborn, Die Familie Landauer, p. 107.
There are two memorial books that remain from the Landauer Foundation, similar to those of the Mendel Foundation. They contain portraits and a few lines concerning the guardians and each member, also such things as occupation and length of residency at the Brother House. The first volume contains 286 portraits, the second, 132 portraits. The founder and first guardian, Mathäus Landauer, is portrayed at the beginning of the first volume. As with the Mendel Memorial Book, each sketch shows the man and the tools of his trade with him.

The Thirty-Years War, which depleted the city's treasury, caused the Council to use part of the endowment since its funds were more accessible than were the holdings of the Mendel Foundation. After Nuremberg was taken over by Bavaria, the Landauer endowment was committed to the general welfare funds in July, 1808. The Landauer as well as Mendel functions for the aged were taken over by the Heilig Geist Hospital.

Karl Ortel, the second guardian chosen after the death of Mathäus Landauer, took office in 1515.

---


46 Ibid., p. 28-29.
In accordance with the founder's wishes and the instructions of the Council, Ortel served as resident guardian during Nuremberg's change to Lutheranism until his death in 1539. His portrait in the Landauer Memorial Book shows him and his wife kneeling in prayer.

The Council frequently referred to Ortel by name in the minutes of its business. "One N. Helfer, a book maker, should be permitted to enter the Landauer Zwölfbrüderhaus provided that Karl Ortel agrees." A problem arose which the Council noted on October 7, 1525, "That the priest of the Zwölfbrüderhaus must take care of the Brothers' spiritual needs in the chapel there." This priest was Hans Mauer. The Council had earlier in the year on February 3, 1525, showed its concern about him by asking the opinions of preachers and learned men regarding him. Also, the Council had stated that Mauer be allowed to remain in the priest's office of the Zwölfbrüderhaus and that he be given one half year's probation. The guardian, Karl Ortel, was to be advised of this and ordered to take care

---

47Amterbuchlein, Nos. 40-49.
48RV 722, f. 10 v., October 18, 1525.
49RV 722, f. 3 v., October 7, 1525.
of this matter. The opinion is dated January 30, 1525 and Hans Mauer's duties were interpreted in light of the endowment document of the Landauer Foundation. The difficulties being religious in nature such as whether a priest should say mass every day or only four times a week. Karl Ortel as guardian was very involved with this matter and stated that his duty did not bind him to go against God's wishes. A petition by Ortel stated that he wished to remain guardian of the Landauer Zwölfbrüderhaus. Accordingly the Council decided that he could remain, but that he had to do his duty in accordance with his conscience, and not go against God's word. If there was a dispute between the priest, Mauer, and the guardian, Karl Ortel, then Mauer must have conformed to the wishes of Ortel and the Council or resigned because the Council gave Karl Ortel a glowing testimonial on August 16, 1527. As guardian he had managed the foundation well and been

50 RV 713, f. 2 v., February 3, 1525.
51 Ratschlag 4, f. 201, January 30, 1525.
52 RV 713, f. 15, February 17, 1525.
53 Ratschlag 4, f. 210, February 17, 1525.
obedient to the Council's commands with a conscientious administration to the needs of the brothers, and the Council demanded that he should continue his work at the Landauer Zwölfbrüderhaus.54

On July 4, 1528, the Council responded to a petition from Ortel to the effect that the amount of money that was in the Landauer Foundation should be held on deposit and be used by him along with the other foundations in the most useful ways.55

There were the usual directions of the Council regarding admission to the Foundation. A Jorg Egenter was told to check with Karl Ortel to see if he could be brought into the Landauer House since he could not be taken into the hospital.56 An individual named Hans Beurl said he wanted admission to the Brother House and that he would meanwhile like to wear the alms badge so he could gather income until he could be admitted.57 Hans Beurl was refused acceptance but still wanted the advantages that

54 RB 14, f. 56 v., August 16, 1527.
55 RV 758, f. 22 r., July 4, 1528.
56 RV 736, f. 18 v., November 1, 1526.
57 RV 744, f. 18 v., June 6, 1527.
came with wearing of the alms badge.\textsuperscript{58} But the Council must have relented, for on October 3, 1527 his petition about leaving the Brother House without permission was refused; however, if he wished to wear the badge, he would be given money from the Alms Fund or from the Rich Alms Fund.\textsuperscript{59} In regard to one Kunssmer, Karl Ortel said he would accept him into the Brother House as soon as a place was vacant.\textsuperscript{60} Karl Ortel, also, was asked to inform Fritz Erberlein when a position was available at the Landauer House.\textsuperscript{61}

There was one man, Hans Kraus, a weaver, who upon his own request was allowed to take his money that he had left on deposit, 100 guldens, and return to his wife.\textsuperscript{62} This was a case in which someone was permitted to leave the Brother House.

\textsuperscript{58}RV 746, f. 14 v., July 31, 1527.
\textsuperscript{59}RV 748, f. 25 r.-25 v., October 3, 1527.
\textsuperscript{60}RV 757, f. 9 v., May 22, 1528.
\textsuperscript{61}RB 14, f. 290 r., January, 1529.
\textsuperscript{62}RV 726, f. 8 r., February 7, 1526.
The Reformation touched on the Landauer Foundation in several ways. First, there was the problem of the priest, Mauer, and how he should perform his duties; second, Karl Ortel obviously became Lutheran and remained guardian for the rest of his life. However, inside the Landauer House, aside from the religious changes, the life continued much as it had before. The Council continued to review petitions for admission, kept close watch on the activities of the Brother House maintenance, as well as the general conduct of the Brotherhood. Since the Council already had physical control of the foundation, it simply extended its power over the spiritual life.

Homes for Elderly Women

Toward the end of the Middle Ages, there were a number of charitable foundations that were called, in Nuremberg, Spiritual Houses (Seelhüsner) which were probably copied from the Beguines of the Netherlands. In Nuremberg, these houses were used as homes for widows or elderly unmarried women who were poor and without
sufficient means to enter one of the convents. In their
earlier period, the Seelhüser were more spiritually
oriented. In later times they became charitable insti-
tutions for the care of older women. There were probably
twenty-two Seelhüser in Nuremberg in the fifteenth
century, each one housing usually between five to eight
women, so that the total population residing in such
facilities was probably about 150 indigent women.

Each house had a leader who directed the spiritual
needs as well as the physical management of the women's
lives. The women who lived in the Seelhüser were called
halfsisters (Halbschwestern) a term used to distinguish
them from the sisters or nuns of the convents.

The oldest such house was founded in 1280 by Fredrich

---

63 Wilhelm Ludwig Liermann, Handbuch des Stiftungs-
rechts, Vol. I of Geschichte des Stiftungsrechts
(Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1963), p. 167 (Hereinafter
referred to as Liermann, Stiftungsrechts).

64 Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 76.

65 Ernst Mummenhoff, "Die öffentliche Gesundheits
und Krankenpflege im alten Nürnberg," Festschrift zur
Eröffnung des neuen Krankenhauses der Stadt Nürnberg.
(Nürnberg: 1898), pp. 65-68 (Hereinafter referred to as
Mummenhoff, "Die öffentliche Gesundheits").
Ebner. The Seelhäuser were usually small, sheltering, as was said above, only five to eight women. Like convents, they were surrounded by walls and had gardens.

The founder and administrator of these houses was usually a patrician. The members had free bed, board, and care. For their sustenance, they practiced handicrafts such as spinning, weaving, and knitting.

It is possible to place the location of about sixteen of these houses;

1. The oldest, founded by Friedrich Ebner in 1280, is on what is today called Schildgasse. It had two rooms for about five halfsisters, and a smaller room for house supplies and clothing. The members lived there rent and tax free, and received about four gulden a year.
2. The house at Schildgasse 8 was founded by Berthold Tucher in 1352. It was administered by the eldest member of the Tucher family. Six poor halfsisters lived a peaceful existence here without conflict or burdens. Each one received eight gulden yearly.
3. Paniersplatz 16 was founded by the Mendel family in 1423, benefiting eight halfsisters who had been faithful servants of this family. They were given medical and physical care. The care for their souls was ministered to at the St. Moritz Chapel.

4. On Shildgasse by the "Yellow Lion" was another house which was founded by the Muffel family.
5. The Spiritual House of St. Sebald was located at Treibberg 15. The church guardian for St. Sebald was the administrator here. The house had three large rooms for eight sisters.
6. The Ebner family founded a house on Stöppelgasse in 1409 with room for five sisters.
7. At Stöppelgasse 9, Berthold Nützel founded a house for former servants of his family.
8.-9. At Untere Wörthstrasse 18, the Nützel family founded another house. A third was near St. James Church.
10. Behind the St. Clara Convent garden there was a house administered by the guardian of the St. Clara Convent. The members of this house were well taken care of by the convent members of St. Clara.
11.-16. There was an endowed house behind the building of the Teutonic Knights; another house on the Plattenmarkt, on Krümmergasse, another at the corner of Weissenburgergasse, and there were three houses located near the St. Katherine Convent.67

After the Reformation, these houses became similar to the poor houses. The houses finally disappeared from the city of Nuremberg in the 1800's.68 These houses served much the same function for poor, aged, and infirm

---


68Mummenhoff, "Die öffentliche Gesundheits," p. 73.
working women as the Mendel and Landauer Foundations did for the poor male artisans.

In 1524 there was a dispute among the citizens of Nuremberg over a Spiritual House in Altdorf. The Council discussed the case of a foundation that was supposed to have been a hospital, but was not being used for this purpose. Therefore, the Council had the house in Altdorf sold and requested an opinion from its jurisconsults concerning the disposition of the proceeds of the sale.\textsuperscript{69} The legal advisors stated that, since the purposes of the founder, Anna Schmid, were not being served, it was their opinion that its disestablishment was right and proper and that the proceeds of the sale should be used for the alms fund. Because this was an honorable disposition of the money the complaints of the citizens were not well founded.\textsuperscript{70} The Council then sent a letter to the Burggrave of Rothenberg informing him that the resolution of the Anna Schmid estate was proper because the property had

\textsuperscript{69}RV 707, f. 10 v., September 2, 1524.

\textsuperscript{70}Ratschlag 4, f. 156, September 7, 1524.
not been used as a hospital as the donor had intended it to be.\textsuperscript{71}

The Council acted strongly against any dissolution of these houses by private citizens. On November 12, 1527 the Council pointed out that no one whose family had established these houses had the right to disestablish it or to divert any of its funds.\textsuperscript{72} The Council's continued interest in these houses is evinced in the number of actions it took in regulating details. For example, when it learned that some houses were not properly caring for their sick members, the Council made it clear that it would have no patience with such behavior.\textsuperscript{73}

The Council also made some of the decisions on the admittance to these houses, especially after 1525. It ordered that one Margaret Weissen be questioned to find out which house she wished to enter, and the amount she needed so that she would not have to rely on alms. This information was to be reported to the Council.\textsuperscript{74} The

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{71}Bb. 88, f. 21, September 10, 1524.
  \item \textsuperscript{72}RV 750, f. 7 v., November 12, 1527.
  \item \textsuperscript{73}RB 14, f. 116 r., November, 1527.
  \item \textsuperscript{74}RV 742, f. 7 r., April 9, 1527.
\end{itemize}
Council arranged to have one Anna Gebhart, who had been a servant for thirty years, be taken care of by the Muffel family and accepted into a spiritual house.\textsuperscript{75} The Council also took up the maintenance of these houses. It decided that the directors of the Common Chest (Castenherren) should build an addition to a spiritual house, thereby improving it and giving it a proper passageway to the street.\textsuperscript{76}

The Council showed its firm control over these spiritual houses by its dissolution of one house and its refusal to permit any private dissolution by heirs. It also assumed full responsibility for the admission of persons to and maintenance of the houses after the Reformation. Thus the purpose for these houses became less religious and more practical.

**The Pilgrim Hospices**

Two hospitals in Nuremberg existed for wandering pilgrims. They were not hospitals in the present-day sense but rather resembled modern hospices. These two

\textsuperscript{75}RV 744, F. 22 r., June 18, 1527.

\textsuperscript{76}RV 752, f. 26 r., January 25, 1528. RB 14, f. 133 r., January 23, 1528.
institutions were the Holy Cross (Heilig-Kreuz) Hospice and Saint Martha's Hospice. Both were on main routes through Nuremberg. Saint Martha's was inside the wall, close to the Frauentor entrance of the city, and the Holy Cross Hospice was inside the wall on the route to Frankfurt near the entrance.

The exact date of the endowment of the Holy Cross Hospice is indeterminate, as are the dates of most of Nuremberg's early institutions. It was founded some time before 1354 by Bertold Haller.77 He was of a patrician family that dealt in exports and finance. Haller's motives for the foundations probably came from observing poor wandering pilgrims. Certainly he acted in accordance with the usual piety of his time in making this foundation.

The first document concerning the hospice is dated March 27, 1354, issued by the Burgraves Johann and Albrecht and recognizing the pious endowment of Bertold Haller to care for foreign pilgrims who were miserable and

homeless. In the hospice there was a chapel to care for the religious needs of the pilgrims. Interestingly enough the Haller family being patricians and not dying out as other families did, continued as guardians (Pfleger). This is interesting because of the City Council's tendency to take control of all such foundations within its territory. Yet the Haller family continued strong. The registers show that the guardian in the years 1520 to 1529 was Jobst Haller. He was of Council rank. Thus the Council in selecting him controlled the foundation.

The endowment consisted of three buildings: the hospice, the chapel, and the house for the chaplain. Since the Holy Cross Pilgrims' Hospice is no longer in existence, it can be seen only in sketches. One of the earliest is in Albrecht Dürer's "Nuremberg from the West."

The personnel consisted of the hospice master and his housekeeper or wife. He took charge of the clothing, feeding, and caring for these poor homeless wanderers. There were handymen and maids to do the actual work.

---

78 Ibid., p. 7.

79 Amterbüchlein, Nos. 40-49.
The inventory of 1496 showed a total of 38 beds: fifteen beds upstairs, seventeen beds on the ground floor for men, and six beds in the women's sleeping quarters. 80

The distribution of food in the week before Easter attracted great numbers of these wanderers to Nuremberg and the pilgrim houses took them in and fed them. During the existence of Holy Cross Hospice, the Haller family continued to make bequests to it. The end of the private foundation came in 1807 when the Haller family gave over control to the United charity fund of the city. 81 The destruction of the buildings occurred with the Second World War. They were not restored.

The guardian during the period of this study held office from April, 1518, to June, 1532. 82 The Lutheran Reformation changed the church service but not the service to the wandering poor.

The Saint Martha Pilgrim Hospice was built and maintained in a fashion similar to that of the Holy Cross.

80 Haller and Eichhorn, Pilgrimsospital zum Heiligen Kreuz, p. 41.

81 Ibid., pp. 63-66.

82 Ibid., p. 81.
Conrad Waldstrome founded the institution in 1363. It was to care for the homeless, sick pilgrims who wandered the highways of Nuremberg. The inhabitants were to be given meat, drink, a place to sleep, and other necessities. There should be warm water with which they could wash their feet and lights in the rooms in order for them to see. The bed linens should be clean, and, of course, the men were separated from the women.

The hospital master and woman, as at the Holy Cross house, managed the institution with the aid of maids and other help as needed. There was a continual funding by bequests from various people after its original foundation. The buildings consisted of the hospital, the chapel, and the house for the chaplain. The guardian (Pfleger) was chosen by the Council. Unlike the Haller family, the Waldstromers did not retain the guardianship. During the period under study here, the guardianship changed several times but remained with the Imhoff family: Hans Imhoff, 1520-21, his widow, 1522-23, and Endres Imhoff, 1524-29.

83 Mummenhoff, "Die Öffentliche Gesundheits," p. 66.
84 Eisen, Christliche LiebeStüchtigkeit, pp. 69-70.
85Unterbüchlein, Nos. 40-49.
The Chapel of Saint Martha remains today just inside the Frauentor entrance and is used for services. But like most of the charitable endowments of Nuremberg, it was taken over by the United Charities fund when Nuremberg came under the government of Bavaria in 1806.86

The Council did not concern itself with the transient populations in these hospices except to make an occasional recommendation such as that of May 7, 1527, when the Council ordered Endress Imhoff the guardian of St. Martha's to take into the hospice a poor man from Hersberg.87 Jobst Haller on April 11, 1524, asked permission to increase the alms allotment at the hospice of the Holy Cross.88 Council made inquiries at both the pilgrim hospices for accommodations for patients in the hospital during the winter of 1527. The Heilig Geist Hospital was too full and all the inmates could not be kept out of the cold, so the Council desired to bring these people into the two pilgrim hospices temporarily. A weekly recompense

---

86 Haller and Eichhorn, Pilgrims-pital zum Heiligen Kreuz, pp. 63-65.
87 RV 743, f. 16 r., May 7, 1527.
88 RV 702, f. 13 r., April 11, 1524.
would be made for them to both the Holy Cross and St. Martha's for all their expenditures.\textsuperscript{89}

The Reformation brought little if any change to these hospices. The Council simply made sure they were well run and utilized them when necessary, but there were no issues that came up in Council's day-to-day transactions that show any change in attitude towards these foundations.

\textsuperscript{89}RV 751, f. 4v-5 r., December 9, 1527. RB 14, f. 119 r., November 10, 1527.
CHAPTER TWO

THE CHARITY HOSPITALS

The Hospital of St. Elizabeth

In the Middle Ages the care of the sick and the center of charity was in the hands of the Church. The monastic orders were the first to accept the sick into their own infirmaries and to give them all the care of which they, the monastics, were then capable. It seems likely that the oldest cloister in Nuremberg, the Schottenkloster of St. Aegidius, also had an infirmary attached to it, but we have little remaining knowledge of this institution.¹

The first hospital in Nuremberg which is documented is St. Elizabeth's, under the organization and care of the Teutonic Knights. The Teutonic Knights called their Nuremberg institutional complex Deutschherren Orden Haus, or Deutscher Hof. The Knights were first formed during

¹Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 5.

63
the Crusades in Palestine as the Brotherhood of the
St. Mary Hospitals of the Germans in Jerusalem. The Crusades had given expression to Christian zeal for recapturing Palestine. Since the numerous pilgrims needed protection on the way to the Holy Land, with the sick and weak requiring similar care, there arose a need for this type of Brotherhood that could at one time have a sword in their hands to fight the Saracens and at another to be in their linen robes caring for the wounded and the sick among the pilgrims. The members were among other things vowed to unrelenting struggle against Christian enemies, to the defense of the Church, to the protection of widows and orphans, and to the care of the sick and suffering.
The more militant purposes served by this brotherhood were lost when the crusaders lost Palestine so the Teutonic Knights transferred their militancy to Northeastern Europe where they founded their own state in Prussia and Livonia.

The Teutonic Knights were distinct from the various other crusading orders because they were composed of men of German origin, which can be noted from their shortened popular name, Deutschherren. Furthermore, in their early period, they were not as aristocratic and
exclusive in membership as the Knights of St. John, or Hospitalers. They had more middle class involvement.

The end of the Palestinian Crusades coincided with the period in which the power of German cities began to increase; and because the Teutonic Knights had, at that time, close connections with the middle class they found a fertile field for their hospital work in the growing German cities. The Teutonic Knights, whose overseas functions were ended, happily seized the opportunity to take over and to establish such hospitals to fill this growing need in many places in Germany. They are better known for their militancy in Slavic lands, yet even after the Protestant conversion of the Grand Master Albert of Hohenzollern in 1525 in Prussia, the other districts of the Teutonic Knights continued to be Catholic.

On February 20, 1207, the Teutonic Knights received a document from Emperor Otto IV, upon the request of his Nuremberg Administrator and the citizens which bestowed upon the Teutonic Knights the St. Jacob's Church and all its accumulated wealth.\(^2\) It is said that Otto IV gave the Order so much real estate that six cross bow bastions

\(^2\)Mummenhoff, "Die Öffentliche Gesundheits," p. 33.
were placed in St. Jacob's Church. It must be noted that the church and lands lay outside of the wall fortifications of Nuremberg until 1452 when the new walls were built. Therefore the order had to have its own defense in this early period. The present-day designation of Deutschherren meadow is a reminder of this Order's existence in that area.

The Apostle James was the patron of pilgrims so it is not unlikely that Nuremberg's St. Jacob's Church already had an infirmary for pilgrims that was also transferred to the Teutonic Knights. Still in 1235, soon after Emperor Frederick II's return from Palestine, he endowed the Knights with the St. Elizabeth Hospital with a chapel of the same name. The exact years for the founding of the hospital are difficult to ascertain. Frederick II spoke in all documents concerning the Order with expressions of the highest praise for their service.

---

3Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 6.


Among the many hospitals that the Order started or took over, St. Elizabeth's in Nuremberg became one of the largest. By various gifts of the Emperor and endowments of the citizens of Nuremberg, the hospital acquired important pieces of real estate and other wealth in and outside the walls of the city and in other places. St. Elizabeth's was the main hospital for Nuremberg for several centuries after its founding.

By 1274 the numbers of the sick had become so large that the means to help them had become too small. It was then necessary to increase the care and the size of such hospitals. Therefore, Bishop Heinrich von Trient called upon the charity of the faithful in a letter of indulgence that year (1274). The German archbishops and bishops exerted themselves in a similar fashion to aid these charitable foundations. From documents of the years 1285 and 1305, St. Elizabeth's is seen accommodating innumerable of the sick and infirm which were taken care of there with benevolence and love. The bishops'  

---

6Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 6.
7Munzenhoff, "Die öffentliche Gesundheits," p. 32.
indulgence letters produced still greater expenditures for the sick.  

Within the hospital there were the Commander, the knights, priests, and lay brothers. The lay brothers cared for the sick, the knights provided protection, and the priests spiritual aid. The knights wore white mantles which had a large black cross. The lay brothers wore gray mantles with a smaller cross. Every one ate in the same room in silence, except for pious reading, with the head table presided over by the Commander and with him the knights. The next table had the lay brothers, who were usually of a lower class, and at the end of the room sat the servants who worked on the premises.

For the work in caring for the sick, the Order also brought in women but under very strict guidelines. No women could live there. Medicine was not advanced and the main care for the sick was of the nature of simple assistance. The sick were served in so far as their sickness or weakness made them unable to serve themselves. For

8Mummenhof, "Die öffentliche Gesundheits," p. 32.
9Schrötter, Deutschordenhaus, p. 57.
that reason female labor was highly valued. However, this was written: "Upon this we take our stand that no name of a female can be used in this Order for manly courage might be severely damaged by such feminine appellations. Yet, service in the hospitals by women and also the giving of women's names to cows is reported better than using men and men's names. Therefore, be it known that this Order will receive to such hospital service female persons as lay sisters." It was thereby made very clear that the Order accepted the help of the women only as more or less an evil.

In the 1400's, the hospital more and more became an institution for the nobles and not for the poor. In that century, it developed the character of a sinecure establishment; and the distinguished effectiveness, which it had displayed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, was almost completely obscured. The Order became more exclusively aristocratic and the city became more concerned to have control over all the activities within the hospital.

---

10 Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 7.
11 Schrötter, Deutschordenhaus, p. 62.
its walls. Thus the Order early came into conflict with the Council. All the churches, cloisters, hospitals, and other such institutions had a guardian (Pfleger) appointed by the city Council with the only exception of St. Jacob's Church and St. Elizabeth's Hospital.\(^\text{12}\) There had been a problem of the right of asylum which the Teutonic Knights possessed and the Council protested over until Emperor Frederick III limited this right in 1480. By 1487 and 1493, agreement was reached with respect to this right of asylum with the Council emerging victorious.\(^\text{13}\)

The city and the Order came into further competition with the establishment of Lutheranism. St. Jacob's Church was lost to the Order entirely and in 1533 a Protestant was established as Vicar in St. Elizabeth's chapel. However, the Order kept its other buildings until after the Thirty Years War.\(^\text{14}\) Finally, in November, 1806, the Bavarian State secularized the possessions of the Teutonic Knights remaining in the city. St. Elizabeth's,

\(^{12}\)Reicke, \textit{Geschichte Nürnberg}, p. 1030.

\(^{13}\)Schröter, \textit{Deutschordenhaus}, p. 62.

\(^{14}\)Ibid., p. 68.
site of the hospital and Order, is today the main police station of Nuremberg, and St. Jacob's Church is being restored from damage done during the Second World War.

The city had no control over the St. Elizabeth Hospital and had jurisdictional conflicts with the Teutonic Knights over rights to wood from the Imperial Forest surrounding Nuremberg. One endowment of St. Elizabeth's that the Council did have control over was the "Golden Drink" (Goldener Trunk) founded by Herdegen Valzner in the year 1406 with a capital of 1040 Gulden. This amount was later increased by various bequests. The hospital inmates received food and wine from the fund one day a week. Through an augmentation of the fund by one Kunigunde, Lebkuchnerin, there was a special expenditure for wine every Sunday. The Council made inquiries in May, 1522 concerning the administration of the Golden Drink at St. Elizabeth's Hospital of the Teutonic Knights.

---

15 Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, p. 170.
16 "Gingerbread maker," Her occupation, and not her last name was given.
18 RV 676, f. 23 r., May 17, 1522.
On February 19, 1523, the Council noted that the Golden Drink was not always being given only to the sick. The Council commanded that this behavior be changed and that the Teutonic Knights be informed of the Council's interest.\(^{19}\) The Council repeated this injunction in September of 1523 to the Hospital Master that the Golden Drink was to be given only to the poor, sick people and the foundation was not to be used in any other way.\(^ {20}\)

Katherine, the widow of Hans Imhoff, was affirmed as guardian of the Golden Drink and was ordered to give aid only to the poor.\(^ {21}\) Wolff Holzschuher was ordered to report back to the Council about the use of the funds for the Golden Drink in the hospital.\(^ {22}\) The Council kept a firm grip on all the foundations' expenditures. This was especially true with the Golden Drink Foundation at the hospital of St. Elizabeth's which was under the care of the Teutonic Knights. This Order of Knights became the only

\(^{19}\)RV 686, f. 16 v., February 19, 1523.

\(^{20}\)RV 694, f. 5 v., September 3, 1523.

\(^{21}\)RV 697, f. 9 r., March 6, 1523.

\(^{22}\)RV 687, f. 11 v., March 9, 1523.
exception to the Council's expanding control over all institutions in the city and the only foundation which the Council controlled at St. Elizabeth's was the Golden Drink. That is why the Council took such pains to make sure that it was administered properly. Katherine, the widow of Hans Imhoff, petitioned Council to be the guardian of Saint Martha's pilgrim hospice and to also retain the guardianship of the Golden Drink at St. Elizabeth's.\(^\text{23}\)

She was allowed to hold both of these offices from 1522 to 1523 but in the second year she had to relinquish the guardianship of St. Martha's to Endress Imhoff.\(^\text{24}\)

At the New Or Heilig Geist Hospital there were frequent changes in the guardianship of the Golden Drink Fund. The Council confirmed that Peter Imhoff who served until November, 1522, needed a successor in the office.\(^\text{25}\)

The next guardian chosen was Dorothea, the housewife of Hieronymus Holzschuher,\(^\text{26}\) but in 1525 there seem to have

\(^{23}\text{RV 681, f. 3 r., September 1522.}\)

\(^{24}\text{Amterbüchlein, Nos. 42-43.}\)

\(^{25}\text{RV 683, f. 16 v., November 27, 1522.}\)

\(^{26}\text{Amterbüchlein, Nos. 40-41. Amterbüchlein, Nos. 42-44.}\)
occurred some difficulties with her administration. The Council on July 11, 1525, decided that she had made too many mistakes and wanted to find another suitable elderly woman.  

It again took up the matter on July 13 and actively sought a replacement.  

On July 15, 1525, the wife of Casper Nützel, the elder, was chosen to be the new guardian of the Golden Drink at the Heilig Geist Hospital. She accepted and remained in office until 1528, when Katherine Imhoff replaced her. The Council decided to end the benefice of the Golden Drink at the St. Elizabeth's Hospital and first discussed this on July 15, 1527, that it would be better to terminate the foundation and guardianship and so wrote it in the foundation book.  

On November 5, 1528, the Council ordered an accounting of the Golden Drink and its complete cessation. The most

27RV 718, f. 20 v., July 11, 1525.
28RV 719, f. 3 r., July 15, 1525.
29RV 719, f. 5 v., July 15, 1525.
30Amterbüchlein, Nos. 45-48.
31RV 745, f. 31 r., July 15, 1528.
32RV 763, f. 6 v., November 5, 1528.
likely reason for the ending of the Golden Drink at St. Elizabeth's and the transferral of Katherine Imhoff as a foundation guardian to the Heilig Geist Hospital would be the relations between the Teutonic Knights and the Council. The Knights remained Catholic. They had a chapel which became the only place Catholics could worship in the City. To stop the money spent on food and drink to the St. Elizabeth's Hospital was to recognize the occurrence of the Nuremberg Reformation and also that the Council did not feel any obligation to aid an institution within its walls over which it had no control.

**The Heilig Geist Hospital**

The "New Hospital," or Heilig Geist Hospital, was founded in 1339 by a wealthy and important citizen, Konrad Gross. He belonged to the Heinzen family, which acquired so much wealth that their name was changed to Gross (Great). It was under the patronage of the Emperor Ludwig the Bavarian that Konrad Gross was able to buy the office of Schultheiss (Mayor) in 1320. It was unusual for this important office to be given to a Nuremberg citizen

---

33 Reicke, *Geschichte Nürnberg*, p. 188.
because it cut back the powers of the burgrave, the keeper of the Imperial Castle. It had previously been held by an outsider. The mayor (Schultheiss) was at this time obliged to swear an annual oath before the Council, for Nuremberg was seeking even greater autonomy as a city. It was a natural development that the city obtained greater privileges with Konrad Gross as mayor (Schultheiss) because he had developed an excellent relationship with the Emperor even to the extent that Ludwig occasionally was his house guest.

The building of the hospital began in the year 1333 although the actual Grosser Stiftungsb briefly (Great Letter of Foundation) is from 1339. The endowment was for the sick and also for the infirm old people. The Heilig Geist Hospital is usually referred to as the Neues (new) Hospital to differentiate it from the Teutonic Orders' St. Elizabeth Hospital which was referred to as the Altes (Old) Hospital. The Burgrave Frederick IV presented Konrad with

34 Georg Löhlein, "Die Gründungsurkunde des Nürnberger Heilig-Geistspitals von 1339," Vol. 52, MVGN 1963-64, p. 65 (Hereinafter referred to as Löhlein, "Gründungsurkunde.")
meadow land along the Pegnitz River in 1331. Konrad had stated that he wished to build a hospital to honor God and to care for Christian souls. It was settled that Gross would be the hospital's guardian during his lifetime and that then his son would be guardian. The Council would have complete control after the son's death.

Toward the end of his life Gross may have felt some bitterness when in the uprising of 1348 he and most of the other patricians had to flee the city. With the restoration of order in 1349, however, he returned, and became so involved with the building and growth of the hospital that he had a stone house built next to it for himself. Later this house was incorporated into the hospital building. Konrad Gross died suddenly on May 10, 1356, while on a trip to Bamberg. His body was returned to Nuremberg and interred in the Heilig Geist Hospital Church, with a gravestone held by eight sorrowing figures sculptured in stone. This gravestone remains in the hospital today.

The Hospital was enlarged over a period of many years. The western court became known as the Gasthof.

The middle court was called the Hanselhof. The Hanselhof contained within it the object which gave it its name, a bronze figure seated in a stone fountain. The figure is wearing the costume of a fourteenth century prebendary. The third court is the Eastern court. It is where the tomb memorial of Konrad Gross today stands, having been taken from the completely destroyed Heilig Geist Church after the Second World War. Then there is the much later section of the hospital extending over the Pegnitz River, completed in 1527.

The hospital, planned and built by the founder, had room for 200 beds. In the first century of existence it usually averaged 100 residents. It served a dual function, that is, of caring for the sick and of serving as a home for the aged. The founder directed that the hospital have six priests to care for the sick and the aged, also that there be a school for twelve indigent students. Of course, the founder expected masses to be said for him each year on the anniversary of his death.

36Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 22.
37Löhlein, "Gründungsurkunde," p. 68.
The original endowment document is in the Nuremberg City Archives. During times of war, the hospital became a place for the wounded. The mentally disturbed were accepted as long as they were not dangerous. Those considered dangerous were placed in a tower and were treated as criminals. Insofar as possible the mentally ill stayed in their own homes, in chains if necessary, but the Council's permission had to be obtained for such detention.

In the middle of the fifteenth century a small house for the insane was constructed on the Insel Schütt, an island in the Pegnitz River, close to the Heilig Geist Hospital. Here people from the hospital attempted to treat these disturbed persons or, if nothing else availed, they simply cared for them.

The Council handled all cases of incompetency and when it felt that a person was sound he was released. Such was the case of a poor peasant referred to in the

action of April 8, 1527.\textsuperscript{40} The Council kept a sharp eye on any abnormal behavior of its citizens but the purpose was paternal and people were released as soon as possible. One incentive for quick release was the Council's urgent need for the hospital's money for their care. The Council's main interest was peace and order in the city. Such was the case when it ordered that an insane person, who had said he had been robbed, be held for further questioning.\textsuperscript{41} It also ordered that a poor woman, who was in the house for the insane, be investigated to see if she could be helped.\textsuperscript{42} A person who was begging came immediately to the Council's attention which ordered the begging officials either to put him in prison or in the house for the insane.\textsuperscript{43} It ordered another person out of the asylum and into prison.\textsuperscript{44} A man, Hans Dittleday, was in the asylum and was ordered by the Council to be fed

\textsuperscript{40}RV 742, r. 5 v., April 8, 1527.
\textsuperscript{41}RV 682, f. 18 v., November 4, 1522.
\textsuperscript{42}RV 717, f. 4 r., May 19, 1525.
\textsuperscript{43}RV 727, f. 6 r., February 28, 1526.
\textsuperscript{44}RV 732, f. 12 r., July 13, 1526.
from the hospital until he was better and then he was to be spoken to sharply in regard to his former blasphemy. The Reformation had little immediate impact on the treatment of the insane.

Diseases like leprosy and later the plague and syphilis had their treatment centers placed outside the city's walls and were not treated at the Heilig Geist Hospital or anywhere else within the walls of the city for fear of contagion.

The personnel of the hospital consisted of a hospital master, a hospital mistress, a cellar keeper who took care of supplies, a collector of rents from the lands owned by the hospital, a cook, a doorkeeper, a cattle keeper for the hospital's own herds, a gravedigger, four handymen, and four maids. The cost of administration and operation was covered by the original endowment and various later bequests by charitable individuals. There was real estate owned and rented by the hospital in innumerable places, both inside the city and especially in the country.

---

45 RV 732, f. 25, July 7, 1526.

The hospital master was answerable for the general administration of the hospital. Each year, with the election of a new city Council, he had to account for his administration to a committee of five of the Council members. He could not accept any one who did not need hospital care. Those accepted had to promise to go to confession and to take communion within two days. On the numerous fast days, fish and herring were served instead of meat. The founder had desired that residents receive a pint of wine with their evening meal and a pint of beer with all other meals. Peter Stromer in 1384 made an endowment giving special food for the sick on each Wednesday during Lent; herring or six figs and a pint of wine.  

The rules were strict in regard to cleanliness. The founder specified that all inhabitants, attendants, and priests should receive at least one bath every fourteen days. The badly sick or child-bearing women must confess to a priest on the day of admittance and also make a will leaving their goods, if any, to the foundation.  

---

Only at the end of the fourteenth century was the first endowment for a hospital doctor made. Before that the care had been simple but good, leaving time and God to heal. Doctors were usually put on probation and then sworn to the Council's service. For the years 1521-27 the doctors listed were Johann Lochner, Sebalt Pusch, and Johann Zacharias in 1520 and 1521. In 1522 a Wolfgang Kern who was not a sworn doctor was added, and in 1523 Johann Schutz, likewise not a sworn doctor, was added. But Johann Magenbuch, who was added to the list in 1524, was a sworn doctor. Johann Lochner had died in 1523. The same list appears in 1525, 1526, and 1527, but all men on the list were not sworn doctors. In 1528, Anthony Schedel was added to the list.

In 1498, the hospital acquired its own pharmacist but his materials had to be checked and accounted for by members of the Council. In the years 1521-26, Hans Stromer and Nicholas Haller did this work. In 1526, Stromer was dropped and Christoph Coler was added. In 1528, Nicholas Haller died leaving Christoph Coler and Endres Imhof the

49 Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 27.
50 Amterbüchlein, Nos. 40-48.
Council overseers for the pharmacy. These overseers probably were considered necessary by the Council because of the possibility of poisonous remedies. The Council took the responsibility to insure that the material used was not harmful. Thus the pharmacists were accountable to the council.

The hospital was badly in need of more room so that the Council decided on October 30, 1487 to enlarge the hospital's facilities. The actual building began in July, 1488. The building of the wing over the river began in 1489. In effect the new hospital wing was built upon arches of a bridge over the Pegnitz River. The building progressed slowly because of a lack of funds. There were several indulgences proclaimed to aid in obtaining the necessary money but unfortunately these did not produce much. There were, also, the technical problems involved in this novel architecture. The man who solved these architectural problems was the City Master Builder and Architect, Hans Beheim. His specialty was altering

51 Ibid.

52 Mummenhoff, "Die öffentliche Gesundheits," p. 35.

53 Ibid., p. 36.
existing buildings and he produced one of his most successful accomplishments with this addition to the Heilig Geist. In the year 1518 the Council decided to finance the completion of the building. In October of that year, the Council decreeing "that the hospital officials, with the knowledge and desire of the Council advisors, should but for 1500 Gulden from Hans Tucher and assign to the hospital use his recently endowed benefice of 50 Gulden yearly income." 

In July of 1527, the last building administrator, Leonhard Held, advised the Council the work was completed and the Council sent members who investigated and reported that Held had done his work diligently and should be given thanks and honored accordingly. The new addition was in the planning stage and under construction for a period of thirty-eight years. With this addition, there was a closer connection between the Heilig Geist


55Mummenhoff, "Die Öffentliche Gesundheits," p. 35.

56Amterbüchlein, No. 47, 1527.

Church and the hospital, for two Sutte priests were endowed by the patrician family of Tucher, one in February 1507 and one in October, 1518. "Now the sick, who could not go to the Church, could hear services in the hospital itself."

The master and mistress of the hospital had to see to the care of the sick, their clothing, and food. For example, on Wednesdays for the morning meal there was milk soup or onion soup, roast meat, white turnips or carrots; for the evening meal, soup, meat, barley or rice in milk.

The new addition gave the hospital a total of 300 beds which gave the city a much needed expansion in its health care facilities.

The Heilig Geist Hospital is today a restaurant and the river addition is a home for old people. During the Second World War, these buildings suffered considerable damage but now they have been restored to the appearance that Hans Beheim gave them.

58 This refers to Sudan (South), the direction of the new wing.

59 Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 50.

The Council was involved in all facets of the new building. The new hospital was to be enlarged as planned by the masters of the Small Council and when it was ready to have a roof, it inquired if there were other alms fund money available for this purpose. On February 21, 1523, the Council wished a report from Ludwig Eisen, a subordinate to Hans Beheim the master builder. The report was to contain all relevant information on the condition of the new building at that time. It was decided that some of the money from the leprosy funds could be expended on the building. The hospital master was also looking for more funds. He petitioned the Council that the estate of Hans Greussen be turned to other good works besides being used for alms and masses. The Council looked into precisely how the building was progressing in detail, especially the kind of stone to be used for ornamentation.

---

61 RV 665, f. 7 r., July 4, 1521.
62 RV 686, f. 18 r., February 21, 1523.
63 RV 677, f. 7 v., May 28, 1527.
64 RV 703, f. 7 r., May 6, 1524.
Johann Magenbuch was granted, after a year-long observation, the right to practice medicine in the hospital as a sworn doctor, to treat the poor people and to dispense medicine. 65 The Council concerned itself also with its servants, one of whom was lying in a common house after having been wounded. It ordered that he be either admitted to the hospital or given a sum of alms money. 66 He was brought into the hospital the next day, September 15, 1524, and he was treated there being also given the sum of one gulden as alms. 67 The Council began in 1525 taking up a number of cases of admittance to the hospital: a sick woodchopper, 68 a Varnbach priest, 69 and Hans Schleichen who had been hurt severely while at work on the building of the St. Sebastian Hospital. It ordered that Schleichen was to be received into the Heilig Geist Hospital or to receive aid in the form of alms money. 70 The Council was

65RV 702, f. 10 r., April 8, 1524.
66RV 702, f. 10 r., April 8, 1524.
67RV 708, f. 1 v., September 15, 1524.
68RV 712, f. 8 v., January 14, 1525.
69RV 714, f. 23 v., March 29, 1525.
70RV 715, f. 12 v., April 11, 1525.
meticulous about caring for city employees. An example of this was Hans Merchel who had been a retainer for many years and needed help in his old age. The Council ordered him to be received into the hospital and the cost of this to be taken from the Common Chest. He was also presented with citizenship.\(^{71}\) Another retainer was not so fortunate. He was not a citizen and was not received in the hospital but was given some alms money.\(^{72}\) There was a Hans Wolf who was to be accepted by Karl Ortel into a Zwölfbrüder house; and if this could not be done, then his case was to be considered by Caspar Busch, the alms official, and he was to be accepted by the hospital.\(^{73}\)

The Council ordered the hospital master to inquire if the daughter of an Ott Zincken was a child for the hospital or not. If she was, she could be accepted there; and if she was not to be admitted, then she should be given weekly alms money.\(^{74}\) The Council did not grant all

---

\(^{71}\)RV 719, f. 18 v., July 31, 1525.

\(^{72}\)RV 721, f. 21 r., October 3, 1525.

\(^{73}\)RV 718, f. 17 v., July 8, 1525.

\(^{74}\)RV 726, f. 2 v., January 26, 1526.
petitions. A Margaret Stricker was declined acceptance into the hospital but she could wear the alms badge if she so desired.75

The Council also set up the schedule for doctors. The two young doctors, Magenbuch and Schutz, must alternate every four weeks in treating the men and then the women. They both must take care of the lepers.76 Many entries are brief: a poor woman should be received into the hospital,77 a poor man should be given a leave of absence of from one to four days to visit his house and wife and then be readmitted to the hospital,78 and a poor woman, who was not a citizen, should be examined to determine if she could receive alms.79 This same poor woman's petition to enter the hospital was denied.80 The Council also took up bequests, such as Contz Haller's

75RV 729, f. 21 r., April 18, 1526.
76RV 737, f. 1 r., November 15, 1526. RB 13, f. 190 r., November 15, 1526.
77RV 737, f. 3 r., November 16, 1926.
78RV 738, f. 28 v., January 6, 1527.
79RV 738, f. 28 v., January 8, 1527.
80RV 738, f. 30 r., January 9, 1527.
yearly gift of wine to the hospital. It decided that perhaps the money could be put to a better use for the hospital as alms in future years.81

The Council constantly used the hospital for the relief of its servants, such as the poor person who was hurt while in service was given two gulden out of the treasury as an alms.82 The same day, January 17, 1527, this poor fellow was ordered by the Council to be admitted to the hospital. He was to be told that this was allowed and his answer brought back to the Council.83 One poor woman was given citizenship and forty pfennigs weekly from the Common Chest but she was denied entrance to the hospital.84

On April 11, 1527, the Council made known its desires concerning the sworn doctors and the treatment of the inmates. They were to be allowed a stated amount of wine every weekday; on three days they should get one pint apiece and on the other two days a quart. Beer was allowed

81RV 737, f. 26 r., December 3, 1526.
82RV 739, f. 8 r., January 17, 1527.
83RV 739, f. 8 r., January 17, 1527.
84RV 741, f. 28 r., April 3, 1527.
daily. Throughout the year at the evening meal they should be given cold milk. The Council discussed the menu in detail as to the meats and vegetables that were to be served. The income from vigils for the dead was to be converted into bettering the care in the hospital. The officials of the hospital were enjoined to improve conditions there. The inmates were to receive a pfennig daily which was for their own use. The Council wanted to be kept constantly informed of the activities in the institution. No one should die without having received the sacrament and proper care. Several good women were to make visits to the hospital during the week to insure that diligence and orderliness were being observed in the care of the sick and that there should be no lack or want.85

The Council was involved with every detail of the hospital care, all the expenditures, and the income from various foundations which were now being converted to the use of the poor inmates of the hospital.

The Council denied entrance to the hospital in many cases. A person named Wolffart could receive an alms but

85RV 742, f. 11 r., April 11, 1527. RB 13, f. 267-268 r., April 11, 1527.
not entrance to the hospital. One Muller Vogler could wear the alms badge, receive something from the Common Chest, but not be admitted to the hospital. A woman named Rener was given citizenship so that she could be accepted into the hospital. Dorothea Best had been in the hospital so long that she was given citizenship so that she could receive alms. It was so cold in December, 1527, that the Council made inquiries if some of the hospital inmates could be received at St. John's or St. Martha's because there were too many cases for all of them to be kept warm.

Another case of the meticulous care that the Council gave to the affairs of the hospital concerned the daughter of someone called Rosenweyden. She was to be permitted to remain in the hospital fourteen days and then to go to her mother's home and receive an income from the alms fund.

---

86 RV 744, f. 34 r., June 19, 1527.
87 RV 747, f. 11 r., August 28, 1527.
88 RV 749, f. 12 r.-13 r., October 21, 1527.
89 RV 750, f. 8 r., November 13, 1527.
90 RV 751, f. 4 v.-5 r., December 9, 1527.
91 RV 753, f. 11 r., February 6, 1528.
A poor, senseless man from Wetzendorff was permitted to receive alms of six gulden and perhaps be put in the asylum here. There was one Christian Ering who had served so long in the Zwölfruder house that Council decided he should be accepted into the hospital.

The Council increasingly used admittance to the hospital in conjunction with various other alms. A Peter Trager from Lypothoff was to be accepted into the hospital but he was not to receive aid from other alms sources. One Hans Geckenhofer had quite a number of troubles with his wife. First the Council put them both into prison. Then Geckenhofer wanted alms relief for his wife while he traveled. Finally the Council decided to take the wife into the hospital because she was sick.

The effects of the Reformation on the Heilig Geist Hospital can be traced in the conversion of endowments for

---

92RV 759, f. 7 v., July 16, 1528.
93RV 759, f. 9 r., July 16, 1528. RV 758, f. 20 r., July 28, 1528.
94RV 763, f. 12 v., November 14, 1528.
95RV 765, f. 9 r., January 7, 1529.
96RV 765, f. 10 v., January 8, 1529.
97RV 765, f. 14 r., January 14, 1529.
masses into a source of income with which to care for the inmates. There were many more cases that the Council interested itself in after 1525 than before. Also there was the increasing discretion which the Council used whether to utilize the hospital, the alms fund, or some other method of relief. It would seem that the Council more directly categorized the hospital with alms relief after 1525. The Council had control over the hospital before 1525, but after that point it began taking up many more individual cases and specified its recommendations. The Council thus showed a stronger interest on a day to day basis in the hospital which is manifested during and after the Reformation.
CHAPTER THREE

THE CHARITIES FOR CONTAGIOUS DISEASES

The Lepers

The first house for leprosy in Nuremberg was St. John's which was known from 1239. It was on the route to Frankfurt, outside the walls of Nuremberg. All houses for contagious disease were places of quarantine. St. John's was one of the two houses for women with this disease. There was a manager of the house with people to care for the sick, a keeper of supplies, and a cook. The other house for women was St. Leonard's which was on the road to Regensburg. It had been founded in 1317 by Hermann Schurstaab of a patrician family. The men were carefully separated from the women. The founder of St. Leonard's required that the women there serve God diligently. St. Leonard's had a church, a house-mistress, and serving people.

1Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 47.
For the men there was St. Jobst which was founded in 1308. It was on the road to Prague. The founder was a priest at St. Sebald's church, Herman von Stein. The other house for men was St. Peter's, the founding year of which is generally accepted as 1329. St. Peter's lay on the route to Augsburg. Each of these houses had personnel to take care of the inmates.

The Council appointed a guardian (Pfleger) who was responsible for the maintenance of order in the particular house assigned to him. He supervised the manager of the house who was accountable to him. The guardian, who was usually a patrician, rendered an account to his fellow councilmen once a year concerning the financial and physical conditions of the endowed house assigned to him.

The guardian had the authority from the Council to place a resident on bread and water if that person was disobedient. If this action was of no help, then the wrongdoer was expelled from the house.

---


3 Eisen, *Christliche Liebestätigkeit*, p. 47.
The common life in these houses was similar to that of the monastics, except that residence in them was based on a commonality of disease. Pious Christians who wished to do good works frequently made charitable contributions to these endowments. Later the houses received some support from the preaching of indulgences. The inhabitants were expected to pray for such charitable donors every day. Medieval piety demanded that charity be done to these unfortunates who were thus removed from the activities of the world.

The money for the maintenance of these houses came from many sources: bequests, pious endowments, and the possessions and begging of the members. Money was donated in large or small amounts, and the houses received food, clothing, and drink as gifts. The residents ate reasonably well, especially on holidays. They had meat, fish, vegetables, beer, and wine, depending upon the day of the week. It was decided that the care in these endowments was for citizens and inhabitants of the city and not for strangers, who received care there for only a short time.⁴

Europe had a strong increase in leprosy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This was probably brought back by returning crusaders and pilgrims from Palestine. However, there were leprosy houses in Metz, Verdun, and Maastricht in the seventh century. The great increase came from urbanization and increased mobility which spread this disease over Europe.

The early signs of leprosy were a white spotted skin, whitened hair, and falling out of the hair. The disease became progressively worse. There was no idea as to a cure and the major solution was to isolate immediately the individual who contracted it. The person had to be present at a church ceremony with the reading of the mass for the dead. During the service, the leper kneeled, covered with a black cloth, or lay upon a bier as a dead person would. After this ceremony, the person was accompanied to the grave-yard where he climbed down into a grave having several shovels full of dirt thrown

5Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 35.

upon him. This early ceremony shows the extent of isolation that the society placed upon this disease. Later this rather gruesome method was discontinued. It was little used if at all in Nuremberg. Yet in Nuremberg the diseased individual was immediately separated from the community after a doctor's report verifying the condition. The person was then placed in one of the four quarantine houses outside the walls of the city. These houses were between one quarter to one half an hour's walk from the city and were placed on the four major roads crossing at Nuremberg.

The houses were never crowded. There were usually not more than twelve inmates. But the number of residents in each of these houses constantly changed. St. John's in the early 1500's had fifteen individuals in 1543 and in 1544 the number sank to eight. In 1609 and 1610 it rose again to seventeen persons, and in 1630 ten persons were there. Towards the middle of the 1600's there seem to have been no residents, and toward the end of the 1600's there were two. In the 1700's there were usually seven or eight. St. Jobst in 1445 numbered ten persons. In 1575

7Ulhorn, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 259.
St. Jobst had thirty-one residents. During the 1600's the number was between three and nineteen. St. Peter's had in the early 1500's about six or seven. This number climbed to fifteen and seventeen in the later 1500's. In the early 1600's, St. Peter's had between thirteen and fifteen residents. This number dropped to eight in the later 1600's and St. Peter's usually contained only two or three in the 1700's. St. Leonard's in the early 1600's had about eleven members. In the 1700's the average was two or three poor women. These houses experienced a slow drop in population and began to serve other functions in the 1700's. With Nuremberg's absorption by Bavaria in 1806, these four houses were given to other agencies. Today only St. Jobst still has some part of the buildings standing. The other houses have disappeared.

The lepers had their own distinctive clothing, a woolen undergarment, covered with a mantle-type cape, and a felt hat. They carried a begging sack in one hand along


with a rosary, and a pilgrim's staff in the other. They shook a wooden bell, extending their begging sacks attached to their staves. The costume changed with the times but it served the function of warning the people to keep their distances.

Concerning the specific inner direction of these places, we know very little. However, the general life can be described. The management of the individual house was under a housemaster, later also called a housefather. For the women there was a housemistress or housemother. There were also a keeper of supplies, a cook, a person who bathed the sick, a sexton, and various others as they were needed. With regard to their spiritual care, St. Jobst already in the 1300's had either its own chaplain or one from St. Egydien's monastery. St. Leonard's being under the care of the St. Lorenz church and St. John's had its own chaplain.

The everyday life in these houses was similar in rules and regulations to the other charitable foundations in Nuremberg, the major difference being the begging which

---

10 Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 46.
11 Lochner, Reformationsgeschichte, p. 187.
these lepers were sometimes permitted to do in the city and sometimes in front of their church doors. These people were, with certain restrictions, permitted to come into the city to sing and to beg. They were compelled to leave the city again within a set time.\footnote{Ibid., p. 189.}

Whatever property these people had belonged to the house, either what they brought with them when they came or what they collected with their begging. A resident had to draw up a will leaving three quarters of his property to the house; and if there was no will, then, all of the property belonged to the house. The wills had to be properly notarized. If a person was expelled from one of these houses, then his property was confiscated.

The residents could not leave the house overnight without the permission of the housemaster. "Without express permission, a member could not go out, either into the city or the fields. Everyone must be in his house by sundown."\footnote{Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 49.} When a leper wanted to travel or to wander, the housemaster would give him fourteen days leave of absence. If the person needed to look after his
inheritance or undertake a pilgrimage,\textsuperscript{14} he could keep his place in the house, otherwise he lost it.

Especial note was taken in the rules of all four houses concerning chastity. The women residents could have no familiar conversation with the males upon the streets. Unchastity was punished by the losing of membership at a house. The restrictions in the men's houses of St. Jobst and St. Peter were in many ways stricter than for the women.\textsuperscript{15} If a resident had an affair with any of the serving women in the house, he would be cast out. At St. Peter's the rules were so strict that there could be no pictures of women, young or old.\textsuperscript{16}

Besides giving all possessions to the house, there were many other regulations to which a new member had to adhere. Upon his admittance, the person made a vow; and if it was discovered that he had broken it, he was cast out of the house and not again accepted. To be chaste and

\textsuperscript{14} Johnann Christian Siebenkees, Materialien zur Nürnberger Geschichte (4 Vols.; Nürnberg: 1792-1795), II, p. 416 (Hereinafter referred to as Siebenkees, Materialien).

\textsuperscript{15} Eisen, Christliche Liebestüchtigkeit, p. 49.

\textsuperscript{16} Mummenhoff, "Die öffentliche Gesundheits," p. 90.
pure for the remainder of his days was considered a duty. Strong punishment was threatened for any violations.

The patrician guardian, the housemaster, and other personnel in each house were expected to keep order, be obedient, and piously care for the sick. At St. Peter's, the guardian was expected to choose from amongst the members the person who was the most God-fearing, just, and religious to be a master of the sick. This person in turn would be responsible for the piety in the house and make sure of the obedience of its members. If a housemaster should neglect his duties, then the guardian had to remove him and the inhabitants had fourteen days during which time they were to choose a different housemaster. If after this length of time no new housemaster was chosen, then the supplies to the house were cut off until they did choose one. The housemaster was responsible to the guardian that the house was well cared for. Without the knowledge and consent of the housemaster no member could

17 Ibid., p. 91.
18 Eisen, Christliche Liebe, p. 48.
19 Siebenkœx, Materialien, p. 414.
keep anything in his possession. The housemaster was responsible that the residents pray daily. Every member at St. Jobst's had to say seven Paternosters and seven Ave Marias.\textsuperscript{20} Disobedience to the housemaster was punished by a money fine. If some one swore, for example, he did not receive his usual allotment of bread for eight days. The housemaster must make sure that no one died without receiving the sacraments. The rules also contained hygienic regulations. No leper could go into the rooms or kitchens of healthy people.\textsuperscript{21}

After being accepted, the individual could bring into the house with him a bed, table cloths, hand towels, a dish, a pint mug, two simple pewter spoons, and two pewter plates for his own use. Upon the death of the person, those items became the property of the house. It was customary for the sick to bathe every fourteen days. If they wished to do so more often, they had to pay for the firewood to heat the water. Two days before the bathing time the housemaster was to inquire of the sexton if he had acquired the necessary wood supply and the

\textsuperscript{20}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 416.

\textsuperscript{21}Eisen, \textit{Christliche Liebestätigkeit}, p. 49.
bathing master was ordered to put the materials for bathing into the customary order.

The residents could receive visitors, such as relatives, only with the explicit knowledge of the house-master; and as soon as the business was taken care of, the visitor must leave. No woman was permitted to stay in the men's houses and no men were permitted to stay in the women's houses as patients.

The word used in Nuremberg to designate a leper was Sondersiech, someone whose sickness had sundered him from normal society. The house was a Kobel, which meant a large house without a courtyard. The word used for each of these four endowed houses was Sondersiechkobel. The regular German word for leper is Aussetz. The word Aussetz comes from the phrase, "aus der menschlichen Gesellschaft hinausgesetzt," that is, "removed from human society." Physicians had nothing to offer these diseased people except rest, and, negatively, the avoidance of spreading the contagion to other people.

\[22\text{Mummenhoff, "Die Öffentliche Gesundheits," p. 92.}\]
\[23\text{Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 36.}\]
For those lepers who did not have a membership in one of the houses and who had to beg around the countryside, there was established a special charity initiated by a preacher, Master Nicholas of the Heilig Geist Hospital. Three women were so moved by his words that they made an endowment for this charity. These three were N. Unslingen, Anna Grundherr, and Anna Neydung. The latter two women were from patrician families. The special charity was for non-citizen lepers. On three days, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday before Easter, these people were allowed into the city and given food, drink, and clothing. The number increased so quickly that the Council discontinued it in 1401. But there was a bad outbreak of the plague soon thereafter and this was taken as God's judgment so that the special charity was reinstituted for the lepers. In 1462 there were 600 persons present. There was a building erected for this purpose where the doctors inspected the sick. This inspection was called the Sondersiechenschau in the records. The dates of the

---

24Lochner, Reformationsgeschichte, pp. 194-96.
building are 1446 and 1448.\footnote{Eisen, \textit{Christliche Liebestätigkeit}, p. 41.} It was built through the direction of the city building master, Hannas Graser. The building is today called the \textit{Weinstadel}.\footnote{Reick, \textit{Geschichte Nürnberg}, p. 592.} It has been restored from the damage of the Second World War and is now being used as a cafeteria and living quarters for students. By 1574 there were approximately 3,000 of these individuals in the city for Easter week.\footnote{Eisen, \textit{Christliche Liebestätigkeit}, p. 44.} At this time the Council decided to transfer the \textit{Schau}, or inspection of the sick lepers, to St. John's, the leper house to the west and outside the walls of Nuremberg. It did this out of fear of contagion from so many sick people.\footnote{Rüger, \textit{Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen}, p. 25.} The visits were discontinued during the Thirty Years' War.

The year of the Leprosy Charity Ordinance is 1448,\footnote{The first of the \textit{Almosenordnungen} for the lepers is contained in the STA: cod. man. 31.4° "Der sonder-siechen. Ursprung und Stiftung Anno 1394." This book was not written until 1462.} with the various leper houses having their own ordinance dates. Flour had to be ground at the right time and
clothing cut and sewn so as to be ready. The amount of money available was increased in 1495 when Hannes Stark bequeathed 200 gulden for this endowment. The Nützel family endowed 300 pans of salted fish each year and later increased the amount.\textsuperscript{31} There were also special letters of indulgence and other endowments given for this annual event. The lepers were inspected by doctors and their confessions were heard by the priests on Wednesday through Friday before Easter and then with their certificate of disease they received their food, drink, and new clothing.

Since 1462, there were more men than women at this event. During the Thirty Years' War, the inspection was discontinued, but it was re instituted in 1654. The last time the leper inspection was held was the year 1663 when there were 242 people involved. After that time this eleemosynary effort was discontinued because of the gradual drop in actual cases of leprosy. The leper show of Easter week had its own guardian appointed out of the Council's membership and he was personally responsible for the orderliness with which this event was conducted.

The guardian for the arrival of the Lepers during Easter Week in 1520 and 1521 was Peter Imhof, the elder. Jorg Wetzol served as the guardian from 1523 through 1529. L. Shurstab and S. Gross were assigned to aid Jorg Ketzel for the event in 1527 to take on the things that were too much for Ketzel to handle. The Council demanded on February 13, 1524, that the Easter activities be more orderly that year. On March 22, 1525, Council gave explicit instructions that the five doctors who did the examining should receive two gulden apiece and that the afflicted individuals could have communion in either religion that they wished. The guardian was to give out lard along with other food as alms in the churchyard. In December of 1528, the Council was concerned that order be kept and not so many beggars be received at the next Easter Week.

32Amterbächlein, Nos. 40-49.
33Amterbächlein, No. 47. Noted in the margin.
34RV 700, f. 35 r., February 13, 1524.
35RV 714, f. 17 r., March 22, 1525.
36RV 764, f. 12 v., December 12, 1528.
The guardian of St. Jobst for 1520 and 1523 was Wolf Bomer. The Council noted that Bomer as guardian on October 5, 1521, had some difficulty with the Carthusian monastery but the Council left the guardian to work out the problem. On January 2, 1524, the Council had to choose a new guardian because Wolf Bomer had retired. Five councilmen selected three men, Clement Volkamer, Bernhardt Baumgartner, and Christoph Coler, and from among these three Clement Volkamer was chosen as guardian to St. Jobst. On April 27, 1528, Clement Volkamer retired. Another selection was made with five men again picking three more men, Nicholas Groland, Wolff Stromer, and Hanns Retter, and out of these three names Nicholas Groland was chosen as guardian. The Council took care of an old priest who, because of his long service at

37Amterbüchlein, Nos. 40-42.
38RV 668, f. 16 r., October 5, 1521.
39RV 698, f. 9 r., January 2, 1524. Amterbuchlein, Nos. 43-48.
40RV 756, f. 18 v., April 27, 1528.
41RV 756, f. 19 r., April 27, 1528; RB 14 f. 196 r., April 27, 1528.
St. Jobst, was given a benefice, and the guardian was enjoined to produce the money for this.\textsuperscript{42}

The Council had the problem of admissions. A Jorg Steinpuhler said he wanted his son examined for leprosy; and if he had it, he should be kept at St. Jobst.\textsuperscript{43} The Council ordered that in Hans Stempuhl's case diligence be used either to bring him into a lepers' house there or take the money from St. Jobst and use it for placing him in a foreign house.\textsuperscript{44} In two cases regarding burial of the dead, the Council determined that they were to be interred in the St. Jobst cemetery.\textsuperscript{45} The Council gave citizenship rights to Lorentz Staubers, a poor man from Erlenstegen, and with that it gave also ten or twelve gulden to the foundation of St. Jobst so that he could be admitted there.\textsuperscript{46} The Council in August, 1524, however, admitted a poor leather craftsman to St. Jobst without the

\textsuperscript{42}RV 662, f. 6 r., April 10, 1521.
\textsuperscript{43}RV 663, f. 1 v., May 2, 1521.
\textsuperscript{44}RV 665, f. 23 v., July 23, 1521.
\textsuperscript{45}RV 669, f. 4 v., October 19, 1521; RV 671, f. 22 v., January 7, 1522.
\textsuperscript{46}RV 669, f. 14 r., October 6, 1523.
payment of a fee.\textsuperscript{47} The Council took care of the city personnel. The person at the hospital who became leprous was admitted to St. Jobst and given citizenship.\textsuperscript{48}

The preacher at St. Jobst, one N. Dolhophen, was given an income of forty-five gulden yearly in January, 1526.\textsuperscript{49} The Council concerned itself with the inmates of St. Jobst and issued two directives to the guardian to improve their condition in February and in May of 1526.\textsuperscript{50}

The pastor at St. Jobst was reprimanded by Council on August 1, 1527, for disobeying the Council's rules in regard to giving services to non-inmates.\textsuperscript{51} The bather at St. Jobst was given a money income yearly in order to pay the rent on his small house.\textsuperscript{52} The preacher at St. Jobst received his reprimand on September 2, 1527.\textsuperscript{53} Clement

\textsuperscript{47}RV 707, f. 8 r., August 29, 1524.
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Volkamer, the guardian, made an accounting for the institution which was acceptable to the Council.\textsuperscript{54} It decided to allow a request by one Jorg Geuder that he receive ten gulden from St. Jobst for his support at another place.\textsuperscript{55} The Council was not ungenerous with such petitions but usually the circumstances, such as service to the city, determined whether the petitions would be granted.

The St. John's house had two guardians in this eight-year period. The first was Peter Imhof, the Elder, who on November 6, 1522, requested the Council to accept his accountancy and resignation. He felt that a change in management would be beneficial.\textsuperscript{56} The Council thereupon appointed Jorg Ketzel in Imhof's place.\textsuperscript{57} Council had a woman transferred from the new hospital to St. John's to be cared for there.\textsuperscript{58} Another poor woman was given
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citizenship so that she could be admitted there. The Council allowed Jorg Ketzel, the guardian, to accept a poor woman who was not a citizen. Bernhart Preminger, who was the priest at St. John's, was asked by the Council why he was not fulfilling his duties there as directed by his benefice. The Council wanted to know why he was not saying masses for the poor inmates. In an item of March 23, 1525, the Council referred to him as Virgilius Premninger and spoke of him receiving a salary of ten gulden every year for three years. The Council asked the guardian to straighten out the situation so that Premninger got his payments. The Council was careful in dealing with the preacher at St. John's, as shown by the fact that on March 23, 1527, it wanted to know about his behavior at the institution. One Sebald Bower was trying to recover his benefice and at first the Council demanded that it be
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put in the Common Chest and denied his request.64 On April 8, 1527, Council decided to give Bower the forty gulden from the benefice of St. John's.65 Jorg Ketzel, the guardian, had a maid who served there whom he wanted as his wife. The Council determined that she should serve out the duration of her contract and then it would consider the request.66

St. Peter's leper house in these years was mentioned very infrequently by the Council. There were two guardians during these eight years. The first was Hieronymus Holzschuher who served from 1520 until July 11, 1525, when upon his own request he was relieved of the duties of guardianship. The Council made known its gratitude for his service.67 Sebastian Schedel took over the guardianship in 1525 and held it through 1529.68 The Council gave a Hans Schwiner citizenship so that he could
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be accepted in St. Peter's. It debated allowing Endres Siber admittance to St. Peter's but it gave him citizenship when he paid for entrance. The building master was ordered to continue building the waterway at St. Peter's, and Jorg Ketzels opinion, as guardian, was asked for by the Council on this matter. This was taken up again on July 1, 1523. The Council took all the building maintenance under close supervision. A Master Gilgen was to be investigated to find if he were sick or not; and if he were found unsound, he was to be accepted in St. Peter's. On May 10, 1525, Master Gilgen was received at St. Peter's and required to go to the religious services as the other inmates did. Some of the benefice money should be returned to his wife at his death. The vicar of St. Peter's was to be given his benefice with an open hand. The amount
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was five gulden yearly and was from the account of St. Egydien.\textsuperscript{75}

The leprosy house of St. Leonard had two guardians during this time, 1521-1528; Wilhelm Schlusselfelder from 1520 until 1523\textsuperscript{76} and Martin Pfintzing from 1524 through 1529.\textsuperscript{77} The Council was concerned that a leprous girl from Hamburg should be taken in at St. Leonard's but kept at the expense of St. Jobst's foundation.\textsuperscript{78} The Council had some difficulty finding a priest for St. Leonard's. They found Wolfgang Zagell and gave him citizenship and he served as priest.\textsuperscript{79} The Council was concerned that the account books of St. Leonard's be inspected by the guardian and the church master of St. Lorenz.\textsuperscript{80} The priest at St. Leonard's priets's request for Schwabach beer was granted.\textsuperscript{81} And the request for wine was made often.
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The priest at St. Leonard's was presented with wine.\textsuperscript{82} The chaplain at St. Leonard's respectfully requested that wine or beer be given to the sick at the price of ten guldens.\textsuperscript{83} That was in January of 1526. In May the Council said that the chaplain could give the inmates beer but he had to be sure that it went only to the people at St. Leonard's\textsuperscript{84} On July 29, 1527, the Council said that if Martin Pfintzing, the guardian, wanted it then beer should be presented to St. Leonard's.\textsuperscript{85} The Council also protected the inmates. A peasant who was annoying them was told that if he continued to do this he would be placed in the prison as punishment.\textsuperscript{86}

The distress about the wine occurred because when the four houses had received frequent donations the inmates became rowdy. On May 22, 1523, the Council forbade any one to give wine to any of the four houses and
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forbade the priests in these houses also to make presents of such wine. 87

The Council would often command the doctors to check if some one was leprous. 88 One poor woman from Gastenhof was ordered examined by a sworn doctor to find out if she was leprous or not. 89 A citizen's child whose condition was uncertain was to be examined for leprosy and to be kept in one of the houses. 90 With a Hans Loder, who was sick, the nature of his illness could not be determined so he was put in one of the four houses. 91 The doctors of medicine were ordered on April 16, 1526, to observe several people in the leper houses to see if they were free of the disease. 92 With a Hans Loder who was sick, the nature of his illness could not be determined so he was given citizenship and was placed in a leper house. 93 The Council
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considered the idea of consolidating some of the four leper houses and thereby lessening the great cost of them, but did not do so.94 On October 24, 1526, the doctors were ordered to observe if a poor boy was leprous or not.95 Another boy was to be watched by the doctors in November, 1526.96 The doctors were ordered to observe a poor woman to see if she was leprous.97 If one Hans Zumerman's wife were found leprous, she should be taken into one of the houses.98 Several people in the New hospital, who were found to be leprous, were moved to the proper houses.99 An official at Elwangen wrote requesting that the doctors observe the master cook from there to see if he was a leper or not.100 The doctors said that another poor person was indeed leprous.101
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The Council had the most entries for St. Jobst's and St. Leonhard's. St. Peter's and St. John's are mentioned less frequently than the other two houses. There was an increase in Council's concern as shown by the large increase in entries concerning lepers in 1525 and thereafter. It appears that the Council took more of its time to supervise these houses. The investigations by the doctors of cases of possible leprosy increase at the time of the 1525 Reformation. The Council thereby took increasing responsibility for these people which can be seen by the number of instances that it discusses these matters in its daily work. There was increasing emphasis on regularity and orderliness. The Council appears to have seen a need which did not seem to have been as carefully handled before the Reformation. Certainly the Council had long had control over the four leper house foundations but there was not the same amount of detailed consideration as in 1525 and thereafter. The Council had a surge of interest in getting these afflicted people off the streets and under proper care. Later in the century there was increased emphasis by the Council on church
attendance by the lepers.\textsuperscript{102} This increased sense of civic duty towards the lepers is manifested in Council's daily routine of business rather than in any official pronouncement. The leper inspection at Easter week continued but the Council was more stringent in its supervision of the activities. The Reformation did not break up the leper foundations; on the contrary it seems to have brought more of the Council's attention to bear on the lepers' problems which produced more strict regulation of their activities.

\textbf{The Plague Hospital}

The St. Sebastian's hospital was established for victims of the plague. It was situated outside the walls and south of the St. John's house for lepers which was on the route to Frankfurt. St. Sebastian's lay alongside the Pegnitz riverbank, downstream from the city. The original bequest for its founding came from the testament of a Nuremberg citizen, Konrad Toppler, who had died several years before in 1490.\textsuperscript{103} He was childless, wealthy, and a
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member of Nuremberg's patriciate. He left a sum of money that the Council could use as it saw fit for the honoring of God. There were also other bequests, such as one giving twenty domiciled poor (hausarme) one shilling each per week. The remainder, after all the other amounts were spent, was about 5,000 gulden. There were four administrators for Toppler's Testament: Sebald Schreyer, Sigmund Pessler, Konrad and Leonhard Marstaller. These men were listed in November 22, 1490, by name. The most important of these four men was Sebald Schreyer. It was he who really applied the money left by Toppler to the planning and building of a house for victims of the plague. Schreyer's family was not from the patriciate of Nuremberg, although he became connected with it through marriage. He was well educated and well traveled, especially in Italy. He returned to Nuremberg where he took up the furrier business which had been his father's.

The idea of the building was well received as being praiseworthy, healthy, and necessary. It would be a house that would have a perpetual income where citizens and

\[104\]Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 53.

\[105\]Mommenhoff, "Die Öffentliche Gesundheits," p. 98.
strangers who caught the plague could be cared for in the necessary ways. However, in order to prevent further contagion, it was important that it be built outside the city's walls.

St. Sebastian's was built near the Weiden mill, close to the Pegnitz. It was a stone building approximately 220 feet long, 90 feet wide, and 30 feet tall. Men and women were carefully segregated into different sections.

The document concerning the foundation of St. Sebastian's mentioned that with no exceptions the guardian of the foundation and the people who drove the plague carts were to put signs on their horses and carts so that every one could identify them. The wagoners were to bring the afflicted into St. Sebastian's where either the afflicted could provide themselves with food, drink, and other essentials or it would be provided for them by the hospital. It was imperative for those who were convalescent to remain until the authorities obtained an opinion from the doctors certifying that they were healthy and thus would not infect other people upon their return into

---
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the city. The dead were gathered into specially marked wagons designated as plague vehicles and the bodies were carried to cemeteries outside the walls where they were buried. This transportation had to be done at a particular hour of the day.107

Like the lepers the plague victims were to be isolated except that recovery was possible from the plague but not so from leprosy. The hospital was opened only during an outbreak of the plague and closed at all other times.108 The spiritual life of the hospital was under the care of the main priests of St. Sebald and St. Lorenz churches. The administration of the sacraments was especially noted as being essential to the spiritual well being of these diseased people.109

None of the clothing and other articles that were brought in or used there by the plague victims could be

107 Ibid., p. 98.
108 Liermann, Stiftungsrechte, p. 308.
sold or given away. Another health measure was to burn in a nearby field all clothing that might have been contaminated. All that the doctors knew about cleanliness was put into practice, such as the order that all dung was to be removed from the front of houses in the city within three days.\textsuperscript{110}

The medical care for St. Sebastian's was set up by Sebald Schreyer and the other administrators to come from the Heilig Geist Hospital. The various doctors and pharmacists there were duty-bound to aid at St. Sebastian's when they were needed during a plague. The doctors were also responsible for all sanitary measures that were needed to prevent the spread of the plague.

The plague hospital had a master but the final responsibility for it lay with the City Council which named the various guardians and lesser managers when it was necessary. Hans Imhof, the Elder, was chosen as guardian for life on January 17, 1519; and on January 27, 1519, Imhof chose as his subordinate manager, Gilgen Kasspot. Kasspot was to receive one gulden a week

\textsuperscript{110}Mummenhoff, "Die öffentliche Gesundheits," pp. 99-100.
regularly and during times of plague he would get two gulden.\(^{111}\)

The guardianship of St. Sebastian's was not regarded as an especially honored office by the Council. On October 15, 1519, the Council asked Jorg Ketzel if he was interested in assuming the guardianship because various changes in hospital management needed to be made. However, he was not personally charged with visiting the house during plague times. On the contrary, he was to make the necessary improvements through the agency of other people. The Council itself promised to aid him in performing the required duties.\(^{112}\)

Although the building was begun in 1498, it took thirty years to complete the entire complex. There was a scarcity of building money and differences between Sebald Schreyer and the Council as to the exact method of construction. The cornerstone of the chapel was laid in 1509 and it was consecrated on June 14, 1513.\(^{113}\) Sebald Schreyer
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\(^{113}\)Ibid., p. 100.
retired as guardian in 1516. The buildings were not completed, but the overall arrangements and guidelines that he had laid down were followed. His death came on May 22, 1520.114 He was the last member of his family.

The Council insisted upon a division into two houses, one for men and one for women, so that there would be no improprieties. While Schreyer was still working on the construction, one of the changes ordered by the Council on June 27, 1514, was to give the already completed sections each a separate roof rather than one large roof as had earlier been decided and it ordered that workmen be found to complete this task. In the next year, the Council reaffirmed that the two divisions with their separate roofs would be a suitable arrangement in the future in time of plague. St. Sebastian's was effectually in operation from the year 1515. The chapel lay to the East. Sebald Schreyer had planned for an archway to connect the chapel to the rest of the complex.115 For the hopelessly sick, an exception was made regarding the segregation of the sexes. This caused some disquiet. However, by order

114 Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, p. 706.
of the Council, they were housed in the last building constructed. The house was constructed out of stone.\textsuperscript{116}

During the second Margrave's War of 1552, St. Sebastian's was burned as were other buildings which were outside the walls of the city. It was possible though to repair it after the end of the War in 1554 as it had been constructed of stone and not entirely destroyed.\textsuperscript{117} Two more houses were added in 1592.\textsuperscript{118}

In 1597, during a plague, the Council forbade the bringing of any feathers, bed clothing, and the like into the city.\textsuperscript{119} However, by the end of the 1600's the plagues had subsided and the hospital began to be used for other illnesses. In 1801 there were only seven beds in use and the necessity for the hospital was so low in priority that some of its furnishings, especially the kitchen apparatus, were turned over to the syphilitic house. Although St. Sebastian's continued to be used as an infectious disease hospital, epileptics and others were received
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there. The residents in 1847 were approximately 61 men and 112 women. The hospital was enlarged in 1898. The growth was continued into the 1900's but it developed into a modern new hospital, bearing little resemblance to the old plague buildings.

After the Reformation (1525) in Nuremberg, the administration of the hospital was assumed, in part, by the newly established Stadtalmosenamt. There was increased interest in cleanliness in this period because of the threat of plague epidemics. The plague wagons rumbled through the streets three times a day during bad plague times. The corpses were buried in the cemetery at St. John's and later, in 1518, they also were buried in the church yard of St. Rochus. The Council again ordered on May 8, 1520, that the clothing of infected people be
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burned and that nothing be sold or given away.124

At one time the period required for convalescence was three weeks but later it was decided that eight days were enough. Those who would not stay under supervision for this period were forbidden entrance to the city for the next four weeks. A pint of wine was given to convalescents to enhance their regaining of strength. In the first half of August, 1518, there was such a large crowd of plague victims that both churches in the city were asked to send out a full-time chaplain to the hospital. He was given a room there to hear confessions and make sure of the spiritual well-being of the sufferers. The Council paid his keep while the two churches were responsible for his salary. At the beginning of September, a special doorkeeper was appointed to keep the healthy from visiting the sick. However, in October the hospital became so filled that the Council began to send some of the sick to outlying villages where they received care.125

125 Ibid., p. 102.
On May 11, 1521, the Council announced that an administrator for St. Sebastian's was required. The men who were charged with producing candidates for this post were Hans Ebner, Caspar Baumgartner, Sigmund Führer, Wolf Stromer, and Hans Bender. From the names that were presented, Endres Tucher, Frederick Tetzel, and Lazarus Holzschuher, the one who was chosen was Tetzel. Again on January 27, 1523, a new guardian was needed and the Council chose Martin Tucher through the mediation of a relative, Anthony Tucher. Martin Tucher promised to do his duty to the Council and to administer the plague house. The job of guardian to this particular institution never attracted many applicants. Martin Tucher settled his accounts with the Council as guardian of St. Sebastian's on July 18, 1528. The Council on the same day stated that 'With the office of guardian of St. Sebastian the requirements were the same as with the
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leper houses." On September 26, 1528, an interim guardian, Joachim Haller, was appointed until a suitable permanent guardian was found. In 1529, the guardian is listed for St. Sebastian's as Christoph Coler. The turnover rate of officials for St. Sebastian's was high; and despite the Council's opinion that the plague house office was equivalent to that of the leper houses, there was difficulty in keeping suitable administrators.

The plague house was not even considered an attractive place by those who had to be inmates. However, a prisoner from Guaditzberg was sent into the hospital of St. Sebastian's. A person called Hans of Kreussen requested to be sent there. A sick child that was found outside the chapel of St. Moritz was consigned to the plague house by the Council. Conrad Bar was the priest who served in the plague hospital but he became
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sick and the Council had to make provisions for the plague victims to receive the sacraments until Bar was well again. 137

There were various imperial meetings held in Nuremberg and the Council was very concerned that the various visiting dignitaries should not be contaminated with the plague. Although the Council had previously decided not to open St. Sebastian's but simply put the sick in various places around the city, 138 the Council was forced into using St. Sebastian's to keep the city free from disease and disorder that might affect an important meeting of the Reichskammergericht. 139 The Council ordered a sick girl into the hospital because it did not want the Archbishop of Trier and his Court to feel disturbed. 140

The Cardinal of Salzburg was so impressed with Nuremberg's plague facilities that the Council ordered a copy of the ordinances for St. Sebastian's to be made up and given to
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The Council was now more willing to keep the house open and on March 5, 1522, ordered that the people working there be properly paid. Conrad Bar, the priest of St. Sebastian's, was to be paid on a weekly basis as long as it was required to keep the facilities open.

There were many ways in which the cost of the building of St. Sebastian's was taken care of. The master of the hospital was ordered to pay a building fee for fourteen days. A Hans Franckengumar was requested to give his alms to St. Sebastian's. The guardian of St. Sebastian's was permitted to borrow 500 gulden from the treasury for the hospital's account but this had to be paid back. Convinced that the plague house was filling an important need, the Council endeavored to find more
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money for it. Accordingly it decided that the people at all the marriage feasts should contribute something to its cost. The guardian was asked to remind all the preachers of this decision. The Council ordered the master of the Heilig Geist Hospital to save money on beer which should go to St. Sebastian's. There was an Ortel family foundation and the Council asked permission of Sigmund Ortel to divert this money for the common use at St. Sebastian's. Council had the customary funeral services discontinued at St. Sebastian's in order to save money which could be used in other ways. The money in another foundation, 380 gulden, was ordered to be given for the use of the building of St. Sebastian's. A foundation of twenty gulden was diverted to the building of St. Sebastian's. The Council showed great ingenuity
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at trying to acquire enough money to complete the plague house.

There is no indication that the Reformation affected St. Sebastian's except insofar as the religious services were changed. The Council was intent on filling a pressing need to remove contagion from the city. St. Sebastian's was not an old institution and therefore had few benefices and endowments. Those that it had needed to be supplemented by direct money aid from the Council.

**Charity for Syphilitics**

Syphilis was observed in Nuremberg by 1496.\(^{154}\)

Through a decision in October, 1496, the Council made provision for citizens and other inhabitants of the city who contracted this disease and who had no means of support. These people were taken into the Pilgrim Hospice of the Holy Cross which was just inside the wall on the road leading to Frankfurt. These diseased persons were to be taken care of as was necessary with food, drink, and a place to stay until the illness left them. If they insisted upon wandering off, then they would have to leave

---
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the city; and on their return, they were required first to go back into the hospice to be declared in sound health.\textsuperscript{155}

In the beginning there was only one room set aside for these people at the Holy Cross Hospice. In the second half of November, 1496, their number had increased to the point where a second room was necessary to contain them. The Council sent the city doctors to care for the afflicted and the cost of all this was borne by the city. The healing of this disease was quite difficult; and, after a period of time, it became apparent that it was most often unsuccessful. In 1499 the Council instructed the guardian of the Holy Cross Hospice as to the amount of time these diseased people must spend there. After two months, they were to be examined and found either sound or still sick. If they were sick, then the care for them was to be continued. The expenses regarding their keep is noted in an order of 1502 from the Council which said that each person should receive in the future for their noon meal: a soup and one quarter pound of meat, and for the evening meal,

\textsuperscript{155}Hummenhoff, "Die Öffentliche Gesundheits," pp. 103-104.
a soup or a vegetable and also an allotment of bread. In addition they were provisioned with the necessary firewood and medicine. 156

In the common language of Nuremberg, syphilis was referred to as Franzosen Krankheit, or the "French Sickness." 157 The syphilitics were forbidden to enter the public baths of the city. The Council tried to halt the spread of the infection and the toll gate keepers were instructed in 1497 to turn away all strangers who appeared to be either syphilitic or plague diseased. 158 Also the lepers who begged in the city on All Saints' Day and other holy days, if they had syphilis, were in this same year not to be permitted entrance to the city. Instead they were sent to the cemetery of St. John's where they received firewood and millet gruel. 159
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The care of the syphilitics was transferred from the Pilgrim Hospice of Holy Cross to a small house on the east side of the Saumarkt which was an island in the Pegnitz River inside the city. When this place was burned down by 1509, the patients were put into another house on the Saumarkt. It did not contain a large hall. Instead most of the place consisted of a large kitchen. A room for the patients was erected on a wall beside the Pegnitz River. They remained here on the Saumarkt island in their own barracks-type quarters until 1523.160

The syphilitics had a particular overseer, Leonhard Held, appointed in 1513, who was responsible for the upkeep of the buildings and the care of the sick. There was a second house for syphilitics established about 1516 at the Teichelmeister Hof for which Leonhard Held was also responsible.161 He had several subordinates to help him and they were all paid by the city for their work. There was the assumption that both places would accept only citizens and inhabitants of Nuremberg as patients.

160 Ibid., p. 104.
The syphilitics had to wear a badge in order to receive the city's protection and charity.\(^{162}\) The badge signified that the person had been checked and certified sick by one of the city's doctors.

The Council provided these afflicted people with occasional refreshment. In 1521, an employee of the Haller business firm in Bamberg diluted grape wine by mixing into it pear wine. This was in four large containers. For this act a fine was imposed on him which he did not pay, with the result that the syphilitics received the diluted mixture from the Council as a gift.\(^{163}\)

In 1522, Leonhard Held, as supervisor, gave one gulden to Master Friedrich Pflock, a royal doctor, for every success that Pflock achieved in curing individuals of the disease. The money came from the funds of the St. Jobst House for lepers and from other such endowments. In 1525 Master Pflock received 100 gulden to practice his medicine on these unfortunates.\(^{164}\)

\(^{162}\) Reicke, *Geschichte Nürnberg*, p. 824.


\(^{164}\) RV 687, f. 10 r., March 7, 1523; cf. RV 687 f. 7 v.
On May 4, 1523, the Council decreed that the syphilitics should be removed from the houses inside the walls and moved to the plague complex of St. Sebastian outside the walls to be cared for there until a building could be constructed for them in the vicinity of St. Sebastian's. It was built north of the St. Sebastian complex. It is not known precisely when the building was erected but it was not made of stone as was St. Sebastian's. It was of Fachwerkbau, a combination of a wooden frame with walls of woven splints that were plastered over. This burned down in 1573. At the time of its rebuilding, it was done in stone and enlarged with two more rooms. The differences between the syphilitic house and St. Sebastian were gradually blurred so that the result was a complex of buildings referred to as St. Sebastian's.

The establishment of a new place for syphilitic victims occurred in the following way. On May 4, 1523, the Council ordered "... the people sick with syphilis

165 RV 689, f. 22 v., May 4, 1523.
166 Jegel, "Nürnberg Gesundheitsfürsorge," p. 16.
167 Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, p. 593.
to be brought to the St. Sebastian lazaret for their healing and care until a new place can be built for them."\textsuperscript{168} And on May 13, the Council recommended ". . . observation of the lazaret and the land around it to see if it would be possible to place the /building for the/ syphilitics here."\textsuperscript{169} Then on May 21, "The assembled Council decided to place the new syphilitic hospital between St. Sebastian's and the Weiden Mill. Further advice should be given on the manner of building."\textsuperscript{170} These three brief entries show the rapidity of the decision to move and build a new syphilitic hospital. The motivation of the Council for placing the syphilitics with the plague victims was to remove contagion from the city and also indicates that there was reason to expect some recovery, unlike among the lepers.

The inmates of the syphilitic houses were noted by the Council. "Leonhard Held said that a youth, who was not leprous, was accepted by the syphilitic house."\textsuperscript{171}

\textsuperscript{168}RV 689, f. 22 r., May 4, 1523.
\textsuperscript{169}RV 690, f. 7 r., May 13, 1523.
\textsuperscript{170}RV 690, f. 14 v., May 21, 1523.
\textsuperscript{171}RV 666, f. 16 v., August 16, 1521.
Leonhard Held was the administrator. The Bishop of Trent requested that the Council take into the syphilitic house a young member of his Court and the Bishop would pay the alms for the boy's expenses. The Council thereupon told Leonhard Held to follow the bishop's wishes in this case.¹⁷² Several housemaids caught the disease and the Council gave them alms funds so that they could be treated.¹⁷³ Leonhard Held and Werner Tachtecker had a disagreement over how much alms Tachtecker had received from Held.¹⁷⁴ The priest at St. Sebastian's, Conrad Freyer, requested permission to give wine to the syphilitics. The Council permitted him to give them one pint of wine apiece but enjoined him to make sure that no one else received any of the wine.¹⁷⁵ Duke Aurach requested from the Council a place in the syphilitic house for a diseased person. The duke's request was turned down by the Council

¹⁷²RV 702, f. 14 v., April 12, 1524.
¹⁷³RV 695, f. 17 v.; RV 694, f. 1 v.; RV 714 f. 10 r.
¹⁷⁴RV 719, f. 18 v., July 31, 1525.
¹⁷⁵RV 704, f. 13 r., June 9, 1524.
because there was no empty place. The Council also refused the requests of Wolf Stromer and Albert Lasch for a place for a syphilitic person but the Council gave him some alms instead. The Council took up the case of Anna Freutzin from Coburg. On April 23, 1526, the Council said that Leonhard Held should review her case because she had served in the city for thirteen years. On April 28, the Council gave her two gulden for her treatment. Then on July 20, the Council told Leonhard Held to receive Anna Freutzin into the syphilitic house.

The Council admonished Held for allowing a poor fellow to lie uncared for in the syphilitic house. One poor sick man had been recommended but the Council refused him admittance. The Council's opinion was that it was not appropriate to take in a foreigner and thereby possibly

176 RV 704, f. 5 r., May 31, 1524.
177 RV 710, f. 6 v., November 17, 1524.
178 RV 729, f. 25 v., April 23, 1526.
179 RV 729, f. 30 r., April 28, 1526.
180 RV 722, f. 17 v., July 20, 1526.
181 RV 756, f. 25 r., May 2, 1528.
displace a citizen. However, he was given money. There were many requests for admission that were either accepted or rejected by the Council. A Fritz Zeiler's request was accepted, as well as many other such common admissions. The Council became concerned with the mixture of diseases at St. Sebastian's and ordered that new houses for the syphilitics be constructed, one for men and one for women. The Council was also concerned for any damage that might occur during a war so it had decided to build St. Sebastian's out of stone, thus making it less liable to damage. The houses for the syphilitics on the other hand were constructed of wood. The Council wanted to use at St. Sebastian's construction methods similar to those that had been used at the Heilig Geist Hospital.

The Council was informed of a doctor, Jorg Elikhofer, who was reputed to have some skill in treating

182RV 751, f. 24 r., June 3, 1528.
183RV 759, f. 4 r., July 13, 1528.
184RV 760, f. 14 r., August 20, 1528; RV 745, f. 18 v.; RV 744, f. 23 r.; RV 747, f. 14 f.; RV 747, f. 11 r.
185RB 13, f. 228 v.-229 r., January 31, 1527.
186RV 741, f. 9 v., March 15, 1257.
syphilis, but it was not willing to permit this doctor to practice at St. Sebastian's.\textsuperscript{187} The Council generously gave the workmen on the new building and the poor inmates a ration of beer.\textsuperscript{188} The Council thanked Leonhard Held for his diligent work with the syphilitics at St. Sebastian's and noted that in his work, there were no shortcomings.\textsuperscript{189}

There was considerable growth during these eight years (1521-28) with the syphilitics being moved out of the city and near to St. Sebastian's, for both hospitals were for the cure of contagious diseases. The Council was just completing the plague house and there was a certain logic in putting the syphilitics near the plague victims in order to save money and not duplicate facilities. The Council paid increasing attention to the syphilitic house during this period. The number of cases and the time taken up by them in Council increased.

It is difficult to determine the impact of the Reformation in the Council's treatment of the syphilitics.

\textsuperscript{187}RV 750, f. 14 r., November 17, 1527.

\textsuperscript{188}RV 743, f. 26 r., May 17, 1527.

\textsuperscript{189}RV 751, f. 21 r., December 27, 1527.
The increased attention and new quarters given by the Council could mean simply an increase in the spread of the disease, but also this was a direct money expense by the Council which was in keeping with its more careful attention to other charities, such as St. Sebastian's. The Council definitely assumed more financial and administrative responsibility for the treatment of the syphilitics during this period thereby centralizing more control over this charity in the hands of the Council.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE ORPHANAGES AND OTHER CHARITIES

The Nuremberg orphanage endowment was probably one of the oldest in Europe. At first the city's orphans were usually taken in by the convents and then by the Heilig Geist Hospital which was founded in 1339 by Konrad Gross. Since the hospital accepted maternity cases and in quite a number of these the mother died, the hospital was often left caring for the newborn babies. The oldest mention in the records of the orphanages for both boys and girls is from the year 1359 when Bernhard von Neuenmart, a Nuremberg merchant, in his testament of June 21 of that year, left a bequest of a yearly income from rents and other sources. Bequests to other city charities from

1 Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, p. 188.

various citizens normally included something for the orphans. That was the manner in which the endowment grew. On November 27, 1354, Heinrich Hunetz gave the income from the sale of some land to the orphanages. In the same year, Ludwig Osterman gave to the orphans of the parish of St. Sebald one Haller pound.\(^3\)

The orphanage for boys received appreciably more of such gifts than did that of the girls. This is perhaps because the boys evoked more sympathy with their plight. The girls' orphanage possessed a house on Maxplatz which was noted in the sources from the year 1425, at least. The orphanage guardian, Konrad Baumgartner, acquired from the medical doctor, Peter Rainhaimer, three houses and a garden for the girls' home. This was located in St. Sebald's parish.\(^4\) The boys' home was in St. Lorenz parish, situated on Breite Gasse. After the girls' home was completely destroyed by fire in 1557, they were moved to the one-time Franciscan monastery on the bank of the Pegnitz River opposite the Heilig

\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 104-105.

\(^4\)Ibid., pp. 104-105.
Geist Hospital. The Barfusser or Franciscan monks had been dissolved in Nuremberg in 1525 during the religious Reformation. The monks who wished to remain could do so. When the orphanage was transferred to the monastery in 1557, there were still two monks residing there. They protested against having their tranquility disturbed. The orphans were put in the eastern part of the Monastery.

In 1560 the boys' orphanage was moved here from its Breite Gasse location. By placing both orphanages in the Franciscan building, there could be a cut in costs by reducing the staff from about sixteen to ten people. For example, each orphanage had had its own dairy as part of its building complex. In this new common setting, many such duplications could be eliminated. Even in the Franciscan monastery building, however, the boys and the girls were kept carefully separated, each group even having its own playground. Only with the caring for the milk cows was there any mingling of sexes.

---

5Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 85.
8Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 85.
In the worst years of the Thirty Years' War, an enlargement of the orphanage became necessary because of the greater number of abandoned children during these years. There was, though, no great change in the building complex until after the great fire of 1671. At that time the children were moved across the Pegnitz River into the Heilig Geist Hospital temporarily. The city treasury was exhausted by war and it was several years before they could afford to rebuild the homes for the orphans. After the government of Bavaria occupied Nuremberg, the orphanage building was sold for 5,000 gulden in 1807. This new government did not make adequate provision for the 100 or more children there and the orphans suffered as a consequence. However, by 1819, the city magistrates again administered the orphanage and the children were again well cared for. What had once been the Franciscan monastery is now part of the Erlangen-Nuremberg University. After the orphanages no longer used part of the buildings, one section of the monastery served as a jail, during the years 1670 to 1700.

---

9Ibid., p. 86.
10Ibid., p. 96.
Originally the purpose of the orphanages was to provide shelter for homeless children of Nuremberg citizens. However, this distinction was, in practice, hard if not impossible to keep. Because a large number of these children were foundlings, there was no way to determine their parentage. The word used in the records for these children was *findel*, which has the English cognate, foundling. The foundlings were usually newborn babies abandoned by the mother (usually out of necessity, shame, or irresponsibility). Nuremberg orphanages, unlike those in Italian cities, never used foundling receivers or window baskets which turned on an axis where babies were left. Probably the stone bendhes, which were built beside most of the city's houses, were the places where the babies were deposited. Sometimes they were left near the hospital, and sometimes even before the city Council building itself. The population of such children was especially large in times of adversity such as plague or war.

A new-born baby was put out to nurse at the expense of the endowment. In 1550-51, there were forty-three babies out at the cost of 142 gulden, and in the orphanage itself there were fifty-eight children being taken
In general, at least from the time of the Reformation, the orphanage kept children only from the age of seven on up. The children who were there were raised with a watchful eye upon their nourishment, clothing, and other needs. From a pronouncement by the guardian, Kunigunde Lochner, dating approximately from 1530, we learn that there were to be appropriate clothes for the children in both orphanages; they and their residences were to be kept clean; and every eighth day after they were bathed they were to receive a complete change of clothing.

The direction of the orphanages was under the care of the guardian chosen by the Council and responsible to the Council. The guardian was ordinarily of a patrician family. There were several house-fathers and house-mothers, along with other personnel, who were in turn responsible to the guardian. Generally the guardians were a married couple, but there were many exceptions to this. An endowment bequest of 1485 stated that they must be

13 Eisen, Christliche Liebestätigkeit, p. 88.
decent, honorable people who could properly read and write so that they could instruct the children in religion and other necessary subjects. They also should have an honorable trade which they could follow.\textsuperscript{15}

In 1511 a member of the Council, Michael Behaim, along with his wife, were chosen as guardians for the orphanages. They retired in 1513. Frau Walburg, the housewife of Jorg Holzschuher, the Elder, was chosen and served from 1513 until 1526. It became customary that a salary of 25 gulden be given yearly. Two members of the Council were charged with checking the accounts of the endowment. Frau Walburg did her accounting through her son, who was a member of the Council. In 1527, Kunigunde Lochner, the widow of the medical doctor Johan Lochner, was chosen as guardian. She served until 1549. She was from the Holzschuher family.\textsuperscript{16} The Council considered her candidacy on May 15, 1526,\textsuperscript{17} and the records for May 24 state, "The Council has chosen the widow of Dr. Lochner


\textsuperscript{16} Mummenhoff, "Das Findel," p. 198.

\textsuperscript{17} RV 730, f. 14 r., May 15, 1526.
as guardian and she is ordered to begin her office."\(^\text{18}\)

The guardian usually had living quarters in the orphanage and had to consult with the Council on all major items. It became customary about this time for the guardian to put a sum of money, 3,000 gulden, in pledge to the city treasury. This was done not only because of the heavy responsibilities required by the work, but also so that the endowment funds would not prove to be too much of a temptation.\(^\text{19}\)

The actual daily work was taken care of by the house-fathers and house-mothers. They took care of daily routines, getting the supplies and supervising the children. Among the other personnel were such people as a cook, cattle keeper, bather, barber, and a part-time doctor. So that the wishes of the Council could be properly executed the guardian was charged with the responsibility of overseeing all matters in both houses. Prayers were said, and the children were raised with a sense of

\(^{\text{18}}\)RB 13, f. 87 v., May 24, 1526.

\(^{\text{19}}\)Eisen, *Christliche Liebe*\textsuperscript{a}t\textsuperscript{a}haftigkeit*, p. 93.
honoring God and the various people who had left bequests to the orphanages.  

The daily life in both houses ran according to a schedule. In summer the children got up at 5:30 a.m. and in winter at 6:00 a.m. They dressed themselves and cleaned their dormitory rooms; morning prayers were said, and then breakfast was served. After that they went to school until lunch. There was free time in which to play after lunch. The children had many tasks to keep them busy. The boys obtained fodder for the milk cows and brought in firewood. The girls did spinning, sewing, and weaving. The girls usually remained one or two years after their Confirmation until they were fully instructed in housework and then were sent to assume jobs as serving maids.

In the opinion of the Church, the learning of prayers was most important. Upon arising, with each meal, and upon going to bed, prayers were said. The children were taught to fear and honor God and to be good in all ways. After the Reformation, a reading from Luther's


commentaries was added to prayers. The routine for Sunday consisted of going to Church in the morning and Vespers in the evening. There was great emphasis on Christian duty, good behavior, and obedience. A child who was disobedient was punished with a whipping.22

The Council tried very hard to insure that the boys could be accepted into a trade but the illegitimate birth of most of them presented difficulties. The various trade organizations usually had rules that did not permit apprentices who were illegitimate to be received. Sometimes the Council would permit the boys to be sent out at a very young age, one example even being a boy of six; usually they were older than this.23 Council would send a letter with the boy attesting to his ability and talent. One Endres Helm, who had learned metal work and who wished to go to Würzburg, requested and received such a letter on April 7, 1526.24

In rather rare cases, children were adopted out of the orphanages by childless couples. For example,

22Eisen, Christliche Liebertätigkeit, p. 90.
24RV 729, f. 4 r., RB 13, f. 71, April 7, 1526.
Hans Seyerlein and his wife, Margareta, made an earnest request to the guardian of the orphans, Walpurg Holzschuher, that they might be allowed to adopt a child named Margretlein. The couple promised to feed, clothe, and to give a dowry to the child, and in this manner to treat her as their own child. Their request was granted.25

The income of the orphanages came, for the most part, from land rents of property that belonged to the endowments. This property was farm land, meadows, and houses in the city itself. There was an income from the profits of church chair rental. The Council in 1524 determined that the pillows used in funerals were to be converted to use of the orphanages.26 Georg Keipper left a 500 gulden bequest to the orphans in 1484, specifying that it be used for the education of the children.27 He left money to many other endowments, but his name is connected most strongly with a charity that later came to be called the Grosses Almosen. The orphanage endowment bought in 1485

26Ibid., p. 299.
and 1489 nine houses for rental income purposes with money from the Georg Keipper bequest. These were in Nuremberg.\textsuperscript{28}

The income from other properties consisted either of money rent or a payment in kind, such as farm produce, to be used in the orphanages. The herds of cows of each orphanage were grazed upon their own meadow land. Another source of income was from various fines paid by citizens. Christoph Scheurl in his description of Nuremberg states that if a member of the Council came late to a session he had to pay a fine of four pfennigs which went to aid the orphans.\textsuperscript{29}

The orphanages possessed their own bakeries where dairy products and grain from their own real estate were used both to feed the children and for sale to increase the income for the orphanages.\textsuperscript{30}

It became customary for well-to-do citizens to remember the orphans with a bequest in their wills. However, income from such diverse sources still left the orphanages open to bitter, financial problems during

\textsuperscript{28}Mummenhoff, "Das Findel," p. 252.

\textsuperscript{29}Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, p. 267.

\textsuperscript{30}Mummenhoff, "Das Findel," p. 266.
difficult times, such as war. The most well-known bequest to the orphans was that of Elizabeth Krauss. She was born in 1569 of simple peasant parents, and came to Nuremberg as a servant when she was ten years old. She was diligent, frugal, and pious. She caught the eye of Konrad Krauss who married her in 1598. Through much diligence, Konrad was able to establish his own business house. Elizabeth outlived him and was 70 years old when she died on April 5, 1639.31 She left a large bequest to the orphans, and each year on St. John's day they had a festive meal in her honor and went to church in memory of her.32 The children usually sang for alms in the city in the period between Christmas and Epiphany. In 1522 the Council ordered that the children sing for the princes who had assembled for a meeting of the imperial Diet.33

The population of the orphanages varied from one time to the next. In 1550 there were about 115 orphans; in 1561 there were 212; in the years 1574 and 1575 there were 371; and during the bad years of the Thirty Years' war,

---

31Ibid., p. 171.
32Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, pp. 624-25.
33RV 684, f. 16 v., December 27, 1522.
1534 to 1535, the number of homeless children rose to 425. The number of children could usually be correlated with the difficulty of the period.

Although the Council did not automatically admit all deserving children to the orphanages, the number who were allowed to enter was quite large. Most of the instances were routine and give only the barest outline of the Council's action. For example, "Hans Reinhart's request for his child's admission to an orphanage is denied. However, he should receive two gulden." A common instance was that of "The child that was found in the St. Nicholas Chapel" who "should be taken in by the orphanage." Sometimes children were accepted temporarily, such as those of Veit Hirschvogel's housemaid who were to be kept until such time as she could recover from childbirth. The Council agreed to the plea that, "A girl, who had a baby (outside the city), did not have the means to support it and one should do God's will and care for it at

34 Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, p. 623.
35 RV 690, f. 10 r., May 16, 1523.
36 RV 690, f. 24 v., June 3, 1523.
37 RV 695, f. 25 r.
the orphanage.\textsuperscript{38} Five children of a woman who lost her senses had to be cared for in the orphanage,\textsuperscript{39} and two fatherless children should be cared for in the orphanage, "since the mother is dead and the grandmother is poverty-stricken."\textsuperscript{40} Most often no reason is given, "Conrad Silbernagel's child is admitted to the orphanage as requested."\textsuperscript{41}

To be born in wedlock was important in this era, so that the Council made a special note of those legitimacy cases. "The poor child whose mother has died and whose father has left should be taken into the orphanage and it should be recorded that this child was legitimate."\textsuperscript{42} Another instance in which the Council makes careful note of this is that of a poor child who is to be accepted by the orphanage and orders that it is to be recorded as "a legitimate child."\textsuperscript{43} A woman, Ursula Kestin, who had

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{38}RV 711, f. 18 r., December 30, 1524.
\item \textsuperscript{39}RV 722, f. 8 v., October 16, 1525.
\item \textsuperscript{40}RV 725, f. 2 v., December 29, 1526.
\item \textsuperscript{41}RV 729, f. 20 v., April 18, 1526.
\item \textsuperscript{42}RV 741, f. 25 v., March 30, 1527.
\item \textsuperscript{43}RV 743, f. 29 r., May 18, 1527.
\end{itemize}
taken in a stray child for the orphanage, was unable to care for it properly. The Council had the child taken into the orphanage and gave the woman some money for the expenses she had incurred.\textsuperscript{44} The Council could speak very bluntly about parentage. "Peter Ottinger's whore's child should be taken into the orphanage.\textsuperscript{45} Children with physical disabilities were admitted, such as, "The poor miserable child, who is senseless," it "should be accepted into the orphanage; and the mother who is in the hospital should receive aid from the Child Bed alms fund."\textsuperscript{46} Sometimes, though, there was rejection of an applicant. "The weaver's request that the orphanage take his woman's child is refused."\textsuperscript{47} In many instances the records do not name the parents, the child, or the reason for denying admittance. Thus only occasionally can the Council's motives for a decision be determined. The entries in the

\textsuperscript{44}RV 750, f. 19 v.; RV 750, f. 21 v.; RV 754, f. 7 v., March 4, 1528.

\textsuperscript{45}RV 760, f. 1 v., August 7, 1528.

\textsuperscript{46}RV 765, f. 10 v., January 8, 1529.

\textsuperscript{47}RV 699, f. 14 r., February 1, 1524.
Council's books usually say only that a request is granted or denied.

The administrative office of the guardian for the orphanages was discussed earlier. It is interesting that the Council in its business items usually referred to the guardian (Pflegerin) as the orphanage mother. For example, the orphanage mother was told to send a house servant to the official at Neukirchen and to bring in an abandoned child to the orphanage. In the case of a foundling child, which had been left with the orphanage mother, a Hans Alt said he had nothing to do with it and that the Council should not imprison him. The orphanage father was often mentioned, but his office was subordinate to that of the guardian. A Hans Meir, who was an orphanage father, petitioned the Council to have citizenship conferred on him. It considered his case and gave him the citizenship.

There are examples cited of the Council concerning itself with the physical condition of the Orphanages.

---

48 RV 699, f. 18 r., November 7, 1521.
49 RV 739, f. 26 v., January 31, 1527.
50 RV 669, f. 18 r., November 7, 1521.
In the instance of the boys' orphanage, the Council was interested in making some building improvements and instructed the building master to investigate the matter and to report on it to the Council. With characteristic foresight, the Council decided to prepare for the construction during Winter in order to be ready for work when Spring came. The building master had to see that everything was prepared in this period. On June 19, 1528, the Council was looking for sources of money to finance this building improvement. It decided to take six gulden yearly from the orphanage funds. The major work was done that Summer but in August the Council again began to store material and make plans during the Winter so that the finishing touches to the work could be done the next Spring. In December, 1528, the Council checked with the building master about the improvements to the boys' orphanage.

51RV 743, f. 29 r., May 18, 1527.
52RV 746, f. 26 v., August 10, 1527.
53RV 758, f. 7 v., June 19, 1528.
54RB 14, f. 46 v., August 10, 1527.
orphanage. It always kept a close watch on finances, preparations, and the actual work.

The Council concerned itself with all aspects of the orphans' lives from their acceptance or rejection into the orphanage itself up to the time of their marriage or admittance into trades. There was the case of a woman who had been in the orphanage and then married. The Council gave her citizenship. It gave citizenship to another former orphan in May, 1525, and a needle maker's wife, who had been an orphan, was also given citizenship.

There does not seem to be much variation in the Council's behavior towards the orphans during the years 1521 through 1528. There was, however, a rise in the number of items concerning the orphans that the council took up in these years. In 1528 there was more time spent by the Council on the problems than there had been in 1521.

55RV 764, f. 20 v., December 22, 1528.
56RV 662, f. 4 v., April 8, 1521.
57RV 717, f. 5 v., May 20, 1525.
58RV 724, f. 4 v., December 5, 1525.
59The Ratsverlasse of 1521 have 11 items and those of 1528 have 20 items concerning the orphans.
However, the decisions it made about the various kinds of items do not vary. The guardian system was not altered, neither were the finances of the orphanage foundations. With the coming of the Reformation, the Council paid more attention to the problems of the orphans but did not change in its attitude toward their treatment.

Small Charities

There were many specific charitable endowments. In 1496 Anthony Ortel, for example, endowed one hundred gulden to the churches for the purpose of driving stray dogs out of them. Every year the income from the original capital which was about five gulden was paid out by the city treasurer to rid the churches of the dogs which were a nuisance and thereby a distraction to the people who were attending services. This item received the attention of the Council but did not involve an elaborate managerial apparatus. It was handled very simply and directly.

Another charity was the Buchslein Almosen, which had been endowed by Konrad Toppler, Katherine Kauer, and

60Siebenkees, Materialien, Vol. 1, p. 376.
Katherine Reitvogel. This charity quickly became combined with the already existing (1388) Burkhard Seiler foundation called Reiches Almosen, which will be described later. The work of the Buchslein Almosen consisted of distributing alms every Friday morning to one hundred poor people assembled at St. Sebald's Church. A prerequisite for receiving the alms was that the individual be a citizen of Nuremberg. Each person was given three kreuzer as poverty relief.

Another small specific endowment was the Wildbad charity. There were six baths in Nuremberg. The Wildbad was located on the south side of the Schütt Island in the Pegnitz River, just inside the city's walls. This charity provided poor people with an opportunity for a free visit to the bath at the Wildbad for reasons of health. If there were recommendations by a city-approved

---

61 Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, p. 621.
62 Waldau, Geschichte Nürnberg, Vol. 4, p. 381.
63 Eisen, Christliche Lebensfähigkeit, p. 99.
64 Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, p. 420.
doctor, the poor person was compensated in order to visit a more distant bath or warm spa. 66 There were various other small endowments which gave aid for particular kinds of poor relief, but none of these had their own guardian appointed by the Council.

The Childbed Charity

The Childbed (Kindbetterin) Charity had its own guardian and was formally endowed in 1495. 67 This charity was for poor women who were pregnant. They usually sat before the doors of the city's churches and begged. 68 There was some charitable relief for them dating from the mid 1400's. An order of the Council designated fifteen gulden to the relief of these poor women in 1461. 69 The women could receive maintenance if the Council so determined.

66 Rüger, Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen, p. 42.
67 Ibid.
68 Eisen, Christliche Liebertäigkeit, p. 99.
Ulrich Kress, who did not belong to Nuremberg's patrician family of that name, endowed in 1595 the Childbed Charity. The cases which came under the direction of this charity were managed by patrician women who supervised the work of the midwives. In addition to this, these maternity cases also received a special badge that permitted them to beg at the church doors. These badges had to be given up as soon as the women had borne the children.70 Siebenkees lists the 1461 endowment with its fifteen gulden in alms mentioned in a letter by the Council which discusses the manner of operation and the people who were to be in charge. Controllers of this annual fifteen gulden in alms were Agnes, the widow of Peter Haller, and Barbara, Martin Haller's housewife. For the common good of the city these women administered these alms and were accountable for its expenditures to the Council.71

A more careful implementation of the Childbed Charity occurred in 1516 under the direction of the Council. In 1518 these maternity cases still received special

70Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, p. 597; cf. p. 621.
badges to permit them to beg. The guardian and several worthy, patrician women who supervised the midwives gave the poor women the following items: a featherbed, linen towels, pillows, and baby's things. The guardian operated through the midwives and the midwives were supervised by the patrician women of the city to insure that proper, decent care was provided to these pregnant women who were wretchedly poor.  

An alms office was created under the Poor Relief Ordinance of 1522, and the Council authorized more regulation of these cases. The city gave more help to women in need of charity after the Reformation of 1525 when the Church's properties were put into the Common Chest (Gemeiner Kasten). This support from the Common Chest continued down to the end of Nuremberg's independence as a free state in 1806.

The guardian during the period 1521 until 1528 was Storin Huter. She was listed in the Council's registry

---

72Rügner, Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen, p. 29.
73Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, p. 621.
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as the Pflegerin, or guardian. The Council's daily business items, however, frequently mention the name of Sibilla Lochausser along with that of Storin Huter. The Council had high regard for both women, "Storin Huter and Sibilla Lochausser, because of their difficult tasks and constant diligence in working with these maternity cases," were given twenty-four gulden apiece. With the Poor Relief Ordinance of 1522, the Council wanted it understood that Storin Huter was to continue with the Childbed Charity and to be aided in improving her activities. Casper Busch, the alms administrator provided for by the 1522 ordinance, was an additional person to whom the Council directed Storin Huter and Sibilla Lochausser to refer charity cases for alms help. The Council directed that Sibilla Lochausser should be given money from the city treasury in order to continue aiding such unfortunates. Some time later Storin Huter was directed to draw money

76 RV 677, f. 2 v., May 23, 1522.

77 RV 677, f. 17 r., June 12, 1522.

78 RV 690, f. 24 r., June 2, 1523.

79 RV 691, f. 10 r., June 17, 1523.
from the treasury to continue her daily work with these charity cases. 80

Each year the Council supplied money to these women. On June 13, 1524, the Council ordered the treasury to give Storin Huter and Sibilla Lochausser each a sum of money to cover the expenses of the charity. The Council praised their diligence and their work. 81 On July 5, 1524, it ordered that Caspar Busch continue to be the person to whom Sibilla Lochausser was directed to refer such charity cases. 82

The Council directed that Sibilla Lochausser on March 23, 1526, be given seventeen gulden in tax money for the maternity work. She was to apply to Caspar Busch if she needed additional funds. 83 She was granted more money on June 8 because of the difficulties involved in supervising these poor childbirth cases. Again the Council

80 RV 691, f. 13 v., June 22, 1523.
81 RV 704, f. 14 v., June 13, 1524.
82 RV 705, f. 11 v., July 5, 1524.
83 RV 728, f. 2 r., March 23, 1526.
praised her for her well done work. The one case that the Council concerned itself with directly had to do with a Contz Schmid's wife who was given aid from the Rich Alms Fund (Reiches Almosen) and given four gulden as support from the Childbed Charity. The Council did not directly discuss other individual cases during these years, 1521-1528. All arrangements were left to the people whom the Council had placed in charge. It had only high praise for the worth of these people's actions.

There was a bequest by the wife of Michael Beheim of a quantity of lard. The Council gave the directors of the Common Chest (Gemeiner Kasten) the problem of transferring this bequest to the Rich Alms Fund (Reiches Almosen). The widow also left one thousand gulden which the Council decided should go to the Childbed Alms Fund to be administered by Storin Huter since this disposition of the bequests seemed best to fulfill the desires in the widow's will. Storin Huter was directed to write up for

84RV 731, f. 12 r., June 8, 1526; RB 13, f. 96 r.
85RV 756, f. 37 r., May 12, 1528.
86RV 758, f. 22 v; RB 14, f. 230 r; RV 759, f. 8 r-8 r.
her own use and for the administrators of the Beheim estate that truthfully she expected to accomplish for the Childbed Alms with this bequest.87

The Childbed Alms Fund retained its integrity with its own guardian, but after the Begging Ordinance of 1522, Caspar Busch, the alms officer, was mentioned frequently as were the directors of the Common Chest after the 1525 Reformation. Although this charity survived in form, the Council seems to have given more regulation and financial direction of it to the new Common Chest directors. The Reformation brought more centralization in the operations of the already existing Childbed charity.

The Rich Alms Fund

One of the first charitable foundations in Nuremberg was the Rich Alms Fund (Reiches Almosen), and it consequently served as a model upon which other later charities were based.88 It was begun in 1388, the same year that Conrad Mendel endowed his Zwälfbrüderhaus. The founder of the Rich Alms Fund was a wealthy citizen of

87RV 759, f. 18 r., July 24, 1528.
88Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, p. 620.
Nuremberg, Burkhard Seiler. He married into the patrician Haller family. His wife was Agnes Haller; and his father-in-law was Conrad Haller, a prominent member of the City Council. Burkhard Seiler, to have contracted such a marriage, had to have possessed great wealth. The marriage was brief with Seiler dying in 1390, the same year in which he had married Agnes. She lived on until 1419. Another item which attests to Seiler's social and financial position is his membership in the City Council beginning in 1379. Such membership was elitist since Nuremberg was an oligarchy. There is little else that has been uncovered concerning his life.

The endowment had a foundation document which gave the general basis for the organization of the charity. The specific direction, by the founder, that the Council administer this endowment is the point that Willi Rüger finds to be a most important characteristic. That Seiler

89 Waldau, Geschichte Nürnberg, Vol. 4, p. 162.
90 Reicke, Geschichte Nürnberg, p. 620.
92 Rüger, Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen, p. 8.
had a secular authority administering a charity without
the church being involved is the basis for regarding this
Rich Alms Fund as the model for the other Nuremberg char-
ities. The Council was empowered to select an adminis-
tration of three guardians who in turn directed the charity
and their actions were strictly accountable to the
Council.\textsuperscript{93} The guardians were members of the Council.
Thus all power was centered within the Council.

The foundation was for twenty domiciled poor
(Hausarme). Later the number was increased to forty
persons. Every Sunday these selected people gathered in
St. Sebald's churchyard south of the choir section of the
building. At this place each person was given two loaves
of bread weighing a total of five pounds, two pounds of
meat, and various other kinds of food, such as, peas,
meal, and herring, depending upon the season of the year.
During the fasts, they were given a small amount of money
instead of the usual meat ration, and four times a year
they were given a container of lard and one half a measure
of salt. Beggers, who were recognized officially and were

under the begging caretakers (Bettelrichter), were excluded from the charity. Only persons who had held Nuremberg citizenship for at least five years were eligible.\textsuperscript{94}

First in eligibility for this aid were the domiciled poor who had children. Those who had two children to provide for received this charity every fourteen days and those persons who had three or more children received the aid every eight days. The guardians had to investigate personally those people who needed this help. The need also had to be attested to by two competent citizens.\textsuperscript{95}

The capital of the fund was increased by various papal bulls which promised indulgences for contributions, and there were many other donations by citizens, such as Burkhard Helchner.\textsuperscript{96} In its beginning, the Rich Alms Fund was considered to be a food charity; but as the Fund increased in size it began to donate money as well as food. Another charity, the Buchslein Almosen was joined to


\textsuperscript{95}Rüger, \textit{Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen}, pp. 20-22.

\textsuperscript{96}Reicke, \textit{Geschichte Nürnberg}, p. 621.
the Reiches Almosen, which made even more money available for distribution. The richness of the endowment is indicated in the name attached to it. Reiches Almosen seems to have been a corruption of "Reich gestiftetes Almosen" ("richly endowed charity").

The Council administered the endowment through three guardians according to Burkhard Seiler's wish. It was the duty of the guardians every quarterly year to seek out the most worthy and needy from amongst the domiciled poor as recipients of aid. Those people who were chosen according to the rules received a tin badge as a symbol of this charity. Every year at Whitsunday, the alms ordinances were read to these aid recipients in order to impress the terms upon them. They were expected to be very regular in their church attendance and to lead lives that were pleasing to God. Also upon Whitsunday the guardians were expected to examine the homes of the persons receiving this charity. Those people whom the guardian

---


98 The seventh Sunday after Easter.

deemed no longer in need of aid were removed from the lists.

The supervision of the domiciled poor was under these three guardians, and the beggars were under the supervision of the begging officials (Bettelrichter). The alms ordinance, which was read to the domiciled poor, is found in the versions of 1388, 1579, and 1609.100 There was an explicit recognition in these ordinances that below the domiciled poor charity cases there existed a group which the authorities considered irresponsibly antisocial because they converted their food charity into money and then drank up the proceeds in a tavern or turned it toward other "evil uses."101

Whitsunday was the day of examination, admonition, and exhortation. The continuance of the charity was made contingent upon the decision of the guardians as to the worthiness of the recipient. All offenders, such as those irregular in church attendance, were threatened with immediate loss of the charity's aid. These threats and

100Rüger, Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen, p. 21.
101Ibid., p. 21.
punishments had little effect for there continued to be transgressions; and in spite of the vigilance of the charity guardians, there continued to be some begging by domiciled poor which was forbidden.  

Most of these charity cases unlike the licensed beggars, continued to live in their own homes and were given this aid because of some special circumstance. Usually their problem was that they had more children than they could afford to raise. This charity was primarily a subsidy for needy large families.

In 1454 a Gothic type structure was erected which contained an office for this charity. This building, which was on the south side of St. Sebald's near the City Hall, contained other offices of the city. Especially well-known was the Schau or test office to which various products manufactured by tradesmen in the city were brought to be examined to see if the standards for export under the city's name were met. Here were examined those

102 Eisen, *Christliche Liebestätigkeit*, p. 98.
articles which gave Nuremberg its fame for quality metal manufacturing. This building was torn down in the early 1800's so there is no trace today of this charity office.105

The Rich Alms Fund retained its system of three guardians until after the 1525 Reformation when the number of guardians was decreased to one. The Rich Alms Fund retained its identity until the city lost its independence to Bavaria in 1806.106 But the guardians of the Common Chest, which was created in 1525, took over most of the administration of the Rich Alms Fund. The alms ordinances of 1579 and 1609 show that the Rich Alms Fund retained an emphasis in the right conduct of religion.107

The years 1521-1528 indicate the diminishing role of the Rich Alms Fund. There were three guardians and one overseer of property in 1521. The overseer, Fabian Haller, was dropped in 1526,108 and the number of guardians dropped

105Rüger, Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen, p. 19.
106Ibid., p. 19.
107Amterbüchlein, No. 41, 1521.
108Amterbüchlein, No. 46, 1526.
from three to one in 1528.\textsuperscript{109} The man remaining, Sigmund Führer, had been one of the guardians through these eight years.\textsuperscript{110} The decrease in the Rich Alms staff was matched with the Common Chest's creation and growth. It was reasonable that the Council would wish to avoid duplication or competition of two organizations. The Council had in 1523 made a Rich Alms Fund guardian out of Caspar Busch, who was already Alms Director for the 1522 Alms Ordinance.\textsuperscript{111} These changes show that the Council was subordinating the Rich Alms Fund until it had only one guardian and most of its functions had been taken over by the Common Chest.

The Council concerned itself on January 4, 1523, with ordering the guardians to consider one Sebastian Kragan's request regarding the Sulzbach Court's judgment on his father's case.\textsuperscript{112} In June the Council noted that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{109}\textit{Amterbüchlein}, No. 48, 1528.
\item \textsuperscript{110}\textit{Amterbüchlein}, Nos. 41-48, 1521-1528.
\item \textsuperscript{111}\textit{Amterbüchlein}, No. 43, 1523.
\item \textsuperscript{112}\textit{RV} 658, f. 7 r., January 4, 1521.
\end{itemize}
the guardians had not influenced the Sulzbach Court.\textsuperscript{113}

Then the guardians were ordered to write to Sebastian Kragan that he should take the Sulzbach Court business up with a Jorg Beselt.\textsuperscript{114}

The case of Sebastian Kragan had influential backers, including an official of Duke Frederick,\textsuperscript{115} and the priest at the St. Mary's Church.\textsuperscript{116}

Money was a constant concern of the guardians of the Rich Alms Fund.\textsuperscript{117} The guardians were told by the Council to accept the thirty gulden from the Franciscan's guardian with one gulden kept back as interest on the twenty-nine gulden.\textsuperscript{118} The Council took an active interest in the fees and rents owed to the Rich Alms Fund. A Cuntz of Lauffenholtz must be written to concerning what fee he

\textsuperscript{113}RV 665, f. 2 r., June 27, 1521.
\textsuperscript{114}RV 665, f. 16 v., July, 1521.
\textsuperscript{115}RV 658, f. 11 v., January 13, 1521.
\textsuperscript{116}RV 661, f. 11 r., March 31, 1521.
\textsuperscript{117}RV 665, f. 1 v., June 27, 1521.
\textsuperscript{118}RV 668, f. 8 v.
should pay to Anthony Kress for the guardians.° Several months later the Council ordered Cuntz to be written to again concerning this fee and Anthony Kress was to receive it for the Rich Alms Fund.°

The Council granted some requests for alms, such as those of a man from Weisach and a Peter Nadler. The Council denied the request of a Stephen Muffel and had the guardians write to Muffel to that effect. The guardians were told to reply to the Count of Ottingen concerning a fee from Forchheim. The Council one month later said that since Cristoph Kress was not satisfied with the fee letter of the Count of Ottingen, the guardians should not buy any more such fees in the Saltzgau.

119RV 673, f. 18 r., February 28, 1522.
120RV 683, f. 5 v., November 10, 1522; RV 683, f. 15 v.-16 r.; RV 692, f. 15 r.
121RV 658, f. 13 r., January 14, 1521.
122RV 669, f. 16 v., November 6, 1521.
123RV 677, f. 3 v., May 24, 1522.
124RV 683, f. 2 v., November 6, 1522.
125RV 683, f. 20 r., December 2, 1522.
The Council ordered Sigmund Führer, a guardian, to pay damages to Paulus Doppler from the Rich Alms Fund.\textsuperscript{126} Martin Pfintzing, one of the three guardians, resigned from his position and the Council named Hans Schnod to replace him.\textsuperscript{127} The Council ordered the guardians to aid the poor people whose crops had suffered damage from hail.\textsuperscript{128} The special concern that the Council showed for some individuals is interesting. One Hans Elenstater was to be sought out to see if he would accept weekly aid from the guardians.\textsuperscript{129}

On June 12, 1523, the Council wanted an accounting taken of the Rich Alms Fund.\textsuperscript{130} The Council was considering whether it would be better to sell a bequest to the Alms Mill or to put it into the endowments fund.\textsuperscript{131} The guardians were given the right to buy several properties
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of Jobst Prandtner near Eschenbach since he wished to sell them.132 Regarding a tenant of the Rich Alms Fund, the Council discussed whether the terms of his holding should be changed.133 The Council determined that 2,000 gulden of the Rich Alms Fund property could be exchanged for a perpetual income from the city's treasury. This was to be accomplished by the guardians.134

Most of the items before the Reformation of 1525 mentioned by Council concerning the Rich Alms Fund had to do with the administration of the large amount of property which the foundation owned in many places.135 On November 14, 1524, the Council stated, "In the name of God, we have decided to improve the charity for the domiciled poor in both parishes. In the future, we will try to be more generous. The previous ordinance is ended by the Council in order to better the situation. The Rich Alms Fund is not effective as it is drawn up. The present

132 RV 693, f. 17 r., August 18, 1523.
133 RV 694, f. 15 r., September 17, 1523.
134 RV 698, f. 2 r., December 18, 1523.
135 RV 703, f. 13 v.; RV 703, f. 16 v.
ordinance shall take its place and the officials are advised to award aid according to this new decree. 136

This action by the Council occurred before the formal change in religion in 1525. The Council kept the form of the directors of the Rich Alms Fund for several years and then Sigmund Führer was left as the only guardian. This decision of November, 1524, shows in part the beginning of the changes to the Rich Alms Fund which made it subordinate to the Common Chest.

There continued to be an official organization called the Rich Alms Fund. On December 7, 1524, the Council told Conrad Schroter, vicar at St. Lorenz, and the guardians of the Rich Alms Fund that Hans Reichenecker must be given his yearly money. At the same time since he could not make it on his own, he should be given five gulden. 137 Veit Harber, a cardmaker, was to be asked if he wanted the Rich Alms, and if not, he should be given two gulden from the Greater Alms fund. 138 The Council asked whether a peasant from Evenreut's condition had

136RV 710, f. 4 r., November 14, 1524.
137RV 710, f. 19 v., December 7, 1524.
138RV 712, f. 4., January 12, 1525.
changed. He was under the jurisdiction of the Rich Alms Fund and the Council wanted to receive an answer from him.\textsuperscript{139} A Jacob Saurzapff was given more help because the Rich Alms money and begging badge were not enough to keep him and his family.\textsuperscript{140}

The Council's items of daily business concerning the Rich Alms Fund decrease with 1525, but there continued some instances. The Council decided to help a Paul Segur with aid now and to give him aid from the Rich Alms Fund so that he would not suffer privations.\textsuperscript{141} The Council determined that the Rich Alms fund should acquire six hundred gulden worth of grain out of its funds.\textsuperscript{142} The widow of a bottler called Hans Huebner, who was killed while in the service of the city, should be given a six gulden alms and also aid from the Rich Alms Fund. The Council gave her the other choices of wearing the begging badge or placing her two youngest children in the

\textsuperscript{139}RV 717, f. 16 v., June 1, 1525.
\textsuperscript{140}RV 718, f. 7 r., June 22, 1525.
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orphanage and receiving help from the Rich Alms Fund.\footnote{143}

The impact of the Reformation of the Rich Alms Fund can be seen in the change in administrators, and the decreasing emphasis that the Council placed on this charity. The endowment remained in name and occasionally Council utilized it, but there was a major shift in financial emphasis. The Council's agenda contained few if any items concerning investment properties and income for the Rich Alms Fund from 1525 to the end of 1528. Previous to the Reformation, the Rich Alms Fund had three guardians and one overseer of possessions. This number was decreased to one man by 1528.

The Dowry Charity

Marriage in this era did not have the romantic overtone that it carries today for it was looked upon more in the nature of a contract. One of the necessary provisions of this arrangement was that a girl must have a suitable dowry. Girls, whose parents were unable to provide a sufficient dowry, were not considered a good match, a handicap that often prevented them from marrying.

\footnote{RV 758, f. 12 v., June 22, 1528.}
Hilpolt Kress, a member of the Nuremberg patrician family of that name, noted this hardship. As a consequence he started the endowment of the Dowry Charity (Jungfern Almosen) in 1427.\textsuperscript{144} The income from this endowment was intended by him to "... yearly, to give pious young maidens, who are honorably born children, the means by which they may all the better and more easily find an honorable husband."\textsuperscript{145}

This charity received additional income in 1514 through a bequest by Ursula Berthold Deichsler. The executor of her estate bought with 250 gulden an annual income in perpetuity from the city treasury of Nuremberg. The letter from the Council which acknowledges this transaction reads in part: "We the burgomasters and Council of the city of Nuremberg make known for the common good, that publicly through this letter we have given our approval and permission for the executor of Ursula Berthold Deichsler's estate, Andreas von Watt, to acquire a ten gulden yearly income as a perpetual asset from the city of

\textsuperscript{144}Rüger, \textit{Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen}, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{145}Eisen, \textit{Christliche Liebestätigkeit}, p. 99.
Nuremberg for the aid of the Dowery Charity."\textsuperscript{146}

\textit{Jungfern} was the local Nuremberg word for \textit{Jungfrau}, or maiden. The charity was usually referred to as the \textit{Jungfern Almosen}. It is translated here as the "Dowry charity" in order to approximate the full meaning of the title.

The Council exercised its control over this endowment through a guardian, picked by the Council, who was responsible for the charity's administration. He was accountable directly to the Council for all decisions and the way in which the money was expended. During these eight years, the guardian was Hieronymus Holzschuher,\textsuperscript{147} who died in 1529.\textsuperscript{148}

Most of Holzschuher's work through this period is reflected in the documents as the supervision of a metal forge shop at Lauffenholz, and the metalworkers there. The Dowry Charity's capital seems to have been invested in this place, so the guardian is given instructions over

\textsuperscript{146} Siebenkees, \textit{Materialien}, Vol. 3, p. 87.
\textsuperscript{147} \textit{Amterbüchlein}, Nos. 41-48, 1521, 1528.
\textsuperscript{148} \textit{Amterbüchlein}, No. 49, 1529.
the years by the Council on this shop at Lauffenholz. In December, 1521, Council wanted to know if the master metal worker and Hieronymus Holzschuher had halted some construction. Several weeks later a Hans Dorss from Wöhrd was instructed to say to the chief Lauffenholtz metal worker that Hieronymus Holzschuher, as guardian of the Dowry Charity, must remain in charge there, and that Holzschuher was continuing the building. Hans Camner, the master metal worker, was not to impede the work. Jobst Haller sought to aid this effort at Lauffenholz and gave some grain as alms towards the work.

In April, 1522, "Hieronymus Holzschuher, as guardian of the Dowry charity, is allowed a new three-story building for the improvement of the Lauffenholz metal forge for the workers. Yet the inhabitants of the new quarters have no right to the forest wood, and the building itself shall not use forest wood; also such quarters can be removed upon the Council's cancellation. The guardian is given the power to supervise the metal shop

149 RV 670, f. 17 r., December 7, 1521.
150 RV 671, f. 8 v., December 19, 1521.
151 RV 672, f. 16 v., January 31, 1522.
and the master metal worker as to the work being carried out."\textsuperscript{152} The Council followed the events carefully. "The guardian of the Dowry Charity is granted living quarters at Lauffenholz with a stable, but for this construction there is no right given to take wood from the common forest."\textsuperscript{153}

Hans Camner petitioned the Council against the rent of seventy gulden which Hieronymus Holzschuher as guardian had set. The Council ordered that this be checked upon to make sure that it would not be unfair.\textsuperscript{154} A week or two later it was reported that Hans Camner's petition was wrong and that the guardian, Hieronymus Holzschuher, was not unfair in his treatment of the problem. The Council expressed confidence in Holzschuher and refused to allow Camner to appeal the matter to the higher jurisdiction of the imperial court.\textsuperscript{155} The Council's opinion in April, 1524, was that the metal works at Lauffenholtz had been
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Improved and with it the Dowry Charity had not been harmed.156

Hieronymus Holzschuher was told to have a special workman determine methods by which to improve the metal works at Lauffenholtz. For this the workman should be given some extra money. This was in July, 1525.157 Holzschuher in June, 1527, said he had removed a forester and written him up in the books as eliminated at the instance of Hans Camner, the master of the metal works.158

The guardian, Hieronymus Holzschuher, is mentioned usually only in connection with managing the metal works which were the source of income. The Council does make mention of a few of the donations from the charity, but most of the donations were not discussed by the Council and were therefore left to the discretion of the guardian.

A "Hans Redner requested that his sister be given money from the Dowry Charity."159 Another case the Council

156 RV 702, f. 13 r., April 11, 1524.
157 RV 719, f. 16 r., July 27, 1524.
158 RV 745, f. 5 r., June 22, 1527.
159 RV 694, f. 9 r., September 7, 1523.
discussed concerned Sext Sturam, who requested money for his daughter's marriage from the Dowry Charity. "Although he is not a citizen, several gulden should be given him."

Citizenship was ordinarily a requirement. The Council ordered an investigation "to find out who the parents of Barbara Rapalein were and if it is appropriate to aid her with the Dowry Charity."

The Dowry Charity was untouched by the Reformation. It remained separate from the Common Chest established in 1525. The main focus of the Council's attention between 1521 and 1528 had to do with the source of the charity's investment. The Council rarely concerned itself directly with the charity's recipients. The religious change was not reflected in the administration of the Dowry charity.

The Keipper Charity

The Keipper Foundation was rarely mentioned in the Council's daily records. It was another of those small charities which were directed by the Council through its guardians.

160RV 717, f. 22 v., June 9, 1525.

161RV 746, f. 23 v., August 8, 1527.
George Keipper, a wealthy Nuremberg citizen, who was the last of his family, made an endowment in 1485. The Council decided to aid those people who were impoverished by virtue of having too many children. These people were called **verschämte arme** (deserving poor). Keipper also made a bequest in his will of 57 gulden yearly of perpetual income to the orphanages in order to hire someone who could read and write and teach the children these skills, plus a little learning in religion. In the care for large families, the conditions for receiving support income were "... being unable to procure food or burdened with a large quantity of children." Either problem was reason enough to fulfill the requirements. Once the person was able to care for himself again, the aid was terminated. Rüger sees these regulated differences in amount of support as tending in the modern direction of individualized welfare.

---


165 Rüger, *Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen*, p. 28.
Council had complete control over the endowment and appointed three guardians (Pfleger) every year to administer the income. These guardians were accountable to the Council for the manner in which they distributed the money. In 1521 Lazarus Holzschuher, Ludwig Schnod, and Wilhelm Schlusselfelder are listed as the guardians. In 1523, Martin Tucher replaced Lazarus Holzschuher in 1523. That was the only change in the guardians through 1528.

This foundation was apparently small and stable. It received no mention in the Council's business proceedings in these eight years. The guardians continued unchanged through the Reformation of 1525. It would seem that this small charity continued as before and the Reformation had no discernable impact upon it.

166Amterbüchlein, No. 41.
167Amterbüchlein, No. 43.
168Amterbüchlein, Nos. 43-45.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE BEGGING PROBLEM

The number of beggars in Nuremberg had grown to constitute almost a small army of homeless, wandering people. They were found in the streets, market places, churches, and other parts of the city. The blind, the lame, and the crippled were there in great crowds. Amongst all these people were legitimate beggars, who were in need of aid, but there were also a host of swindlers so that begging, especially by strangers, developed a bad name. Nuremberg, being a prosperous city, attracted great numbers of beggars; and was one of the first to set forth regulations concerning them in 1370.\(^1\)

In Nuremberg, it should be noted, the guilds and trades organizations were not independently operative after 1348. Therefore these societies did not develop a basis for members' mutual aid and welfare. Nuremberg's organized

charitable aid came, for the most part, from the endowed societies which have been discussed earlier. Yet there was local begging and a large influx of foreign beggars. The city had to contain and to regularize the problems that arose from the increasing number of beggars. Yet,

It is surprising, given the present position of research in social history, that no other German city tried to regulate its beggars earlier or in more detail than did Nuremberg.²

In 1370, the Council promulgated a set of regulations which were an attempt to reduce the problem of these beggars. These regulations were an effort to protect the poorer citizens of Nuremberg from increasing encroachment by foreigners. Begging was permitted only with permission of the begging officials appointed by the Council. Only local inhabitants and citizens could beg whereas the foreigners were to be turned away. The begging official was empowered to give a badge which allowed a person to beg within the city. This badge was to be given only to those who had a legitimate need for it and their names were entered in a book.³ This badge

²Rüger, Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen, p. 30.
³Ibid., p. 31 "unfortunately these sources were lost in the 1600's."
constituted a license to beg but the badge holders were no longer to be permitted to beg inside the churches. Rather, they could only stay outside the church doors and in other designated places. With any infraction of these regulations, the offender was to be sent out of the city for one year and a distance of at least one mile.\footnote{Waldau, \textit{Geschichte Nürnberg}, Vol. 4, p. 328.}

Pignot Weigel, in the 1370 regulations, was placed in charge of keeping order with this begging problem. He was a member of the Council. In fact he was the last of his family to be in Council. He died in 1373.\footnote{Rüger, \textit{Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen}, p. 68.} Weigel was instructed to investigate the needs of each poor person on St. Michael's day and again upon St. Walpurgis' day. Two or three competent citizens were to aid him by attesting to the poor individual's need. He was to recheck every half year to see if the person's condition was unchanged. The students who needed aid were told not to beg in the streets; the schoolmaster should determine and tell the Council concerning those who were in need. The foreign beggars were limited in their stay in the city...
to no more than three days. The most interesting characteristics of this 1370 set of regulations was the requirement that Pignot Weigel, the guardian, have the testimony of two or more citizens regarding an individual's neediness. This was one of the first attempts to enlist the citizenry officially and honorably in working with the poor.

In 1478, a little over a century later, a new set of regulations concerning begging within the city was put forth by the Council. These new regulations put more negative restrictions on the activities of the beggars. Many groups were described in this ordinance for the first time. There were the poor who were ashamed to beg during daytime and provision was made for them to beg at night, two hours in the summer and three hours in winter. Beggar's children, who were over the age of eight, were to be taught a trade whereby they could later maintain

---


7 Rüger, Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen, p. 31.

themselves. Beggars with such terrible physical deformities that "The mere sight of them might do harm to pregnant women"\(^9\) were not to display these deformities in public places for the purpose of gathering alms. Also forbidden were the group who were like side show performers that did tricks, sang, made pictures, or showed strange animals as a method of gaining contributions.\(^10\)

This new ordinance placed the religious beggars into two categories. Those who begged out of sickness were permitted, but those who were the wandering pilgrim types were forbidden to beg before the churches. The lepers, who were a special group, were not forgotten in their privilege to be allowed inside the city once a year at Eastertime in order to beg and to receive other special aids. Women who were destitute and pregnant were given a special badge which allowed them to beg before the doors of the churches; and they were also under the supervision of selected, respectable women. The special badge had to be returned after the poor woman's child had been born.\(^11\)

---


\(^11\)Ibid., p. 389.
This ordinance of 1478 reveals a sense of individualization much more than did the one of 1370. In 1478, the various kinds of begging were noted with greater precision and exactness for their provision. The ordinance of 1370 had not had this kind of explicitness.\(^{12}\) In 1478, there was a stronger emphasis on work:

"... no one on any workday should sit idle; on the contrary, they should spin or do other types of work which would bring them an income."\(^{13}\) Also noteworthy is the nature of the almsgiving. For example, foreign beggars must"... be able both to say and to pray the Our Father, Hail Mary, the Creeds, and the Commandments."\(^{14}\)

The ordinance of June 22, 1518, is the one which Willi Rüger discovered and printed for the first time in 1932.\(^{15}\) For the most part, it is simply a renewal of the 1478 ordinance almost word for word. The new items are the increased control which is given to begging officials

\(^{12}\)Rüger, *Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen*, p. 32.


\(^{14}\)Ibid., pp. 72-73.

\(^{15}\)Ibid., pp. 70-76.
(Bettelrichter); their permission had to be gained in order to beg in the city and the amount of money which these begging officials received to fulfill their tasks. For example, the Council ordered, "Out of the treasury, give each of the begging officials thirty-five pfennig per week." These officials were to set various fines for transgressions against the provisions of the ordinances. Included in this 1518 ordinance, for the first time, were the syphilitics whose right to beg was regulated. The main thrust of this renewed ordinance was to remove the foreign beggars from the city.

Willi Rüger believed that this newly discovered ordinance had relevance to the discussions of previous scholars over whether the Reformation terminated or continued a Catholic evolutionary process in welfare care and whether the Lutherans initiated a new program or simply furthered an existing one. Rüger places great emphasis on the 1518 ordinance being primarily a renewal of the 1478 one. The 1522 ordinance was a great change from the 1518 ordinance. Therefore, Rüger states, "One cannot

\[16\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 75.}\]
\[17\text{Rüger, Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen, p. 36.}\]
speak of evolution in Ratzinger's sense, if one examines the ordinances of both 1518 and 1522. The 1518 ordinance is one repeated from forty years before almost unchanged."18 Another scholar, Franz Ehrle, had written,

It was the Nuremberg Ordinance /of 1522/ that was the last phase of a social process that had existed for a long time during the Catholic period. This already existing social process was modified and changed and at that moment the change in the social position brought the process to a standstill.19

As was noted earlier in the Introduction, Feutwanger supported Ehrle but was more cautious in his conclusions.20 But Windkelmann's work took strong exception to the idea that this was a continuation of a Catholic process.21 Rüger's own position was that the ideas leading to the ordinance of 1522 were already known to the humanists and that the entrance on the scene of the Reformation thought gave strong impetus to the already existing humanism as

18Ibid., p. 37.
embodied in the economic and social activities in Nuremberg. 22

Among Luther's writings, his **Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nations**, of 1520, has the clearest statement of his opinion on begging and civic poor relief:

One of the greatest necessities is the abolition of all begging throughout Christendom. Nobody ought to go begging among Christians. It would be a very simple matter to make a law to the effect that every city should look after its own poor, if only we had the courage and the intention to do so. No beggar from outside should be allowed into the city whether he might call himself pilgrim or mendicant monk. Every city should support its own poor, and if it was to small, the people in the surrounding villages should also be encouraged to contribute, since in any case they have to feed so many vagabonds and evil rogues who call themselves mendicants. In this way, too, it could be known who was really poor and who was not.

There would have to be an overseer or warden who knows all the poor and informs the city council or the clergy what they needed. Or some better arrangement might be made. As I see it, there is no other business in which so much skullduggery and deceit are practiced as in begging, and yet it could all be easily abolished. Moreover, this unrestricted universal begging is harmful to the common people. . .23


This writing and the Long Sermon on Usury\textsuperscript{24} were widely read and influential.

Some traces of this influence may be found by examining the daily records of the city Council of Nuremberg, which was forthright in its strictures concerning begging. On March 9, 1521, the assembled Council demanded that begging by foreigners in the city be stopped and that only the Council determine who might beg here.\textsuperscript{25} This stern admonition was repeated on May 10.\textsuperscript{26} On July 24, the Council ordered the ordinance concerning begging to be read aloud again in the parish churches.\textsuperscript{27} The Council was referring to the ordinance of 1518 which was restatement of the one of 1478. The begging officials (\textit{Bettelrichter}) were warned and the various villages which surrounded the city were admonished to observe diligently this ordinance and to give no more money to foreign beggars.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{24}Luther's Works, Vol. 45, pp. 273-310.
\textsuperscript{25}RV 660, f. 19 v., March 9, 1521.
\textsuperscript{26}RV 663, f. 6 v., May 10, 1521.
\textsuperscript{27}RV 665, f. 24 v., July 24, 1521.
\textsuperscript{28}RV 665, f. 24 r., July 24, 1521.
By October, the begging officials were to be given a sum of money because they had removed so many of these foreign beggars.\textsuperscript{29} These officials handled the cases and were given recognition for individual items or general instructions.\textsuperscript{30} A leper, who had not been given permission to beg by the begging officials caused the Council to order that no one should give him clothing or other aid.\textsuperscript{31} Since the begging officials needed more funds, the Council granted the money upon their request.\textsuperscript{32}

The Council, in 1521, showed its intense distress with the foreign beggars. The helpers of the begging officials, of whom there were four, were given an added reward for their trouble in protecting the city from beggars.\textsuperscript{33} A keeper of a house frequented by beggars was called in along with his wife and the inhabitants of his house. They were questioned, especially the keeper of the

\textsuperscript{29}RV 669, f. 8 r., October 26, 1521.
\textsuperscript{30}RV 658, f. 8 r.; RV 660 f. 19 v.; RV 667 f. 1 v.
\textsuperscript{31}RV 661, f. 2 v.
\textsuperscript{32}RV 667, f. 10 v.; RV 666 f. 15 r.
\textsuperscript{33}RV 667, f. 1 v., August 22, 1521.
house, as to where he had been and what business he had been on.\textsuperscript{34} Another person who kept a house for beggars which was behind St. Jacob's church was brought in along with the beggars there and they were put in Council's prison (Loch).\textsuperscript{35} There were three beggar youths who were put into the prison to be kept for questioning.\textsuperscript{36} In October, three youthful beggars were questioned and forbidden to come back into the city for the next year.\textsuperscript{37}

Several persons made requests to the council that they be permitted to beg. The request of one Margaret Schuster was turned down on September 13, 1521.\textsuperscript{38} A man from Langenzahn was denied his request to beg as the St. Apolian chapel or at St. Mary's church.\textsuperscript{39} The Council denied an individual from Fandorf's request to beg in the

\textsuperscript{34}RV 669, f. 8 v.
\textsuperscript{35}RV 669, f. 7 r., October 25, 1521.
\textsuperscript{36}RV 664, f. 1 v., May 30, 1521.
\textsuperscript{37}RV 668, f. 15 r.
\textsuperscript{38}RV 667, f. 20 v.
\textsuperscript{39}RV 659, f. 3 v.
There were, however, exceptions to such denial. The Cardinal and Archbishop of Salzburg requested that one Claus Weissen be allowed to beg. Also Richard, Archbishop of Trier, requested and received the right for a Margaret Hertin and a Hans Vischer to beg. In the text, there is no explanation for the requests, but powerful intercessors were often used. Throughout the year, the only request that the Council granted on its own was to a Saues Agrers. She did not beg daily but the Council did grant her request to stand before the St. Mary's church and to receive alms there. This was decided on June 8, 1521.

In 1522, the Council continued harassing foreign beggars with imprisonment, interrogation, and then forbidding them the city. However, powerful intercessors again produced exceptions. Prince Ferdinand, Archduke of

---

40 RV 670, f. 4 v.
41 RV 670, f. 4 v.
42 RV 668, f. 15 r., October 4, 1521.
43 RV 664, f. 9 v., June 8, 1521.
44 RV 682, f. 10 v., October 21, 1522; RV 676, f. 2 v., April 24, 1522; RV 682, f. 9 r., October 20, 1522.
Auxtria, requested that one Cuntz Hess be allowed to wear a begging badge.\textsuperscript{45} Also the Hungarian Queen requested in December that an Ottila Mauer and a Wilhelm Welder be allowed to beg in the city.\textsuperscript{46} Another beggar, though, who submitted a begging petition to the Council was denied and it told the begging officials to send him out of the city.\textsuperscript{47} The beggars who were staying at the beggars' house behind St. Jacob's church were imprisoned.\textsuperscript{48}

One Hans Heckel, who had previously been banished, was permitted by the Council to return and to beg after he had acquired the necessary begging badge.\textsuperscript{49} Another poor man, who had been sent from the city by the begging officials, was permitted to return; but he still did not receive the badge to beg.\textsuperscript{50} One Cuntz Volken was permitted to beg without a badge. For a long time, he had been forbidden to beg; and although on his return he did

\textsuperscript{45}RV 676, f. 23 v., May 17, 1522.
\textsuperscript{46}RV 684, f. 12 r., December 18, 1522.
\textsuperscript{47}RV 673, f. 10 r., February 15, 1522.
\textsuperscript{48}RV 684, f. 19 v., December 31, 1522.
\textsuperscript{49}RV 674, f. 3 v., March 7, 1522.
\textsuperscript{50}RV 673, f. 16 v.-17 r., February 27, 1522.
not get a badge, he was still permitted to beg, which was unusual considering the attitude of the Council.\textsuperscript{51} To see if the poor students must keep to the ordinance of 1518 on begging, the chief begging official was ordered to seek the schoolmaster's advice on behalf of the poor students.\textsuperscript{52} The begging officials were ordered to keep beggars away from the foreign dignitaries outside the churches, and the chief begging official was commanded to review the list of the beggars who had been accepted earlier.\textsuperscript{53} The imperial Diet was in session in Nuremberg in 1522 and 1523, so the city Council wanted to maintain a good appearance. The villages around the city were ordered not to harbor beggars, especially those who did no work.\textsuperscript{54} One beggar with a deformity of his tongue was particularly ordered away from the city and to do no more begging.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{51}RV 673, f. 14 r., February 21, 1522.
\textsuperscript{52}RV 673, f. 9 r., February 15, 1522.
\textsuperscript{53}RV 675, f. 13 r., April 15, 1522.
\textsuperscript{54}RV 675, f. 13 v., April 15, 1522.
\textsuperscript{55}RV 676, f. 7 v., April 29, 1522.
Again in 1522 the city became increasingly concerned with the influx of foreign beggars. On May 20, the Council demanded that no one should be permitted to beg without permission from the Council itself. Individual consideration was given to each case. On May 24, the Council decided to have a new ordinance concerning begging drawn up and a copy to be placed at all the main points of the city. The needs of the domiciled poor (Hausarme) and people who could not support their children were to be written into the new ordinance. The Council on July 7, 1522, determined that most official begging should come to an end. In both parish churches as well as in the St. Mary's church, there would be receptacles placed to receive alms. The income from these alms boxes and its distribution was to be carefully supervised. The two parish church masters were to read the ordinance from both churches and the four begging assistants were to read it

56 RV 672, f. 13 v., January 24, 1522.
57 RV 676, f. 26 v., May 20, 1522.
58 RV 677, f. 4 r., May 24, 1522.
59 RV 678, f. 13 v., July 7, 1522.
before the Welch Fountain. To be included in this ordinance, was a provision to determine the needs of the poor and to instruct the officials regarding their duties. This was to be made a part of the beginning of the 1522 ordinance.

On September 1, 1523, the ordinance was printed which the Council had enacted on July 23, 1522. It regulated the New Alms fund for the domiciled poor. The name Great Alms (Grosses Almosen) was used probably to avoid confusion with the already existent Rich Alms (Reiches Almosen) foundation. The name soon evolved into the Common Alms fund (Gemeines Almosen) because of the Common Chest (Gemeiner Kasten) which was set up during Nuremberg's Reformation in 1525. The ordinance of 1522 made provision first for the indigenous poor, and it began with a preamble quoting the biblical injunctions to care for the poor and needy. The begging officials had the supervision of the foreign beggars and could place them in

---

60 RV 678, f. 12 v., July 7, 1522.
61 RV 678, f. 20 r., July 16, 1522.
prison if they begged after having been forbidden to do so. The Council recognized its duty to bring order into alms giving and the regulation of beggars. An example of such regulation was that children who begged must learn a trade.  

The administrators were charged with procuring four able men to aid them in keeping order. They were to check the beggars and the number of days begged, to prevent sideshows and thievery, to check for Godlessness among the beggars, and to make sure that the alms were distributed to the proper people. Each man had a quarter of the city to supervise. If these aides determined it necessary, then a person could receive a badge to beg but was restricted as to where he could beg. If this was violated, he would not receive alms. Each beggar had to wear a badge upon his hat and to stay out of taverns and other unseemly places. His right to beg depended on his obedience to these regulations. 

The many domiciled poor who were good people and for good Christian reasons were ashamed to beg, were to

---

63 Ibid., pp. 79-80.
64 Ibid., pp. 80-81.
receive aid directly from the official. The alms official was to search these people out and aid them. Also he was to aid the old people who likewise were ashamed to wear the badge. The badge was to be given to those who out of inability, poverty, or other weaknesses could not make their own living. The badge had to be given up once a person was able to support himself. The students in the five schools who sang for alms must have and wear their badges in order to beg around the city or to sing before houses. Poor priests who requested alms were to be taken care of by their superiors and by one another, but they were not to beg. The administrators were to search out the domiciled poor people who were sick and pregnant women who were poor and to give them food and medicine as was necessary. 65

The ordinance of 1522 said that the foreign beggars who came to Nuremberg and who were neither local nor citizens, were forbidden to stay or to beg inside the city limits. The two begging officials (Bettelrichter) and their four aides (Almosdiener) were responsible for

65 Ibid., pp. 81-88.
protecting the city from these foreigners and to strictly regulate their activities.66

The preachers were enjoined to endorse only this new alms ordinance from their pulpits and no other. Alms receptacles were to be placed in the churches and also in each church there was a pole with a sack on the end which was to be passed around the church to collect alms. This alms collection was to be distributed for the aid of the orphans, lepers, and others who needed help. The church-master of St. Sebald's was ordered to contribute to this fund thirty earlier bequests which had been given to the church for charity. The administration of the New Alms fund (Grosses Almosen) were responsible for distributing produce and money to the designated domiciled poor, students, syphilitics, and others who needed help from this charity.67

Pious people were encouraged through their bequests, donations, and endowments to increase this alms fund of 1522.68 This charity received during its first three

---

66 Ibid., p. 84.
67 Ibid., pp. 80-81.
68 Ibid., p. 87.
years of existence (1522-25) from such methods the large amount of 13,000 gulden. 69 When aid was requested from eligible people, such as those who had too many children to support, the alms official gave them assistance. Sometimes this aid came in the form of food and clothing or money to buy other necessities of life. The money for this assistance came from the New Alms fund. 70

On Mondays of every week or fourteen days, as was needed, the officials were ordered to seek out the deserving poor and assist them. They were to go through their living quarters to investigate the conditions there. The inhabitants were to be busy with some form of work. 71 Old or disabled couples were to receive fifty to sixty pfennigs in aid. If they had children, they would receive seventy to ninety pfennigs. A single disabled person was to get thirty-five to forty pfennigs and so forth. This was all to be done in accordance with brotherly love and a pious Christian desire to care for the poor. If any case


71 Ibid., p. 89.
occurred that was not covered by these regulations of the 1522 ordinance, it was brought to the attention of the Council and the officials would rectify it.\textsuperscript{72} This brief summary of the 1522 ordinance gives a general view of the provisions it made for the poor.

Caspar Busch, who died in 1527, was the first actual guardian. He served from 1523 until 1527. There were also ten directors with two chief directors, all chosen from the Council. Caspar Busch and a Georg Kotzel served for a time without a salary.\textsuperscript{73} The city was divided into four wards, each having a salaried aide as provided for in the ordinance. This arrangement was changed with the Reformation of March, 1525. The number of directors dropped to two in 1525 and rose to four in 1526.\textsuperscript{74} The income from the possessions of the churches, monasteries, and convents was turned over to the Common Chest (Gemeiner Kasten) which paid for the salaries of the preachers and teachers, the upkeep of the churches and schools, and also for poor

\textsuperscript{72}Ibid., p. 89.
\textsuperscript{73}Ehrle, "Die Armenordnung," p. 478.
\textsuperscript{74}Amterbüchlein, Nos. 45-50.
relief. With the 1525 Reformation, Caspar Busch was placed in charge of the City Alms Office until his death in 1527. He was replaced by Lucas Setzinger for 1528. Sebastian Schedel administered the Land Alms Office for these years.

The 1522 ordinance was a practical affair which attempted to regularize begging and the care of the poor. The document according to Otto Winckelmann appears to include several Protestant views such as student begging and begging by the clergy. An examination of the effect for the years 1523-1525 shows more directly how the regulations were handled on an everyday basis.

In 1523, the Council was having problems with youthful beggars. On August 31, 1523, they were expelled from the city. There were twelve of them in the Council's prison where they had been questioned about their

---

75 Amterbüchlein, Nos. 45-48.
76 Amterbüchlein, Nos. 45-48.
77 Winckelmann, "Die Armenordnungen von Nürnberg (1522)," p. 259.
78 RV 694, f. 4 r., August 31, 1523.
activities and behavior.\textsuperscript{79} One, Claus Weissen, who had been in trouble in 1522, was freed from his imprisonment and forbidden to return to the city.\textsuperscript{80} A Hans Gotz was sternly spoken to concerning whether he had permitted any beggars to stay at his house.\textsuperscript{81}

The begging officials were kept busy with the enforcement of the restrictions of the ordinance. Beggars were questioned, released, or imprisoned as the officials thought necessary.\textsuperscript{82} A Herman Henlin, for example, was asked about his connection with a begging girl.\textsuperscript{83} The keeper of a house for beggars on the Leder Alley had eight imprisoned beggars released to his observation and responsibility.\textsuperscript{84}

The Council was very concerned that the new ordinance of 1522 was being properly observed and that there

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{79}RV 694, f. 6 r., September 3, 1523.
\item \textsuperscript{80}RV 685, f. 24 v., January 21, 1523.
\item \textsuperscript{81}RV 696, f. 15 v., November 9, 1523.
\item \textsuperscript{82}RV 688, f. 9 r., March 31, 1522.
\item \textsuperscript{83}RV 692, f. 6 v., July 10, 1523.
\item \textsuperscript{84}RV 685, f. 9 r., January 7, 1523.
\end{itemize}
was no begging by foreigners in the city. The officials in charge were ordered to keep a closer watch. One Jacob Bind was forbidden to remain in the city. The Council was especially distressed with the foreign beggars who, in spite of the new ordinance, were to be found outside of the houses of dignitaries visiting Nuremberg for various imperial conferences. This type of begging was again strongly forbidden on December 4, 1523.

On January 21, 1524, the Council was still faced with this problem of beggars in front of the lodgings of the visiting dignitaries who had gathered in the city. Foreign beggars who did not wear the begging badge were denied food in these areas. If these foreign beggars did not heed the warning of the Council or listen to the commands of the begging officials, then with the help of the guard these beggars were to be imprisoned. The foreign beggars must depart and those who were citizens were examined but must wear a begging badge if they were to beg.

---

85RV 688, f. 9 v., March 31, 1523.
86RV 697, f. 15 r., December 4, 1523.
87RV 699, f. 6 v., January 21, 1524.
Those beggars who had been found gambling were to be placed in prison and questioned. On January 26, 1524, the foreign beggars were again ordered removed from the city since they lacked the necessary begging badges. Where it was discovered that beggars had changed their clothes to escape detection, they must be placed in the prison. Claus Hass was ordered to turn over the keys of the two beggar prisons to Sebald Haidens. An illustration of the Council's deep concern with the problem of beggars was an item that a begging official himself had an ailment on April 15, 1524. The Council ordered that these begging officials should receive generous wages for their year's service. One of the lesser begging officials, Fritz Seybolt, was given citizenship since he performed the duties of a citizen.

88 RV 699, f. 8 v., January 23, 1524.
89 RV 699, f. 10 r., January 26, 1524.
90 RV 702, f. 10 v., April 8, 1524.
91 RV 702, f. 17 v., April 15, 1524.
92 RV 705, f. 4 v., June 27, 1524.
93 RV 706, f. 10 v., August 5, 1524.
The Council reprimanded the begging officials on October 3, 1524, for not being diligent enough in impressing the beggars with warnings. The Council warned that it would dispense with the services of those who did not improve in their work.⁹⁴ On November 4, 1524, the begging officials were back in favor by keeping good order among the foreign beggars on All Saints' Day and were rewarded with a payment of three gulden.⁹⁵ In December, some beggar boys were warned to leave the city and the begging officials were to insure that these instructions were followed and that none of these boys remained.⁹⁶

On January 5, 1525, three beggar boys who were in prison were questioned and the sick ones were permitted to leave.⁹⁷ A Cuntz Singer was questioned upon instructions of the begging official Fritz Seybolt concerning a murder.⁹⁸ Fritz Seybolt handled the request of a

⁹⁴RV 708, f. 12 r., October 3, 1524.
⁹⁵RV 709, f. 19 v., November 4, 1524.
⁹⁶RV 711, f. 7 r., December 15, 1524.
⁹⁷RV 712, f. 1 v., January 5, 1525.
⁹⁸RV 713, f. 8 v., February 11, 1525.
Hans Hofmann. The Council noted that Seybolt's daughter had made a trip to Altenberg. In September, 1525, Fritz Seybolt left the service of the city as a begging official to take on a new job. The Council ordered a beggar imprisoned for breaking his obligation. Some Beggar boys who had been imprisoned for disobedience were released and forbidden to return to the city. On October 16, 1525, the Council ordered the begging ordinance of 1522 to be read and observed by the begging officials with the warning that where it was not observed they would be reprimanded for lack of diligence. One Ella Burckhardt was ordered given a strong, stern warning that if she continued to beg she would be placed in a sack as punishment and presumably dumped into a nearby stream.

---

99RV 714, f. 21 v., March 28, 1525.
100RV 715, f. 10 v.
101RV 721, f. 14 r., September 22, 1525.
102RV 718, f. 15 r., July 5, 1525.
103RV 721, f. 2 v., September 7, 1525.
104RV 722, f. 8 v., October 16, 1525.
105RV 723, f. 18 v., November 27, 1525.
In 1526, there was an increase in the number of begging problems discussed by the Council, whereas there had been a marked decline in such cases since the 1522 ordinance had been put into effect. One beggar, Hans Schuster, on February 5,\textsuperscript{106} and another on February 17,\textsuperscript{107} were to be threatened with punishment by the begging officials if they did not immediately leave the city, as was another beggar on February 19.\textsuperscript{108} The begging officials were ordered to interrogate the beggars in the city's prison on February 20,\textsuperscript{109} and on February 28, 1526.\textsuperscript{110} The Council ordered the keeper of a house for beggars at Steinpuhl to be sent for and advised that begging by foreigners was forbidden there.\textsuperscript{111} The month of May had three more instances of beggars who were to be questioned and punished if they did not leave the city.

\textsuperscript{106} RV 726, f. 6 v., February 5, 1526.  
\textsuperscript{107} RV 726, f. 14 r., February 17, 1526.  
\textsuperscript{108} RV 726, f. 14 v., February 19, 1526.  
\textsuperscript{109} RV 726, f. 16 r., February 20, 1526.  
\textsuperscript{110} RV 726, f. 16 r., February 28, 1526.  
\textsuperscript{111} RV 730, f. 3 r., May 5, 1526.
immediately.\textsuperscript{112} On July 4, 1526, the Council took under advisement the suggestion to improve the office of the begging officials and perhaps adding another person to the staff\textsuperscript{113} to lessen the increased number of foreign beggars that had been arriving in the city.

On July 17, 1526, the Council decided that one Peter Puheler, who had come to the city to live with his daughter, would neither be made a citizen nor be allowed to beg.\textsuperscript{114} A beggar who was in the prison was ordered to leave the city under threat of punishment.\textsuperscript{115} The Council ordered the man, who was either blind or had some eye problem, to be given fourteen days of treatment with the eye doctor but he was still not permitted to beg.\textsuperscript{116} A young boy, Sebald Feuchter, was to be questioned by the begging officials and then to be imprisoned in order to

\textsuperscript{112} RV 730, f. 13 v., May 15, 1526; RV 730, f. 18 v., May 18, 1526; RV 730, f. 24 r., May 26, 1526.

\textsuperscript{113} RV 732, f. 6 r., July 4, 1526.

\textsuperscript{114} RV 732, f. 14 v., July 17, 1526.

\textsuperscript{115} RV 733, f. 8 v., July 31, 1526.

\textsuperscript{116} RV 733, f. 24 r., August 13, 1526.
be further interrogated.\textsuperscript{117} The petition of Hans Hass was heard by the begging officials and he was brought to the city for possible aid.\textsuperscript{118} The junior begging official was ordered by the council to listen to a poor woman's problems, find out her desires, and to report this back to the Council.\textsuperscript{119} One Hans of Swainaus, who was imprisoned because of complaints, especially concerning his begging, was to be given money and ordered to leave the city.\textsuperscript{120} A begging official was told to inquire of Mynnem Wolf how much money he had and if he desired to beg in the city.\textsuperscript{121} The begging officials received orders concerning some women beggars who were to be interrogated and perhaps punished.\textsuperscript{122}

The Council continued to show great concern in 1526 with the problems of begging. On October 15, one begging

\textsuperscript{117}RV 734, f. 13 r., September 1, 1526.
\textsuperscript{118}RV 734, f. 17 v., September 4, 1526.
\textsuperscript{119}RV 734, f. 22 r., September 6, 1526.
\textsuperscript{120}RV 734, f. 24 r., September 7, 1526.
\textsuperscript{121}RV 735, f. 21 r., October 10, 1526; RV 735, f. 26 r., October 12, 1526; RV 735, f. 27 v., October 13, 1526.
official was imprisoned in order to ascertain if he had been receiving money from beggars, presumably as bribes.\textsuperscript{123} Caspar Busch, the city alms official, received inquiries from Hans Schreck regarding a position as a begging official. Busch was ordered to make a report on him.\textsuperscript{124} Another man, Wolf Beutler, was also petitioning for the job of begging official.\textsuperscript{125} A member of the Council, Nicholas Groland, was ordered to review all the job applications and to give the Council his advice concerning them.\textsuperscript{126} The man who was chosen was Hans Schreck. He had previously been a minor city aide. Another Council member, Nicholas Haller, was ordered to inform Schreck of his appointment on October 29, 1526.\textsuperscript{127} The Council ordered that Schreck's wife and children should receive extra support while he held this position.\textsuperscript{128}

\textsuperscript{123}RV 735, f. 29 v., October 15, 1526.
\textsuperscript{124}RV 735, f. 30 r., October 16, 1526.
\textsuperscript{125}RV 735, f. 31 v., October 17, 1526.
\textsuperscript{126}RV 736, f. 13 v., October 26, 1526.
\textsuperscript{127}RV 736, f. 16 r.; RB 13, f. 172 v.
\textsuperscript{128}RV 736, f. 18 r.-18 v., November 1, 1526.
In 1527, the cases concerning begging dwindled to two. On January 3, 1527, a beggar boy was placed in the prison to be interrogated.\textsuperscript{129} The other instance occurred on April 13, 1527, when a beggar was forbidden to beg in either the city or the countryside otherwise he would be punished for his disobedience.\textsuperscript{130} This great decrease in the number of items taken up by the Council is probably the result of a combination of circumstances: the increase in the activities of the officials of the Common Chest (Gemeiner Kasten), the very strong measures taken by the Council in 1526 to eliminate foreign beggars and to increase the scope of the activities of the begging officials, and the fact that the Council's time was being taken up so much by local poverty relief, through the agency of the Common Chest, that it had to rely on its designated begging officials to deal with the individual begging problems without taking up so much time during the Council's meetings.

In 1528, the number of cases considered by the Council rose to nine. A beggar, who was discovered on

\textsuperscript{129} RV 738, f. 21 r., January 3, 1527.

\textsuperscript{130} RV 742, f. 15 r., April 13, 1527.
January 7, was ordered imprisoned. A woman who had previously been refused permission to beg in the city was allowed to return but there was still no mention of permitting her to beg. One Hans Volck, who had been ordered by the begging officials to leave the city, was allowed to stay and the officials of the Common Chest were ordered to allow him to wear the begging badge. A beggar who was in the prison was ordered interrogated on April 11, 1528. One Fritz Kropel wrote to the Council on behalf of an Adam of Friedenburg requesting permission for Adam to beg in Nuremberg. The Council denied the request stating that there were enough beggars here already. However, a sum of money was ordered given to Adam and he should be sent away. The Council ordered a beggar from Eisten imprisoned and interrogated.

131 RV 752, f. 5 v., January 7, 1528.
132 RV 752, f. 15 v., January 14, 1528.
133 RV 754, f. 20 r., March 16, 1528.
135 RV 756, f. 34 r., May 9, 1528.
136 RV 757, f. 21 r., May 30, 1528.
The begging officials were ordered to investigate the petition of a beggar called Wilhelm on September 22.\footnote{RV 761, f. 14 v., September 22, 1528.} A beggar who had been denied access to the city by the begging officials was to be granted entrance.\footnote{RV 762, f. 19 v., November 25, 1528.} The officials were ordered on December 3, 1528, to see to the burial of a beggar who had died.\footnote{RV 764, f. 5 v., December 3, 1528.} In the year of 1528, the Council's actions concerning the beggars were mainly interventions in cases that had been handled by the begging officials' staff. The Council was following its policy of delegating cases to the appointed authorities.

For the years 1521 and 1528, the chief begging official was Johann Peuschel. His two main assistants were Hans Jacob and Friedrich Seybolt. Seybolt resigned and was replaced in 1526 by Hans Schreck.\footnote{Amterbüchlein, Nos. 41-48.} The major officials therefore enjoyed the confidence of the Council throughout this period from 1521 to 1528 during which the new ordinance of 1522 was issued. The Council showed even greater reliance on these men in 1527 and 1528 when it...
ceased taking up so many of the individual begging cases in its daily meetings and left their disposition to the begging officials. The duties of these officials primarily were concerned with enforcement of the Council's directives concerning beggars, especially those who were foreign to the city.

The years 1521 through 1528 show a change in the way that the Council managed begging. The items in the agenda of the Council from 1521 and 1522 illustrate its deep concern which makes the 1522 ordinance more understandable. The new regulations contain elements of the daily experience of the Council. However, the 1522 ordinance was a change from the past. In examining the cases which followed this new ordinance, it can be seen that the Council was trying to enforce the new patterns. The ordinance of 1522 made provision for a New Alms fund (Grosses Almosen) to aid the indigent poor with Caspar Busch as its main administrator. The 1525 Reformation established the Common Chest, which absorbed the functions of the New Alms fund of 1522 with Caspar Busch continuing to be charged with poor relief in the city. The number of items concerning begging taken up by the Council fluctuated, with a decrease for the years 1523 to 1525, an increase in 1526,
and then a decrease for 1527 and 1528. The kind and number of items per year reflect the changes in the Council's methods for dealing with the problem of begging. The large variations over these eight years give an impression that the Council was combining the Reformation ideas such as prohibition of foreign beggars and municipal responsibility for local poor relief on begging with its own experiences with the problem. By examining the individual actions of the Council during this period, the Council can be observed in its efforts to establish new methods for handling begging, both domestic and the elimination of foreign beggars.
CHAPTER SIX

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMON CHEST

Martin Luther had suggested in his Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation of 1520 that every city make provision for its own poor. He wrote that poor relief should be organized in order to replace the existing disorganized system.\(^1\) Karlstadt drew up an ordinance for Wittenberg which was based on some suggestions by Luther. This ordinance was issued in January, 1522. It placed all the church revenues of the city in a Common Chest which was under the control of both laity and clergy. Nuremberg enacted an alms ordinance in July, 1522, which was printed in September, 1523.\(^2\) The Nuremberg ordinance, while it provided for beggars and poor relief, did not at that time go as far as Wittenberg's in

---

\(^1\)Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation, 1520, Luther's Works, Vol. 44, pp. 123-217.

\(^2\)Rüger, Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen, p. 38.
placing all church revenues in a Common Chest.

Other cities adopted this system of a Common Chest. Among them was Leisnig, a small town in Electoral Saxony. Leisnig requested Luther's advice on their Common Chest ordinance which would organize all church properties, provide for religious services and schools, and relieve the poor and needy. Luther wrote a letter to the Leisnig City Council on January 29, 1523, in which he expressed his approval of their institution of a Common Chest.⁴ He later also replied in the form of a written preface to the ordinance. He had both his preface and the Leisnig ordinance printed together in August, 1523.⁴

The concept of a Common Chest was, therefore, not new to Nuremberg's city Council. The growth of the idea became progressively stronger as the Council had to create and organize the proper authority and institutions to meet the city's particular needs. The outcome of the Religious

---


Colloquy of March, 1525, was no surprise. The Council was concerned with order and reasonably enough adopted its own form of the Common Chest before the Colloquy. The immediate problems were what to do with the church funds and revenues, how to pay the preachers and teachers, how to maintain the physical facilities, and also how to relieve the poor and needy. The Common Chest was evolved by the Council to handle these problems. It was not enacted in a formal sense.

The ways in which the Council dealt directly with alms giving before the Common Chest was established can be seen in the following items taken from the Council's daily record from January, 1521, until the beginning of 1525, when the Common Chest came into full stature. These entries show the various interests and methods of alms giving by the Council.

The Council was in the habit of granting money for work which was done well. This amounted to a reward. However, quite often the word "alms" (Almosen) was used to designate the reward.  

\(^5\) Although it had administrators who

\(^5\) RV 660, f. 7 r., February 24, 1521.
supervised the general alms giving, the Council frequently devoted its attention to individuals, such as the case of a person from the nearby village of Wöhrd. He was given the right to gather alms for the next eight days in front of St. Mary's church. Another citizen's petition to gather alms there was denied. It also ordered that a person, who was poor and sick, be taken under care by the Franciscan monks at the city's cost.

1522

In 1522, the Council permitted the last indulgence to be preached. On November 10, it gave the Master of St. Sebald's church the right to announce the gathering of alms as it had occurred in previous years. In March, 1523, it ordered that there be "... no indulgence banners or such for alms for lepers." A city servant, who was injured in the performance of his office was ordered given

---

6RV 666, f. 7 r., August 3, 1521.
7RV 667, f. 19 r., September 11, 1521.
8RV 668, f. 17 r., October 5, 1521.
9RV 683, f. 5 v., November 10, 1522.
10RB 12, f. 153 and 155, March, 1523.
an alms of three gulden.\textsuperscript{11} Some prisoners were given alms under the direction of Hans Lochinger.\textsuperscript{12} A note to Sigmund Führer, Council member, from one Anna Aichhorn was ordered answered to the effect that she and her children would receive alms aid.\textsuperscript{13}

The Council received bequests and gave individual attention to their disposition in these years before the Common Chest. A Cuntz Horn left money for charity and the Council decided, in March, 1522, to give twenty gulden of the money to the convent at Pillenreut.\textsuperscript{14} On October 29, 1522, the administrators of Horn's estate had a surplus and the Council ordered the money to be distributed to the licensed beggars and the domiciled poor.\textsuperscript{15} The Council repeated this action the next day and used some of the money for other purposes.\textsuperscript{16} The executor of one Leonhard

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{11}RV 680, f. 17 v., May 12, 1522.
\item \textsuperscript{12}RV 680, f. 6 r., August 16, 1522.
\item \textsuperscript{13}RV 680, f. 17 v., September 6, 1522.
\item \textsuperscript{14}RV 673, f. 19 r., March 1, 1522.
\item \textsuperscript{15}RV 682, f. 16 v., October 29, 1522.
\item \textsuperscript{16}RV 682, f. 17 r., October 30, 1522.
\end{itemize}
Schmidt's estate was ordered to direct the money left by Schmidt into the New Alms Fund which had just been set up.17

The 1522 ordinance began the New Alms Fund (Grosses Almosen) which was established for the relief of the indigenous poor. The Council ordered on September 22, 1522, that where the beggars had previously gathered alms, every priest was to be furnished with a copy of the new ordinance. There was a new set of rules for this New Alms Fund which was for the domiciled poor. These rules were to be posted in every church. Thereby those needing such help could be informed and could obtain what they needed from the New Alms Fund.18 The guardian of this new fund was ordered to administer the alms carefully and honestly.19 The church master of St. Sebald's was ordered to divert a previous charitable gift into the New Alms Fund to be given to the domiciled poor and students as needed.

17RV 681, f. 8 r., September 18, 1522.
18RV 681, f. 11 r., September 22, 1522.
19RV 681, f. 11 v., September 22, 1522.
In return, the recipients were to give prayers of thanks to God for the soul of the founder.20

The Council set limits for receiving alms. Those who did not reside in a district could not obtain alms there.21 All of the Homes for Indigent, Elderly Women, (SeelhMuser) were to be granted aid from this New Alms Fund.22 The Council advised the villages of Sampach and Gleissenburg, by written messages, as to how and where the alms funds should be administered in the future by the villages.23 The Council now asked its advisers how the goods and lands of the churches and the New Alms Fund should be supervised and regulated with an overseer, who would take care of the rents and other such income around the countryside.24 The Council ordered that those people who had been receiving weekly aid would now receive it from the agency of the New Alms Fund.25

20RV 681, f. 13 r., September 25, 1522.
21RV 682, f. 7 r., October 16, 1522.
22RV 682, f. 14 r., October 25, 1522.
23RV 682, f. 13 v., October 25, 1522.
24RV 682, f. 3 v., October 10, 1522.
25RV 684, f. 12 r., December 18, 1522.
On March 19, 1523, the Council was disturbed about the condition of the Alms Mill on the Fischbach Stream. Consequently the Teutonic Order hospital master was warned not to interfere with the flow of the stream which turned the mill or he would be punished.\textsuperscript{26} It ordered, upon request of the Margrave, that one Hans Regenspurg, who was a poor man imprisoned for begging, be released, presented with citizenship, and given a weekly charity by the Alms Fund directors.\textsuperscript{27} A Cuntz Stetten's request to gather alms was denied.\textsuperscript{28} A servant of the city, Fritz Neidhardt, injured his hand while working on the Franciscan bridge. The Council ordered him given six gulden from the Domi-ciled Poor Fund at the expense of the city.\textsuperscript{29}

On June 9, 1523, the Council designated several overseers to ride around the countryside and receive the rents and monies belonging to the Alms Fund.\textsuperscript{30} The Council

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{26}RV 687, f. 22 v., March 19, 1523.
\item \textsuperscript{27}RV 688, 1 v., March 26, 1523.
\item \textsuperscript{28}RV 688, f. 9 r., March 31, 1523.
\item \textsuperscript{29}RV 689, f. 22 v., May 5, 1523.
\item \textsuperscript{30}RV 691, f. 4 r., June 9, 1523.
\end{itemize}
ordered that Melchior Haupt, who was the priest at St. Mary's church, be given a suitable amount of money for his needs from the Alms Fund.31

On August 22, 1523, the Council decided to have the alms ordinance of 1522 printed and it charged Lazarus Spengler with following through on the order to insure action.32 On March 2, 1523, the Count of Eisenburg wanted a copy of the new alms ordinance of 1522. The Council ordered Caspar Busch to reply to the Count by sending him a copy.33

A Hans Müllner was designated the overseer in the countryside for the goods and lands of the Alms Fund and the churches. His payment must be given at the proper time.34 A smith was ordered by the Council to be given citizenship in order to make him eligible to receive alms aid.35 The Council made several grants to individuals

31 RV 692, f. 8 v., July 11, 1523.
32 RV 693, f. 19 v., August 22, 1523.
33 RV 687, f. 4 r., March 2, 1523.
34 RV 693, f. 22 r., August 26, 1523.
35 RV 694, f. 15 v., September 17, 1523.
from the Alms Fund at this time.36

The famous preacher, Andreas Osiander, received by the Council's consent an additional thirty gulden yearly. A widow, Barbara Schenk, requested to be allowed to endow this amount to the city's treasury so that Osiander should remain as the preacher for St. Lorenz. Any extra money was to be given to the New Alms Fund for the domiciled poor as was needed.37 The widow died in 1525 and left Osiander the right to buy her house at a low sum.38 This earlier endowment of Barbara Schenk in 1523 shows the impact that Andreas Osiander was making in Nuremberg by his preaching. The Council agreed to her petition on March 8, 1523.39

The executor of the estate of Leonhard Schmidt of Wührd said that the surplus estate would go into the New Alms Fund to be distributed to Schmidt's friends who were

36RV 695, f. 5 r.; RV 695, f. 10 v.; RV 688, f. 3 r.; RV 690, f. 2 v; RV 697, f. 2 r.

37RV 690, f. 8 v., May 15, 1523.


39RV 687, f. 3 v., March 8, 1523.
The Council ordered a poor, suffering woman to be presented with citizenship, thereby making her eligible for aid from the New Alms Fund. The administrator of the New Alms Fund was ordered to pay two gulden yearly for a Nicholas Helchner's rent as long as he lived.

The Council used the New Alms Fund to take care of Fritz Neidhardt, who had hurt his hand in the city's service. He had requested seventeen gulden but he received six gulden from the New Alms Fund. One Wolf Aman was given New Alms aid until another minor official job became available to him.

1524

In 1524, the distribution of charity from the Council came primarily through the agency of the New Alms Fund. On January 15, the peasants who had been driven from their houses and who were staying in the buildings

---

40RV 691, f. 3 r., June 8, 1523.
41RV 691, f. 7 r., June 12, 1523.
42RV 695, f. 22 v., October 16, 1523.
43RV 697, f. 23 r., December 15, 1523.
44RV 698, f. 8 v., January 2, 1524.
yard and in the hospital, were ordered to be given alms money. The Council commanded that the Alms Fund in the city treasury should aid the clergy in both parish churches with the amount of ten gulden extra salary until the Council could bring proper financial order into the two parishes. The two church provosts were ordered to insure that the clergymen were paid this money. The Council granted many individual requests for alms.

The clergy of both parish churches were told to preach alms giving from the pulpit and in the homes. The church provosts were to give the income from this collection to the alms administrator. The clergy were ordered to read aloud the 1522 ordinance to encourage alms giving. The clergy themselves should receive a good salary and any shortage should be taken care of out of the Alms Fund. For a priest at the New Hospital, Andreas Dober, the Council decided to make his mother a citizen which

---

45RV 699, f. 2 r., January 15, 1524.
46RV 700, f. 13 r., February 26, 1524.
47RV 700, f. 13 v.; RV 702, f. 20 r.; RV 703, f. 3 v.
48RV 705, f. 13 v., July 7, 1524.
made her eligible for weekly alms. This was done to better his income, and the Council continued to look for a benefice for him.\textsuperscript{49}

The New Alms Fund received money from fines. A craftsman, Melchior Koch, had to pay a fine into the Fund so that he and his helpers could continue to work.\textsuperscript{50} One Thomas Lauffenholtz said he was not involved in quarreling and should not have to pay a fine into the New Alms Fund. The Council maintained that he must pay the fine.\textsuperscript{51} The Council granted aid to several individuals but specified that no foreigner could receive aid.\textsuperscript{52}

The Council, on November 2, 1524, decided that the entire printing of Thomas Münzer's small book should be acquired. It was the opinion of the Council that the book would have caused more uproar than Christian, brotherly love. The book seller, who had it printed, was given an

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{49}RV 705, f. 10 v., August 5, 1524.
\item \textsuperscript{50}RV 703, f. 19 v., May 21, 1524.
\item \textsuperscript{51}RV 706, f. 16 v.-17 r., August 13, 1524.
\item \textsuperscript{52}RV 707, f. 6 r.; RV 708, f. 10 r.; RV 709 f. 4 r.; RV 707, f. 10 v.; RV 711, f. 12 v.; RV 701, f. 4 v.
\end{itemize}
alms to the equivalent of printing 400 of these books.\(^{53}\)

A laborer who lived on Kotgasse had his house damaged by the fountain nearby. He had to pay eight gulden to have that portion of his house rebuilt. The Council ordered that this man receive reimbursement from the New Alms Fund.\(^{54}\) The fund was used in many such indirect ways for relief and redress.

The Council ordered that the officials in charge of the New Alms Fund be granted an overseer for the properties of the fund and a horse for him to ride. The money granted for this purpose was 150 gulden yearly. The Council also decreed the overseer should receive seventy-two pfennigs a day as support money when he was outside the city on the affairs of the Alms Fund.\(^{55}\) Fabian Haller was the person chosen by the Council as the Fund's official to oversee its properties outside the city and he was to be given the 150 gulden yearly as his salary.\(^{56}\)

\(^{53}\text{RV 709, f. 18 r., November 2, 1524.}\)
\(^{54}\text{RV 701, f. 11 v., March 22, 1524.}\)
\(^{55}\text{RV 710, f. 13 r., November 28, 1524.}\)
\(^{56}\text{RV 710, f. 16 r., December 2, 1524.}\)
The officials of the New Alms Fund were informed of the Council's decision on December 6, 1524, to place Caspar Busch in charge of the city's alms work and Sebastian Schedel was put in charge of the territory outside the city. There was an arrangement that for every 1,000 gulden of income which they brought into the fund, they would receive a small remuneration.57

The Beginning of the Common Chest

It is apparent that the Council was already setting up the functions of the Common Chest with the appointment of Caspar Busch and Sebastian Schedel to office. The New Alms fund was quickly absorbed by the Common Chest. It can be seen that the Council did not abruptly set up the Common Chest agency with the March, 1525, Colloquy. The evolution of the New Alms Fund began taking place as the Council created new methods through practical application. The items of daily business concerning alms giving seem to give the Council impetus in centralizing and expediting the process.

57 RV 711, f. 4 r., December 12, 1524.
The Religious Colloquy of March, 1525, marked only the formal break with Catholicism; and since the Council was a cautious, deliberative body, it began discussion of the Common Chest almost one year before the actual break. The Comon Chest was to take over the physical administration of the church properties and goods and the functions of the New Alms Fund charitable work.

On March 10, 1524, the cutlery tradespeople asked the Council if it would be proper for them to take the money in their account and place it in the Common Chest for the aid of those who might need it and that perhaps other groups, who heard God's word daily, might feel it their Christian duty to do the same.58

On October 12, 1524, the Council ordered the masters of both churches to turn over all money from masses for souls. The Rich Alms Fund was instructed to turn over its money for the domiciled poor. In the beginning, these monies were to be placed in a chest. Responsible people of ability were ordered selected to keep this chest in order.59 On October 15, the bakers

\[58\text{RV 701, f. 2 r.; RV 701, f. 4 v.}\]

\[59\text{RV 708, f. 18 r., October 12, 1524.}\]
asked permission to give their group's money into the Common Chest. 60

This was the beginning of a movement to place money from all sources into the Common Chest. The first religious order to volunteer all their possessions was the Augustinian Monastery which "... prayerfully asked for and request," that this be done. 61 On December 24, 1524, the Council accepted the request of the Augustinian Order. Those wishing to leave the order might do so and those who preferred to stay would receive for the rest of their lives the necessities of life. All the possessions of the Monastery were to be given into the "... newly created Common Chest of the Great Alms." 62 The Augustinian Order was the one which had been very influential in bringing the new ideas of the Reformation to Nuremberg. Johannes von Staupitz had preached and taught at the Nuremberg Augustinian Monastery, and Luther who had been an Augustinian monk had close ties with it.

60RV 709, f. 4 r.-4 v., October 15, 1524.
61RV 711, f. 5 r., December 13, 1524.
62RV 711, f. 15 v.; RV 711, f. 15 v.
The Common Chest organization was set up on December 13, 1524, when the Council ordered Nicholas Groland, Leo Schurstab, Jorg Ketzel, and Lienhart Tucher to be the directors of the new Common Chest. These men were to meet as soon as possible to pick out two men to administer it. This appears to be the formal action by the Council to make provision for the practical everyday matters in connection with the coming change in religion. 63

These early arrangements give a deepened perspective that the actual mechanics of the Reformation had been proceeding in the Council from a time much earlier than the Colloquy of March, 1525. On March 18, 1525, the four directors of the Common Chest were confirmed in their positions. Also Caspar Busch was reaffirmed as the alms official for the city and Sebastian Schedel for the territory. 64

The Council commanded on January 28, 1525, that no persons should beg either by day or by night. If they had a legitimate need, they might apply to the Common Chest

63 RV 711, f. 5 v.; December 13, 1524.
64 RV 714, f. 13 r.; RB 12, f. 274-275.
for relief. This was the beginning of the Council placing local begging under the control of the Common Chest.

The Augustinians' case was turned over to the Chest officials to complete the transfer of income and possessions. The next religious group were the Carmelites, who requested on May 15, 1525, that they be allowed to give over their entire possessions in the same manner as the Augustinians. On May 12, the Grundlach Convent made the same kind of request. Sebastian Schedel, who was the territorial alms official, was ordered to make the proper arrangements. The nuns of the Convents at Engeltal and at Pillenreut put the possessions of their convents at the disposal of the Council. The possessions were to be added to the Common Chest. The Council received a request from the Carthusians who wished all their possessions to be placed in the Common Chest. The twelve brothers of the

65 RV 712, f. 19 v.
66 RV 714, f. 11 v., March 16, 1525.
67 RV 716, f. 26 v., May 15, 1525.
68 RV 716, f. 24 r.-24 v., May 12, 1525.
69 RV 716, f. 22 r., May 10, 1525.
Carthusians reported that they were following their convictions in this matter.\textsuperscript{70} The directors of the Common Chest were ordered to take over that monastery and administer the lands and goods.\textsuperscript{71}

The Common Chest took over the responsibility for building repairs to the churches. The first such mention was a request by the abbot of St. Egydien Monastery on May 15, 1526.\textsuperscript{72} The two parish church administrators were told that in the future they should make their requests to the Common Chest.\textsuperscript{73} The church master of St. Mary's gave up his office and the Common Chest officials were delegated to administer the church.\textsuperscript{74} The new administrator for St. Mary's church was given twenty-two gulden yearly from the Chest. The five vicars at that church had their benefices removed and they were to receive money from the Chest in compensation. The old administrator, Daniel

\textsuperscript{70} RV 722, f. 3 v.; RB 13 f. 41 r.
\textsuperscript{71} RV 722, f. 3 v.; RB 13, f. 41 r.
\textsuperscript{72} RV 717, f. 2 v., May 18, 1525.
\textsuperscript{73} RV 717, f. 17 v., June 2, 1525.
\textsuperscript{74} RV 719, f. 17 r.; RV 719, f. 21 v.; RV 720, f. 19 r.; RB 13, f. 29 v.
Schmid, was ordered given eight gulden.\textsuperscript{75}

The Council thanked Philip Melancthon for his advice to them concerning using part of the Common Chest money for the establishment and maintenance of schools. The Council ordered its appreciation be appropriately conveyed to Melancthon for this advice.\textsuperscript{76} There were various requests for aid from the Common Chest.\textsuperscript{77}

On March 25, 1925, the vicar of St. Sebald was invested with his office. The Alms Officials were charged by the Council with seeing that this was done properly under the new system.\textsuperscript{78}

The Council decreed that two pounds of lard be given to each poor person. This alms was to be at the cost of the Common Chest. Fireworks were also ordered in the celebration of the victory of Pavia. The \textit{Te Deum} should be sung in both churches with the organ accompaniment in order that everyone could celebrate. The fireworks

\textsuperscript{75}RV 720, f. 19 r., September 1, 1525.
\textsuperscript{76}RV f. 45 r.-45 v., November 17, 1525.
\textsuperscript{77}RV 724, f. 5 r.; RV 723, f. 14 v; RV 723, f. 10 r.; RV 723, f. 4 v.
\textsuperscript{78}RV 714, f. 20 v., RB 12, f. 295.
were to be held in the market place and the state pipers were to play before the doors of St. Mary's church.79

On December 22, 1525, the Council ordered that the money from the Common Chest be used with care and good advice.80 The Council was cautious. With the chest assuming so many new responsibilities, the guidelines might become blurred and the funds misapplied.

1526

In 1526, the Common Chest was given many orders regarding the income from benefices.81 Many villages wanted their priests confirmed.82 The people of Teuffenbach requested a preacher and the Council ordered that Chest officials send them a suitable individual.83

The Council ordered that a benefice in the city that was held from Venice should be bought by the treasury

79RV 714, f. 5 v.; RV 714, f. 8 v.
80RV 724, f. 14 v., December 22, 1525.
81RV 725, f. 10 v., RV 726, f. 12 v.
82RV 727, f. 2 r.
83RV 724, f. 25 r., March 20, 1526.
out of the money from the Chest.\textsuperscript{84} The Council became interested in establishing a place in both parishes where the poor could be temporarily lodged.\textsuperscript{85}

There were cases where persons wanted the return of their own or their families endowments.\textsuperscript{86} The widow of one Fritz Schmausser had made an endowment to St. Lorenz. Meanwhile she was in need. The Council decided to return one half of the money to her on a yearly basis.\textsuperscript{87} The widow of Bartelmas Korn wanted an endowment returned but the Council refused her request.\textsuperscript{88} To one Jorg Wegenle, the Council denied the return of his parents' bequest. However, if he were in need, the full interest from the bequest would be given to him.\textsuperscript{89} A Michael Meier and his aunt applied for the return of Frederich Rosenriester's bequest of twelve gulden for eternal masses for his soul.

\textsuperscript{84}RV 729, f. 27 r., April 25, 1526.  
\textsuperscript{85}RV 725, f. 7 v.; RV 729, f. 10 r.  
\textsuperscript{86}RV 727, f. 18 v.  
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The Council refused and based its rejection on its understanding of God's Word and the opinion of its learned advisors. The Council ordered that these two people had no justification for such an inheritance to revert to them and so advised the Chest officials.90 One of Martin Haller's daughters petitioned for a return of money but the Council replied that the other daughter seemed content to let the money be used as alms. The petition was politely refused.91

The Council made inquiries of a Stefan Gauckenstein to find out if his eight gulden bequest in the city treasury could be used by the Common Chest for the aid of the poor.92 One Thomas Löffelholtz wrote the Council asking for the return of the land which his parents had endowed to the Augustinian Monastery. Sigmund Führer, who was a friend of Thomas Löffelholtz, spoke in favor of returning the bequest.93 The Council ordered the director

---

90 RV 726, 5. 8 v.; RB 13, f. 58 r., February 8, 1526.
91 RV 726, f. 10 v., February 13, 1526.
92 RV 726, f. 2 v., January 26, 1526.
93 RV 733, f. 35 r., August 21, 1526.
of the Common Chest to return a part of the endowment.\textsuperscript{94} Jobst Haller, who was the guardian of the Holy Cross Hospice, told the Council that it had been a long time since the five gulden for the pilgrim alms was donated. Meanwhile the interest could be used. The Council decided to investigate the matter.\textsuperscript{95} Jobst Haller was given permission to use the money almost a week later.\textsuperscript{96}

The Council received various requests for alms aid.\textsuperscript{97} A tailor requested that he had the right to be given the alms badge.\textsuperscript{98} The Chest officials were ordered to reply to Dr. Johann Mantel, an Augustinian.\textsuperscript{99} The officials wrote to him that twenty gulden seemed the proper amount for the city to give him.\textsuperscript{100} One Virgilius Prenyns said that he held his benefice by an agreement
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with the officials of the Common Chest and that this contract could not be ended. 101 The Council decided to deny Prennyena the fifty-two gulden offered him yearly by the alms guardians upon the time of his transferral. 102 A Jorg Jager was willing that a half-part of his benefice be given up if the Chest officials would find another for him. 103

The city had problems disentangling rents and possessions in other territories. 104 The Bishop of Würzburg requested that part of the income from the sale of lands at Rugsburg be given to the Common Chest. 105 The Alms officials sent to Rothenberg to collect the fifty gulden in rent owed to the Carmelite Monastery. 106

The bishop of Bamberg, in whose diocese Nuremberg was, raised difficulties for the alms fund of the Common

101 RV 737, f. 32 r., December 7, 1526.
102 RV 738, f. 6 v., December 17, 1526.
103 RV 729, f. 20 v.; RV 738, f. 14 r.; RV 732, f. 5 v.; RV 735, f. 18 r.
104 RV 733, f. 10 v., August 2, 1526.
105 RV 733, f. 10 v., August 2, 1526.
106 RV 729, f. 11 r., April 12, 1526.
Chest because it decreased his income. The Council and the bishop having discussed this problem,\(^{107}\) he wrote the Council demanding his taxes.\(^{108}\) The Council ordered that the taxes by the bishop be stopped.\(^{109}\) It commanded that the treasurer of the bishop be forbidden all taxes, before notaries and witnesses, and that none of his income should be given until the bishop had rescinded his denunciation on oath.\(^{110}\) The Council continued to add restrictions.\(^{111}\) It also took pains to explain that it was the Carmelites, among others, who had given their possessions into the Common Chest and that now the city had the duty to collect the rents from their possessions. The Bamberg treasurer was asked not to interfere in the Council's collection of income in Forchheim, although he administered the other income for the Bamberg Chapter's account. The Council would not interfere with the treasurer as long as he did

\(^{107}\text{RV 736, f. 15 r.}\)

\(^{108}\text{RV 736, f. 24 r., November 5, 1526.}\)

\(^{109}\text{RV 736, f. 26 v., November 7, 1526; RV 736, f. 31 v., November 10, 1526.}\)
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\(^{111}\text{RV 737, f. 6 v.; RV 738, f. 11 v.}\)
not interfere with the Common Chest officials in the village of Reut where the Nuremberg Carmelite monks also had owned property which now belonged to the Common Chest. The Council asked His Grace, the Bishop, to keep his treasurer from interfering with that income in Forchheim which now belonged to the Common Chest in Nuremberg and the Council would settle accounts as to who had received what monies so far that year. 112

The Dominican monks petitioned to abandon their possessions and monastery to the Common Chest. The Council ordered an inquiry to ascertain if this was the desire of all the monks. 113 One month later, on September 17, 1526, it accepted the petition on behalf of the Common Chest. The directors of the Chest were ordered to accept the possessions and to make an accounting of this to the Council. 114 A Carthusian monk was granted permission to learn a trade in order to support himself.

112 RV 737, f. 6 v.; RB 13, f. 182 r.-183 r., November 19, 1526.

113 RV 734, f. 21 r., September 5, 1526.

114 RV 734, f. 37 v.; RB 13, f. 145 v., November 19, 1526.
The Chest officials were ordered to find the means for him to do this.\textsuperscript{115} As for the three Augustinian brothers remaining in the monastery, the Council determined that they must make up their minds whether or not to remain there or their supply of food would be stopped.\textsuperscript{116}

The Council ordered the Chest officials to begin negotiations with the prioress and the Convent of St. Katherine. Meanwhile the preacher there had taken a wife and the Convent did not want him to continue in office. The Chest officials were told to straighten out the situation.\textsuperscript{117} The monasteries which had been given to the Chest were ordered to consolidate their remaining people in one place in order to reduce the cost of maintenance.\textsuperscript{118}

The administrative officials of the Chest, Caspar Busch and Sebastian Schadel, received a number of cases from the Council directing their actions.\textsuperscript{119} The Council
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ordered the orphanages to be placed under the supervision of Sebastian Schedel at this time to bring them into better order.120 Sebastian Schedel was ordered to listen to the petition of one Contz Hiltprant because it concerned an endowment and to determine the man's needs.121 Caspar Busch reported that he did not find the administrative work of the Common Chest to be difficult.122

The small Council ordered the accounting of the Common Chest or Great Alms on May 26, 1526.123 On June 11, it reported that it had asked Hieronymous Ebner and Caspar Nützel to do an inquiry into the administration of the Common Chest. The report stated that Caspar Busch and Sebastian Schedel were found to be doing a faithful and diligent job of administering the organization.124

120 RV 730, f. 17 r., May 18, 1526.
121 RV 729, f. 9 v., April 10, 1526.
122 RV 731, f. 26 v., June 22, 1526.
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1527

The Common Chest continued in 1527 to acquire more responsibilities and respect from the Council as being a practical method of administration. The Chest officials were given more orders from the Council to aid individual cases.125 When Caspar Busch died, the Council decided that his job of overseeing the city alms office was too difficult for one person. It inquired if it should perhaps appoint two men to replace him.126 Lucas Setzinger was approached by the Council to replace Caspar Busch as the alms official for the city,127 and was confirmed as the official on October 21, 1527.128 Two of the officials of the Common Chest, Lucas Setzinger and Joachim Haller, were singled out by the Council for commendation because they had performed their duties well.129

125RV 739, f. 32 v.; RV 740, f. 2 v.; RV 740, f. 14 r.; RV 740, f. 29 v.; RV 745, f. 29 v.
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On January 12, 1527, the Council announced that there was not enough money in the Common Chest to care for the poor in both parishes. Therefore, the Council ordered a redistribution of the existing money in the fund until the situation improved. The benefices of the church workers from the preachers to the grave-diggers were to be reduced by half. The priests who were not in residence should receive nothing. The income that had come into the Chest from the monasteries must remain there and be used for alms relief. The Chest officials had a knowledge of all the endowments which the citizens had made and these must be given to the poor relief. These measures should insure that there would be enough alms relief for the poor.130

The Council was concerned because some of the chaplains in the New Hospital Church and at St. Mary's were not using the complete Lutheran service. It ordered that the practice be stopped or the chaplains would be sent from the city.131 The officials of the Common Chest

130RV 739, f. 4 r.; RB 13, f. 220 r.-220 v., January 12, 1527.

131RV 739, f. 11 v.-12 v., January 29, 1527.
received many direct orders from the Council concerning individual cases.\textsuperscript{132} They were ordered to collect the yearly forty gulden which the administrator of the Teutonic Order house had owed to the Carmelite Monastery. This money must be paid into the Common Chest.\textsuperscript{133} The Chest officials and the building master were ordered to prepare the school at the St. Lorenz Church, the cost of the school to be taken from the church's income and possessions.\textsuperscript{134} The Council decided to sell some of the possessions of the Convent of St. Katherine near the village of old Lyndelberg. The land near Schroden was to be kept and sold at a later date.\textsuperscript{135}

The Chest officials were ordered by the Council to hear the petition of the preachers of Grebern, and the loan official there, Bartel Haller, must be changed.\textsuperscript{136}
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A Carmelite brother from Augsburg must be given eleven gulden by the directors of the Chest. The monastery in Augsburg must be written requesting that this man be accepted there.  

The preacher at Heroldsberg, Blasius Stockel, must be given twelve gulden in addition to his regular salary. The Council ordered that Willibald Schwab, a priest, must be immediately given the full salary that his benefice produced in one year.

The Common Chest officials performed widely varied actions in regard to the former monastics. The Dominicans who remained in the monastery after all the possessions had been given to the Common Chest Fund should receive 400 gulden from the Chest because of the difficulties the monks found in adjusting to the secular world. The Dominicans, several months later, said they would not elect or confirm a new prior, but that they wanted to use their own church and not be forced to attend a different church.

---
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one. An Augustinian monk, who had been consorting with a whore in a whorehouse, must be given thirteen gulden of the 100 gulden which was due him. Meanwhile the Council ordered the Chest officials to say to him that he had lost its trust.

Joachim Haller was to be asked to administer the goods and possessions of the churches and monasteries within the city as part of the Chest fund. He replied to the Council that although the tasks were very difficult, he would try to fulfill the Council's expectations for a year's trial period. The Common Chest dealt with requests for aid, for administrative changes of church personnel, and building maintenance. The Chest officials had difficulties with a priest, Jorg Lochinger. On August 7, he was permitted to remain at his place at

---
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St. Mary's until a replacement could be found. The Council, on August 12, decided to allow Lochinger to remain despite Johann Schorn's petition against him. The next day Schorn complained strongly against this decision since Schorn, who was Lochinger's replacement, wanted to immediately move into the benefice house occupied by Lochinger. Schorn wanted recompense for any extra rent which he might have to pay in the interim. On September 16, the Council decided to give Lochinger fifteen gulden in part payment for the 100 gulden owed him and requested that he leave the house he was occupying. The Council was told on September 30 that Lochinger's whore said Lochinger was appealing the case. The Council, on October 5, asserted that the petition of Lochinger's whore was not valid and directed that she be so informed.

---
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The Common Chest officials were ordered to investigate exactly where to put the St. Lorenz school and were advised that the house for the schoolmaster be as inexpensive as possible. It was decided that the house of one of the priests or the office of the church would do in order to avoid a superfluous cost.\textsuperscript{152} On September 9, 1527, the Council decided to make inquiries to find out if one Talber would be a good schoolmaster and take the position. If he would not, then the Common Chest officials must look elsewhere for a schoolmaster.\textsuperscript{153}

There were a number of individual alms cases which the Council reviewed and made decisions on.\textsuperscript{154} A poor woman, whose husband was killed while working on a project at St. Lorenz, must be given six gulden from the treasury by God's will. Her husband left her with four small children.\textsuperscript{155} One Ellis Rotterdorffer was presented with
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citizenship and alms relief. An official asked the Council to assume a month's cost of medical care for a poor woman who had been hurt. The request of a weaver from Osterberg was granted. He could have alms and wear the alms badge. The alms officials were ordered to listen to the petition of the widow of Sigmund Schwambs and determine if she qualified for aid. The Council ordered that on All Saints' Day the poor should be fed venison at the cost of the Council.

1528

In 1528, after the Common Chest agency had been in operation for several years, the Council began to rely upon it and fewer items were considered directly by the Council. The salary of Sebastian Schedel as alms official was reset at 200 gulden yearly for his services. Also, he must be recompensed by the officials of the Chest, for
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the services he performed as secretary to the Common Chest for two years. 161 The Council gave him various other orders. 162

The officials of the Chest were ordered to make a loan to a person named Schopper and to carefully have a wagon sent in order to properly honor his sister's wedding. 163 One Erhart Zwickel's case was ordered brought to the Chest official's attention so they might help him by giving him the official alms badge to wear. 164 A Katherine Schenck was particularly recommended to the Chest officials by the Council as worthy of aid. 165 The Council heard the petition of Jorg Herl and Claus Lang on behalf of the son of one Bernspring and ordered the Chest officials to give him an alms badge and proper help. 166 It ordered inquiries made concerning Johan Baumgartner,
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a one-time Augustinian, as to where and how he was doing.\textsuperscript{167} The Chest officials were directed to settle many other cases for the Council.\textsuperscript{168}

The preacher at Feucht complained to the Council that he was not receiving his twenty-five gulden a year salary. The Council decided to find out whether or not the neighboring peasants could give part of the money. If this was not possible, then the village of Altdorf would pay the money.\textsuperscript{169} One Joseph Bauknecht had resigned a benefice at the Convent of St. Katherine. The Council ordered the Chest officials to hear his complaint.\textsuperscript{170}

The Common Chest officials needed more money and were directed to sell a piece of land in order to have money for poor relief. They also were asked to pay back to the treasury the 1,000 gulden which the Chest had
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borrowed. The Council decided that the endowment money from several benefices belonged in the Common Chest. Those that were unencumbered must be given to the Chest from the Treasury, but those that were doubtful should be kept separate. This benefice money was needed to help support the poor. The Council decided that the Schurstab benefice, which the son wanted returned, belonged in the Common Chest. The son should be given aid until an office became available for him in the New Hospital.

The Council ordered that the visitation of the preachers within its territory be done as indicated in the instructions. The preachers should visit the villages of Lauf, Hersbruck, and Altdorf and the others at another time. There were to be three preachers and two Council members on the visitation committee. In the city itself the visitation group consisted of the preachers, two Chest officials, and two council members. This

---
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visitation was held in common with that of the Ansbach-Brandenburg Margravate. Its purpose was to bring Lutheran uniformity in religion and it marked in part the completion of the Reformation in these two states. 175

Ursula, the widow of Johan Schwanheuser, petitioned the Council for aid and the Chest officials were ordered to inquire concerning her state. The convent members were to be told to be patient in keeping her for fourteen days. 176 The widow of Jacob Henlers, who had gone to Hungary and not into the service of the city, petitioned the Council for help. At first her request was denied. Then the Council, "doing God's will," gave her some money and said that if she needed more she could apply to the Chest officials. 177

There were many more petitions to the Council for aid which were directed to the Common Chest officials for
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settlement. A request by Contz Fritsch, the Council approved, "by God's will," and gave him alms money.

One Peter Frannis who had a wife and many children must, "by God's will," be given several gulden as an alms.

A Symon Koch must be helped by the Chest officials and given citizenship. Brigide, the daughter of Thomas Ruff, must be given eight gulden as an alms for her marriage.

The Council denied a request of one Hans Hagen of Güntersbühl and inquired what other kind of alms he wanted. It asked if he wanted to buy a rental farm and also how many children he had. The Council decided that one Els Wehin, who had served the city in the prison and had been badly burned, should receive an income from the Chest. It decided to give two gulden to the Common

---

178RV 752, f. 28 v.; RV 752, f. 28 r.; RV 752, f. w1 v.; RV 755, f. 2 v.; RV 760, f. 15 r.; RV 753, f. 16 v.
179RV 753, f. 28 r., February 19, 1528.
180RV 757, f. 22 v., June 2, 1528.
181RV 761, f. 6 v., September 8, 1528.
182RV 762, f. 12 v., October 17, 1528.
183RV 764, f. 5 r., December 3, 1528.
184RV 763, f. 16 v., November 18, 1528.
Chest instead of having the usual religious services in honor of the community's welfare. 185

The drop in the number of items concerning the Common Chest and alms relief for 1528 parallels the decrease for 1527 and 1528 in items concerning beggars. The Council set up the Common Chest and during the first several years of its existence, the Council supervised this new organization very carefully. However, authority in these matters had to be delegated or the Council would not have had enough time to devote to other matters pressing for attention. The Common Chest was organized before the religious Colloquy of March, 1525. The Chest was charged with supervising former church possessions and disbursing money for religious needs and for alms relief. The items of alms relief mentioned here are only those which came directly to the Council's attention. The Chest organization must have had many more such requests to decide on.

The Common Chest was a direct product of the Reformation even though its organization was started before the city's formal Reformation. The Common Chest took over

185 RV 763, f. 15 r., November 17, 1528.
both the New Alms Fund and its administrator, Caspar Busch. Both the Alms Ordinance of 1522, which created the New Alms Fund, and the Common Chest's evolution show strong Lutheran influences. The effect of the Reformation on alms giving as seen through the minutes of the Council can be observed as steadily increasing until the Common Chest administered most of the Council's direct charity.

Of course, the Common Chest in the first few years of existence had the task of receiving and consequently administering all the church and monastic properties. This encompassed granting and discontinuing benefices, disbursing salaries for preachers, dealing diplomatically with the problems arising from the bishop of Bamberg's complaints over his lost revenues, and the problems of the remaining monastics.

During the year 1528, the Council considered fewer items of business concerning the monasteries and the monks. It spent the first few years of the existence of the Common Chest and the New Alms of 1522 paying close attention to the work of the officials in charge. As the Council's confidence in its chosen men increased, the number of cases in its daily records concerning those agencies decreased. The Council could afford to trust its
officials' judgment.

The Common Chest was a direct product of the Reformation. However, it was also formed and modified by the practical experience of Nuremberg's governing class. Most of the cases which the Council took note of were decided in favor of the petitioner. This gives the impression that the Council expected the Chest officials to be strict while the Council was most often benevolent in these alms relief cases. The organization of the Common Chest of 1525, having incorporated some of the ideas and officials of the New Alms Fund of 1522, appeared to be settling into a stable agency by the end of 1528.

The Common Chest organization of Nuremberg was widely admired. It was written about by Johann Honterus, a Reformer of Kronstadt in a section of Hungary called Transylvania (Siebenbürgen). He published in 1543 a collection of Reformation writings including a description of the methods Nuremberg used in its Reformation. The Common Chest's organization and administration were therein carefully but briefly outlined. Thus Nuremberg not only

---

received the Reformations' influence, but its solutions to problems in poor relief influenced others.
CONCLUSION

In Nuremberg at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the governing power and responsibility was in the hands of the patricians, who were deeply involved in the commercial life of the city. They were frugal, business-like, and good managers of their fortunes. This was a beneficent oligarchy among whom the habit of establishing charitable foundations, endowments, and bequests for the benefit of the less fortunate members of the community had existed for several centuries before the Reformation. Most of these charities were established and received additional bequests as pious good works which benefitted the souls of the donors and the souls and physical well-being of the recipients. The result was that the city had acquired an extensive system of charities before 1521.

The Council had carefully obtained control over these charities by systematically placing a guardian in charge of the administration of each charity. These guardians were usually either members of the Council or
belonged to the patriciate from which the Council was formed. The guardians were held accountable for their administration of the charities. At least once a year, the accounts and finances were inspected by designated members of the Council. Thus charity in Nuremberg before the Reformation drew its financial support from private funds accumulated through endowments and bequests, but it was publicly administered under the supervision of the Council which attempted to coordinate the activities of charities and actively intervened in many particular cases to insure that the needs of the poorer citizens were provided for.

Most of these previously existing charities emerged from the Reformation with their separate identities and foundation monies intact. The Rich Alms Fund, however, continued in name but most of its functions and finances were taken over by the Common Chest. The Childbed Charity's functions also came to be more under the supervision of the Common Chest. Both the Dowry Charity and the Keipper Charity show little if any dislocation by the Reformation. With these existing charities, the Council's main interest seems to have been to avoid any duplication and inefficiency which were repugnant to these merchant
The details of these charities were dealt with meticulously by the Council. There was a rise in the number of items per year brought up in the Council's meetings during the period under consideration, 1521-1528, concerning the orphanages and the Heilig Geist Hospital. The Council gave more attention to the problems of both institutions especially regarding admissions. The Heilig Geist Hospital began to be utilized more directly for alms relief by the Council. The hospital of St. Elizabeth was under the direction of the Teutonic Knights who remained Catholic. The Council had exercised little control over this institution before the Reformation and proceeded to withdraw any support from it after the change in religions. Of the two Golden Drink endowments, the one at the Hospital of St. Elizabeth was withdrawn while the one at the Heilig Geist Hospital was continued by the Council.

The four leper houses of St. Jobst, St. Leonard, St. Peter, and St. John retained their separate endowments and guardians but the Council showed an increased interest in their management. The plague house of St. Sebastian and the Syphilitic Charity were relatively new and possessed few benefices or endowments. The Council gave
them both more money and direct attention to their administration. It took an increased responsibility for the inmates of these charities and the care that was given to them.

The two pilgrim hospices of St. Martha and of the Holy Cross continued unchanged by the Council. The hospices kept their separate identities, endowments, and their guardians appointed by the Council. With the various Homes for Elderly Women, the Council prevented any endowment house from being dissolved by heirs of the founder and also it assumed the responsibility for admissions and maintenance support for these houses. The Common Chest was ordered to aid them if necessary. Both the Mendel and the Laudauer houses for the Twelve Brothers were continued without interruption. The Council left their foundations' money and their organization under the guardians intact.

The arrangements which the Council made for the charities which had existed before the Reformation were to retain those institutions whose functions were not duplicated by the Common Chest, to withdraw any aid from the remaining Catholic institution of St. Elizabeth, and to increase the amount of control and attention devoted by
the Council to the remaining charities. The Council's records show a marked increase in items concerning their admissions, administration, and finances. The records indicate a strong growth of these charities from 1521 through 1528. Whereas the Council already possessed physical control over these institutions through the system of guardians, the Reformation caused it to assume their religious supervision as well. The Catholic mass in these foundations was replaced by an evangelical service.

The Council was definitely interested in the efficiency that centralization might bring but it did not dissolve the endowments of these existing charities; and with the exception of the Rich Alms Fund, they were not absorbed by the Common Chest. This was in spite of the fact that these institutions had received most of their endowments as pious good works benefitting the soul of the donors. The Council retained these charities intact because it already controlled them, their efficiency was proven, and the Council remained inherently conservative. The new provisions for poor relief by the Council were created to supplement the existing system, not to supplant it.
The new provisions came in two definite steps. Both the Poor Relief Ordinance of 1522 and the creation of the Common Chest in 1524-25 were produced by the Council primarily out of a response to practical necessities. The ordinance of 1522 was an attempt on the part of the Council to control begging and still provide for the legitimate needs of the city's poor. The introduction of the ordinance has a short discussion of faith and love as the motivation for almsgiving but the discussion is too general to be definitely interpreted as Catholic or Lutheran. The thrust of the ordinance itself gives the impression of the Council attempting to create a practical solution by which it could establish order and responsibility in begging and almsgiving. In light of the ordinance of 1518 discovered by Rüger,¹ which was a restatement of the ordinance of 1478, the ordinance of 1522 can probably best be described as transitional with the Council in the process of changing its rationale from Catholic to Protestant in welfare reform.

The ordinance of 1522 dealt with the immediate problems of begging and the care of the incapacitated poor.

¹Rüger, *Mittelalterliches Almosenwesen*, p. 70.
The religious influence seems secondary to practical civic concerns. The ordinance shows humanistic influence only inasmuch as the Council had assimilated those ideas to pragmatically handle provision for poor relief. Any humanist orientation appears to be subordinate to both the religious influence and practical necessity. In examining the daily actions of the Council concerning begging and poor relief, the city can be seen trying to enforce the ordinance's regulations in order to establish new methods of dealing with the problems and seems to have achieved a degree of success since the number of items concerning begging shows a decrease for the years 1523, 1524, and 1525.

The Common Chest for Nuremberg was nowhere explicitly codified into regulations. Its formation began at least six months or more before the city's formal break with Catholicism in March, 1525. The items concerning its beginning taken from the Council's records give a strong impression that the events forced the Chest's creation. The requests of the artisans and the monastics to place their monies and possessions in a Common Chest caused the Council in October, 1524, to set up such a Chest to receive
The monies and possessions.\(^2\) The Common Chest was formally organized on December 13, 1524.\(^3\) Officials were placed in charge to deal with the problems of poor relief, the salaries of the clergy, and the supervision of former church possessions.

The records of the Council reveal a process of evolution into Reformation which was somewhat unusual but in keeping with the conservatism of the Council. "Only in a couple of the imperial cities did the council pick up the impulse from the people, at the start or after a short hesitation, and then lead the Reformation quickly and directly to victory. The best-known example of this is Nuremberg. . ."\(^4\) Soon after Luther's sermons and pamphlets became available to the general public, popular pressure for reform grew in Nuremberg and the Council could not long withstand or ignore it. The government of Nuremberg itself, however, contained influential men who had

\(^2\)RV 708, f. 18 r., October 12, 1524.

\(^3\)RV 711, f. 5 v., December 13, 1524.

early and strongly taken up Luther's cause. An excellent illustration of this is "... Lazarus Spengler, the secretary of the city council of Nürnberg, who, in 1520, published his *Plea in Defense of Martin Luther* (Schutzred), ... a man who made the basic ideas of Luther fully his own and was clearly directed by them in his political plans. The relations between Nürnberg and the University of Wittenberg, which had existed since the founding of the latter, became close and intimate in these years." The municipal authorities were sensitive to the new trends but were cautious in committing the city to Protestantism.

The Council through its daily business increasingly manifested the influence of Luther's teachings that almsgiving was not in itself a good work by which merit and salvation could be achieved and that almsgiving was the duty of a Christian which arose from a Christian concern for one's neighbor. Thus charity was one's expression of faith in God and a consequent love for one's fellow man. These teachings were given a concrete expression by the

---

Council as it began to take up more of its daily sessions with the various problems of charity.

The Council's provisions for charity and poor relief must be viewed as a process of growth. This study has attempted to place the Council's actions in a context of time in order to better assess the extent of the influence of the Reformation upon Nuremberg's provisions for charitable action. The Council's items of business concerning provisions for charity show a change that occurs slowly over the span of the eight years, from 1521 through 1528, examined here. The Council proceeded with caution allowing the force of everyday necessities to shape its policies rather than an abrupt new formulation. Its primary interest was the well-being of the community and it reflected the community's desires. Nuremberg's Council, unlike those of Leisnig and Wittenberg, did not seek to impose change through legislation upon its citizens; instead it was guided by the change in the community's opinions. There was a gradual increase in the amount of time which the Council devoted in its daily agenda to provisions for the poor among its citizens. Without question, it may be said that the Reformation had an impact on the city's treatment of charity. This influence, however,
must be traced more as a gradual development rather than as a sudden transformation.
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