

# New Europe College Yearbook 2003-2004



---

ANDREI A. AVRAM  
MARIN CONSTANTIN  
SILVIA MARTON  
MARIUS OPREA  
MÁRIA PAKUCS  
BRÎNDUȘA PALADE  
DRAGOȘ PETRESCU  
CORINA IOSIF SÎRBU  
MIRUNA TĂTARU-CAZABAN  
LAURA TUȘA-ILEA

---

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

Copyright © 2005 – New Europe College

ISSN 1584-0298

NEW EUROPE COLLEGE

Str. Plantelor 21

023971 Bucharest

Romania

Tel. (+40-21) 327.00.35, Fax (+40-21) 327.07.74

E-mail: nec@nec.ro



## MÁRIA PAKUCS

Born in 1973, in Miercurea-Ciuc

Ph.D., Central European University, Budapest

Dissertation: *The Trade of Sibiu in the Sixteenth Century: The Evidence of the Town's Customs Registers*

Research assistant, "Nicolae Iorga" Institute of History, Bucharest

Research grants and travels to Germany, Belgium, France, Hungary

Participation in conferences and symposia in Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria,  
United Kingdom

Articles and studies on social and economic history of Transylvania during the  
late Middle Ages and the Early Modern times



# “GUTE ORDNUNG UND DISCIPLIN”: PATTERNS OF SOCIAL DISCIPLINE IN SIBIU (HERMANNSTADT) IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

This paper investigates the specificity of social disciplining and social control in the town of Sibiu in the Reformation era. It will discuss the strategies applied by the urban society in order to create an ideal society shaped by commonly shared civic, political, and moral values.

## **1. Definition of concepts and methodology of research**

The very notion of “social discipline” or “social control” already has some tradition in history writing. Initially, the term *Sozialdisziplinierung* was employed in 1969 by Gerhard Oestreich in his analysis of the creation and functioning of the absolutist state.<sup>1</sup> The concept has been challenged, criticized and enriched in meanings and fields of research ever since.<sup>2</sup> In a fundamental overview of the problem, Heinz Schilling acknowledged the significance of the concept for understanding the early modern society and state. The author lists an entire range of concepts (*Sozialdisziplinierung, soziale Kontrolle, Sozialregulierung, Policyordnungen*, etc.) which have been employed by social historians to address the question of early modern society’s striving to exert control and regulation over individuals and social groups.<sup>3</sup> Although in many case studies social control is understood narrowly in terms of the control and prevention of crime,<sup>4</sup> the scope of the concept in this research extends to cover the measures taken by political, ecclesiastical and other civic bodies in order to impose administrative order and bring about change in the moral values of individuals.<sup>5</sup>

“Discipline” and “Policey” were part of the political vocabulary of the sixteenth-century Sibiu authorities, as will be discussed later. The very notion of “Policey” in this period was equal to the idea of civic order which secured the preservation and maintenance of the community.<sup>6</sup> Recently, the publication of early modern *Policeyordnungen* in the German speaking world has seen some remarkable progress.<sup>7</sup> However, history writing in Romania has not reacted at all to these developments in European historiography, and this makes my analysis of social discipline in Sibiu an innovative approach in this respect. Opening a new avenue of research has the advantage of bringing to light new approaches and interpretations in social history, though the current stage of my work is still subject to further revisions and refinements.

In the specific case of Sibiu, the mechanisms of social control and social discipline will be investigated based on different norms and regulations which aimed to legitimize the right of the town authorities to exert control over its citizens, maintain civic order and create an ideal model of moral comportment. The source material for the analysis consists of:

- A. Civic norms:
  - town statutes;
  - town ordinances and sumptuary laws;
- B. Norms imposing church discipline;
- C. Corporate norms:
  - guild statutes, apprentices’ articles;
  - neighborhood articles.

These sources will be examined in order to understand how social control was exerted over the citizens of Sibiu by the various social and professional bodies. My working hypothesis is that the town ordinances, which were intended to discipline and educate the entire community of citizens, together with guild and neighborhood articles that regulated the life smaller groups of individuals, can be seen as a coherent and convergent effort by all these institutions to create an ideal society. The keystone of such an endeavor is the willingness and consensus of the targets of this social control.<sup>8</sup> Being a citizen of Sibiu required acceptance and obeisance to the rules. Social harmony and the common good was the common end for all sixteenth-century Sibiu inhabitants, which were to be obtained exclusively by behaving and living properly. The task of

providing this to the citizens was mostly assumed by the city council, and it was the embracing of the Lutheran faith which increased the authority and legitimacy of the civic authorities to do so, as will be argued throughout this study.

## **2. The historical development of Sibiu: between the medieval tradition and the early modern times**

Founded in 1160 by the mythical figure of Hermann from Nürnberg,<sup>9</sup> the town acted since its beginnings as the center of the province of Sibiu: the administrative, juridical and ecclesiastical center of all Saxon inhabited territories and different groups of colonists. Some historians believe that the hegemonic role of the town was sought from the start, and their assertions are based on the particular early topography and type of settlement employed in Sibiu. The reconstruction of the original parcel division, consisting of smaller lots of 500-1,100m<sup>2</sup>, together with the initial surface of the settlement, which was significantly larger than those found in neighboring villages, indicate that Sibiu was intended to have a somewhat different purpose than the average colonist settlements in Transylvania.<sup>10</sup> During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Sibiu strengthened its position as a capital of the Saxons in Transylvania. The town evolved into a very important manufacturing and commercial center for Transylvania. This trend was strongly and consistently promoted and supported by the new economic and defense policies of the Hungarian Kings of the fourteenth century. For Sibiu, this resulted in a number of special commercial and trading privileges. Although disputed in early twentieth-century historical writing, it has now been established that one of the major Levantine trade routes passed through Wallachia and the Saxon towns of southern Transylvania, routes which played an important role in providing Central Europe with oriental goods, especially spices. In the fourteenth and fifteenth century Sibiu remained an outpost of the Hungarian kingdom that maintained hegemony over Wallachia.

Sibiu also preserved and strengthened its leading position within the Saxon community. The continuing efforts to fortify the town had many positive consequences: the minting chamber of Transylvania was transferred to Sibiu in 1427 due to the Ottoman threat, a fact which again had crucial consequences for the economic growth of the town. The mayors of Sibiu eventually monopolized the office of the minting

chamber in the period 1444-1499, even intermittently farming out the minting of the coins.<sup>11</sup> After an almost three-century long process, in 1486 Hungarian King Matthias Corvin reinforced the privileges in the *Andreanum* (1224) and instituted at the same time the existence of the autonomous juridical and legislative unity of the Transylvanian Saxons, the Saxon University – the “Intact Unity of Saxons” as Konrad Gündisch has put it (*Sächsische Nationsuniversität, universitas Saxonum*).<sup>12</sup> It united the Seven Seats of the Saxons, the Two Seats of the Saxons, and the *Burzenland*.

Tax registers at the turn of the sixteenth century counted 1,103 tax paying household units, which enabled István Draskóczy to estimate the population of Sibiu at around 5,500 inhabitants.<sup>13</sup> In 1510, according to other opinions, Sibiu had 1,311 taxable units, that is approximately 6,500 residents<sup>14</sup> with full citizen’s rights. Around 1500 one fifth of Sibiu’s inhabitants was made up of the “inquilini”, who did not have a house. Naturally, there was also a number of non-citizens residing in town: day-laborers, journeymen, apprentices, and marginals.<sup>15</sup>

Politically, sixteenth-century Sibiu was governed by an annually elected mayor and the Small Council (*magistratus, senatus*) of 12 members (*senatores, consules*) who were also appointed yearly but usually held their seats for life. The existence of this governing body was first mentioned as early as 1292.<sup>16</sup> Up until 1541, each member of the Small Council was responsible for collecting city taxes in one of the twelve units into which Sibiu was divided. They were exempt from paying taxes for the houses which they inhabited.<sup>17</sup> However, this responsibility was withdrawn from the council members in the town statutes of 1541. Each was rewarded for his efforts with yearly wages of 80 florins.<sup>18</sup>

Political leadership of Sibiu was confined to the higher social strata of the town. Members of the Small Council and other high-ranking officials were elected from the most influential patrician families, who acquired their wealth through long-distance trade in cloth and spices. During the Middle Ages, many rich merchants from Italy and Nuremberg settled in Sibiu.<sup>19</sup>

According to Gustav Gündisch, the composition of the council in the sixteenth century reveals the balance of power in the city. In the period 1526-1555, of 60 council members 31 were merchants, 17 were artisans, 9 were handworkers, and 3 were learned<sup>20</sup> (two notaries and a physician<sup>21</sup>). The mechanisms by which council members were appointed were not

unequivocal, as they were in Nuremberg. In Sibiu, in 1521, the Small Council was “closed” through the decree of the elderly members, which listed the families entitled to participate in the dancing in the city hall.<sup>22</sup> A decision by the Sibiu council of 1550 which forbids the election of members’ relatives to the council “in order to avoid conspiracies” appears to indicate that blood affiliation did indeed play an important role in the selection.<sup>23</sup> The position of each member in the council was very well established, as indicated by the lists of senators. Ascension to a higher position was possible either by appointment to a high office (royal judge, judge of the seat, bailiff) or by the election of new members who filled the lower ranks. If a councilor was appointed to a high office outside the council he would retain his initial position on return to regular membership.<sup>24</sup> Throughout the sixteenth century, public life in Sibiu was dominated by a number of important politicians, including Mark Pemfflinger, a fervent partisan and faithful follower of the Habsburgs who played a decisive role in the Reformation, Peter Haller, an extremely rich merchant who became involved in the political turmoil in Transylvania in the middle of the sixteenth century, and Albert Huet, who modeled the evolution of the Saxon community at the end of the period.

The Great Council (*Hundertmannschaft, centumviri*) was founded in 1495.<sup>25</sup> It included members of the guilds, who had a say in the major decisions through their elderly representatives and formally approved the composition of the Small Council.<sup>26</sup> The Great Council was generally represented in the political events of the town through its eldest and most respected members. In the symbolic representation of the town’s political structure, the *Hundertmannschaft* was also referred to as the community (“Die Gemein”).<sup>27</sup>

After Transylvania became an autonomous principality under Ottoman suzerainty in 1541, several events marked the evolution of the Saxon community. One of the most important of these events was the embracing of the Lutheran faith in the middle of the sixteenth century. In 1552, the Saxon University sanctioned the Reformation book, which contained the “Kirchenordnung aller Deutschen in Siebenbürgen” that had been written by Johannes Honterus five years earlier<sup>28</sup> and decreed Lutheranism as the “national” faith of all Christians living on Saxon territory.<sup>29</sup>

In my view, this increased political and religious independence of the Transylvanian Saxons had as one of its consequences the more coherent policy of confessionalization and social discipline as applied by each community. This study focuses exclusively on Sibiu. However, published

sources, though still scarce, reveal that similar town ordinances enforcing public discipline as well as guild articles imposing rules of good behavior and proper manners were also widespread among other Transylvanian towns during the sixteenth century.<sup>30</sup>

The Saxons were one of the three political nations represented in the Transylvanian Diet, the legislative body of the principality, and therefore an active part of its political life.<sup>31</sup> They entered the new political situation with a rich tradition of protection from central authority (the former Hungarian kings) through the granting of various privileges. Protection and confirmation of these privileges was a continuous issue on the political agenda for the Saxons. Their medieval inheritance was the foundation for the political and juridical status of the Saxon nation within the principality of Transylvania.

### **3. Authority and social control in Sibiu in the sixteenth century: between order and disorder, norm and practice**

Historian Robert Scribner laid the theoretical grounds for understanding social control in sixteenth century German cities. His main assumption was that:

The aim of social control is to create a deep-rooted consensus within civil society, which leads to the acceptance of the social and political order as legitimate and purposive.<sup>32</sup>

He also distinguished four forms of social control: 1. "the exercise of coercion"; 2. "political regulations"; 3. "legitimation of the existing order"; and 4. "ideology."<sup>33</sup>

In Sibiu, the political authority and rulership was represented by the Small Council. This institution assumed the task of issuing town ordinances which required a certain behavior and civic attitude or the town citizens and proscribed punishment for disobedience. The legitimation of the central authority and the public expression of the ideology of "good order and discipline" is captured in words in the town statute of 1589, written under the supervision of one of the major figures in the whole of Saxon history, the royal judge Albert Huet. The preamble to this rather lengthy text dwells on the glorious history of the forefathers of the town, who

were able to found it and adorn it “with nothing but good order and government – *Policey*”:

By the mercy of the Almighty God the beloved ancestors of the Saxon nation obtained this Saxon land through their faithful services to kings and emperors, and built this land with towns, markets, and villages, and even fortified it with fortresses in several places, and were offered these to have in their possession for eternity, just as this town of Hermannstadt, which took its name from the chieftain Hermann, was built and adorned with nothing else but good order and government.<sup>34</sup> (My translation from German)

The good tradition was kept alive by closely watching over marriages, inheritances, and property rights, but also with attention and guards in all streets and neighborhoods, in all guilds, and in the town council. The need for good customs, order and discipline (*Gute Gewohnheit, Ordnung und Disciplin*) was necessary for the preservation of the ancient town liberties and privileges, the text continues. This necessity was recognized as well as acknowledged by the council together with the community.<sup>35</sup> Things were not changed, but brought back to the old state of things, reshaped into the right order. Innovation was made with eyes turned toward the past, to the state of the unaltered tradition.<sup>36</sup> The same unawareness of the change toward a new direction as well as the aversion toward change can be identified in the statutes of the handshoemakers and tanners guild in 1540:

For the welfare and the use of the entire land, with the will and the wise council of all Germans, we started and took to an end an order (*Ordnung*), that is a rectification (*Rechtfertigung*) of the laws of the handworkers' guilds and we removed and abolished totally all the bad and unusable statutes and agreements which have appeared from a long time ago until now, and we decided to keep unchanged the good and the useful ones...(My translation from German).<sup>37</sup>

Control over marriages, property rights, and inheritance laws was also legitimized through this statute.<sup>38</sup> “The capital of the Saxons” survived troubled years and turmoil because of the “good peace and unity”.

No quarrel, discord, disturbance, no hatred and envy of the folk, no uproar and treason led to destruction or ruin, eternal praise, honor and thanks to God.<sup>39</sup> (My translation from German)

Citizens were offered “protection and security” (*Schutz und Schirm*) by the town authorities, who made sure to punish everyone who broke the order.<sup>40</sup> This political vocabulary is very much related to sixteenth century discourse.<sup>41</sup> Other provisions of this town statute will be discussed later in this study.

The affirmation of the commonly shared values and ideals was strongly promoted through civic rituals. Public ceremonies were a feature of urban life throughout European cities, and Sibiu was no exception to the rule. The available information, however, is not as rich as the existing material for German and Italian cities<sup>42</sup> but is sufficient to demonstrate that secular, political rituals were also practiced in Sibiu.

The swearing in of officers is documented by two sources, which are different in nature and in richness of detail. The first is a short note in the town book that also contains the annual lists of the high officials. For the year 1570, the town notary notes beside the name of the royal judge Augustin Hedwig that “on the day of 8 January he was elected by his majesty John II at the Diet in Mediaș and on the day of 16 January was inaugurated and made known with honor (*honorifice inauguratus et publicatus*) in Sibiu by Mateus Nagy, the king’s man.”<sup>43</sup>

A more detailed account of this particular installation ceremony of a royal judge is given by Albert Huet in his diary. The date of 1 February 1577 marked the beginning of his impressive political career. On that day he had just been elected in eleventh position as a new council member, a position which became available after the death of two senators the previous year.<sup>44</sup> It is important to note that Huet had been chosen to be a member of the Great Council the year before.

Anno 1577 I was called to become a member of the honorable wise council and was installed on 1 February, when Georg Hecht was the Burgermeister.<sup>45</sup>

On the very same day, however, the death of the former royal judge, Augustin Hedwig, opened the way for Huet’s promotion to the highest position among the Transylvanian Saxons.

In the year 1577, on *dominica ludica*, that is on the 24<sup>th</sup> day of March, Christoff Bathori, the voyvod of Transylvania and count of the Szeklers, sent from Alba Iulia two secret councilors and high commissioners, Gergely Apaffy and Sandor Kendi, who handed over to me the office of royal judge together with a credential letter. The third day I was announced at the town hall in front of the honorable wise council and the centumvirs. Then, accompanied by the council together with the community with the town flag and the two commissioners in front of me, I walked under the flag. Then they were all my guests at five tables, when I offered the two commissioners two pairs of golden cups.<sup>46</sup> (My translation from German)

Although in 1589 the town officials proudly asserted that the town had resisted revolts and riots, just one generation earlier, a bloody episode had shaken the foundations of the community. After several difficult years of Habsburg occupation, the mayor Peter Haller and the other councilmen decided in 1556 to abandon the Habsburg party and take a pro-Ottoman position, triggering the rage of the Great Council. The unfortunate event of a huge fire in March 1556 rapidly led to chaos: many houses burnt and 81 people lost their lives. A furious crowd gathered in front of town hall to demand that the officials join them and inspect the site of the disaster. The royal judge, Johann Roth, was murdered during the events.<sup>47</sup> Hieronymus Ostermayer, the chronicler, reported with consternation that the people "did not obey the councilmen any longer and took the governing (*Regiment*) into their own hands..."<sup>48</sup>

The extreme violence and killing were severely punished by Peter Haller, who only managed to restore peace by mid April. After a thorough investigation and interviewing of eye witnesses which lasted several days at the beginning of May 1556, the leaders of the riot were punished and the murderer of Roth sentenced to death.<sup>49</sup> The cost of reconstruction for the damaged houses was paid for by the public budget.<sup>50</sup> Some guilds also contributed to help the needy.<sup>51</sup>

This crisis in the political life of Sibiu was triggered by the different political views of the Small and the Great Council. Challenges to the decision of the town senate occurred again in 1581. The *Hundertmannschaft* then succeeded in forcing the Small Council to accept their choice of mayor. The elected Burgermeister, Blasius Raw, died after only one year in the position.<sup>52</sup> The citizens then proposed Johann Wayda as candidate but the senate refused to give its consent because Wayda was not a sitting member in the Small Council.<sup>53</sup> The reaction of the outraged citizens was prompt: they gathered around the towers to protest

against the arbitrary dismissal of their candidate by the senate. The discussions that took place at the Heltauer Gate are very revealing as to the level of awareness of Sibiu's citizens of the town laws. A certain Lukas Roth spoke first:

I ask the devil about the law, who made this law? We did, and when we do not like them we make others. We are the citizens and we have the freedom, therefore we are now making Hans Wayda mayor. Whoever speaks against this, we show him our fist, don't we?<sup>54</sup> (My translation from German)

He also encouraged his fellow citizens to elect a new council if their decision was not followed. The calm was restored by the balanced speech of Michael Engler, a butcher with a good reputation in the community. After condemning Lukas Roth for his bad mouth, he turned to the laws and the rights of the Saxons, which he knew very well:

You know that I am acquainted a little with our rights, and in the letter (charter) of King Andreas it is written that "the royal judge of Sibiu should not name in an office anyone who does not live among you and the people should elect the person who seems the most suitable". And another writing about the town liberty, which is also more than one hundred years old, says that "no mayor should be mayor more than two years one after the other, every other year a new mayor should be appointed or elected, so that the council of the land and of the town and the rights are not forgotten".<sup>55</sup> (My translation from German)

Indeed, a fragment of a town statute from the end of the fifteenth century contains these exact instructions regarding the election of the town's mayor.<sup>56</sup> The knowledgeable citizen continued his speech in front of his fellow townsfolk in an extraordinarily convincing manner, building up the tension to deliver a remarkable admonition to the council:

There is nothing written about the council and so we are only respecting the law when we tell the Great Council that they should elect Hans Wayda. And we tell our brothers from the other towers, that there is no law according to which the mayor should be a council member. So we stand by our decision and when the council sees that we too know and respect the laws but will not give in, they will see in the end that they had put their bear hands into hot coal, and that no one can prove us wrong.<sup>57</sup> (My translation from German)

Eventually, Johann Wayda became the “elected” mayor of the town. Ironically, he was able to hold his position continuously between 1581 and 1585. The requirement whereby one mayor should not hold more than two terms was never brought up. In fact, in the course of the sixteenth century, other mayors ran the affairs of Sibiu for longer periods of time. Augustin Hedwig, for example, was mayor of Sibiu for nine years, from 1557 to 1565, while Simon Miles was in office between 1566 and 1576.<sup>58</sup>

What is also interesting about this episode is the extent to which certain individuals were aware of their hometown’s history and politics. It is evident that the authority of the Small Council could be challenged not just in an extreme and violent manner as in 1556, but also through debate and invocation of town rights and privileges. Power was still subject to negotiation in the sixteenth century: citizens would obey and be disciplined as long as their voice could be heard at critical moments. They had their say and opinion as to who was suitable to run the city. I have no information as to why Johann Wayda was able to win the hearts of the people but safely assume that the support he received did not go unreciprocated.

#### **4. “Institutions and instruments” of social control in Sibiu**

It is difficult to make a clear-cut distinction between these institutions and instruments in the Sibiu of the sixteenth century. The scope of the various disciplining authorities overlap each other, and as I will argue later in this study, the city council was able to obtain legitimacy not just in its overlapping with other institutions but also in taking over some of their attributions.

##### **4.1. *Town council and town ordinances***

So far I have discussed the town statute of 1589 which synthesized the ideology of “good order and discipline” in Sibiu. In the following, I will examine closely the town ordinances and the decisions of the Saxon University concerning the public behavior of community members. My main argument is that during this period, political authorities began and succeeded in taking over disciplining attributes from the former medieval corporations. Proper or improper conduct was the concern of the city

fathers or leaders of the community. Social control targeted the behavior and mores of the citizens.

In the great South-German cities of Augsburg and Nuremberg, the city councils took rapid steps after the Reformation to create order through town ordinances. In Augsburg, such an “Ains erbern rats der stat Augspurg zucht und pollicey ordnung” was printed as early as 1537.<sup>59</sup> It aimed to punish and remove from the Christian body of the city all evildoers who disobeyed the word of God, did not attend church and follow the “true Christian religion”. Church discipline became of interest to the town fathers, who dedicated the first three articles of this ordinance to these matters. Other areas of concern were, in this order, excessive drinking, nightwalking, staying in taverns after nine o’clock in the evening, playing and betting, marriage, divorce, and prostitution.<sup>60</sup> This “Discipline Ordinance”, believes Lyndal Roper, marked a crucial moment in the transfer of moral control to the civic council.<sup>61</sup>

The law published in Nürnberg in 1572, “Vernewte policeyordnung, mandata und gesetz”,<sup>62</sup> is even more elaborate than the Augsburg ordinance. Here also the blasphemous, those who disregard the word of God, are the first to be mentioned.

Sibiu’s close relations with these German towns were established centuries before. Common economic, but also political and cultural interests connected the two remote regions.<sup>63</sup> There was an interesting exchange of information of various kinds, from political events to trading opportunities. In the sixteenth century, apprentices from Nuremberg and Augsburg still spent their apprentice years in Sibiu, just as Transylvanian Saxons had the opportunity to learn their trade abroad in Germany.<sup>64</sup> When the barbers of Sibiu and Braşov decided to put down their statute in writing, the preamble to their founding letter stated a German inspiration:

We are informed with sufficient accounts and sealed letters that the barbers and surgeons in the German land (*in Teutschem Land*) have their guild statute in all towns...<sup>65</sup> (My translation from German)

Peter Haller, the political figure who dominated the public life of the Saxons and of Transylvania, came from the Haller family of Nuremberg and maintained contact with his relatives.<sup>66</sup> My argument is that Sibiu’s political leaders were informed and aware of the developments in these two cities and that this new policy of increased control of the civic

government over the body of inhabitants also appealed to them. However, I am unable to prove beyond doubt that there was a straightforward imitation by Sibiu officials of the policies applied in Nuremberg and Augsburg. Moreover, whatever happened in Sibiu happened on a much smaller scale and with less refined legal and administrative instruments.

The first town sumptuary law was issued in Sibiu in 1547 aimed at restraining immoderation and intemperance during weddings. The same ordinance was renewed in 1574, when the number of tables for guests was limited to twenty.<sup>67</sup>

The ordinance of 1565, however, marks a turning point in the city council in terms of its taking more definite steps toward controlling and disciplining its citizens. This particular town mandate regulates areas of civic life which were already under the supervision of the disciplining authorities of the neighborhood and guilds. The most important claim made encroached upon the guilds, where the council pronounced its jurisdiction in matters previously subject to the authority of the guild masters. The ordinance did not forbid celebrations; it aimed only to harness excessive feasting which would lead to unruliness:

1. In the neighborhoods, on Sundays and on other holidays, the host should not offer more than one course. On Ash Wednesday, the host offers one course and the neighborhood another course, without any banquet. And the following day they should all be quiet and content, without any further feasts and celebrations.
2. When an apprentice is appointed, the celebration on this occasion should only contain two courses and all other useless things should be forgotten. Guests should be invited only to fit one table.
3. When a master is appointed, there should be two tables of guests and no more than two courses of food.
4. Similarly, when an engagement is closed, each party should settle for two tables of guests, and 20 tables for the wedding. And no one should breach this without the approval of the honored Council, under the penalty of one florin for each extra table.<sup>68</sup>

The mirror reflection of the norm and practice can be followed with regard to this particular regulation. Although ten years had passed since this statute was issued, the 1575 wedding of Albert Huet was, according to his own description, organized in an opposite manner. After having served at the imperial court in Vienna under Ferdinand and Maximilian, Huet returned to his hometown (*Vaterland*) in 1574. The 37-year-old man

set his eyes on Margaretha, a young girl of 15 and the granddaughter of Augustin Hedwig, then royal judge of the Saxons. Huet spoke to the young maiden on 1 July, and the engagement was concluded on 2 August. The wedding celebration was postponed several times due to the death of Huet's mother and then that of his father-in-law. Eventually, the happy event took place on the Sunday of 6 February 1575. The festivity lasted for two days, and included the preparation of 50 tables for guests, spread among six houses for the first days, followed by public celebrations and games during the second day.<sup>69</sup>

It was common practice in Augsburg, for instance, for patrician or rich merchant families to apply for an exemption from the harsh wedding regulations, which, naturally, were granted to them by the council.<sup>70</sup> There is no trace in the documentary evidence of Albert Huet having made any such application, however considering his social and political status, it is quite possible he never did. His marriage to the niece of the royal judge of the Saxons was a beneficial event for the public life of the city, a great political moment which, through the rank and number of attendees, established the position of Sibiu itself within the Saxon community and its relations with the central government of Transylvania.

The second part of this 1565 town ordinance was designed to bring some order to the status of journeymen, servants, and maids. These individuals were perceived by the collective imaginary as being disruptive to social harmony, either in terms of their uncertain social and civic status, or their uncontrolled sexuality.<sup>71</sup>

The main idea behind this "Ordnung fon den taglönerns, für knechten vnnd ihrem lohn"<sup>72</sup> was to establish contractual relations between journeymen, who did not belong to a strict economic organization that could protect their interests, and employers, who were thus compelled to respect the competition on the labor market. The last article of this law addresses the slippery field of female disobedience:

Servant maids who do not want to serve pious people but go to live with widows or other townspeople and want to look after themselves should not be free of tax but should pay 2 lot for the town.<sup>73</sup>

Although the reasons behind this decision are not explicit, the motivation in obliging maids to pay taxes – which they clearly could not afford – was to force them to enter the service of married couples where they could be surveyed and controlled at the same time. Abhorrence for

the unleashed sexuality of young single females, combined with the well-known lustful conduct of widows is not surprising.<sup>74</sup> Old women of 50-60 years old who married young men were to pay a fine of 100 gold florins, which at the time, in 1577, would buy 20 kg of pepper or 25 Turkish rugs.<sup>75</sup>

The town council issued another decree during the same year that stated that people living in “wild marriages” should be married on the threshold of the church or pay a penalty of 10 florins and the bride should have her head uncovered, while the groom must walk to and from the church bare foot.<sup>76</sup>

As I argued earlier, it was the lay authorities that took it upon themselves to discipline and educate the people, invading areas of life previously belonging to the church or the guilds.

The town council was just one of the authorities concerned with the proper behavior of individuals. The University of Saxons, the common political body of all Transylvanian Germans, was also actively involved in the norm creation process. Its decisions were applied over the entire Saxon territory and were expected to be respected in towns and villages alike. Beside major deliberations over politics or finances, the University occasionally addressed more mundane but by no means less important issues. Taverns, for example, represented one of the more vexing problems for the community. By their nature, these were noisy socializing places, the sight of many games and many a scandal where drinking led to unruly behavior (*Unzucht*). The main targets of the disciplining regulations were, again, the servants and maids.

In 1551, the Saxon authorities demanded the following:

No meeting place of the servants and maids, called *Spielstuben* by the people, should be accepted in towns and villages, in order to avoid scandal. And they should not be allowed to drink late into the night.<sup>77</sup>

The issue was addressed again six years later, in 1557, this time with mentioning the fine to be paid by the deprived:

Although the taverns were oftentimes discussed and deliberated over because many vices and misconduct happen there, we decide that from now on anyone who is found in the tavern after the bell toll should be fined with one florin. The servants are allowed to meet after noon until vesper time, and they should go home after that.<sup>78</sup>

What does the reiteration of a certain norm mean in this context? Authors today acknowledge that the repetition of norms does not necessarily imply their ineffectiveness. Martin Dinges argues that in the late Middle Ages there were several grounds for such repetitiveness: the change of rulership, the actualization of an obsolete norm, the unsuccessful application of a norm, and the administrative impediments to its application in terms of disobedience.<sup>79</sup> It seems that so far taverns were a matter of “concern”<sup>80</sup> for several reasons. They were the gathering place for servants, who were disruptive and disobedient people by nature. And in taverns, servants drank and played without supervision. The uneasiness caused by the combination of all these factors is a very sixteenth-century attitude.

#### **4.2. Church discipline**

The history of Sibiu and its citizens in the sixteenth century cannot be understood without the Reformation. Embracing the Lutheran faith was a great moment of change, when all Transylvanian Saxons found in the rediscovery of the genuine “Word of God” another common pillar of their identity.<sup>81</sup> The Reformation in Transylvania was an urban phenomenon, just as everywhere in Europe. In Sibiu, the first Lutheran preachings were heard as early as 1523 and soon found adherents among merchants and citizens, as the famous letter of complaint of the Sibiu chapter to the bishop of Esztergom showed.<sup>82</sup> Once Mathias Ramser (Ramaschi) had accepted being a parishioner of Sibiu in 1536, the Reformation in Sibiu was complete. The achievement was strongly supported by several influential political figures of the town, such as Mark Pemflinger and Georg Huet.<sup>83</sup>

Without doubt, the support of the civic authorities in the success of the Reformation came with a price. One of the major outcomes of the urban Reformations of the sixteenth century was increased interference by lay government into matters previously dealt with exclusively by the church. The same shift in the balance of power and control occurred in Sibiu as well. I will discuss here two chief aspects of this: the enforcing of church discipline; and the control of church marriages by the civil institutions.<sup>84</sup>

The main agents in imposing church discipline were naturally the pastors. They were responsible for the catechization of their parishioners,

for their attending the divine service on Sundays, and for organizing annual visitations. These duties were established by the Synod of the Lutheran Church.<sup>85</sup> The Saxon University and the Synod of the Lutheran church reached an agreement to be “as one” in 1559 (*Artickel aus der Reformation, in welche die weltliche Oberkeit Deutscher Nation sampt ihren Kirchendienern eins worden sein, ein iedes theil darnach zu leben*).<sup>86</sup> The following provision permitted the authority of the civic council to play a role in supervising church discipline:

Those who contempt the ceremonies should be admonished first by the word of God. When they do not follow it and do not renounce their malice (*Bosheit*), they should be punished by the pastors and the political magistrate.<sup>87</sup>

The Saxon University took to this mission in earnest. Two years before the agreement, in 1557, the community of Saxons had already issued a decision concerning church attendance and measures to be taken against the disobedient.

Although the divine word is brought to daylight so loud and pure, the youngsters and the coarse folk despise the churches and the word of God, and laymen stay at home during the preaching or wander through the fields or in the streets, or at the market place. Wherever these will be found to neglect the sermon intentionally and without good reason, they should be placed in the cage (*Fidell*) in order to be an example (*Beybild*) to the others. And in all communities where there are no cages, they should be erected.<sup>88</sup>

The public humiliation of the sinful was also a strong instrument of discipline and punishment in Reformed Germany.<sup>89</sup> In Sibiu, stocks (*Pranger*) were erected in 1550,<sup>90</sup> and were removed from the town's main square (the Great Ring) together with the cage and the gallows pole only in the eighteenth century, when the city council transferred them upon the insistence of the Austrian authorities.<sup>91</sup>

Marriage was the second greatest concern of both the secular and religious authorities. I have already discussed the insistence of town ordinances on how wedding celebrations were supposed to be held in Sibiu. The efforts for order and good demeanor during weddings had another side to the story as well. Marriage was to be concluded in church,

and this public ceremony was to precede the private one. The view of the Lutheran clergy and council concurred in this respect. In the visitation articles drawn up for the use of the pastors in 1577, they were urged to exhort young people not to start their married life before the church ritual:

Young married people, who forgot their honor and discipline (*Zucht*) and had started their marriage in an unchristian fashion, if they repent in time, they should be brought without delay to the church to be married, the woman with her head covered, and they should be shown at the church door, so that the others learn, watch, and be aware.<sup>92</sup>

The town council also issued a law during the same year stating that people living in “wild marriages” should be married on the threshold of the church or pay a penalty of 10 florins, while the bride must have her head covered and the groom must walk to and from the church bare foot.<sup>93</sup> The aim of these rules was evident: they strived to prohibit and prevent pre-marital sexual relations, that is, improper sexual behavior.<sup>94</sup> As to good morals and proper marriage, although the aforementioned 1572 ordinance dwelled extensively on marriage and the wedding, the town council of Nuremberg prepared a new order ten years later. The text, forthrightly called a “mandate against prostitution”, serves exclusively to impose church weddings and forbid sexual intercourse before the church ceremony had taken place.<sup>95</sup> By this time, prostitution (*Hurerey*) had taken on new meanings to cover also adultery and concubinage.<sup>96</sup>

Although to my knowledge there were no moralizing books for use by household heads, as can be seen in sixteenth-century Germany,<sup>97</sup> a definition of a proper marriage was still given by the council members of Sibiu. In 1590, one former member of the council, Matthias Raw, the son of Blasius Raw, a highly respected member of the community and mayor of Sibiu between 1579 and 1580, was involved in a bitter case of divorce. The Sibiu chapter asked for references about Matthias Raw from the men who sat together in the council. The royal judge, Albert Huet, together with the mayor, the bailiff (*villicus*), and the town notary, supplied a common *Attestorialbrief*, stating that Matthias Raw had behaved properly in his office. They had heard often that Raw was unhappy with his wife and therefore admonished him, instructing him to live happily with his spouse, share the same room, table, and bed with her as was appropriate for a devoted husband.

... er sollte fridlich mit seiner hausfraw leben, wie einem fromen hauswirt zustehet, vnd mit ir in einer stuben, einem tisch vnd einem bette beinwohnen, wie einem fromen eheman zustehet.<sup>98</sup>

Apparently, the scandal cost Matthias Raw his seat in the Small Council.<sup>99</sup> His charge that his wife was always “irritating him and throwing things at him” did not weigh heavily enough. The outcome of the process is not known.<sup>100</sup>

### **4.3. Guilds**

Guilds were the economic and social backbone of the town. After the first guild statutes in 1376, which documented the existence of 19 guilds in Sibiu,<sup>101</sup> in the sixteenth century the number of guild grew to 28.<sup>102</sup>

Guilds in Sibiu, just as in western Europe at the time, had obtained the right to guide their professional and communal life according to written statutes. Their regulatory purpose was chiefly focused on issues concerning the organization of the craft: admission to the trade as an apprentice, mastership, quality of work, the conditions for buying raw materials and selling finished products, duties of the guild members, etc. However, medieval guilds also disciplined their members with regard to their behavior and social conduct.<sup>103</sup> Apart from the already mentioned 1376 charter, which in practice contains a joint statute for more guilds, during the sixteenth century the different guilds drafted their own statutes. The “honor” of the guild was to be preserved through the proper demeanor of the guild masters. These early statutes focused mainly on the duties and obligations of the masters. They were occasionally approved by the city council.

A turning point in the relationship between guilds and political authority took place in 1539-1540. During these two years, a great effort of renewal took place: the Saxon University, represented by the mayors of Sibiu, Braşov, and Bistriţa, confirmed or granted new statutes to several guilds (butchers, coat makers, rope makers, shoemakers, tailors, potters, goldsmiths).<sup>104</sup> For the sake of the “common good”,<sup>105</sup> the city fathers decided to rectify all guild statutes by removing the useless and bad articles that had been added over the years and keeping the “good and the useful” ones. All the re-formed statutes had a similar preamble, the wording of which bore a striking resemblance to the ideas of the religious

reformers of the time. However, the intentions behind granting the new (or renewed) statutes were not innocent: the town authorities took over the right to punish certain offences, which previously were dealt with by the guild masters. Offences ranged from the shoemakers buying skins to which other guilds members were entitled<sup>106</sup> to the spilling of blood and violence.<sup>107</sup> Moreover, the guilds were forbidden to modify their statutes or to act according to decisions not first brought to the attention of and granted approval by the council.<sup>108</sup>

The goldsmiths from Sibiu did not consent to the new policy imposed on them by the town authorities. Two days after the issuing of their new statute (the goldsmiths had had a written statute since 1494)<sup>109</sup> the members of the guild drafted a letter of complaint requesting the modification of certain articles. They resented the control of their work and castigation of masters who tampered with the quality of silver by the town judges.

In this article [the sixth-M.P.] it is our complaint that the magistrate should make punishment, because in the old guild letter it is written that the guild master should go around every four weeks, and whatever silver he could find that is incorrect, finished or unfinished, plated in gold or not, he should take it away and take it to the guild... This is our plea and request to you that you should let this punishment and judgment be made within our guild...<sup>110</sup>

The goldsmiths were granted another statute in 1561, but the magistrate had not given in to these requests. However, one of the articles encouraged the masters to present their grievances to the town council:

It should not be forbidden to anyone to complain or to come in front of the council with his protest or request. Whoever does this or hinders it should pay a mark of silver to the council.<sup>111</sup>

All through the sixteenth century, similar articles were put down on paper for various guilds.

My principal argument in this matter is that, just as in Augsburg, for example, there was a transfer of power and control from the guilds to the city council. In Augsburg, this was accomplished by attracting guild members into the central council.<sup>112</sup> In Sibiu, a similar trend cannot be substantiated due to the lack of reliable studies into the economic and

social life of the town during the period. What can be shown, however, is the shift of power at the level of norms. Beside the increased power in terms issuing guild regulations and punishment, using the 1565 town statute the town council also prescribed how admission to the guild should be celebrated. These particular moments in a handworker's profession (apprenticeship, mastership) were the core of every medieval guild statute. Their regulation by the central government of the town was, in my view, a political statement and an affirmation of supremacy.

The disciplining of the young boys who entered into the community of a guild had also been an attribute of the adult masters. Documentary evidence from the sixteenth century shows that an increasing number of statutes were composed for apprentices, clearly indicating a growing pressure for proper conduct (*Zucht*) and respect for honor and hierarchy. Defamation and betrayal of common values was not accepted. In 1575, for example, the association of goldsmith apprentices reached an agreement on the rules of conduct of its members:

First, whoever starts a fight and speaks badly of the other's honor, the fine is 50 pence.

Item, if someone tells what had been spoken or done between the apprentices, the fine is 25 pence.<sup>113</sup>

Moreover, the sixteenth-century guild statutes and apprentice articles put a stronger emphasis on the table manners of their members. A young apprentice was also supposed to behave properly at the common table: good manners required keeping food and wine inside and spilling them out by accident or because of drunkenness was punished in all guild statutes. The statutes of shoemakers of 1559 have, all in all, 40 articles, 12 of which deal with misbehavior and rude manners.

If one apprentice drinks or eats beyond measure and spills out the drink and the food he should be penalized with one week's pay.<sup>114</sup>

The cloth makers had gradually increasing fines for spilling and throwing up wine:

If one gushes out wine, 10 pence. If one spills the wine and cannot cover it with the palm of his hand, the fine is two pence. If he spills more, he should refill the measure.<sup>115</sup>

Excess in any of its forms, be it of drinking, eating, or verbal expression, was definitely not tolerated and was to be excised from the daily and festive life of the community.

Playing cards<sup>116</sup> or games involving gambling were allowed within certain limits. The shoemaker apprentices were punished under the following conditions in the articles already mentioned from 1559:

No apprentice should play games involving money with an other, such as stones or cards, in the church yard, in a house or in the market place; because wherever they will be caught, God forbid that they had played with only half a pence, they will be fined with half a pound of wax.<sup>117</sup>

Control over norm breakers, however, became a concern of the town council. The most comprising statute for all apprentices working in Sibiu was approved by the town mayor and the royal judge in 1581: *Pollicey und Zuchtordnung vnd straffen allerley handwerkßknechten vnd studenten auch kauffknechten ihn der Hermannstadt*. The eldest apprentice had the duty of reading these articles aloud for the others on festive occasions when they all were gathered. The first point discouraged apprentices to drink from the can and urged them to drink with a small cup or a glass in order to avoid drunkenness. Apprentices were forbidden to swear and curse, bicker, or use their fists or knives. Gaming and playing was allowed, “for reasons of pleasure”, as long as the bet did not exceed one penny. After nine o’clock in the evening they were supposed to go home quietly, without shouting and wandering in the streets: whoever was found after the curfew alone in the street “without light”, or eavesdropping under the windows was to be taken in by the night watchers to the town hall.<sup>118</sup> In my opinion, by this time the legitimacy of the town council vis-à-vis the disciplining and behavior control of Sibiu inhabitants was a *fait accompli* that went unchallenged.

The fortunate finding of an accounting register from 1593, in which the then mayor, Johann Wayda, recorded the income of the town from fines, allows us to contrast the norm with practice. Grouped under the heading “The Fines” (*Folgen die Strafen*), the entries are highly revealing: nightwalkers, quarrelsome individuals, or people playing at night were all held to account for breaking the rules. From this record, it appears that the main troublemakers were servants and apprentices, who, interestingly, are not listed by their own names, but by those of their masters. The fine issued to two tailors’ apprentices found in the street at

night was 1 florin each, whereas two other youngsters, apprentices of a barber and a founder, were to pay 2 florins each for being caught with two widows at night.<sup>119</sup> Although the town statutes and neighborhood articles do not refer to misbehavior in terms of sexual conduct, the latter entry in the record indicates that this was also an issue of concern. The shoemakers' guild decided to stipulate in its 1559 articles that any apprentice seen in the company of a "public woman" (*offenbore Frau*) should be made to pay half a pound of wax. It appears that young and inexperienced boys were more exposed and the most likely to give in to such temptations.<sup>120</sup>

#### **4.4. Neighborhoods**

The regulations discussed so far had been mostly for the control and discipline of youngsters, who were just beginning to experience and learn about adult life in many of its aspects: profession, proper conduct, and sexuality. However, the picture of social discipline in Sibiu is not complete without also investigating neighborhood statutes, which began to be put down in writing in 1563. Neighborhoods (*Nachbarschaften*), contrary to certain beliefs,<sup>121</sup> were not an institution specific to Transylvanian Saxons. They also existed and are documented in other German regions, such as Münsterland, around the city of Essen, and in cities on the Rhine valley.<sup>122</sup> The first documentary evidence of the existence of such an organization in Sibiu goes back to the end of the fifteenth century.<sup>123</sup> Neighborhoods were formed of all households on one particular street. The household fathers met once a year, on Ash Wednesday, when a common feast was celebrated and decisions were made.

These decisions of the "honored neighborhood" were to be obeyed by all its members – more specifically, grown men, the masters of their households. Naturally, most of the articles dealt with the duties of each member of the neighborhood: attending common activities, funerals, participating in the night watch, and street cleaning. However, interestingly, civility and good behavior were also matters of concern. Again, as with other ordinances and regulations, proper demeanor was itself constituted in opposition to penalized conduct. Defamation, scolding, aggressive behavioral outbursts, or the playing of games resulted in various punishments and fines. Playing cards was not entirely forbidden for grown-ups, either, as long as it took place at a table and was played together with skittles and checkers. The inventory of the *Burgergasse*

neighborhood from 1577 lists three checkerboards.<sup>124</sup> However, honor was more important than conduct. “Whoever accused someone of lying” was penalized more severely than playing cards in the aforementioned articles pertaining to the neighborhood.

The heads of neighborhood were also agents of the city council in enforcing town laws. This is an entirely opposite to the situation in Augsburg, for instance, where neighborhoods openly resisted interference and control by the town authorities.<sup>125</sup> In Sibiu, the “neighborhood fathers” were to keep an eye on and work together with the *Trabanten*, who were paid through the town budget to maintain order in the streets.<sup>126</sup>

## 5. Conclusion

This study has sought to analyze social disciplining and social control as understood and practiced in sixteenth-century Sibiu. I have argued that the city council accumulated more power over its citizens in a number of stages. Issuing town ordinances was one of the means at the council’s disposal. These norms formed part of the “reality” of the rhetoric of the authorities because they determined “Vorstellungen über das Wichtige und Richtige”, as Martin Dinges so rightly puts it.<sup>127</sup>

My hypotheses do not contradict the assumptions of Konrad Gündisch, however. On the contrary, they only serve to strengthen my opinion that upon a layer of voluntary self-disciplining a concentrated and conscious effort was made by the town council and the Saxon University to bring within their power all possible means of social control, a process which also included an overlapping and taking over of the authority and legitimacy of this control from other institutions – the church and the guilds. Moreover, the sixteenth century saw the fashioning of the “ideology” of “good order and discipline”, an ideology which infiltrated the discourse and rhetoric of all social groups.

## NOTES

- 1 Gerhard Oestreich, "Strukturprobleme des europäischen Absolutismus", in *Geist und Gestalt des frühmodernen Staates. Ausgewählte Aufsätze von Gerhard Oestreich*, ed. Brigitta Oestreich, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin, 1969, pp. 187-8.
- 2 Heinrich Richard Schmidt, "Sozialdisziplinierung? Ein Plädoyer für das Ende des Etatismus in der Konfessionalisierungsforschung", in *Historische Zeitschrift* nr. 265, 1997, pp. 639-682.
- 3 Heinz Schilling, "Profil und Perspektive einer interdisziplinären und komparatischen Disziplinierungsforschung jenseits einer Dichotomie von Gesellschafts- und Kulturgeschichte", in *Institutionen, Instrumente und Akteure sozialer Kontrolle und Disziplinierung im frühneuzeitlicher Europa*, ed. Heinz Schilling, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt a.M, 1999, esp. pp. 26-7.
- 4 See for example Eva Österbeg, Dag Linström, *Crime and Social Control in Medieval and Early Modern Swedish Towns*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Uppsala, 1988.
- 5 A similar definition of the notion in Anja Johann, *Kontrolle mit Konsens. Sozialdisziplinierung in der Reichsstadt Frankfurt am Main im 16. Jahrhundert*, Waldemar Kramer, Frankfurt a.M., 2001, p. 17.
- 6 Sixteenth-century author Melchior von Osse used the term by applying an aristotelian quotation: "politiam essem ordinem quendam inhabitancium in principando et in subjiciendo". Gerhard Oestreich, "Policey und Prudentia civilis in der barocken Gesellschaft von Stadt und Staat", in *Strukturprobleme der frühen Neuzeit. Ausgewählte Aufsätze von Gerhard Oestreich*, ed. Brigitta Oestreich, Duncker&Humblot, Berlin, 1908, pp. 366-7.
- 7 See for example the most recent volumes of *Repertorium der Policeyordnungen der Frühen Neuzeit*, gen eds. Karl Härter und Michael Stolleis, vol 4, Baden un Württemberg, ed. Achim Landwehr, Thomas Simon, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt a.M., 2001; vol. 5, Reichsstädte, ed. Henrik Halbleib, Inke Worgitzki, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt a.M., 2004.
- 8 A. Johann, *Kontrolle mit Konsens*, p. 15.
- 9 Georg Soterius, *Cibinium*, manuscript in the Bruckenthal Museum, 11.
- 10 Paul Niedermaier, "Dezvoltarea urbanistică și arhitectonică a unor orașe transilvănene din secolul al XII-lea până în secolul al XVI-lea", in *Studii de istorie a naționalităților conlocuitoare din România și a înfrățirii lor cu națiunea română. Naționalitatea germană*. vol. 1. Editura Politică, Bucharest, 1976, p. 132.
- 11 Huszár Lajos. *Az erdélyi fejedelemség pénzverése*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1995, p. 9, 23.
- 12 Konrad Gündisch. "Autonomie de stări și regionalitate în Ardealul medieval", in *Transilvania și sașii ardeleni în istoriografie. Din publicațiile Asociației de studii transilvane Heidelberg*, Hora Verlag, Sibiu, 2001, pp. 33-53.

- 13 István Draskóczy, "Az erdélyi Szászföld demográfiai helyzete a 16. század  
 elején", in *Erdélyi Múzeum* LXI, 1999, no. 1-2, p. 25, table 5.
- 14 Samuel Goldenberg, "Urbanization and Environment. The Case of Medieval  
 Towns in Transylvania", in *Urbanization and Human Environment. Social  
 and Historical Studies*, The Center for Information and Documentation in  
 Social and Political Sciences, Bucharest, 1973, p. 16.
- 15 Gustav Gündisch, "Der Hermannstädter Aufstand des Jahres 1556", in *Aus  
 Geschichte und Kultur der Siebenbürger Sachsen: ausgewählte Aufsätze  
 und Berichte*, Böhlau Verlag, Köln, 1987, pp. 213-4.
- 16 *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen*, (hereinafter:  
 UKB) vol 1, Sibiu, 1892, p. 76.
- 17 See the 1541 town statute: in Friedrich Schuler von Libloy, *Merkwürdige  
 Municipal-Constitutionen der Siebenbürger Szekler und Sachsen*, Sibiu,  
 1862, p. 71: "Mer die Herren des gantzen Radts sollen in den Häußern, so  
 sy ynne wohnen, fray syzcenn, sonder alle ander Häuser, dy sy habenn,  
 sollen sy vorczynsen nach Markczalung".
- 18 *Ibid: Die Herren, die purger, dy nach den Gnaden Gottes yerlichen erwelet  
 werden sollen von der Statt yerlichen vor yre Sorg habenn mytteynander yn  
 eyner Summa fl. 80.*
- 19 Gustav Gündisch, "Die Oberschicht Hermannstadts im Mittelalter" in  
*Zeitschrift für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde* 4, no.1, pp. 3-21.
- 20 Gustav Gündisch, "Peter Haller. Bürgermeister von Hermannstadt und  
 Sachsengraf, 1490?-1569)" in *Deutsche Forschungen im Südosten*, no. 1,  
 1944, p. 66.
- 21 National Archives Sibiu (hereinafter: NAS), Inv. 211, nr. 1.
- 22 Jackson Spielvogel, "Patricians in Dissension: A Case Study from  
 Sixteenth-century Nürnberg", in *The Social History of the Reformation*, ed.  
 Lawrence P. Buck and Jonathan W. Zophy, Ohio State University Press,  
 Columbus, 1972, p. 87.
- 23 NAS, Inv. 211, nr. 1, 149v: *Notandum quod unanimi et maturo consilio  
 senatus Cibiniensis deliberavit et conclusit a modo et in posterum sese  
 observandum quod in senatoris ordine se quempiam legere oportuerit nullus  
 quicum aliquo senatore in senatu existente affinitate sit iunctus eligi diceat  
 ne propter affinitatem privato affectui indulgentes aliqui vel partes facian vel  
 conspirationes moneant quod sepius factum esse, plurime Reipublice  
 exemplo esse possunt. Id cum maturo consilio sit decretum, huic libro  
 civitatis est insertum. Ex commissione dominorum de consilio.*
- 24 See the lists of high officials and Senate members from 1522 to 1600 in the  
 town book: NAS, Inv. 211, nr. 1 and 2.
- 25 Georg Eduard Müller, *Stühle und Distrikte als Unterteilungen der  
 Siebenbürgish-Deutschen Nationsuniversität, 1411-1876*, Böhlau, Köln,  
 1985, p. 78.

- 26 From 1522 onwards the town book contained also listed the names of the town officials. In some years, the heading mentions that the composition of the council was elected by the Great Council: *habita est electio Magistratus Cibiniensis a 100viris eiusdem Reipublicae Cibiniensis hoc modo...* See e.g. NAS, Fund "Magistratul oraşului Sibiu. Acte administrative". Inventory 211, nr. 2, 160r (1587), 168r (1588).
- 27 1541 town statute.
- 28 Georg Daniel Teutsch, *Urkundenbuch der evangelischen Landeskirche A.B. in Siebenbürgen*, vol. 1, Sibiu, 1862, p. 6 sqq.
- 29 Krista Zach, "Stände, Grundherrschaft und Konfessionalisierung in Siebenbürgen. Überlegungen zur Sozialdisziplinierung (1550-1650)", in *Konfessionalisierung in Ostmitteleuropa. Wirkungen des religiösen Wandels im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert in Staat, Gesellschaft und Kultur*, ed. Joachim Bahlcke, Arno Strohmeyer, Franz Steiner, Stuttgart, 1999, pp. 388-90. See also István György Tóth, *Old and New Faith in Hungary, Turkish Hungary, and Transylvania*, in *A Companion to the Reformation World*, ed. R. Po-chia Hsia, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 2004, pp. 214-16.
- 30 For Bistrița see Oskar Meltzl, *Über Luxus und Luxusgesetze*, Sibiu, 1870, pp. 23-4 and Friedrich Teutsch, "Aus der Zeit des sächsischen Humanismus", in *Archiv des Vereins für siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Neue Folge* (hereinafter: *Archiv*) 16, no. 2, 1881, pp. 274-77. For Cluj several town statutes are published in *Corpus statutorum Hungariae municipalium. A magyar törvényhatóságok jogszabályainak gyűjteménye*, (hereinafter: *Corpus statutorum*) vol. 1, eds. Sándor Kolozsvári, Kelemen Óvári. Budapest, 1885, pp. 256-60.
- 31 Krista Zach, "Fürst, Landtag und Stände. Die verfassungsrechtliche Frage in Siebenbürgen im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert", in *Ungarn Jahrbuch*, nr. 11, 1980-1981, pp. 63-90.
- 32 R.W. Scribner, "Social Control and the Possibility of an Urban Reformation" in *Popular Culture and popular movements in Reformation Germany*, Hambledon Press, London, 1987, p. 177.
- 33 *Ibid.*, p. 176.
- 34 *Corpus statutorum*, vol. 1, p. 542.
- 35 *Ibid.*, p. 543.
- 36 Gerald Strauss, *Law, Resistance, and the State. The Opposition to Roman Law in Reformation Germany* Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1986, p. 74.
- 37 *Handel und Gewerbe in Hermannstadt und den Sieben Stühlen (1224-1579)* (hereinafter: *Handel und Gewerbe*), ed. Monica Vlaicu et al., Hora Verlag, Sibiu, 2003, p. 338.
- 38 *Ibid.*, p. 543. Scribner, "Social Control," p. 177.
- 39 *Corpus statutorum*, vol. 1, p. 543.
- 40 *Ibid.*

- 41 Scribner, "Social Control," p. 177.
- 42 Edward Muir, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 229-68.
- 43 NAS, Inv. 211, nr. 2, 25r.
- 44 NAS, Inv. 211, nr. 2, 82r.
- 45 The diary of Albert Huet is a unique source for sixteenth century Transylvania. His notes made on the blank pages of a breviarium have already been published in various variations. See Daniel Heinrich, *Einnerungen an Albrecht Huett, aus seinem eigenhändigen Tagebuche und aus sicheren Quellen geschöpft*, Sibiu, 1847, pp. 28-31; Gustav Seivert, *Die Stadt Hermannstadt, eine historische Skizze*, Sibiu, 1869, p. 70-71; G.A. Schuller, "Zeitgeschichtliche und biographische Aufzeichnungen auf den Deck- und Titelblättern älterer Bücher", in *Korrespondenzblatt des Vereins für siebenbürgische Landeskunde* (hereinafter: *Korrespondenzblatt*) 30, no. 4-5, 1907, p. 36-38. These three editions differ slightly from each other in their reading of Huet's handwriting.
- 46 Schuller, "Zeitgeschichtliche", p. 38.
- 47 G. Gündisch, "Der Hermannstädter Aufstand", esp. pp. 217-34.
- 48 *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Brassó in Siebenbürgen*, (hereinafter: *Quellen*) vol. IV, Braşov, 1903, p. 518.
- 49 A. Scheiner, "Die Sprache des Teilschreibers Georg Dollert", in *Archiv*, 37, 1933, pp. 32-46.
- 50 NAS, Fund "Magistratul oraşului Sibiu", Inv. 197, no. 18, *Rationes consulares*, 17v: *Eodem anno (1556) in mensio Julio pro subleuacione inopia pauperum civium combustorum ex voluntate senatus et communitatis ex consistorio dati f. 300*.
- 51 Gustav Seivert, *Die Stadt Hermannstadt*, p. 47, where the author offers an excerpt from the accounting register of the tailor's guild: the masters were offered a loan of 28 gold florins and 2 measures of grain for free.
- 52 NAS, Inv. 211, no. 2, p. 97v.
- 53 Johann Wayda appears in the lists of senators for the first time in 1569 and was a regular member of the Small Council until 1577, rising from 12<sup>th</sup> position in the first year of his mandate to 6<sup>th</sup> in 1577. He reentered the council in 1586 after having been mayor of Sibiu between 1581-1585 in first position among the senators. NAS, Inv. 211, no. 2, 25r, 36r, 41r, 49r, etc.
- 54 Gustav Seivert, "Ausgestorbene Originale aus dem Siebenbürger Sachsenlande" in *Siebenbürgischer Volkskalender* 19, 1870, p. 6.
- 55 *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.
- 56 Gustav Seivert, *Hermannstädter Lokal-Sstatuten*, Sibiu, 1869, pp. 10-11.
- 57 Seivert, "Ausgestorbene Originale", p. 7.
- 58 See the lists of officials in the prothocol book of Sibiu, NAS, Inv. 211, nr. 2, passim.

- 59 Wolfgang Wüst, *Die "gute" Policey im Reichkreis. Zur frühmodernen Normensetzung in den Kernregionen des Alten Reiches*, vol. 1, *Der Schwäbische Reichkreis*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 2001, pp. 77-88.
- 60 *Ibid.*
- 61 Lyndal Roper, *The Holy Household. Women and Morals in Reformation Augsburg*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989, p. 56.
- 62 Wüst, Wolfgang, *Die "gute" Policey im Reichkreis. Zur frühmodernen Normensetzung in den Kernregionen des Alten Reiches*, vol. 2, *Der Fränkische Reichkreis*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 2003, pp. 125-166.
- 63 Ulrika M. Schwob, *Kulturelle Beziehungen zwischen Nürnberg und den Deutschen im Südosten im 14. bis 15. Jahrhundert*, München, 1969.
- 64 See the relevant exchange of letters in *Handel und Gewerbe*, pp. 380-1.
- 65 *Quellen*, vol. 9, eds. Gernot Nussbächer, Elisabeta Marin, Aldus Verlag, Braşov, 1999, pp. 382-7.
- 66 Gustav Gündisch, "Peter Haller, Bürgermeister von Hermannstadt und Sachsengraf (1500-1569)", in *Südostdeutsches Archiv*, XXXII-XXXIII, 1989-1990, pp. 5-10.
- 67 Fr. Schuler von Libloy, *Siebenbürgische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1, Sibiu, 1867, p. 133.
- 68 *Corpus statutorum*, 1, pp. 537-8.
- 69 The description of the event is given by Albert Huet himself in his diary. See Daniel Heinrich, *Erinnerungen an Albrecht Huett aus seinem eigenhändigen Tagebuche und aus sicheren Quellen geschöpft*, Sibiu, 1847, pp. 29-30.
- 70 Roper, *Holy Household*, p. 152.
- 71 Katharina Simon-Muscheid, "Kleidung, Lohn und Norm – Objekte im Beziehungsfeld zwischen Mägden, Knechten und Meisterleuten in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit", in *Norm und Praxis im Alltag des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit. Internationales Round-Table-Gespräch, Krems an der Donau, 7. Oktober 1996*, ed. Gerhard Jaritz, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997, pp. 55-74.
- 72 *Corpus statutorum*, 1, p. 539.
- 73 *Ibid.*
- 74 Roper, *Holy Household*, p. 55.
- 75 Libloy, *Rechtsgeschichte*, p. 135.
- 76 *Ibid.*, 133.
- 77 *Corpus statutorum*, I, p. 525.
- 78 *Corpus statutorum*, I, p. 531.
- 79 Martin Dinges, "Normsetzung als Praxis? Oder: Warum werden die Normen zur Sachkultur und zum Verhalten so häufig wiederholt und was bedeutet dies für den Prozess der 'Sozialdisziplinierung'?", in *Norm und Praxis im Alltag des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit. Internationales Round-Table-Gespräch, Krems an der Donau, 7. Oktober 1996*, ed. Gerhard Jaritz, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997, pp. 44-46.

- 80 Marjorie Keniston McIntosh, *Controlling misbehavior in England, 1370-1600*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, p. 8.
- 81 Krista Zach, "Toleranță religioasă și construirea stereotipurilor într-o regiune multiculturală. "Biserici populare" în Transilvania" in *Transilvania și sașii ardeleni în istoriografie. Din publicațiile Asociației de Studii Transilvane Heidelberg*, Editura hora, Sibiu, 2001, pp. 64-7, 74-5.
- 82 *Monumenta ecclesiastica tempora innovatae in Hungariae religionis illustrantia*, eds. V. Bunyitay et al., vol. 1, Budapest, 1902, pp. 258-62. See also Reinerth, Karl, *Die Gründung der evangelischen Kirchen in Siebenbürgen*, Böhlau, Köln, 1976, p. 25 sqq.
- 83 Seivert, *Die Stadt Hermannstadt*, p. 54.
- 84 Susan C. Karant-Nunn, *The reformation of ritual. An interpretation of early modern Germany*, Routledge, London, 1997, p. 32.
- 85 See for instance the *Articuli de pastorum vita et moribus* ordered in 1574 and the *Articuli quidam ad disciplinam ecclesiasticam pertinentes* from 1578: G. D. Teutsch, *Die Synodalverhandlungen der evangelischen Landeskirche A.B. in Siebenbürgen im Reformationsjahrhundert*, Sibiu, 1883, pp. 193-5, and pp. 225-7.
- 86 *Ibid*, pp. 23-5.
- 87 *Ibid*, p. 24.
- 88 *Corpus statutorum*, vol. 1, p. 535.
- 89 Karant-Nunn, *Reformation of ritual*, pp. 128-30.
- 90 Heinrich Herbert, "Der Pranger in Hermannstadt" *Korrespondenzblatt*, VII, no. 12, 1884, pp. 134-5, where the author also provides excerpts from the 1550-51 town accounting register detailing expenses incurred for the building of the stocks.
- 91 *Ibid*, 135. See also, Olga Beșliu, "Centrul istoric al Sibiului. Imagine și simbol" *Historia Urbana*, IX, no. 1-2, 2001, p. 64.
- 92 G.D. Teutsch, "Die Artikel der geistlichen und weltlichen Universität für die Generalkirchenvisitation im Jahr 1577", Abdruck aus *Statistisch Jahrbuch der evangelischen Landeskirche A.B. in Siebenbürgen*, 4 1875, p. 21.
- 93 Libloy, *Siebenbürgische Rechtsgeschichte*, p. 133.
- 94 Karant-Nunn, *Reformation of ritual*, pp. 33-42.
- 95 "Mandat wider die Hurerei" in *Die evangelische Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, ed. gen. Emil Sehling, vol. XI. Bayern: Franken, J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1961, pp. 557-8.
- 96 Roper, *Holy Household*, 130-1.
- 97 Steven Ozment, *When fathers ruled: family life in Reformation Europe*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass., 1983.
- 98 Inv. 211, nr. 2, 203r.
- 99 NAS, Inv. 211, nr. 2, 196r: to the right of his name, the notary mentions that he was released from his offices due to certain matters (*exauctoratus propter certas causas*).

- 100 Schuller, G.A., "Aus dem Innerleben Hermannstadts am Schlusse des 16.  
Jahrhunderts", in *Kalender des Siebenbürger Volksfreundes*, 1929, pp.  
133-41.
- 101 *Handel und Gewerbe*, 64-71.
- 102 G. Gündisch, "Hermannstädter Aufstand", p. 213.
- 103 Roper, *Holy Household*, p. 37.
- 104 *Handel und Gewerbe*, pp. 303-33.
- 105 The "common good" (*gemeiner Nutz*) was also an ideal of the Augsburg  
guilds: P.J. Broadhead, "Guildsmen, religious reform and the search for the  
common good: the role of the guilds in the early Reformation in Augsburg",  
in *The Historical Journal*, 39, 3, 1996, pp. 577-97.
- 106 *Handel und Gewerbe*, p. 318.
- 107 Tailors guild statute, *Handel und Gewerbe*, p. 324.
- 108 *Handel und Gewerbe*, pp. 303-33.
- 109 *Ibid*, p. 213.
- 110 *Ibid*, p. 335.
- 111 *Quellen*, vol. 9, p. 258.
- 112 Roper, *Holy Household*, p. 76.
- 113 *Handel und Gewerbe*, p. 444.
- 114 *Handel und Gewerbe*, pp. 373-76.
- 115 *Ibid.*, p. 461
- 116 An interesting finding relating to a sixteenth-century card game was made in  
Sibiu in 1906: Sigerus, Emil, "Ein altes Kartenspiel" *Korrespondenzblatt*, 30,  
no. 1, 1907, p. 9-10.
- 117 *Handel und Gewerbe*, p. 374.
- 118 Published by Franz Zimmermann, "Das Registers der Johannes-Bruderschaft  
und die Artikel der Hermannstädter Schusterzunft aus dem 16. und 17.  
Jahrhundert" *Archiv* 16, no. 2, 1881, pp. 415-16.
- 119 Kurz, Anton, "Jahresrechnung des Johann Waida, Bürgermeisters von  
Hermannstadt für das Jahr 1593" *Magazin für Geschichte, Literatur und alle  
Denk- und Merkwürdigkeiten* II no. 4, 1846, pp. 474-5.
- 120 *Handel und Gewerbe*, p. 375.
- 121 The belief that they were specific to Transylvanian Saxons is not only a  
widespread popular belief but also occurs in a number of more scholarly  
works. See Plajer, Dietmar, "Siebenbürgisch-sächsische Nachbarschaften  
vom 16. bis zum Ausgang des 19. Jahrhunderts" *Forschungen zur Volks-  
und Landeskunde* 41, no. 1-2 (1997), 176.
- 122 Münch, Paul, *Lebensformen in der frühen Neuzeit*, Propyläen, Frankfurt  
a.M., 1992, pp. 276-7. For a comprehensive publication of the Sibiu  
neighborhood articles see Franz Zimmermann, "Die Nachbarschaften in  
Hermannstadt. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Stadtverfassung  
und Verwaltung in Siebenbürgen" *Archiv*, 20, no. 1, 1885, pp. 7-202.

- <sup>123</sup> Albu, Ioan, *Inscripții der Stadt Hermannstadt aus dem Mittelalter und der frühen Neuzeit*, Hora Verlag, Sibiu 2002, p. 19.
- <sup>124</sup> Zimmermann, p. 135.
- <sup>125</sup> Hoffmann, Carl A., "Nachbarschaften als Akteure und Instrumente der sozialen Kontrolle in urbanen Gesellschaften des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts", in *Institutionen, Instrumente und Akteure sozialer Kontrolle und Disziplinierung im frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, ed. Heinz Schilling, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt a.M., 1999, p. 188.
- <sup>126</sup> *Corpus statutorum*, vol. 1, p. 545.
- <sup>127</sup> Dinges, "Normsetzung als Praxis?", p. 41.