

École Doctorale Francophone en
Sciences Sociales,
Europe Centrale et Orientale

Travaux du colloque

*Bonnes et mauvaises mœurs dans la société
roumaine d'hier et d'aujourd'hui*

5-6 mars 2004
New Europe College, Bucarest

Volume coordonné par
Ionela BĂLUȚĂ et
Constanța VINTILĂ-GHIȚULESCU

New Europe College

Éditrice : Irina Vainovski-Mihai

La publication de ce volume a été rendue possible par l'appui accordé au NEC par le Ministère Français des Affaires Etrangères - Ambassade de France en Roumanie

Copyright © 2005 – Colegiul Noua Europă

ISBN 973-7614-09-7

BEHAVIOR CONTROL IN SIBIU IN THE 16th CENTURY BETWEEN NORM AND PRACTICE

Mária PAKUCS

The goal of this paper is to identify the moral values and the behavior standards which were attached to the ideal of good order in the town of Sibiu in the sixteenth century. These can be extracted from town ordinances and regulations, church visitation articles, as well as from the statutes of various professional and communal organizations which become abundant in this period, more specifically in the second half of the century. These statutes and articles can be integrated into a coherent policy of the town authorities as well as civic corporations to shape the conduct of the community members and to punish misbehavior. The emphasis was therefore put on amending the improper gestures, actions, manners, and comportment in public. Thus, the ideal of the good behavior constitutes itself in opposition to the unruly conduct, and it was rarely described or captured into words as such. While aiming at mapping the ideal modell of good conduct in Sibiu through these various ordinances, an attempt to contrast the norm against the actual practice of punishment, as much as it is allowed by the available sources, will be made as well.

As a political capital of the Transylvanian Germans (Saxons), Sibiu had a strong medieval tradition of the organization of the urban life, with a certain degree of freedom in electing its government acquired as early as the fourteenth century.¹

Politically, the town of Sibiu in the sixteenth century was governed by an yearly elected mayor, a Small Council consisting of 12 members who were also appointed yearly but usually held their seats for life, and a Great Council (the *Hundertmannschaft*, *centumviri*) with 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. The administration of justice was in the hands of the *Stuhlsrichter*. According to tax books from the beginning of the sixteenth century, there were 1 100 taxable household units in Sibiu, a figure which allowed the approximation of the populace to around 5,500 inhabitants.²

After Transylvania became an autonomous principality under Ottoman suzerainty in 1541, several crucial events marked the evolution of the Saxon community. Embracing the Lutheran faith in the middle of the sixteenth century was one of the most important ones. In 1552, the Saxon University sanctioned the Reformation-book containing the "Kirchenordnung aller Deutschen in Siebenbürgen" written by Johannes Honterus five years earlier and decreed the

¹ G.E. MÜLLER, *Stühle und Distrikte als Unterteilungen der Siebenbürgisch-Deutschen Nationsuniversität, 1141-1876*, reprint ed., Köln, Böhlau Verlag, 1985, p. 32.

² István DRASKÓCZY, "Az erdélyi Szászföld demográfiai helyzete a 16. század elején" *Erdélyi Múzeum*, LXI, 1999, no. 1-2, p. 25, table 5.

Lutheranism as the “national” faith of all Christians living on Saxon territory.³

This increased political and religious independence of the Transylvanian Saxons had in my view among its consequences a more coherent policy of confessionalization and social discipline applied by each community. The present study focuses exclusively on Sibiu but available published sources, although still scarce, reveal that similar town ordinances enforcing public discipline as well as guild articles imposing good behavior and proper manners became also widespread among other Transylvanian towns during the sixteenth century.⁴

Social disciplining during the Early Modern period has become a well-established avenue of research in the past decades. The theoretical grounds of this concept – laid down in 1968 by Gerhard Oestreich concerning the efforts of the

³ 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 BÄHLCKE, Arno STROHMEYER, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner, 1999, p. 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, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2004, p. 214-16.

⁴ For Bistrița see Oskar MELTZL, *Über Luxus und Luxusgesetze*, Sibiu, 1870, p. 23-4 and Friedrich TEUTSCH, “Aus der Zeit des sächsischen Humanismus” in *Archiv des Vereins für siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Neue Folge* 16, 1881, no. 2, p. 274-77. For Cluj, several town statutes are published in *Corpus statutorum Hungariae municipalium. A magyar törvényhatóságok jogszabályainak gyűjteménye*, vol. 1, eds. Sándor KOLOZSVÁRI, Kelemen ÓVÁRI, Budapest, 1885, p. 256 (hereinafter: *Corpus statutorum*).

absolutist state ⁵ – have been enriched with new meanings and fields of application.⁶

The targets of the behavior control and social discipline in Sibiu were the inhabitants of town from all walks of life. Although apprentices, adolescent boys acquiring the skills of a trade, or servants and maids caused more worry for the town fathers, adult married men were also subject to learning proper conduct and to punishment.

The analysis of how the ideal of good behavior was built in Sibiu throughout the sixteenth century will be based upon the main authoritative civic, religious, and professional bodies which issued normative rules in this respect. The main values promoted by these norms were discipline (*Zucht*), moderation, the observance of hierarchies, and honor.

The city council was the principal institution to create and enforce disciplining ordinances for the entire community of citizens. Happy events in each individual's life as well as common feasts accepted by the custom were to be celebrated with temperance. The Council of Sibiu issued in 1565 an ordinance which very strictly established the allowed number of courses during festive meals and of tables during certain occasions.

1. Among 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

⁵ Gerhard OESTREICH, "Strukturprobleme des europäischen Absolutismus" in *Geist und Gestalt des frühmodernen Staates. Ausgewählte Aufsätze von Gerhard Oestreich*, ed. Brigitta OESTREICH, Berlin, Duncker & Humblot, 1969, pp. 187-8.

⁶ See for instance the collective volume of works on this topic *Institutionen, Instrumente und Akteure sozialer Kontrolle und Disziplinierung im frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, ed. Heinz SCHILLING, Frankfurt a.M., Vittorio Klostermann, 1999.

I. *Les mœurs entre prescription et contrôle social*

neighborhood an other 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.⁷

The mirror reflection of the norm and practice can be followed with regard to this particular regulation. Although ten years had past since the issuing of this statute, the 1575 wedding of Albert Huett, a high notable of Sibiu, descendant of a prestigious patrician family, was organized in an opposite manner. The festivity lasted for two days, and it included the preparation of 50 tables for guests, spread in six houses for the first day followed by public celebrations and games during the second day.⁸ However, it was a common practice in Augsburg, for instance, that patrician or rich merchant families applied for exemption from the harsh wedding regulations – which naturally were granted to them by the council.⁹ There is no

⁷ *Corpus statutorum*, 1, 537-8.

⁸ 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.

⁹ Lyndal ROPER, *The Holy Household. Women and Morals in Reformation Augsburg*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989, p. 152.

trace in documentary evidence of Albert Huet making such an application but considering his social and political status it may be that he never did make one. His marriage to the niece of the royal judge of the Saxons was a beneficial event in the public life of the city, a great political moment which, through the rank and number of the attending guests, established the position of Sibiu itself within the Saxon community and its relations to the central government of Transylvania.

The second part of this 1565 town ordinance aimed at creating order in the status of journeymen, servants, and maids. These individuals were perceived by the collective imaginaire as disruptive of the social harmony either by their uncertain social and civic status or by their uncontrolled sexuality.¹⁰

The servant maid who does not want to serve pious people but goes to live with widows or other townspeople, and want to look after themselves, they should not be free of tax but should pay 2 lot for the town.¹¹

Although the reasons for such a decision are not explicit, the motivation behind obliging maids to pay taxes – which they most definitely could not afford to do – was to force them to enter the service of married couples where they could be surveyed and controlled at the same time. The abhorrence from the unleashed sexuality of young single females combined with the well-known lustful conduct of widows is not surprising.

¹⁰ 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, p. 55-74.

¹¹ *Corpus statutorum*, 1, 539.

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 extended over the entire Saxon territory and were supposed to be respected in all towns and villages alike. Beside major deliberations concerning politics or finances, the University occasionally addressed more mundane but by no means less important issues. The taverns represented one vexatious problem for the community. By their nature, these were noisy socializing places, where games were played and scandals burst out, and drinking led to unruly behavior (*Unzucht*). The main targets of the disciplining regulations in this case, again, were the servants and maids.

In 1551, the Saxon authorities demanded as follows:

No meeting place of the servants and maids, called *Spielstuben* by the people, should be accepted in towns and villages, in order to avoid scandals. And they should not be allowed to drink late into the night.¹²

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

Although it was discussed and deliberated oftentimes over the taverns, 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.¹³

¹² *Corpus statutorum*, I, p. 525.

¹³ *Corpus statutorum*, I, p. 531.

One weighty disciplining agent for unproper conducts and disorderly behavior was the church. Although through the Reformation most of the moral supervision of the community members was transferred from the Church to the lay authorities,¹⁴ the clergy retained distinct attributions in this respect. Through sermons and by the power of example, Lutheran parsons were in charge of educating and admonishing their congregation. In the "Articles concerning the life and the mores of the pastors" (*Articuli de pastorum vita et moribus*), concluded in 1574, the synod of the Lutheran church of the Saxons decreed:

III. The life of the ministers should be pure, honorable, and accordant to the doctrine, so that they can be a model of the faithful and an example to the flock. [...] They should not be jeering or scandalous in their mores, should not dedicated themselves to luxury, drinking or other harmful vices.¹⁵

Pastors were also suggested to be modest in their clothing – an exhortation which also extended to their spouses. Any display of luxury in habit and accessories (rings on fingers, carriages) was to be avoided.

VII. The clothes of the priests should be decent and accordant to our order. The luxury in clothing should be absent, and the same we want from the wives of the priests, so that they should not expose themselves arrogantly to scandal and mockery because of frivolity.¹⁶

¹⁴ ROPER, *Holy Household*, p. 56.

¹⁵ G. D. TEUTSCH, *Die Synodalverhandlungen der evangelischen Landeskirche A.B. in Siebenbürgen im Reformationsjahrhundert*, Sibiu, 1883, p. 193.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

Moreover, pastors should not be quarrelsome or be engaged in useless disputes, and they should display the same reserved attitude and refrain from snarling in an outburst of emotions during public gatherings.¹⁷ They were totally forbidden to play cards, an indulgence of the laymen.¹⁸

As mentioned earlier, most of the disciplining attributes were undertaken by the civil authorities. Thus, the Saxon University was able to issue measures in order to secure church attendance.

Although the divine word is so loud and purely brought to daylight, 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 on purpose 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.¹⁹

The power of personal example, in a positive or negative manner, is again to be found in the sixteenth century norms. The public humiliation of the sinful was a strong instrument for discipline and punishment in Reformed Germany as well.²⁰ In Sibiu, a stocks (*Pranger*) were erected in 1550,²¹ and it

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 195.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 196.

¹⁹ *Corpus statutorum*, 1, p. 535.

²⁰ Susan C. KARANT-NUNN, *The reformation of ritual. An interpretation of early modern Germany*, London, Routledge, 1997, p. 128-30.

²¹ Heinrich HERBERT, "Der Pranger in Hermannstadt" *Korrespondenzblatt des Vereins für siebenbürgische Landeskunde*, VII, 1884, no. 12, p. 134-5, where the author also provides excerpts from the 1550-1551 town account book with expenses made with the building of the stocks.

were removed from the town's main square (the Great Ring) together with the cage the only in the eighteenth century, when the city council had to transfer it upon the instances of the Austrian authorities.²²

For the visitations, which were desirable to be performed annually but if not possible then at least once in three years,²³ pastors were given a list of tasks and advice as well as questions to be inquired. Naturally, catechization and church attendance were the main concerns but unproper, sinful lifestyles were also to be ammended. Interestingly enough, the first church visitation articles drafted for the use of the Lutheran pastors in 1577 had separate points for the clergy and for the laymen, the congregation. Together with their duty as teachers and responsables for the souls of their parishoners, the pastors were also in charge with their leading a proper life. Article XIX of the church visitation specifically addressed the issue of non-Christian marriages. Learning to behave and live properly was also stimulated by the power of example.

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.²⁴

²² Ibid, p. 135. See also Olga BEȘLIU, "Centrul istoric al Sibiului. Imagine și simbol" *Historia Urbana*, IX, 2001, no. 1-2, p. 64.

²³ TEUTSCH, *Synodalverhandlungen*, p. 194.

²⁴ G.D. TEUTSCH, "Die Artikel der geistlichen und weltlichen Universität für die Generalkirchenvisitation im Jahr 1577", in *Statistisch Jahrbuch der evangelischen Landeskirche A.B. in Siebenbürgen* 4, 1875, p. 21.

With respect to marriage, there was more involved than just the good morals. The Reformed church strived to impose church marriages, more precisely on the one hand to impose the practice and to bridle premarital sex on the other.²⁵ In the case of Sibiu, the town council also issued a law during the same year, stating that people living in “wild marriage” should be married on the threshold of the church under the penalty of 10 florins; the bride will have her head uncovered, while the groom will walk to and from the church bare foot.²⁶

The same 1577 visitation articles urged Lutheran clergymen to amend drunkenness and idleness as well as the straying of the faithful during the divine service.

Those who work on Sunday and run here and there during the preaching and the divine service, go walking in the fields or in the streets, or indulge themselves into drinking and playing cards or dice, should be put into the cage or into the asylum until they become smart and witty.²⁷

Church discipline and civic discipline were simultaneous processes which had a common end of inculcating in the individuals of the community a set of shared moral and behavioral values.

Guilds were among the most efficient social bodies that provided both the model and the control over behavior. Since medieval times, guilds were organized around common interests of the members, economical and social alike. Their statutes were put down in writing already in the fifteenth century, revealing thus that the efforts for discipline and proper

²⁵ KARANT-NUNN, *Reformation of ritual*, pp. 32-5.

²⁶ Fr. Schuler VON LIBLOY, *Siebenbürgische Rechtsgeschichte, vol. 1. Einleitung, Rechtsquellen und Staatsrecht*, Sibiu, 1867, p. 133.

²⁷ G.D. TEUTSCH, “Die Artikel”, p. 21.

behavior were not necessarily either an initiative or an innovation of the town council in the sixteenth century.²⁸ Generally, the statutes of one guild was chiefly regulating the standards of the profession: the conditions of labor hours, the quality of the final product, the strict limitation of purchase of raw materials and sale, the number of allowed apprentices, etc. Guilds, however, were also responsible for disciplining unruly behavior of their members in an attempt to preserve the collective interests and honor of the craft.²⁹ In the sixteenth century, there is an evident increase of the written statutes of various guilds in Sibiu, and more interestingly, written articles of apprentices' brotherhoods, which definitely point to a growing pressure for proper conduct and observance of honor and hierarchies. The associations of journeymen and apprentices were subject to the guild discipline. Defamation and betrayal of common values was not accepted. For instance, in 1575, the association of the goldsmith apprentices reached an agreement on the rules of conduct of its members:

First, whoever starts a fight and speak 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.³⁰

Moreover, the sixteenth century guild statutes and apprentices articles put a stronger emphasis on the table manners of their

²⁸ Konrad GÜNDISCH, "..."Natürlichen Geboten zu Gehorchen". Freiwillige Sozialdisziplinierung am Beispiel mittelalterlicher Zunftordnungen in Siebenbürgen" *Historia Urbana* VI, 1998, nr. 1-2, pp. 23-27.

²⁹ ROPER, *Holy Household*, 36-7.

³⁰ *Handel und Gewerbe in Hermannstadt und in den Sieben Stühlen 1224-1579*, ed. Monica VLAICU et al. Sibiu, hora Verlag, 2003, p. 444.

members.³¹ A young apprentice was supposed to behave properly at the common table. Good manners required keeping the food and the wine inside: spilling them out by accident or because of drunkenness was sanctioned in all the guild statutes. The statutes of the shoemakers of 1559 have all in all 40 articles, and 12 out of these 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.³²

The clothmakers had gradually increasing fines for spilling and throwing up the 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.³³

The excess in any of its forms, be it of drinking, eating, or verbal expression was definitely intolerable and needed excision from the daily or festive life of the community.

Playing cards³⁴ or bet games were allowed within certain limits. The shoemaker apprentices were sanctioned under the following conditions in the already mentioned articles from 1559:

³¹ Certainly, the defining book in this regard is Nibert ELIAS's *Civilizing Process*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

³² *Handel und Gewerbe*, pp. 373-76.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 461.

³⁴ An interesting found of a sixteenth century card game was made in Sibiu in 1906: Emil SIGERUS, "Ein altes Kartenspiel" *Korrespondenzblatt des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde* 30, 1907, no. 1, pp. 9-10.

No apprentice should play games on 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 only on half of pence, he will be fined with half a pound of wax.³⁵

The most comprising statute for all apprentices working in Sibiu was approved by the town's 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. The apprentices were forbidden to swear and curse, to bicker and to use their fists. 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 supposed to be taken by the nightwatchers to the City Hall. Gaming and playing were tolerated "for reasons of pleasure" as long as the bet did not exceed one pence.³⁶

A legitimate question can be raised with respect to the actual enforcement of these norms. A fortunate find of an account book from 1593 in which the then mayor, Johann Wayda, entered the incomes of the town on the fines enables

³⁵ *Handel und Gewerbe*, p. 374.

³⁶ Published by Franz ZIMMERMANN, "Das Registers der Johannes-Bruderschaft und die Artikel der Hermannstädter Schusterzunft aus dem 16. und 17. Jahrhundert" *Archiv des Vereins für siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Neue Folge* 16, 1881, no. 2 4, pp. 15-16.

the contrasting of the norm to the practice. Grouped under the heading of “The Fines” (*Folgen die Strafen*), the entries are more than revelatory: nightwalkers, quarrelsome individuals, or people playing at night were all held liable for breaking the rules. From this account book, it appears that the main troublemakers were servants and apprentices, who interestingly enough are not listed by their own names but with the names of their masters. The fine for two tailors’ apprentices found in the street at night was 1 florin for each of them, whereas two other youngsters, apprentices of a barber and of a founder, had to pay 2 florins each for being caught with two widows at night.³⁷ Although town statutes or neighborhood articles do not refer to misbehavior related to the sexual conduct, the latter entry in this account book prompts me to assume that this was also a matter of worry. 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 punished to pay half a pound of wax. It seems that young and inexperienced boys were more exposed and likely to give in to such temptations.³⁸

The regulations discussed so far had as subjects of control and discipline mostly youngsters, who were just beginning to experience and learn about adult life in many of its aspects: profession, proper conduct, sexuality. However, the picture of the social discipline in Sibiu cannot be complete without investigating the neighborhood statutes as well, which started to be put down in writing in 1563. Neighborhoods

³⁷ Anton KURZ, “Jahresrechnung des Johann Waida, Bürgermeisters von Hermannstadt für das Jahr 1593” *Magazin für Geschichte, Literatur und alle Denk- und Merkwürdigkeiten* II, 1846, no. 4, pp. 474-475.

³⁸ *Handel und Gewerbe*, p. 375.

(*Nachbarschaften*), contrary to certain beliefs,³⁹ were not a specific institution of the Transylvanian Saxons. They were documented in other German regions as well such as the Münsterland, around the city of Essen, or in cities on the Rhine valley.⁴⁰ The first documentary evidence about the existence of such an organization in Sibiu goes back to the end of the fifteenth century.⁴¹ Neighborhoods grouped all households of one particular street. Members met once a year, on Ashwednesday, 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-up men, 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 nightwatch, or cleaning the street. Interestingly enough, civility and good behavior were also a matter of concern. Again, just as in the case of other ordinances and regulations, the norm constitutes itself in opposition with the penalized conduct. Defamation, scolding, aggressive outbursts of comportment,

³⁹ Their being a specific of the Transylvanian Saxons is not widespread only in popular belief but can be found in certain scholarly works as well. See Dietmar PLAJER, “Siebenbürgisch-sächsische Nachbarschaften vom 16. bis zum Ausgang des 19. Jahrhunderts” *Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde* 41, 1997, no. 1-2, p. 176.

⁴⁰ Paul MÜNCH, *Lebensformen in der frühen Neuzeit*, Frankfurt a.M., Propyläen, 1992, p. 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 des Vereins für siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Neue Folge*, XX, 1885, no. 1, p. 7-202.

⁴¹ Ioan ALBU, *Inschriften der Stadt Hermannstadt aus dem Mittelalter und der frühen Neuzeit*, Sibiu, hora, 2002, p. 19.

or playing games resulted in various amounts of punishment and fine. Playing cards were not entirely forbidden for grown-ups either, as long as it happened at the table and it was played together with skittles and checkers. The inventory of the Burgergasse neighborhood from 1577 lists three checker boards among the objects in its possession.⁴² However, honor was more important than conduct. Slander (“whoever accused someone of lying”) was penalized more severely than playing cards in the already mentioned articles of the Burgerstrasse neighborhood.

The heads of the neighborhoods were agents of the city council in enforcing the town laws. This is quite opposite to the situation in Augsburg, for instance, where the neighborhoods openly resisted the interference and the control of the town authorities.⁴³

There is no traceable evidence in the written sources about a possible contestation of these consistent regulatory efforts. So far, it seems that there was a consensus within the community, vertically and horizontally alike, toward achieving a behavioral and moral model of the individuals. Compliance with the increasingly numerous limitations of good behavior in the street, at church, at work, and at home was an obligation as well as an honor. Being part of the community of the citizens of the town offered the security of belonging to a very well defined social and economic structure which in return guaranteed survival.

⁴² ZIMMERMANN, “Die Nachbarschaften,” p. 135.

⁴³ Carl A. HOFFMANN, “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, Frankfurt a.M., Vittorio Klostermann, 1999, p. 188.

The ideology of the social harmony was built around the concept of good order and discipline. The Town statute from 1589 summarizes the entire effort for norm creation and enforcement and motivates the need for such discipline. The good order helped Sibiu come through troublesome times and they will also enable the town to preserve its ancient liberties, privileges and customs.⁴⁴

As for the explanations for this new attitude toward the individual and the community, I can only offer some hypothetical answers. In Germany and in England, authors⁴⁵ who discussed similar topics found that an increasing social pressure caused by immigration or by population growth and other economic factors stimulated local communities, cities or small villages, to strive for communal order and harmony. Due to the lack of specific, in-depth studies into the economy and society of Sibiu, I cannot rule out the impact of similar factors for Sibiu, too.

However, my conjecture until now is that this new policy in Sibiu was not a spontaneous and local development but rather a result of the “enlightened” views of certain public figures of the town, such as Peter Haller and Albert Huett, who adapted their first-hand knowledge acquired abroad for their home town and fellow citizens.

⁴⁴ *Corpus statutorum*, 1, 542-44.

⁴⁵ For England the most recent research is by Marjorie KENISTON MCINTOSH, *Controlling misbehavior in England, 1370-1600*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998.